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**I. BACKGROUND**

Congress has expressed its intent that the U.S. Government (“USG”) work in cooperation with Public International Organizations (“PIOs”) and other bilateral and multilateral donors. Sections 102(b)(11), 103(b)(2), 209(c), 301(a), and 635(b) of the [Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (“FAA”)](http://inside.usaid.gov/ADS/faa.pdf) authorize the USG to work with other donor partners.[[1]](#footnote-1) This policy is also stressed in the [Presidential Policy Directive on Global Development](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/09/22/fact-sheet-us-global-development-policy), which repeatedly highlights the role of “multilateral development banks, U.N. agencies, [and] other international organizations” in U.S. development policy and the “sustainable international order” that is to be the outcome of U.S. efforts at global development. This USAID Policy Guidance on Delegated Cooperation and Responsibility Determinations Regarding Development Partners: Requirements and Resources (the “Guidance”) is intended to be used in conjunction with the policies and procedures set forth under ADS Chapter 308 (Awards to Public International Organizations) and ADS Chapter 351 (Agreements with Bilateral Donors).

**II. Practical Justifications for Donor Coordination**

Coordination among donors:

* Eases the administrative burden of the host country in managing assistance.
* Reduces duplicative efforts.
* Exploits the comparative advantages of other donors where they possess sectoral expertise/experience or strong ties/special relationships in the partner country.
* Reduces operational burden for USAID by utilizing the operational capacity of other donors in implementing/managing activity.
* May be useful when USG presence in a partner country may be unpalatable to local populations.

**III. ROLE OF THE DELEGATED COOPERATION SECRETARIAT**

In order to facilitate the Agency’s dealings with multilateral and bilateral donors, the Agency has established the Delegated Cooperation Secretariat (“DCS”) to disseminate, and be a repository for, information regarding USAID’s counterpart development partners. The DCS conducts and advises on “Responsibility Determinations” made with respect to certain donor partners. By centralizing certain functions, the DCS aims to allow more consistent and streamlined application of Agency policies toward such partners. The DCS may perform other functions in accordance with the ADS or as delegated by other Agency bureaus and offices.

**IV. DCS LEADERSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP**

In addition to the Chairperson (as determined by the members), membership in the DCS consists of senior representatives (or their alternates as approved by the membership) from the following bureaus/independent offices:

- PPL/DE

- Pillar Bureaus

- Regional Bureaus

- M/CFO

- M/OAA

- GC

- Others (as deemed necessary by the DCS)

**V. DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS**

1. Public International Organizations. A PIO is typically composed of multiple member states (i.e., sovereign countries) that contribute to such PIO’s general operating funds and agree to abide by such PIO’s “charter” or other governing document. As a result of their intergovernmental composition, PIOs are not generally subject to U.S. laws or business standards. USAID makes awards to PIOs where a PIO shares one or more common development objectives with the Agency (such as the [United Nations Development Programme](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/mdgoverview.html)). The DCS is responsible for maintaining the “[List of Public International Organizations](http://inside.usaid.gov/ADS/300/308maa.pdf)” as referenced in [ADS 308](http://inside.usaid.gov/ADS/300/308.pdf). After the Office of the General Counsel (“GC”) or the [Bureau for Food Security](http://inside.usaid.gov/BFS/) (for international agricultural research centers) determines whether an organization is a PIO for the purposes of ADS 308, the DCS includes such organization in the List of Public International Organizations and designates the PIO into one of three categories based on the Agency’s experience with the organization and a determination of the organization’s level of responsibility (see Section VI.A. below). The DCS may change PIO category designations when appropriate. Please refer to ADS 308.3.1.2 for a description of each PIO category.
2. Bilateral Donors. A “Bilateral Donor” typically refers to another country that provides development assistance to a third country (or persons or organizations within a third country), usually acting through its development agency, ministry, or department. USAID has significant experience dealing with other Bilateral Donors, usually involving USAID as the lead development agency receiving inward donations or gifts, typically from “[high-income](http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups#High_income)” nations that are original members of the [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development](http://www.oecd.org/home/0,3675,en_2649_201185_1_1_1_1_1,00.html) (“OECD”) (such as the [UK Department for International Development](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/) (DFID) and [DANIDA](http://um.dk/en/danida-en/), the development assistance arm of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs). However, in the early twenty-first century, other, non-OECD high income countries (such as [South Korea](http://www.koica.go.kr/english/main.html)) and some upper-middle-income countries (such as [Brazil](http://www.abc.gov.br/) and [India](http://www.dfa.gov.za/)), have become active in the international development arena. As a result, USAID has increased the frequency with which it provides funds to Bilateral Donors as contributing partners. For outgoing grants and contributions, the DCS will seek to provide information to Missions that aids in structuring partnerships with various types of Bilateral Donors as USAID increases its level of donor cooperation as contributors to programs managed/led by other Bilateral Donors.

**VI. RESPONSIBILITY DETERMINATIONS OF PIOs AND BILATERAL DONORS; ASSIGNMENT OF PIOs BY CATEGORY**

A Responsibility Determination is a “desk review” analysis led by the Agreement Officer with relevant subject matter support provided by the following backstops: Technical; Program; Chief Financial Office/Controller; Office of Acquisition & Assistance; GC/RLA. This analysis seeks to verify, after conducting appropriate due diligence and upon information and belief, that there exists, or does not exist, a reasonable basis to conclude that a donor partner is not sufficiently responsible to receive USAID funding. Responsibility Determinations rely primarily upon the most recent, publicly available reports, evaluations, policies, news items, or other information produced by the subject donor partner or third-party sources, including, but not limited to, the [Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network](http://www.mopanonline.org/) (“MOPAN”), the [OECD Development Co-operation Directorate – Development Assistance Committee](http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_33721_1_1_1_1_1,00.html) (“DAC”) (all such information referred to as “Relevant Information”), and the U.S. Department of State’s United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI). Where possible, Relevant Information should be dated within the last (i) five years for any initial Responsibility Determination, or (ii) two years for any subsequent update determination.[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. Public International Organizations. To determine that a PIO is responsible, a Responsibility Determination must make best efforts to consider several factors as deemed necessary and appropriate, including, without limitation, such PIO’s: past operational performance with respect to USG and other donor-funded projects; history of compliance with the terms and conditions of funding agreements; most recent audited financial statements; and applicable policies and procedures.
2. Category One PIOs: The DCS will conduct “Responsibility Determinations” for Category One PIOs on a periodic basis, in consultation with relevant bureaus within USAID and other USG agencies (such as the Government Accountability Office, USAID’s Office of the Inspector General, and the State Department’s Bureau of International Organization Affairs) as necessary. Category One PIOs may be presumed to be “responsible” for purposes of entering into delegated cooperation arrangements. The DCS may recategorize a Category One PIO as a Category Two or Category Three PIO as circumstances warrant.

The designation of a PIO as a Category One PIO does not preclude additional inquiry or investigation of a PIO’s level of responsibility as facts and circumstances merit. For example, if with respect to a proposed agreement by a USAID mission, an Operating Unit is privy to information about the PIO’s capacity or performance in that country that might adversely impact the ability of that PIO from meeting the objectives under the proposed activity, the Operating Unit may inquire as to specific issues prior to entering into an agreement and may choose to negotiate with the PIO on appropriate steps to mitigate any identified risks.

1. Category Two PIOs: Category Two PIOs are not presumed to be “responsible” and are subject to Responsibility Determinations by the relevant Operating Unit with respect to any proposed project or program.
2. Category Three PIOs: Category Three PIOs are either subject to special restrictions or award conditions or are not currently eligible for USAID funding, based on their financial or management performance or for any other reason deemed appropriate.
3. The *Responsibility Determination Template* for Category Two and Three PIOs is included as Attachment 1 to this Guidance.
4. Bilateral Donors. Information with respect to Bilateral Donors may usually be found on such Bilateral Donor’s website or that of other reputable and reliable third-party sources, such as the OECD/DAC. Responsibility Determinations of Bilateral Donors should always be sensitive to the diplomatic and political relationships that exist between the USG and friendly governments and demonstrate the appropriate levels of professional courtesy that exist between government agencies with comparable missions. Generally, any nation (i) that was an original member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the G7[[3]](#footnote-3), the European Economic Community, or (ii) that, as of the date of this writing, is a member nation of the OECD or the European Free Trade Association, may be presumed to be a “responsible” Bilateral Donor and no Responsibility Determination shall be required; provided, that the relevant Operating Unit shall not have knowledge of any deficiencies in the capacity of any such Bilateral Donor’s development agency, ministry, or organization in respect of a particular region, bureau or office, specific personnel, or any other relevant circumstances that could reasonably be expected to pose systemic or severe risk to the capacity of such Bilateral Donor’s development agency, ministry, or organization as it relates to the intended development activity. *If there is any question as to whether a Responsibility Determination should be conducted with respect to any particular Bilateral Donor, please contact the DCS at* [*dcs@usaid.gov*](mailto:dcs@usaid.gov)*.* The DCS Responsibility Determination Template for Bilateral Donors is included in Attachment 2 to this Guidance.

**VII. RESOURCES**

Donor partner information, sample documents, case studies, templates, useful web links, and other tools may be found on the [Delegated Cooperation Secretariat Sharepoint](http://spsinternal.usaid.gov/teams/DCS/default.aspx) and at the [Donor Engagement Toolkit website](http://inside.usaid.gov/PPL/offices/de/toolkit/). Questions, comments, or information relevant to Responsibility Determinations and donor partners should be forwarded to the DCS at [dcs@usaid.gov](mailto:dcs@usaid.gov).Questions or comments regarding the Toolkit may be sent to [DEToolkit@usaid.gov](mailto:DEToolkit@usaid.gov).

MEMORANDUM TO THE FILE

**SUBJECT:** Responsibility Determination for [Name of PIO] [*NOTE – THIS TEMPLATE IS INTENDED FOR OPERATING UNIT USE FOR CATEGORY TWO AND THREE PIOs*]

**FROM:** [*NAME OF AGREEMENT OFFICER*],Agreement Officer

**DATE:** [Month, Day, Year]

1. **SUMMARY**

This memo constitutes the Responsibility Determination for [*Name of PIO*] (“[XXX]”) for *“*USAID cost-type grants and project contributions under the authority of Section 308.3.2.2 of the Automated Directives System (“ADS”).

1. **LEGAL BACKGROUND**

Congress has expressed its intent that the U.S. Government (“USG”) work in cooperation with bilateral and multilateral donors. Sections 102(b)(11), 103(b)(2), 209(c), and 301(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act (“FAA”) authorize the USG to work with and make awards to international organizations.

Public International Organizations (“PIOs”) are generally international PIOs, International Agricultural Research Centers, and certain regional PIOs. [XXX] is listed as an established PIO on the “List of Public International Organizations: A Mandatory Reference for ADS 308”, or, in accordance with ADS 308.3.1.1, the Office of the General Counsel (“GC”) has otherwise determined that [XXX] is a PIO. In order for any PIO to receive USAID assistance, it must be determined to be responsible in accordance with ADS 308.3.2.2. [XXX] is a Category [Two or Three] PIO; therefore, this memo serves as the written memorialization confirming [XXX]’s responsibility.

1. **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**
2. **Description of [XXX]**

Please provide a brief description of the PIO. Consider the PIO’s history, mission, or mandate, and any significant strategic developments in recent years.

1. **USG Engagement with [XXX]**

Please provide a brief description of the PIO and its relationship to/with the USG.

1. **DETERMINATION**

As a part of its determination that [XXX] is a responsible recipient of taxpayer funds, USAID must make best efforts to consider several factors as deemed necessary and appropriate, including, without limitation, [XXX]’s: its past operational performance with respect to USG and other donor-funded projects; its history of compliance with the terms and conditions of funding agreements; its most recent audited financial statements; and its applicable policies and procedures.

[NOTE TO DRAFTER: *Responsibility determinations rely primarily upon the most recent, publicly available reports, evaluations, policies, news items, or other information produced by the subject PIO and third-party sources, including, but not limited to, the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (“MOPAN”)[[4]](#footnote-4), the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate – Development Assistance Committee (“DAC”)[[5]](#footnote-5), or the UK Department for International Development[[6]](#footnote-6) (all such information referred to herein as, “Relevant Information”). Where possible, Relevant Information should be dated within the last (i) five years for any initial responsibility determination, or (ii) two years for any subsequent update determination[[7]](#footnote-7). Any information used for a Responsibility Determination that does not meet the above time period requirements should be clearly identified.*]

In consideration of the following information, [Name of USAID Operating Unit] determines that [XXX] is a responsible organization.

1. **Role in MeetingInternational Development Objectives**
   1. *Role in International Development System*

Please briefly describe the PIO’s role in the international development system, including its strengths and qualities, not already covered in Section III(a) above.

* 1. *Role in Meeting Development Objectives of USAID*

Please briefly describe the intersection between the PIO’s role in the international development system and USAID’s development objectives.

1. **Organizational Structure, Management, and Operational Performance** 
   1. *Organizational Structure/Leadership*

Please briefly describe the PIO’s organizational structure and attach any available Relevant Information, such as the organization chart and list of board members and executive managers (with bios, if available).

* 1. *Management*

Please briefly describe any relevant evaluations of the PIO’s internal management systems and evaluation procedures and attach any available Relevant Information, such as written policies regarding procurement, human resources, compliance or ethics. If necessary, please consult with relevant internal USAID expert staff for guidance on acceptable standards (e.g., OAA, HR, GC, etc.).

Has the review uncovered any shortcomings in management policies that could reasonably be expected to pose systemic or severe risk to the PIO’s internal management capacity or professional reputation as a whole? Y N

Has the review uncovered any shortcomings in management policies that could reasonably be expected to pose severe risk to the PIO’s management capacity or professional reputation with respect to a particular sector, bureau, or office of the PIO or in respect of a particular region? Y N

If the answer to either question above is “Yes”, please provide a written explanation as an attachment to this Responsibility Determination as Exhibit IV(b)(ii).

* 1. *Performance*

*[Please briefly describe any performance evaluations or reports of [XXX]’s development projects or programs and attach any Relevant Information by [XXX], any agent of the USG (such as the USAID Office of the Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office, or report by any Congressional committee) or any third party (e.g., MOPAN, OECD/DAC, etc.). If necessary, please consult with relevant internal USAID expert staff for guidance on acceptable standards (e.g., regional bureaus, technical personnel, etc.).]*

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in project or program management or execution that could reasonably be expected to pose systemic or severe risk to the PIO’s performance or professional reputation as a whole? Y N

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in project or program management or execution that could reasonably be expected to pose severe risk to the PIO’s performance or professional reputation with respect to a particular sector, bureau, or office of the PIO or in respect of a particular region? Y N

[*If the answer to either question above is “Yes”, please provide a written explanation as an attachment to this responsibility determination as* Exhibit IV(b)(iii).]

1. **Financial Condition**

[*Please briefly describe the PIO’s financial condition and internal controls and attach any available Relevant Information, such as auditors’ reports, opinions, audited financial statements and notes. If necessary, please consult with relevant internal USAID expert staff for input on the PIO’s financial condition (e.g., CFO).*]

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in financial management or controls that could reasonably be expected to pose systemic or severe risk to the PIO’s financial condition or professional reputation as a whole? Y N

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in financial management or controls that could reasonably be expected to pose severe risk to the PIO’s financial condition or professional reputation with respect to a particular sector, bureau or office of the PIO or in respect of a particular region? Y N

[*If the answer to either question above is “Yes”, please provide a written explanation as an attachment to this Responsibility Determination as* Exhibit IV(c).]

1. **Other Information**

[*Please highlight and/or attach any other Relevant Information that should be included in a review of the PIO. Such information may include recent news items, media reports, or press releases, negative or positive, that is relevant to assessing the integrity, capacity, management, performance, or professional reputation of the PIO as a whole, in respect of a particular region or with respect to a particular sector, bureau, or office of the PIO.*]

[*Clearance page follows*.]

V. **RESPONSIBILITY DETERMINATION**

Based on the foregoing and pursuant to its authority under ADS 308.3.1.2, [*OPERATING UNIT*] has determined that [XXX] is a responsible organization for purposes of the proposed agreement.

Clearance

Date:

Date:

Date:

**ATTACHMENTS**

* Organization Chart
* List of Board Members/Executive Management
* HR, Compliance Policies, etc.
* Auditor’s Opinion
* Most Recent Audited Financial Statements
* Other Information
* Exhibits (if any)

**file memorandum**

**SUBJECT:** Responsibility Determination for [Bilateral Donor]

**FROM:** [*NAME OF AGREEMENT OFFICER*],Agreement Officer

**DATE:** [Month, Day, Year]

[***Relevant Considerations Prior to Undertaking a***

***Responsibility Determination for a Bilateral Donor***

*A “Bilateral Donor” typically refers to another country that provides development assistance to a third country (or persons or organizations within a third country), usually acting through its development agency, ministry or organization. Responsibility Determinations of Bilateral Donors should always be sensitive to the diplomatic and political relationships that exist between the USG and friendly governments and demonstrate the appropriate levels of professional courtesy that exist between government agencies with comparable missions. Generally, any nation (i) that was an original member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the G7[[8]](#footnote-8), the European Economic Community, or (ii) that, as of the draft date of this template, is a member nation of the OECD or the European Free Trade Association, may be presumed to be a “responsible” Bilateral Donor and no Responsibility Determination shall be required; provided, that the relevant Operating* *Unit shall not have knowledge of any deficiencies in the capacity of any such Bilateral Donor’s development agency, ministry, or organization in respect of a particular region, bureau or office, specific personnel, or any other relevant circumstances that could reasonably be expected to pose systemic or severe risk to the capacity of such Bilateral Donor’s development agency, ministry, or organization as it relates to the intended development activity. If an Operating Unit questions whether a Responsibility Determination should be conducted with respect to any particular Bilateral Donor, please contact the Delegated Cooperation Secretariat at* [*mailto:dcs@usaid.gov*](mailto:dcs@usaid.gov)*.* *Please delete this provision from the template prior to proceeding with any Responsibility Determination.*]

**I. SUMMARY**

This document memorializes [NAME OF OPERATING UNIT]’s determination of [Country X Development Agency] (“[XXX]”) as a responsible entity pursuant to the requirements of ADS 351.3.2.1 with respect to [Project X][[9]](#footnote-9).

**II. LEGAL BACKGROUND**

Congress has expressed its intent that the U.S. Government (“USG”) work in cooperation with bilateral and multilateral donors. Sections 102(b)(11), 103(b)(2), 209(c), and 301(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act (“FAA”) authorize the USG to work with and make awards to foreign donor organizations and agencies.

**III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

**(a) Description of [XXX]**

[*Provide a brief description of the Bilateral Donor. Include the Bilateral Donor’s history, mission, or mandate, and any significant strategic developments in recent years.*]

**(b) USG Engagement with [XXX]**

[*Provide a brief description of the Bilateral Donor and its relationship to/with the USG, including any recent history of USAID engagement with XXX.*]

1. **DETERMINATION**

As a part of its determination that [XXX] is a responsible recipient of taxpayer funds, USAID must make best efforts to consider several factors as deemed necessary and appropriate, including, without limitation, [XXX]’s: its past operational performance with respect to USG and other donor-funded projects; its history of compliance with the terms and conditions of funding agreements; its most recent audited financial statements; and its applicable policies and procedures.

[NOTE TO DRAFTER: *Responsibility determinations rely primarily upon the most recent, publicly available reports, evaluations, policies, news items, or other information produced by the subject Bilateral Donor and third-party sources, including, but not limited to, the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate – Development Assistance Committee (“DAC”)[[10]](#footnote-10) (all such information referred to herein as, “Relevant Information”). Any information used for a Responsibility Determination that does not meet the above time period requirements should be clearly identified.*]

In consideration of the following information, [Name of USAID Operating Unit] determines that [XXX] is a responsible organization.

**(a) Role in MeetingInternational Development Objectives**

* 1. *Role in International Development System*

Please briefly describe the Bilateral Donor’s role in the international development system, including its strengths and qualities, not already covered in Section III(a) above.

* 1. *Role in Meeting Development Objectives of USAID*

Please briefly describe the intersection between the Bilateral Donor’s role in the international development system and USAID’s development objectives.

**(b) Organizational Structure, Management, and Operational Performance**

(i) *Organizational Structure/Leadership*

Please briefly describe the Bilateral Donor’s organizational structure and attach any available Relevant Information, such as the organization chart and list of senior managers (with bios, if available).

(ii) *Management*

[*Please briefly describe any relevant evaluations of the Bilateral Donor’s internal management systems and evaluation procedures and attach any available Relevant Information, such as written policies regarding procurement, human resources, compliance or ethics. If necessary, please consult with relevant internal USAID expert staff for guidance on acceptable standards (e.g., OAA, HR, GC, etc.).*]

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in management policies that could reasonably be expected to pose systemic or severe risk to the Bilateral Donor’s internal management capacity or professional reputation as a whole? Y N

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in management policies that could reasonably be expected to pose severe risk to the Bilateral Donor’s management capacity or professional reputation with respect to a particular sector, bureau, or office of the Bilateral Donor or in respect of a particular region? Y N

If the answer to either question above is “Yes”, please provide a written explanation as an attachment to this Responsibility Determination as Exhibit IV(b)(ii).

* 1. *Performance*

Please briefly describe any performance evaluations or reports of [XXX]’s development projects or programs and attach any Relevant Information by [XXX], any agent of the USG (such as the USAID Office of the Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office, or report by any Congressional committee) or any third party (e.g., OECD/DAC). If necessary, please consult with relevant internal USAID expert staff for guidance on acceptable standards (e.g., regional bureaus, technical personnel, etc.).

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in project or program management or execution that could reasonably be expected to pose systemic or severe risk to the Bilateral Donor’s performance or professional reputation as a whole?

Y N

Has the Responsibility Determination uncovered any shortcomings in project or program management or execution that could reasonably be expected to pose severe risk to the Bilateral Donor’s performance or professional reputation with respect to a particular sector, bureau or office of the Bilateral Donor or in respect of a particular region? Y N

If the answer to either question above is “Yes”, please provide a written explanation as an attachment to this Responsibility Determination as Exhibit IV(b)(iii).

**(c) Financial Condition**

Please briefly describe the Bilateral Donor’s internal controls and attach any available Relevant Information, such as auditors’ reports or financial statements.

**(d) Other Information**

Please highlight and/or attach any other Relevant Information that should be included in a review of the Bilateral Donor. Such information may include recent news items, media reports, or press releases, negative or positive, that is relevant to assessing the integrity, capacity, management, performance, or professional reputation of the Bilateral Donor as a whole, in respect of a particular region or with respect to a particular sector, bureau, or office of the Bilateral Donor.

[*Clearance page follows*]

**V. DETERMINATION**

[*Responsibility determinations rely primarily upon the most recent, publicly available information produced by the subject Bilateral Donor or qualified third-party sources, such as the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate – Development Assistance Committee (“DAC”)[[11]](#footnote-11), (any such information referred to herein as, “Relevant Information”).*]

In consideration of the following information, [NAME OF USAID OPERATING

UNIT] has determined [XXX] to be a responsible Bilateral Donor with respect to [Project X].

Clearance

Date:

Date:

Date:

**ATTACHMENTS**

* Organization Chart
* List of Senior Management
* HR, Compliance Policies etc.
* Most Recent Financial Statements/Performance Reports
* Other Information
* Exhibits (if any)
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1. “Assistance efforts of the United States shall be planned and furnished to the maximum extent practicable in coordination and cooperation with assistance efforts of other countries, including the planning and implementation of programs and projects on a multilateral and multidonor basis.” FAA § 102(b)(11); “The President may make loans, advances and grants to, make and perform agreements and contracts with, or enter into other transactions with…any friendly government or government agency…in furtherance of the purposes and within the limitations of this Act.” FAA § 635(b). *See* FAA § 209(a): “The Congress recognizes that the planning and administration of development assistance by, or under the sponsorship of the United Nations, multilateral lending institutions, and other multilateral organizations may contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of that assistance through participation of other donors in the development effort, improved coordination of policies and programs, pooling of knowledge, avoidance of duplication of facilities and manpower, and greater encouragement of self-help performance.” *See also* FAA § 103(b)(2). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For example, only the most recently published quarterly financials would constitute Relevant Information. However, if a PIO’s Charter or other incorporating document has not changed in ten (10) years, such document would also be Relevant Information, as would any relevant amendments/additions to such document. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The G7 (or “Group of Seven”) is an international finance group consisting of the finance ministers from seven industrialized nations. The G7 began in 1975 as the Group of Six and included the countries of France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, and United States, and was joined by Canada the following year. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. http://www.mopanonline.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en\_2649\_33721\_1\_1\_1\_1\_1,00.html [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. http://www.dfid.gov.uk/What-we-do/Publications/ [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For example, only the most recently published quarterly financials would be relevant information. However, if a PIO’s Charter or other incorporating document has not changed in 10 years, such document would also be Relevant Information, as would any relevant amendments/additions to such document. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *The G7 (or “Group of Seven”) is an international finance group consisting of the finance ministers from seven industrialized nations. The G7 began in 1975 as the Group of Six and included the countries of France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, and United States, and was joined by Canada the following year.* [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Consider whether the Responsibility Determination is appropriately conducted for the Bilateral Donor agency as a whole, or solely in respect of a particular project. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en\_2649\_33721\_1\_1\_1\_1\_1,00.html [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en\_2649\_33721\_1\_1\_1\_1\_1,00.html [↑](#footnote-ref-11)