



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MUNICIPAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND IDP HOUSING REHABILITATION PROJECT

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN (DRAFT)

CONTRACT: AID-EDH-I-00-08-00027-00, TASK ORDER: AID-114-TO-11-00002

7 JULY 2011

This document was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Tetra Tech for the Municipal Infrastructure and IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project, Task Order number AID-114-TO-11-00002 under the USAID Architectural and Engineering (A&E IQC).



MUNICIPAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND IDP HOUSING REHABILITATION PROJECT

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN (DRAFT)

CONTRACT: AID-EDH-I-00-08-00027-00, TASK ORDER:
AID-114-TO-11-00002

7 JULY 2011

The following document was prepared by Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (<http://www.tetrattech.com>).

DISCLAIMER

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the sole responsibility of Tetra Tech EM, Inc. and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.



July 7, 2011

Mr. Bradley Carr
Water Irrigation and Infrastructure Advisor
Office of Economic Growth
US Agency for International Development
11 George Balanchine Street
Tbilisi, 0131
Georgia

Re: Performance Monitoring Plan (Draft for Discussion) for the Municipal Infrastructure and IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project.

Dear Mr. Carr:

This report is being submitted to you in accordance with the requirements of task order no. AID-114-TO-11-00002 of contract AID-EDH-I-00-08-00027-00. It provides Tetra Tech's Performance Monitoring Plan (Draft) for the Municipal Infrastructure and IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project.

If you require a bound/color printed copy, please let me know.

We look forward to your review and welcome your comments and suggestions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Jeffrey W. Fredericks'.

Jeffrey W. Fredericks, P.E., PhD
Chief of Party
Tetra Tech, Inc.
USAID/ Caucasus – Municipal Infrastructure and IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project (GMIP)
10th Floor, 154 Aghmashenebeli Ave.
Tbilisi, 0102, Georgia
Tel: +995322910401, Fax: +995322910401
Email: Jeff.Fredericks@tetrattech.com

CC: USAID (George Kokochashvili); MDF (Kartlos Gviniashvili); Tetra Tech (Firouz Rooyani, Dean White, Tom Chicca, Illia Elovshvili)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
Acronyms	ii
1. Introduction and Program Overview	3
1.1 Authorization	3
1.2 Purpose Of Report	3
1.3 Background	3
1.4 Project Objectives	3
1.5 Project Components	4
2. Main Elements of the Performance Monitoring Plan	5
2.1 Usaid Results Framework	5
2.2 Pmp Objectives	5
2.3 Evaluation Plan Framework	5
2.4 Project Tasks	10
2.5 PMP Indicators	17

Table of Tables

Table 1 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Framework.....	7
Table 2 Project Implementation Plan	12
Table 3 Project Performance Indicator Table	19
Table 4 Performance Indicator Worksheet.....	21

ACRONYMS

CCN	Cooperating Country National
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	USAID Contracts Office
COP	Chief Of Party
DCOP	Deputy Chief Of Party
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
EA	Environmental Assessment
EC	European Commission
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPI	Economic Prosperity Initiative USAID Project
ESS	Environmental Scoping Statement
GEL	Georgian Lari
Geo	Geo Ltd
GMIP	Municipal Infrastructure And IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project (the project)
GoG	Government of Georgia
HO	Home Office
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
IL	Implementing Letters
Kav	Kavgiprotransi-Mg Ltd
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (German International Development Banking Agency)
LTTA	Long Term Technical Assistance
MDF	Municipal Development Fund
MoLHSA	Ministry of Labor Health and Social Affairs
MoRDI	Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure
MRA	Ministry of Refugee Affairs
MRDI	Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure
NEO	New Economic Opportunities (USAID Project)
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NTP	Notification to Proceed
PE	Licensed Professional Engineer
PEA	Programmatic Environmental Assessment
PMC	Project Management Committee
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Corporation Agency
SOW	Scope of Work
STTA	Short Term Technical Assistance
TBD	To Be Determined
TOCOTR	USAID Task Order Cognizant Technical Officer
Tt	Tetra Tech EM Inc
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNTC	United Nations Treaty Commission
USAID	United States Agency For International Development
USG	U.S. Government
WB	World Bank

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROGRAM OVERVIEW

I.1 AUTHORIZATION

Under the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/ Caucasus – Municipal Infrastructure and IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project (GMIP) Contract No. AID-EDH-I-00-08-00027-00 Order No: AID-114-TO-I 1-00002, Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Tt) is responsible for providing support to monitor current processes and practices, identify and mitigate areas of risk, and carry out oversight and quality control efforts to ensure that selected municipal and Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) infrastructure projects are implemented effectively and in accordance with U.S. and Georgian standards and regulations.

The period of performance for the contract is May 23, 2011– November 22, 2013.

I.2 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present the GMIP Draft Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP). The purpose of the PMP is to identify the start date of each task and the expected completion date. Critical path timelines with milestones will be established identifying relevant sub-activities needed to achieve successful completion. The PMP will report progress against USAID established indicators over the life of the activity – these indicators have been provided to Tt by USAID.

I.3 BACKGROUND

The dual shocks of Georgia's August 2008 conflict with Russia and the global economic downturn pose serious challenges to Georgia's economic stability. This in turn puts pressures on Georgia's political stability. The conflict, crisis, and subsequent slowdown in economic growth and foreign direct investment have placed a severe strain on Georgia's national budget and its ability to finance core investments in critical regional development initiatives. Many years of decline in the quality, coverage and maintenance of basic services, including water supply, sewage, local roads, solid waste services, and irrigation systems have dramatically reduced Georgia's quality of life in rural areas and constrained private sector growth. Such degradation and instances of conflict-related damage have resulted in significant constraints to the productive capacity and quality of life of thousands of Georgians, including old and new IDPs, rural poor, and persons directly or indirectly affected by the 2008 conflict with Russia.

I.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The major purpose of this project is to improve the infrastructure in five selected municipalities - Dusheti, Mtsketa, Gori, Kareli, and Oni, affected during Russian Georgian conflict in 2008 and improve living standards for nearly 4,000 houses constructed by the GoG without running water or sewer systems for IDPs from the August 2008 conflict, to provide each house with a shower, sink, toilet, water taps and other renovation as necessary. The funds will also be used to upgrade existing IDP shelters and redevelop buildings for use as durable housing for IDPs from previous conflicts. Funding will also support various other activities focused on ensuring overall sustainability of IDP housing.

Activities performed under this task order will complement and reinforce the activities, project management, and engineering expertise of USAID/Georgia and its implementing partners. From

2010 to 2013, USAID/Georgia will undertake works in the infrastructure sector in collaboration with the GoG's Municipal Development Fund (MDF) to upgrade municipal infrastructure in targeted municipalities, to install and extend irrigation channels, and to upgrade IDP housing. Municipal infrastructure and irrigation rehabilitation will be implemented through an agreement with the MDF, and the IDP housing will be implemented through a separate agreement with this same agency. It will be expected to form a close working relationship with the MDF in the implementation of both projects, accompanying the MDF in all phases of the project and providing monitoring and oversight services to the MDF and USAID. The purpose of this award is to monitor current processes and practices, identify and mitigate areas of risk, and carry out oversight and quality control efforts to ensure that selected infrastructure projects are implemented effectively and in accordance with U.S. and Georgian standards and regulations. Efforts will not duplicate work that MDF does or might perform under its agreement with USAID. The monitoring and oversight role will encompass all areas of project intervention, from procurement planning to final acceptance. It will help to ensure that infrastructure deliverables are effective, efficient, and sustainable and that implementation is carried out within allowable budgets, time restraints, and within accepted quality standards.

1.5 PROJECT COMPONENTS

The project includes three major components and two subcomponents:

1. Component 1: Municipal Infrastructure
2. Component 2: Rehabilitation Of Irrigation Infrastructure
3. Component 3: IDP Durable Housing
 - Subcomponent 1: Provide Water And Sanitation Upgrades For IDP Cottage Housing For IDPS From The August 2008 Conflict
 - Subcomponent 2: Provide Durable Housing Solutions For IDP From 1990s Conflict

2. MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

2.1 USAID RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The results framework is prepared by USAID. USAID organizes its projects under Strategic Objectives (SOs) for management purposes. In this framework, under each SO are Intermediate Results (IRs) and under these are Sub-Intermediate Results (SIRs). These three levels act as a nested hierarchy of objectives guiding USAID projects. The Performance Monitoring Plan is structured to evaluate and monitor a project to ensure it meets the USAID SO & IRs.

2.2 PMP OBJECTIVES

In preparing the PMP, Tt considered several objectives. As described by Bamberg and Eleanor (1983) an evaluation and monitoring system should be effective in providing constant feedback on the extent to which the projects are achieving their goals by:

- **Identifying potential problems** at an early stage and propose possible solutions.
- **Monitoring the accessibility of the project** to all sectors of the target population.
- **Monitoring the efficiency** with which the different components of the project are being implemented and suggest improvements.
- **Evaluating extent** to which the project is able to achieve its general objectives.
- **Providing guidelines** for the planning of future projects.
- **Improving project design.** Use of project design tools such as the log frame (logical framework) results in systematic selection of indicators for monitoring project performance. The process of selecting indicators for monitoring is a test of the soundness of project objectives and can lead to improvements in project design.
- **Incorporating views of stakeholders.** Objectives should be set and indicators selected in consultation with stakeholders, so that objectives and targets are jointly “owned”. The emergence of recorded benefits early on helps reinforce ownership, and early warning of emerging problems allows action to be taken before costs rise.
- **Showing the need for mid-course corrections.** A reliable flow of information during implementation enables managers to keep track of progress and adjust operations to take account of experience.

2.3 EVALUATION PLAN FRAMEWORK

Tt will ensure that the program is implemented fully in line with USAID requirements. To the extent deficiencies are identified, Tt will provide immediate technical assistance to remedy:

- Non-compliance with USAID tendering requirements as defined by USAID
- Transparency and adequacy of evaluation process
- Evidence of adequate competition (see below) Tt will be responsible for evaluation and reporting to USAID based on review of the tenders, bids/proposals received, and evaluation committee discussions. Integrity of the procurement process is assured for the program To protect against any procurement abuse, such as bid-rigging or collusion
- Evidence of adequate competition (number of bids, costing information, history of bidders) Tt will be responsible for evaluation and reporting to USAID, presuming that Tt will have access to all tender materials, bids/proposals and evaluation committee discussions. Projects are implemented in accordance with expected budget To protect

against project and program budget overruns except as warranted due to changed conditions

- % actual versus planned expenditure, followed by an analysis of the reasons for variance Tt will rely on information provided by the MDF and contractor submissions. Projects are implemented in line with expected timeframe To ensure that the benefits of the projects are able to be captured in the timeframe expected, or ahead of schedule, as well as to protect against time-delay related budget overruns
- % actual versus planned, followed by an analysis of the reasons for variance Tt will rely on information provided by the MDF and contractor submissions. Project beneficiaries are not adversely impacted by project construction/rehabilitation activities. This program will involve extensive rehabilitation and construction related activities that can impact beneficiaries and others. It is important to strive to limit this potentially adverse impact to as short a period as practical and cost efficient).
- Complaints from program beneficiaries and other parties
- Extent to which project timing is achieved (% actual vs planned)

Each project component and sub-component should have its own objectives for evaluation. For irrigation this could be the amount of agricultural land brought into productive purposes, amount of agricultural output achieved; for municipal water projects, the water quality improvement and availability of water supply; for IDP housing, the extent to which sanitary and living conditions improve for residents, the amount of housing fit for long-term habitation, and/or beneficiary satisfaction. These objectives will be defined for each project and will then be evaluated post implementation to evaluate the extent to which specific project objectives were met, the reasons for any variances and the implications for other project designs. The evaluation metrics will have to be defined for each project based on project specific objectives. This will also include how the metric will be derived (e.g., identify the source for the information required to evaluate the objective). Tt will design an evaluation approach on a project specific basis and in consultation with USAID and MDF.

Given the variety of infrastructure projects and sites potentially associated with this program, and in line with the objectives, it is suggested that a standard project management monitoring and evaluation software system be introduced. It is recommended that the system be implemented and used by USAID, MDF, Tt, and all contractors. The system could be continuously updated and would readily provide the necessary evaluation and monitoring status of key program activities for reporting use by all parties.

For evaluation purposes, the following table indicates the key metrics that will be monitored and provide the information necessary for evaluation purposes. Further, evaluation sometimes presumes an 'after the fact' review of the extent to which objectives are being achieved. Evaluation should be an ongoing function, taking the results of the project monitoring and using this to regularly evaluate the extent to which program (and individual project) objectives are being achieved.

An indicative Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Framework is given below.

Table I Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Framework

Objectives for evaluation	Purpose	Metrics	PMP Indicators	Data Source
MDF conducts tenders in accordance with USAID requirements	Ensure that the program is implemented fully in line with USAID requirements. To the extent deficiencies are identified, provide immediate technical assistance to remedy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-compliance with USAID tendering requirements as defined by USAID. • Transparency and adequacy of evaluation process. • Evidence of adequate competition (see below) 	To be Determined	Tt will be responsible for evaluation and reporting to USAID based on review of the tenders, bids/proposals received, and evaluation committee discussions.
Integrity of the procurement process is assured for the program	To protect against any procurement abuse, such as bid-rigging or collusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate competition (number of bids, costing information, history of bidders) 	To be Determined	Tt will be responsible for evaluation and reporting to USAID, presuming that Tt will have access to all tender materials, bids/proposals and evaluation committee discussions.
Projects are implemented in accordance with expected budget	To protect against project and program budget overruns except as warranted due to changed conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % actual versus planned expenditure, followed by an analysis of the reasons for variance 	To be Determined	Tt will rely on information provided by the MDF and contractor submissions.
Projects are implemented in line with expected timeframe	To ensure that the benefits of the projects are able to be captured in the timeframe expected, or ahead of schedule, as well as to protect against time-delay related budget overruns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % actual versus planned, followed by an analysis of the reasons for variance 	To be Determined	Tt will rely on information provided by the MDF and contractor submissions.

Objectives for evaluation	Purpose	Metrics	PMP Indicators	Data Source
Project beneficiaries are not adversely impacted by project construction/rehabilitation activities	This program will involve extensive rehabilitation and construction related activities that can impact beneficiaries and others. It is important to strive to limit this potentially adverse impact to as short a period as practical and cost-efficient).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints from program beneficiaries and other parties. • Extent to which project timing is achieved (% actual vs planned). • During project and post-project beneficiary feedback (perhaps supplemented by more formal beneficiary survey research) 	To be Determined	This will be monitored by both Tt field staff and the MDF.
Health and safety of contractor staff and beneficiaries are adequately protected	A priority is to ensure that program activities are conducted in accord with sound health and safety requirements, to prevent accidents and loss of time. An 'early warning' system of problems with health and safety will be needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accidents and their severity 	To be Determined	Tt will rely on information from contractors as well as Tt field staff and MDF personnel.
Project objectives are achieved	Each project will have its own objective such as: for irrigation, e.g., the amount of agricultural land brought into productive purposes, amount of agricultural output achieved; for municipal water projects, e.g., the water quality improvement and availability of water supply; for IDP housing, e.g., extent to which sanitary and living conditions	The evaluation metrics will have to be defined for each project based on project specific objectives. This will also include how the metric will be derived (e.g., identify the source for the information required to evaluate the objective).	To be Determined	Tt will design an evaluation approach on a project specific basis and in consultation with the MDF.

Objectives for evaluation	Purpose	Metrics	PMP Indicators	Data Source
	<p>improve for residents, amount of housing fit for long term habitation, beneficiary satisfaction. These objectives will be defined for each project and will then be evaluated post-implementation to evaluate the extent to which specific project objectives were met, the reasons for any variances and the implications for other project designs.</p>			

2.4 Project Tasks

One of the purposes of the PMP is to identify the start date of each task and the expected completion date. Critical path timelines with milestones are to be established identifying relevant sub-activities needed to achieve successful completion. The PMP will report progress against USAID established indicators over the life of the activity. Below is a description of services that Tt is expecting to deliver. Based on the proposed Project Implementation Plan the start date of each task and the expected completion date have been identified. These are presented in the Table below. This will form the basis for monitoring project activities.

2.4.1 Environmental Scoping Statements

Environmental scoping statements are being carried out for Components 1 and 2 by MDF and will determine the range of alternatives and identify the potentially significant issues to be analyzed in-depth in follow-on environmental impact assessments (where identified). The scoping statements are expected to classify interventions as having either negative determination with conditions – requiring the preparation of environmental mitigation measures, or as having a positive determination requiring environmental project specific impact assessments. Tt will review the scoping statement deliverables produced by MDF contractors and provide appropriate technical input in order to secure successful finalization of the scoping process.

2.4.2 Programmatic Environmental Assessment

The PEA will be carried out for Component 3 and will include a comprehensive analysis of environmental considerations that are associated with all aspects of the proposed activity. The PEA will assess multiple projects and interventions within the IDP Housing component and will identify impacts and mitigations of proposed interventions, will engage project beneficiaries in the review and decision making process, and will provide information and make recommendations for design, construction, and operation and maintenance of project infrastructure. The PEA will be approved by the USAID Mission and Bureau Environmental Officers.

2.4.3 Environmental Impact Assessment (for Components 1 and 2 – if required)

The environmental impact assessment (EIA) is a systematic process to identify, predict and evaluate the environmental effects of proposed actions and projects and will encompass an in-depth environmental review of expected impacts and mitigations of proposed irrigation infrastructure interventions. It will engage stakeholders in the review and decision making process and will provide information and make

2.4.4 Planning Activities

Tt will provide professional engineering and technical planning assistance that will include:

1. Review of designs and specifications for systems and equipment for facilities; statements of work (SOW) for associated services; cost estimates; requests for proposals; and invitations for bids.
2. Training needs. These could include training for MDF staff in project implementation as well as beneficiaries tasked with operating and maintaining project infrastructure and IDP housing improvements.
3. Review of existing information, feasibility studies, technical surveys, environmental studies, and other relevant and appropriate studies and analysis.

4. Continuous budget monitoring of all project activities including MDF and their contractors, and timely notification to USAID and MDF of the status of USAID funding.

2.4.5 Design Review Activities

Tt will carry out detailed review of housing and infrastructure designs, plans, and cost estimates for assigned USAID programs and activities including any proposed changes to designs during the course of project implementation. In addition, Tt will ensure that the design products comply with the appropriate GoG and US standards and best practices.

2.4.6 Technical Support and Oversight

Tt will provide project management oversight services for contracts/agreements to assure engineering and construction best practices for IDP housing and infrastructure development and rehabilitation that will include but not be limited to:

1. Review of feasibility and cost/benefit analysis of proposed interventions to help maximize USAID investment impact. This includes review of all infrastructure projects proposed by the GoG for accept/reject decisions based on technical and economic criteria.
2. Provision of technical oversight to implementation staff, keeping USAID and MDF personnel informed of work progress and implementation issues through regular meetings and written communications.
3. Ensure that all interventions are in accordance and compliance with appropriate USAID and Georgian engineering, architectural, construction, and environmental codes and regulations including, but not limited to, applicable occupation safety, fire codes, and 22 CFR 216.
4. Support and monitor MDF to insure compliance with the procurement policies and procedures specified by agreement between USAID/Georgia and MDF. These processes will include but are not limited to evaluation of bidders, bidding documents, and technical evaluation, award analysis, and evaluation of contract modifications.
5. Preparation and/or review of reports and work plans, providing recommendations regarding the viability and cost effectiveness of proposed interventions and identification of alternative approaches as necessary.
6. Monitoring the adequacy, quality and acceptability of delivered goods and services through construction inspection and surveillance services, review of contractor reports, and meetings with implementation partners.
7. Assistance in the development of solutions for architecture and engineering issues that cannot be resolved by the implementers.
8. Reviewing of and responding to proposed changes in design and construction contracts, the validity of claims and contract time extensions.
9. Administrative responsibilities including but not limited to activities such as estimating expenditures, reviewing payment vouchers, responding to audits, assessing claims, and performing other related activities.
10. Quality control/quality assurance services, including materials measurement and services analysis, environmental monitoring, and testing to ensure delivered products are in accordance with design specifications and drawings.

Table 2 Project Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish
1	NOTICE TO PROCEED	0 days	5/25/2011	5/25/2011
2	Mobilization	30 days	5/26/2011	7/6/2011
3	Mobilize Project Startup Team	10 days	5/26/2011	6/8/2011
4	Mobilize COP and Key Personnel to Tbilisi	18 days	5/26/2011	6/20/2011
5	Kickoff Meetings: Establish Communication Program	5 days	6/9/2011	6/15/2011
6	Establish Project Management Committee	2 days	6/9/2011	6/10/2011
7	Establish Office in Tbilisi	15 days	6/9/2011	6/29/2011
8	Interview & Hire Local Support Staff	20 days	6/9/2011	7/6/2011
9	Engage Local CCN Sub-Contractor	20 days	6/9/2011	7/6/2011
10	Finalize Performance Monitoring Plan	20 days	6/9/2011	7/6/2011
11	Compose Year 1 Work Plan	20 days	6/9/2011	7/6/2011
12				
13	Conduct Rapid Appraisal - Desktop Review	9 days	6/8/2011	6/20/2011
14	Review of MDF Procurement Processes	5 days	6/8/2011	6/14/2011
15	Review of MDF Proposed Infrastructure Improvements	5 days	6/8/2011	6/14/2011
16	Evaluation prioritization of Infrastructure rehab options	8 days	6/8/2011	6/17/2011
17	Develop Selection and Prioritization Criteria	5 days	6/8/2011	6/14/2011
18	Component 1 - Roads, bridges, drainage, & W&S in Municipalities	5 days	6/8/2011	6/14/2011
19	Component 2 - Irrigation rehabilitation projects	5 days	6/8/2011	6/14/2011
20	Component 3 - Housing related water & sewer rehabilitation	5 days	6/8/2011	6/14/2011
21	Review and Approval of Selection Criteria by Mission & GoG	3 days	6/15/2011	6/17/2011
22	Finalize infrastructure rehab priorities for all Components	1 day	6/20/2011	6/20/2011
23				
24	Implement Activities for each Component	494 days	5/18/2011	4/8/2013
25	Component 1 Municipal Infrastructure	493 days	5/18/2011	4/8/2013
26	Project design study	52 days	5/18/2011	7/29/2011
27	ENV Scoping + FS Implementation by LTD " Kavgioprotransi-MG "	43 days	5/18/2011	7/18/2011
28	Contract Signed	0 days	5/18/2011	5/18/2011
29	A. Report Outline/TOC	2 days	5/19/2011	5/20/2011
30	B. Work Plan	5 days	5/19/2011	5/25/2011
31	C. Report on Existing Environmental Information	7 days	5/19/2011	5/27/2011

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish
32	D. Report on Existing Technical Information	7 days	5/20/2011	5/30/2011
33	E. Report on Site Investigations	14 days	5/27/2011	6/15/2011
34	F. Report on Stakeholder Meetings	25 days	5/19/2011	6/22/2011
35	G. Scoping Statement Final Report	5 days	6/23/2011	6/29/2011
36	H. Feasibility Studies	10 days	6/30/2011	7/13/2011
37	Presentation	3 days	7/14/2011	7/18/2011
38	Tt Review Scoping Statement	7 days	6/30/2011	7/8/2011
39	Tt Review Feasibility Study	7 days	7/14/2011	7/22/2011
40	Finalize Facility Selection	5 days	7/25/2011	7/29/2011
41	EA's or MP as required by Tt	60 days	6/9/2011	8/31/2011
42	Support MDF in stakeholder participation and conduct IEC & Outreach	60 days	6/9/2011	8/31/2011
43	Develop EA Protocol	7 days	6/9/2011	6/17/2011
44	Receive KAV Scoping Statement Final Report	0 days	7/22/2011	7/22/2011
45	Prepare and submit ER Checklist	20 days	7/5/2011	8/1/2011
46	Prepare and submit EMMP	30 days	7/21/2011	8/31/2011
47	Prepare and submit EIA Reports, as necessary	15 days	8/11/2011	8/31/2011
48	Prepare and submit EA Report, as necessary	5 days	8/25/2011	8/31/2011
49	Project selection	6 days	9/1/2011	9/8/2011
50	Implement EA based on approved report	400 days	9/27/2011	4/8/2013
51	Support MDF in stakeholder participation and conduct IEC & Outreach	400 days	9/27/2011	4/8/2013
52	Implement Capacity Building and Training according to the plan for the site local authorities	400 days	9/9/2011	3/21/2013
53	MIP Design	90 days	9/9/2011	1/12/2012
54	Procurement	45 days	9/9/2011	11/10/2011
55	Preliminary Design if needed	30 days	11/11/2011	12/22/2011
56	Design information sharing with the stakeholders	40 days	11/11/2011	1/5/2012
57	Design	45 days	11/11/2011	1/12/2012
58	Procurement Documentation	0 days	1/12/2012	1/12/2012
59	MIP Construction	310 days	1/13/2012	3/21/2013
60	Tendering and Award of Contracts through Mission and MDF	45 days	1/13/2012	3/15/2012
61	Monitoring & Reporting	260 days	3/16/2012	3/14/2013
62	"High Level" Construction Supervision	260 days	3/16/2012	3/14/2013
63	Capacity Building and Training on O & M of the constructed facility	260 days	3/16/2012	3/14/2013
64	Completion Reports	5 days	3/15/2013	3/21/2013

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish
65	Component 2 Rehabilitation of Irrigation Infrastructure	494 days	5/18/2011	4/8/2013
66	Project design study	44 days	5/18/2011	7/18/2011
67	ENV Scoping + FS Implementation by LTD " Kavgioprotransi-MG "	44 days	5/18/2011	7/18/2011
68	Contract Signed	0 days	5/18/2011	5/18/2011
69	A. Report Outline/TOC	2 days	5/19/2011	5/20/2011
70	B. Work Plan	5 days	5/19/2011	5/25/2011
71	C. Report on Existing Environmental Information	7 days	5/19/2011	5/27/2011
72	D. Report on Existing Technical Information	7 days	5/20/2011	5/30/2011
73	E. Report on Site Investigations	14 days	5/27/2011	6/15/2011
74	F. Report on Stakeholder Meetings	25 days	5/19/2011	6/22/2011
75	G. Scoping Statement Final Report	5 days	6/23/2011	6/29/2011
76	H. Feasibility Studies	10 days	6/30/2011	7/13/2011
77	Presentation	3 days	7/14/2011	7/18/2011
78	Tt Review Scoping Statement	7 days	6/30/2011	7/8/2011
79	Tt Review Feasibility Study	7 days	7/14/2011	7/22/2011
80	Finalize Facility Selection	5 days	7/19/2011	7/25/2011
81	EA's or MP as required by Tt	60 days	6/9/2011	8/31/2011
82	Support MDF in stakeholder participation and conduct IEC & Outreach	60 days	6/9/2011	8/31/2011
83	Develop EA Protocol	7 days	6/9/2011	6/17/2011
84	Receive KAV Scoping Statement Final Report	0 days	6/29/2011	6/29/2011
85	Prepare and submit ER Checklist	25 days	6/29/2011	8/2/2011
86	Prepare and submit EMMP	45 days	6/29/2011	8/30/2011
87	Prepare and submit EIA Reports, as necessary	15 days	8/11/2011	8/31/2011
88	Prepare and submit EA Report, as necessary	5 days	8/25/2011	8/31/2011
89	Project selection	6 days	9/1/2011	9/8/2011
90	Implement EA based on approved report	412 days	9/9/2011	4/8/2013
91	Support MDF in stakeholder participation and conduct IEC & Outreach	412 days	9/9/2011	4/8/2013
92	Implement Capacity Building and Training according to the plan for the site local authorities	412 days	9/9/2011	4/8/2013
93	Irrigation Channels Design	90 days	9/9/2011	1/12/2012
94	Procurement	45 days	9/9/2011	11/10/2011
95	Preliminary Design if needed	30 days	11/11/2011	12/22/2011
96	Design information sharing with the stakeholders	40 days	11/11/2011	1/5/2012
97	Design	45 days	11/11/2011	1/12/2012

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish
98	Procurement Documentation	0 days	1/12/2012	1/12/2012
99	Irrigation Channels Construction	322 days	1/13/2012	4/8/2013
100	Tendering and Award of Contracts through Mission and MDF	45 days	1/13/2012	3/15/2012
101	Monitoring & Reporting	260 days	4/3/2012	4/1/2013
102	"High Level" Construction Supervision	260 days	4/3/2012	4/1/2013
103	Capacity Building and Training on O&M of the constructed facility	260 days	4/3/2012	4/1/2013
104	Completion Reports	5 days	4/2/2013	4/8/2013
105	Component 3 IDP Durable Housing	494 days	5/18/2011	4/8/2013
106	DP Cottage Settlements & DH Project design study	356 days	5/18/2011	9/26/2012
107	ENV Scoping + FS Implementation by LTD " GEO "	30 days	5/18/2011	6/28/2011
108	Contract Signed	0 days	5/18/2011	5/18/2011
109	A. Report Outline/TOC	2 days	5/18/2011	5/19/2011
110	B. Work Plan	5 days	5/18/2011	5/24/2011
111	C. Report on Existing Environmental Information	7 days	5/18/2011	5/26/2011
112	D. Report on Existing Technical Information	8 days	5/18/2011	5/27/2011
113	E. Report on Site Investigations	20 days	5/18/2011	6/14/2011
114	F. Report on Stakeholder Meetings	25 days	5/18/2011	6/21/2011
115	G. Scoping Statement Final Report	5 days	6/22/2011	6/28/2011
116	Tt Review	7 days	6/29/2011	7/7/2011
117	Finalize Facility Selection	5 days	7/8/2011	7/14/2011
118	PEA by Tetra Tech	60 days	6/9/2011	8/31/2011
119	Develop EA Protocol	7 days	6/9/2011	6/17/2011
120	Receive GEO Scoping Statement Final Report	1 day	6/29/2011	6/29/2011
121	Prepare Scoping Report	30 days	6/30/2011	8/10/2011
122	Prepare PEA	15 days	8/11/2011	8/31/2011
123	Prepare and submit EA Report, as necessary	5 days	8/25/2011	8/31/2011
124	Project selection	0 days	9/28/2011	9/28/2011
125	Implement EA based on approved report	260 days	9/29/2011	9/26/2012
126	Support MDF in stakeholder participation and conduct IEC & Outreach	260 days	9/29/2011	9/26/2012
127	Implement Capacity Building and Training according to the plan for the site local authorities	260 days	9/29/2011	9/26/2012
128	IDP Cottage Settlements & DH Design	88 days	9/29/2011	1/30/2012
129	Procurement	45 days	9/29/2011	11/30/2011

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish
130	Preliminary Design if needed	30 days	12/1/2011	1/11/2012
131	Design information sharing with the stakeholders	40 days	12/1/2011	1/25/2012
132	Design	45 days	11/29/2011	1/30/2012
133	Procurement Documentation	0 days	1/30/2012	1/30/2012
134	DP Cottage Settlements & DH Construction	310 days	1/31/2012	4/8/2013
135	Tendering and Award of Contracts through Mission and MDF	45 days	1/31/2012	4/2/2012
136	Monitoring & Reporting	260 days	4/3/2012	4/1/2013
137	“High Level” Construction Supervision	260 days	4/3/2012	4/1/2013
138	Capacity Building and Training on O & M of the constructed facility	260 days	4/3/2012	4/1/2013
139	Completion Reports	5 days	4/2/2013	4/8/2013
140				
141	Project Reporting & Deliverables	645 days	6/6/2011	11/22/2013
142	A. Report of Rapid Appraisal of Proposed Infrastructure Subprojects	0 days	6/7/2011	6/7/2011
143	B. First Year Work Plan	0 days	7/7/2011	7/7/2011
144	C. Bi-Weekly Construction Progress Reports	621 days	6/6/2011	10/21/2013
145	D. Project Selection Reports	589 days	7/11/2011	10/10/2013
146	E. Quarterly Progress Reports	588 days	7/10/2011	10/10/2013
147	G. Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA)	0 days	8/31/2011	8/31/2011
148	H. Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP)	0 days	7/7/2011	7/7/2011
149	I. Annual Work Plans	522 days	9/1/2011	9/1/2013
150	J. Annual Report	523 days	11/1/2011	11/1/2013
151	J. Annual Report 1	0 days	11/1/2011	11/1/2011
152	J. Annual Report 2	0 days	11/1/2012	11/1/2012
153	J. Annual Report 3	0 days	11/1/2013	11/1/2013
154	K. End of Activity Report	0 days	11/22/2013	11/22/2013
155	L. Success Stories	589 days	7/11/2011	10/10/2013

2.5 PMP INDICATORS

The key elements required when identifying and identifying proper performance indicators are listed below:

1. **Performance Indicators and their Definitions:** Each performance indicator needs a detailed definition. Be precise about all technical elements of the indicator statement. Include in the definition the unit of measurement.
2. **Data Source:** Identify the data source for each performance indicator. The source is the entity from which the data are obtained, usually the organization that conducts the data collection effort. The same source should be routinely used to ensure consistency.
3. **Method of Data Collection:** Specify the method or approach to data collection for each indicator. Note whether it is primary data collection or is based on existing secondary data.
4. **Frequency and Schedule of Data Collection:** Performance monitoring systems must gather comparable data periodically to measure progress. Depending on the performance indicator, it may make sense to collect data on a quarterly, annual, or less frequent basis. When planning the frequency and scheduling of data collection an important factor to consider is management's needs for timely information for decision making.
5. **Responsibilities for Acquiring Data:** For each performance indicator, the responsibility the operating unit for the timely acquisition of data from their source should be clearly assigned to a particular office, team, or individual.

Suggested format for collecting and presenting the project performance indicators is shown in below.

A typical performance indicator worksheet required for USAID reporting is also presented below.

Table 3 Project Performance Indicator Table

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT	DATA SOURCE	METHOD/ APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION	DATA ACQUISITION		ANALYSIS, USE AND REPORTING	
				SCHEDULE/ FREQUENCY	BY WHOM (PERSON/ TEAM)	SCHEDULE/ FREQUENCY	BY WHOM (PERSON/ TEAM)
Program Element level indicators							
Component 1: Municipal Infrastructure							
Indicator PE1.1:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE1.2:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE1.3:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Component 2: Rehabilitation Of Irrigation Infrastructure							
Indicator PE 2.1:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE 2.2	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE 2.3:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Component 3: IDP Durable Housing							

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT	DATA SOURCE	METHOD/ APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION	DATA ACQUISITION		ANALYSIS, USE AND REPORTING	
				SCHEDULE/ FREQUENCY	BY WHOM (PERSON/ TEAM)	SCHEDULE/ FREQUENCY	BY WHOM (PERSON/ TEAM)
Subcomponent 1: Provide Water And Sanitation Upgrades For IDP Cottage Housing For IDPS From The August 2008 Conflict							
Indicator PE 3.1.1:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE 3.1.2:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE 3.1.3:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Subcomponent 2: Provide Durable Housing Solutions For IDP From 1990s Conflict							
Indicator PE 3.2.1:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE 3.2.2:	Definition: Unit of measure:						
Indicator PE 3.2.3:	Definition: Unit of measure:						

Table 4 Performance Indicator Worksheet

Performance Indicator (including precise <u>Unit of Measurement</u>):											
Unit:											
Results Data	Baseline Year: 10/11	11/12	12/13								
Targeted											
Actual											
Indicator Description (Definition):											
Data Source: Primary Source: Secondary Source:						Rationale/Critical Assumptions for Indicator:					
Schedule/Frequency of Data Collection:						Method/Approach of Collection/Calculation					
Responsible Officer:											
Data Limitation and Quality Assessment:						Data Analysis/Dissemination Plan:					
						Other Donors in Sector:					
Indicator's Relevance to <u>Gender</u>:											
Indicator's Relevance to <u>Poverty</u>:											
Additional Comments:											