



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# MUNICIPAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND IDP HOUSING REHABILITATION PROJECT

Annual Report Year 1 (May - September 2011)

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

10 November 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

---

Annual Report Year I (May – September 2011)

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

10 November 2011

The following document was prepared by Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (<http://www.tetratech.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.



November 10, 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: Annual Report Year 1 (May – September 2011) 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 Annual Report Year 1 (May - September 2011) for the Municipal Infrastructure and IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project.

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

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink 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](mailto:Jeff.Fredericks@tetrattech.com)

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

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

<b>Table Of Contents</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acronyms</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>1. Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Progress Of Major Activities/Deliverables During The Period Of Performance (May – September 2011)</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Problems And Issues And Steps Taken To Resolve/Remedial Actions</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>4. Program Staffing</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>5. Financial Report</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>6. Reports and Deliverables or Outputs</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>ANNEX A Additional Oversight Reports</b> .....	<b>21</b>

## 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. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

### **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-I14-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 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 summarize progress of the major activities during Year I (May – September 2011), indicating any problems encountered and steps taken to resolve them or proposing remedial actions as appropriate. The report identifies any problems, delays, or adverse conditions that materially impair Tt's ability to meet the requirements of the contract.

### **I.3 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
  - a. Subcomponent 1: Provide Water And Sanitation Upgrades For IDP Cottage Housing For IDPS From The August 2008 Conflict
  - b. Subcomponent 2: Provide Durable Housing Solutions For IDP From 1990s Conflict

### **I.4 Summary**

The purpose of the foregoing referenced task order is to provide technical assistance and support to the USAID Mission in Georgia in its efforts to monitor current processes and practices, identify and mitigate areas of risk, and carry out oversight and quality control to ensure that selected municipal and IDP infrastructure projects are implemented effectively and in accordance with certain U.S. and Georgian standards and regulations. The Tbilisi-based tetra Tech Team provides oversight and monitoring of planning, design, and technical matters, while also contributing to capacity building, mentoring, and collaboration/coordination with appropriate stakeholders. The municipal and IDP infrastructure projects include:

- Projects for road repairs, flood protection, water supply, and combined water supply/wastewater/drainage

- agricultural irrigation projects focused on rehabilitation of the primary and secondary canals on certain systems
  - water & sanitation upgrades for cottage housing for IDPs to design and install potable water systems and improve liquid and solid waste disposal in their settlements
  - Durable Housing Solutions for IDPs rehabilitation of approximately 2,600 family dwelling units
- c. In this reporting period, Tetra Tech concentrated on establishing an office near the Municipal Development Fund (MDF), and undertaking some of the preliminary work necessary to successfully tackle the three components which will target selected municipal infrastructure in specific municipalities, to install and extend irrigation channels, and to upgrade housing for Internally Displaced Persons (IDP).
- d. Deliverables for the Reporting Period include:
- Rapid Appraisal Report & Presentation
  - First Year Work Plan
  - Bi-Weekly Meetings and Reporting
  - Quarterly Progress Reports
  - Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) for Component 3
  - Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP)
- e. A large number of memoranda were prepared in review of an equally large number of project submissions by MDF's two sub-contractors, Kagiprotransi-MG Ltd (Kav) and GEO Ltd (GEO). The Tt memoranda provided comments and advice relating to the documents submitted by the two sub-contractors as part of Tt's ongoing effort to support USAID/Georgia in their efforts to improve certain infrastructure damaged during its recent conflict with Russia and to provide decent housing for its citizens displaced in that unfortunate clash.
- f. Our commitment to capacity development of Georgian staff was supported by the hiring of 8 local nationals in infrastructure management, environmental impact assessment, displaced persons public relations & outreach, legal issues, procurement, and administrative matters. That commitment will likely continue to expand in the coming year although the precise numbers and budget has not been quantified at this point in time.

## **2. PROGRESS OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES/DELIVERABLES DURING THE PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE (MAY – SEPTEMBER 2011)**

---

Activities carried out during the report period included:

### **Mobilization/ Startup:**

A Notice to proceed (NTP) was issued on 23 May 2011. Immediately following the NTP, Tt dispatched Dean White (President Tetra Tech ES, Corporation Response Officer) and David Sharashenidze (Tt ES Home Office Coordinator). Key personnel Ilia Eloshvili (Infrastructure Manager and DCOP) and Teimuraz Levanishvili (Housing Rehabilitation Manager) were brought on board. A kick-off meeting was held on 7 June. Chief of Party, Jeff Fredericks, arrived in Tbilisi, Georgia on 20 June.

Office furniture and computers equipment were purchased and delivered. Lease arrangements for an office, three vehicles and an IT support contract were signed. Project staff moved into the Tt GMIP office on 27 June. Office internet service and email was established.

A Project Management Committee (PMC) was formed. The PMC includes representatives from USAID, Municipal Development Fund (MDF), and Tt. Regular weekly meetings (Wednesday) were held at MDF to discuss project activities and progress. Separate weekly meetings were held between USAID and Tt staff.

Assessment work for A Report of Rapid Appraisal of Proposed Infrastructure Subprojects was carried out from 23 May to 10 June 2011, and the Report itself was submitted to USAID within 15 days of the award. Based on the results of the rapid appraisal, Tt determined that the program was ready for aggressive implementation.

A draft First Year Work Plan was submitted on July 7.

A Quarterly Report (May – June 11) was submitted on July 10.

A preliminary Draft Project Monitoring Plan (PMP) was submitted on July 11.

### **Environmental Scoping Statements**

Senior Environmental Specialists, Dr. James Gallup (13-17 June and 29 July - 27 August) and Dr. Karen Menczer (6-20 August) carried out STTA to provide technical support on Components 1 and 2 Environmental Scoping Statements (ESS) and the Component 3 Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA). They were assisted by STTA local consultants David Girgvliani, PhD, and Mamuka Gvilava. The principal effort was directed at finalizing the GMIP Component 3 Scoping Statement and PEA and assisting with an Environmental Review Checklist and a Site Specific Environmental Compliance Plan (ECP) for Tiriponi Irrigation Scheme (GMIP Component 2).

Environmental scoping statements to determine the range of alternatives and identify the potentially significant issues to be analyzed in-depth in follow-on environmental impact

assessments were prepared by MDF through two separate contracts. One contract was with Kavgioprotransi-Mg Ltd (Kav) for Components 1 and 2 and one contract for Component 3 with GEO Ltd. Tt reviewed the scoping statement deliverables produced by the MDF contractors and provided appropriate technical input in order to move the scoping process forward toward finalization.

Tt staff attended the GEO stakeholder meeting on Cottage Communities (Comp 3a) held in Teliani on 23 June and that for the Durable Housing Component (Comp 3b) held in Kutaisi on 29 June.

Tt prepared and submitted a draft ESS (12 Aug) and PEA (26 Aug) for Component 3: IDP Durable Housing Activity. The ESS was approved by BEO on 6 September, while the PEA remains under review with USAID. Tt also submitted Site Specific Environmental Compliance Plans (SSECP) for the Tiriponi Irrigation Project (Component 2), as well as the Municipal Infrastructure Projects for Oni roads and the Dusheti flood protection projects. Indeed, while primary responsibility for the preparation of these documents resided with MDF's contractor, Kav, a substantial amount of time and effort was spent by Drs. Gallup and Menczer in assisting with development of the SSECP for Tiriponi based upon an impression that the Mission intended to pursue a Negative Determination with Conditions for the environmental review process related to Component 2 activities. The foregoing effort notwithstanding, the BEO has now clarified its position that a full Environmental Assessment will be required for both Component 1 and Component 2.

#### **Project Design Study/Project selection:**

The Project Design/Project Selection Phase began in May 2011 with the award of two contracts by MDF to prepare environmental scoping statements (ESS) and technical/feasibility reports on all GoG proposed sub-projects. During a Steering Committee workshop held on September 15, agreement was reached on implementation of sub-projects for Component 2 (Irrigation) and Component 3.2 IDP Housing. Decisions on sub-projects for Component 1 (Municipal) and Component 3.1 (Cottages) are expected by November 15.

One of Tetra Tech's main efforts during the report period (June – September 2011) was to review and provide oversight services for the two local MDF contracts. This was carried out by providing input, advice, and direction during the course of implementation of these tasks. Tetra Tech conducted desk top review of all reports and drawings prepared by the MDF contractors. Remarks and recommendations were prepared by Tt and submitted to MDF. Tt worked directly with the contractors to assist them in making the corrections. After receiving the studies a second time, Tt again reviewed the reports and drawings to verify whether the contractors had considered Tt's recommendations. Where necessary, additional comments were resubmitted by Tetra Tech to the contractors and to MDF. After it became clear that more than desktop reviews were required to verify the quality and accuracy of the technical reports, at the request of USAID, Tetra Tech carried out site visits to all proposed sub-projects. Details on the two MDF contracts and Tetra Tech's role in the review process are presented below.

## **Components I&2 (Kavgiprotransi-MG Ltd)**

The first contract (contract no. USAID/NS/02 2011) was between MDF and the local firm Kavgiprotransi-MG Ltd (Kav) for technical and logistical services in support of the development of an environmental scoping statement (ESS) and assessment of feasibility of the rehabilitation of municipal infrastructure and irrigation channels focused on rural populations, IDPs or persons affected by the 2008 conflict with Russia. The contractor was requested to conduct studies on 8 municipal and three irrigation sub-projects. The municipal sub-projects were in 5 locations: Oni, Dusheti (2), Mtskheta, Gori (3), and Kareli. They included five road projects, one flood protection project, one water supply activity, and one combined water supply/wastewater/drainage project. The three irrigation sub-projects were in the Shida Kartli region and included Tiriponi (20,058 ha), Saltvisi (9,772 ha) and Tezi Okami (2,140 ha). The scope of work for the irrigation schemes was limited to rehabilitation of the primary and secondary canals on these systems.

The contract period for Kav was 8 weeks from the signing of the contract. The performance period was from May 18 to July 18, 2011. The contract was later extended for 3 days in an amendment signed on July 15. The payment schedule, though not the contract amount, was also adjusted at that time.

The contract was designed to meet two major objectives, referred to as 'Objective A' and 'Objective B'. The terms of these Objectives are summarized below:

*Objective A.* Obtain technical and logistical services to support USAID's efforts to carry out environmental scoping and develop a scoping statement (ESS). The purpose of an ESS is to identify significant environmental issues relating to the proposed rehabilitation of certain municipal and irrigation infrastructure, to determine the range of alternatives, and to identify those issues to be analyzed in depth in a follow-on programmatic environmental assessment. Three tasks were required with respect to Objective A: 1) identify and review existing environmental information and studies related to the Irrigation and Municipal Infrastructure Project component, 2) carry out site visit investigations to ascertain additional environmental issues, and 3) obtain stakeholder input and feedback in organized meetings to help insure that significant environmental issues are identified and that upgrade and rehabilitation activities best serve these recipients. The final output was an ESS in a format approved by MDF/USAID. The ESS so produced was then to be submitted for approval by the USAID Georgia Mission Environmental Officer (MEO) and the USAID Bureau Environmental Officer (BEO).

*Objective B.* Conduct a technical assessment and prepare feasibility studies (e.g., construction sustainability, cost, benefit) for future design of the rehabilitation projects that was to be used for tendering. The feasibility studies were required to examine both the technical and economic aspects of proposed projects. The contractor was to provide sufficient technical information to allow the MDF and USAID to select those proposed projects with the highest benefit per investment cost and the most feasible to implement.

There were a number of deliverables with assigned due dates written into the contract. The intermediate deliverables were:

- A. Report Outline/Table
- B. Work Plan
- C. Report on Existing Environmental Information
- D. Report on Existing Technical Information
- E. Report on Site Investigations
- F. Report on Stakeholder Meetings
- G. Scoping Statement Final Report
- H. Feasibility Studies

At start-up, Tetra Tech was given copies of Deliverables A-D. Tt provided its evaluation on June 8; however, the changes were never resubmitted by Kav. Deliverable E was received on June 13. On June 21 comments on that Deliverable were sent to MDF, and the revised Deliverable E was received on August 31. Payments were approved by USAID on September 2 for completing Tasks A through E.

Tt staff attended the Kav stakeholder meetings on Municipal Infrastructure (Comp 1) held in Dusheti on July 5 and Irrigation (Comp 2) held in Gori on July 1. Deliverable F, a Report on the Stakeholder Meetings, was submitted on August 31. It was approved by Tetra Tech.

In general, the Deliverable Gs were to be project specific reports summarizing the results (environmental and technical) of investigations and information gathered under the contract, including a list of relevant findings, conclusions, and recommendations limited to 10 pages (not including appendices with the sketch design, etc.). A draft ESS was to be included with each report. The contract included a suggested format for such a report. The required review time by USAID and MDF was to be within one week. KAV was required to finalize and return the report to USAID and MDF within 3 days. This was to be followed by an oral presentation to USAID and MDF. The Deliverable G ESS for Tiriponi Irrigation System was received on July 13 and comments were provided by the Tetra Tech Environmental team on that same date. ESSs for the all three irrigation sub-projects were received on July 21. The ESSs for the eight municipal sub-projects were received on July 26. They were evaluated by the Tetra Tech environmental team and comments on these ESSs were provided to MDF and Kav on July 27. Kav submitted the revised ESSs on August 2. After final review the Tetra Tech environmental team recommended that the ESSs be sent to USAID as attachments to Environmental Report Checklist and Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plans. That said, the quality was such that even with additional changes the Tt environmental team believed it was doubtful that the BEO would approve the documents as thorough and useful ESSs that could be used to support preparation of an EA or PEA.

Deliverable H was the final feasibility study reports for each of the 8 municipal and 3 irrigation sub-projects. These reports were to provide sufficient technical information to allow MDF and USAID to select those proposed sub-projects with the highest benefit per investment cost and the most feasible to implement. The contract included a suggested format for the reports. For Deliverable H, it was agreed that Oni roads sub-project would be used as an example. On July 12 Tt received a copy of the Oni roads sub-project feasibility study. Tetra Tech delivered its comments on July 15. Copies of all of the feasibility studies were received on July 21. Tetra

Tech's comments to those studies were sent between July 24 –26. Revised feasibility studies on the municipal and two irrigation sub- projects were received on August 2. That for the Saltvisi irrigation system was received on August 4. The economic analysis carried out by Kav indicated that none of the municipal sub-projects were feasible. Further review during the preparation of the cost matrix for project selection in August indicated that verification of the information provided in the feasibility studies required additional work and Kav was so requested to make that review. Kav submitted revised reports on September 7 showing 6 of 8 sub-projects as economically feasible based on revised costs that reduced contingencies from 10% to 5%.

USAID realized that verification of the information provided in the feasibility studies required more than a desk top review. Tetra Tech was requested to visit each of the sub-project sites to evaluate the accuracy and quality of the Kav work. MDF was informed that final approval of Deliverable H would be dependent on the outcome of the site visits.

Site visits by Tetra Tech to all of the eight municipal sub-projects and the three irrigation systems were carried during August and September. The approach to the site visits was to compare the data presented in the technical reports with information gained during the site visits and develop recommendations. Results of the site visits showed discrepancies between some of the works proposed by Kav in the feasibility studies and the actual field conditions. Site visit reports with recommendations are under preparation.

### **Components 3 (GEO Ltd):**

The second contract (contract no. USAID/NS/01 2011) was between MDF and the local firm GEO Ltd (GEO) for technical and logistical services in preparation of the Environmental Scoping and Small Feasibility Study for the IDP Settlements. A main purpose of the contract was to develop an environmental scoping statement (ESS) and technical assessment of buildings associated with this activity. The work was divided into two components, Component 1: Provide Water and Sanitation Upgrades for Cottage Housing for IDPs from the August 2008 War, and Component 2: Provide Durable Housing Solutions for IDPs from 1990s Conflict.

For the Cottage Housing component USAID has targeted upgrades for nearly 4,000 houses constructed by the GoG following the August 2008 war by providing technical and financial assistance to design and install potable water systems and improve liquid and solid waste disposal in the settlements. Specific actions would include: the making of water supply improvements, the installation of indoor plumbing, and the installation of waste water treatment systems. The contractor was requested to prioritize IDP settlements where water availability is not a constraint for the installation of indoor water taps. Where water supplies are insufficient to support the installation of indoor water taps, additional alternative water sources were to be explored, such as wells. The contractor was also to consider making use of appropriate water conservation and recycling measures.

For the Durable Housing component the contract indicted that Ministry of Refugee Affairs (MRA) had identified 118 potential additional buildings for USAID rehabilitation. USAID target was to provide assistance to GoG and help finance rehabilitation of approximately 2,600 family dwelling units. The contractor was expected to inspect facilities and recommend its selection of those buildings to be rehabilitated. A list of facilities was attached to the contract. An additional

61 buildings were later added to the initial list of facilities to be inspected and considered for rehabilitation.

The period of performance was 6 weeks, from May 18 to June 29, 2011. After additional work was added, the contract was extended for 18 working days until July 22 in an amendment signed on June 29. No changes were made to the payment schedule or the contract amount.

The contract was designed to meet two major objectives, again denominated as 'Objective A' and 'Objective B' and summarized as follows:

*Objective A.* Obtain technical and logistical services to support USAID's efforts to carry out environmental scoping of planned IDP housing upgrades and rehabilitation. The environmental scoping statement (ESS) was to identify significant environmental issues relating to the proposed housing upgrades and determine the range of alternatives and identify those issues to be analyzed in depth in the follow on programmatic environmental assessment. The scoping process was to help eliminate detailed study of issues that are not significant and issues that have been addressed by prior studies. The ESS was to focus on what alternatives and probable significant environmental impacts are to be considered and a detailed description of associated elements of the built and natural environment. To carry out the scoping process, environmental issues were to be identified, reviewed, and prioritized. Three tasks were to be performed by the contractor: 1) identify and review existing environmental information and studies related to IDP housing, 2) carry out site visit investigations to ascertain additional environmental issues, and 3) obtain stakeholder input and feedback in organized forums or meetings to help ensure that significant environmental issues are identified and that upgrade and rehabilitation activities best serve these recipients and that significant implementation issues are identified. The contractor was required to investigate a sampling of approximately 25% of all IDP proposed housing.

*Objective B.* Prepare the technical assessment and provide preliminary report (construction sustainability, etc.) for future design of the rehabilitation works, which will be then used in the bidding documents for the rehabilitation of the IDPs' housing. Specific tasks to be performed by the contractor included: 1) assess the structural stability of the building (existing condition/damages of the walls, and other main structural elements, foundation, roof) and prepare a report about the feasibility of rehabilitation of the facility and safety for living; 2) review internal and external water, sanitation, drainage, power, gas, etc. systems and conditions; 3) examine the building condition in terms of ground water impact to exclude the dampness of the walls and floor; and 4) provide short description of the existing condition, sketch design for technical options for usage of the living spaces, with necessary pictures, calculations, parameters. The contractor was required to investigate 100% of all IDP proposed housing.

As with the contracts involving the previously mentioned contractor, there were a number of deliverables with assigned due dates written into the contract. The intermediate deliverables were:

- A. Report Outline/Table
- B. Work Plan
- C. Report on Existing Environmental Information associated with the IDP Housing and Infrastructure activity to include content and assessment of existing environmental impact/issues materials identified by previous programs
- D. Report on Existing Technical Information that included a literature review of technical issues associated with the IDP Housing and infrastructure (including internal and external water, sanitation, drainage, power, gas, etc. systems and condition, etc.)
- E. Report on Site Investigations of environmental and technical issues related to IDP housing rehabilitation and an assessment of the structural stability of the 118 buildings (25 % for ESS and 100% for technical assessment);
- F. Report on Stakeholder Meetings, two meeting, one for each component.
- G. Scoping Statement Final Report. This Report was not to exceed 10 pages (excluding appendices with the sketch design, etc.) and was required to summarize the results (environmental and technical) of all investigations to include a list of relevant findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The Report was to be divided into two sections, 1) scoping statement, and 2) feasibility of collective centers. It was also to include a draft scoping statement in a format acceptable to USAID.

At start-up Tt was given copies of Deliverables A-C. Tetra Tech provided an evaluation on June 8. The requested changes were never resubmitted GEO. Deliverable Ds for 11/14 cottage settlements were received on July 4. The Georgian versions for the remaining three cottage settlements were received on August 15. Deliverable E for 73 DH buildings was received on August 9 and included a description and inventory of each building, sketch drawings (AutoCAD) of the floor plans of each building, and a bill of quantities, and photos. The report on eleven Cottage Communities was received on August 12. The Tetra Tech engineering team reviewed and commented in detail on both sets of deliverables.

Payments were approved by USAID on August 23 for completing Tasks A through E.

Tt staff attended the GEO stakeholder meetings on Cottage Settlements held at Teliani IDP Settlement on June 23 and Durable Housing in Kutaisi on June 29. Deliverable F, a Report on the Stakeholder Meetings, was submitted on July 15 and was approved by Tetra Tech.

The draft scoping statement for Deliverable G was submitted on July 20. It was reviewed by the Tetra Tech environmental team. The report was used to support the ESS and PEA prepared by Tetra Tech for the IDP Durable Housing Activity. The final Deliverable G, 10 page, summary report has not been submitted by GEO.

During the project preparation phase numerous questions arose regarding the accuracy and completeness of the data collected by GEO. It was realized that verification of the information

provided in the GEO technical studies would require more than a desk top review. USAID requested Tetra Tech to visit each of the project sites to evaluate the accuracy and quality of the GEO work. MDF was informed that final approval of Deliverable G would be dependent on the outcome of the site visits.

Tt's approach to the site visits was to compare the data presented in the GEO technical reports with information gained during the site visits and develop recommendations. Checklists were prepared. Site visits were made by Tetra Tech to all 14 of the cottage communities during August and September. Site visits to all 93 buildings selected for rehabilitation by MRA were conducted during September. Two additional short term staff from Kutaisi were hired to assist with the building site visits. Results of the site visits showed discrepancies between some of the works proposed by GEO. For example the estimated cost of the DH buildings provided by GEO should be increased by 5%. Site visit reports with recommendations are under preparation. . MDF was informed that final approval of Deliverable H would be dependent on the outcome of the site visits.

The GEO proposal for the waste water treatment facilities (WWTF) for the cottages was found to be incomplete. At the request of USAID Tetra Tech investigated possible alternatives. Tt looked at three possible options: 1) septic tank with infiltration field (SWWIS), 2) aerated lagoon, and 3) a modular treatment system plant package (Biotal). The study examined area requirements, as well as initial and O&M costs. Results showed that six of the nine settlement requiring treatment facilities could be served by the SWWIS system. Additional field studies will be carried out to confirm these recommendations.

The criteria for the **Project selection matrix** were presented by Tt at the Work Plan workshop held on 3 August. A draft project selection matrix was prepared by Tt and presented to USAID and MDF at a coordination meeting held on 26 August.

In mid-August MDF suggested that three new sub-projects be considered under the Municipal Infrastructure rehabilitation program. USAID requested that these be submitted formally by GoG with justification. The projects are listed below.

#	Name	Cost, GEL
1	Rehabilitation of Water Supply System Headworks in Oni	400,000
2	River bank protection in Skra, Gori District	400,000
3	River bank protection in Gori	500,000

The following is a summary of the **status of the project selection list** after being presented and discussed by the Steering Committee at the Steering Committee meeting held on September 15. The final review by USAID is ongoing.

### **Municipal Infrastructure**

1. MRDI will submit prioritized sub-projects officially;
2. Dusheti Riverbank Protection, Sagolasheni-Dvani Road, Gori Water Supply and Metering sub-projects are priorities for MRDI along with three new sub-projects: i) water supply headworks in Oni (GEL 400 thousand); ii) River bank protection in Skra, Gori District (GEL 500 thousand);, and iii) River bank protection in Gori (GEL 500 thousand);
3. Gori Railway Settlement Water Supply, Sewerage and Storm Water sub-project would probably be dropped;
4. Volume of civil works under the rest of the sub-projects would be decreased;
5. Georgian United Water Company (GUWC) would prepare detailed design of the water supply/sewerage sub-projects;
6. MDF would elaborate volume of works under road rehabilitation sub-projects using World Bank Guidelines for Road Rehabilitation Projects prepared for Georgia;. Construction contracts would be made directly (skipping detailed design preparation stage).

### **Irrigation Sub-Component**

1. Modified Option III was selected – rehabilitation of critical/significant facilities on Tiriponi main canal after first crossing with occupied territories would be added to originally suggested rehabilitation works under Option III (complete rehabilitation of Saltvisi irrigation system, rehabilitation of main canal and secondary canals of Tiriponi irrigation system up to the first crossing of occupied territory);
2. Over 25 thousand hectares would be covered (maximum area feasible);
3. Financing of rehabilitation of Tezi-Okami irrigation system was rejected. It had the highest rehabilitation cost/area ratio. MOA will complete rehabilitation of the Tezi-Okami scheme using other funds.

### **IDP Cottage Settlements**

1. MRDI and MDF are reluctant to finance construction of waste water treatment system at cottage settlements due to social issues. No village in Georgia has a waste water treatment plant. Only a few cities have treatment plants.

### **IDP Buildings**

1. Buildings for rehabilitation would be selected at a meeting with participation of MRA, MRDI, USAID and MDF representatives to be held ASAP.
2. The buildings would be selected out of the 119 buildings throughout Georgia (remaining after studying 205 buildings proposed by MRA);
3. Social-economic issues would be considered during selection of the buildings along with rehabilitation cost per apartment;
4. The selection would be made out of the list with rehabilitation costs containing 10% contingencies;
5. MRDI suggested to contract out construction works for 90% of allowable costs in the beginning and the rest at a later stage;
6. MRA took responsibility for relocating IDPs during construction works;
7. MRA asked to give at least 1 month notice and to shorten rehabilitation period for collective centers;
8. Financing and construction plans would be given to MRA;
9. Collective centers would be priority during construction phase;
10. MRDI suggested to prepare construction contracts by lots – 10 buildings per lot;

11. Legal ownership issues (as to whether the subject property is publicly or privately owned) are being investigated;
12. The statistics on the proposed building list are listed below:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Number of Buildings, units	93
Total Cost, \$	25,791,083
Average Cost Per Apartment, \$	11,357
Total Number of Apartments, units	2,271
Total Number of 1 room Apartments, units	1,119
Total Number of 2 room Apartments, units	797
Total Number of 3 room Apartments, units	355
Total Area, m2	126,676
Collective Centers	59 (63.4 %)
Empty Buildings	34 (36.6%)

## **Procurement**

The procurement phase began on 15 September 2011 and is on-going.

The Tt project team is assisting MDF to prepare the procurement documents. The activities to be carried out by Tt include assist with Bidding Document preparation (Works), clearance of Bid Documents, assistance with Pre-Bid Conference, clearance of Evaluation Report, and clearance of contract. The tenders for construction related work will largely target local and regional firms. For the tender documentation, Tt is assisting MDF in preparing specifications and technical documentation. MDF is responsible for ranking, awarding, and contracting. For the Design-Build tenders Tt is providing special assistance in preparing Employers Requirements.

To fast track the construction process it is planned that for municipal sub-projects the roads will be direct construction contracts, water supply will be traditional Design-Bid-Build, and Flood Protection will be Design-Build. The irrigation sub-project will be Design-Build. The IDP Cottage settlements will be Design-Build. The IDP Buildings will be direct construction.

A Procurement Plan was prepared by MDF and reviewed by Tetra Tech for Component 2: Irrigation and Component 3b IDP Buildings. For Component 2: Irrigation and Component 3b.

IDP Buildings MDF expects to announce bids at the end of October; opening of bids by mid-December; and signing contracts in early February 2012.

The schedules for the procurement of the Municipal (8 sub-projects) and the Cottage Communities are dependent on final selection of sub-projects which is still on-going.

### **Training/Workshops**

A Year I Work Plan Workshop was held at Radisson Blu Iveria, Tbilisi on 3 August. The goals of the workshop were to: i) develop project year one work plan, ii) discuss project procurement options, iii) introduce QA/QC plan, and iv) develop sub-project selection criteria. The Workshop provided an opportunity to focus on procurement/operations, design build/design bid build, a project management plan, and priorities for project selection criteria. An updated implementation schedule was prepared and dates for delivering key items were set. A total of 22 individuals participated in the GMIP Work Plan Workshop. This included participants from USAID (3), Municipal Development Fund (7), and Tetra Tech (12). A workshop report was prepared.

Tt sponsored the Steering Committee meeting held at the Radisson Blu Iveria Hotel, Tbilisi on September 15. The MDF Program Manager presented general background information about the projects and the results of the feasibility studies (Kav & Geo) for all sub-components of the project. Because available funds are insufficient to finance all suggested sub-projects, priorities were discussed and identified. Decisions were made based on the discussions with all parties participating. A total of 23 individuals participated in the meeting. This included participants from US Embassy (2), USAID (3), Ministry Rural Development and Infrastructure (1), Ministry of Refugees (1), Ministry of Agriculture (2), Mtkvari-M Irrigation Company (1), Municipal Development Fund (5), and Tetra Tech (8). Minutes of meeting were prepared by MDF.

### **Branding**

All reports and submittals are in accordance with the branding plan.

USAID stickers have been placed on all office equipment.

Business cards were prepared.

Because Tetra tech is hired only for project oversight, the office sign should only contain the Tetra Tech logo.

### **Financial Review**

Tt initiated the review of all MDF invoices being submitted to USAID in accordance with Cash Advance / Liquidation Policies and Procedures outlined in Appendix 2 of Implementation Letters 3 and 4 (February 18,2011) between USAID and MDF under the assistance agreement No. AAG-114 - G – 10-002 for Improved Infrastructure, Economic Opportunities and Support for Internally Displaced Persons dated August 12, 2010.

### **Coordination with Other Donors and Technical Assistance Activities**

Tt staff participated in the following meetings during the quarter:

- COP attended the USAID Partners Meeting held on 28 June at USAID and on 29 September held at Faetoni restaurant.
- An introductory meeting was held on 30 June at USAID with Chemonics staff from the USAID New Economic Opportunities (NEO) Project.
- CHF International, Georgia, on design of Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Wastewater Infiltration System (SWIS) used for the USAID funded Kartli Schools Rehabilitation Project.

### **3. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES AND STEPS TAKEN TO RESOLVE/REMEDIAL ACTIONS**

---

#### **Capacity of local contractors**

The two MDF contractors are behind in their progress and their deliverables. Delays by the MDF contractors may lead to delay in the final selection of project focus and perhaps in the initiation of the procurement process. Tt is working with MDF and the two contractors to provide support, clarification, review and guidance to ensure that the contracts are completed as soon as possible and in a manner that meets USAID and MDF standards and requirements. The program has been designed with a tight schedule and fixed budget. Each phase is dependent on the previous phase. Project selection is dependent on the results of the environmental scoping and feasibility studies that are currently being carried out by two local consultants. The results of the scoping tasks will be used by Tt in the preparation of the Program Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the IDP component and site specific EAs (if required) and/or risk mitigation plans for the municipal infrastructure component. The PEA and EAs will be required to be completed before moving to the design phase. Therefore delays in one phase could have a cascading effect that would delay the next phase and ultimately delays in project implementation.

#### **Capacity of MDF**

Certain elements of the program, such as the quality selection criteria required for goods and services under the implementing letters will need very close analysis to ensure that the MDF and local market are able to understand and implement these provisions effectively (and transparently).

The necessity for MDF to assume various construction management roles will need to be addressed. Staff members are often assigned to many projects and can be considered as having their time and energies spread too thinly among these many competing obligations. Their ability to give in-depth review of the work products of their contractors can be compromised under such circumstances. Enhancement of their formal documentation of review would be warranted, as would establishment of formal processes for such review. MDF is currently considering a project management system which would place a Project Manager (PM) over each of the various contracts with a Core Team supporting the PM in the Home Office and a Site Team placed in the field to directly monitor and supervise the construction activities. Tt continually assesses the capacity of MDF to engage and timely complete its various tasks in support of the GMIP activities, and Tt may find it helpful to provide additional support at some point in future weeks and months of GMIP.

#### **Lack of communication between MDF and other stakeholders**

Of the various program components, the IDP durable housing will be the most complicated component to address. The issues surrounding IDPs and the intense sensitivity of IDPs, their interaction with each other and with broader non-IDP communities, can be complicated and require careful consideration throughout to avoid possible problems during implementation and even outright conflict. Cooperation on the early stages between MRA/MDF and USAID to identify, anticipate and plan actions required to mitigate risks for all possible issues will be

essential for final success. There may be more than 90 apartment buildings and 2000 families that will be affected. IDPs in the durable housing units will be relocated during construction—it will be impossible and dangerous to remain in the buildings during renovations. If temporary relocations are implemented without good and regular communication, and without adequate provision for quality of life issues, IDPs will not only fail to support the rehabilitation, but the larger Georgian community (NGOs, politicians, etc.) may fail to support it, and may actively work against the project. Poorly planned and implemented temporary relocation could derail support for the project (IDP buildings). If relocation is not implemented in a transparent manner, the impacts could be significant. Mitigation, in the form of a Resettlement Plan with regular and inclusive communication, will be required to offset any adverse impacts.

Rehabilitation of the irrigation systems presents another set of issues that must be carefully managed. Any shutdown of parts of the irrigation system during the irrigation season must be managed properly to avoid water shortages to the users that could result in crop yield and income losses. MDF must ensure proper coordination and scheduling between the construction contractor and the operator of the irrigation systems.

### **Technical & Geographical Diversity of the proposed projects**

GMIP is composed of a wide range of type of projects, from roads, flood control, the installation of domestic water supply and wastewater systems, to the rehabilitation of apartment buildings and free standing cottages. Additionally, the facilities are situated over a fairly wide area of Georgia, and travelling from one to another can take several hours by road. There will be over 90 buildings located in 5 regions, 14 cottage communities, infrastructure improvement projects in 5 municipalities, irrigation rehabilitation in two large schemes. Successfully covering QA on all these sub-projects will be a major challenge. This wide diversity of activities over a wide geographical area presents engineering, management and site supervision challenges.

### **Roles & Responsibilities of Tetra Tech**

Tt has many and varied roles and responsibilities under the GMIP program, from oversight on project management, construction, procurement, and Quality Assurance and Quality Control, to support in document preparation, environmental and other studies, as well as analyses of studies prepared by others. To assume and prepare for these roles and responsibilities, Tt has assembled a staff focused on oversight. Tt has limited staff poised to assume direct design review, or direct contract management. While Tt can draw on its vast cadre of talented engineers, there is only a limited presence of expats present in Tbilisi.

#### 4. PROGRAM STAFFING

---

The GMIP LTTA and STTA professional, technical, and administrative support staff for the reporting period are shown below:

#### RESIDENT STAFF

NAME	POSITION
Jeffrey Fredericks, P.E. PhD	Chief of Party
Ilia Eloshvili	Infrastructure Manager & DCOP
Teimuraz Levanishvili	Housing Rehabilitation Manager,
Mamuka Shaorshadze	Environmental Specialist
Archil Lezhava	Displaced Person Relations/Outreach
George Nizharadze	Office Operations Manager
Irakli Kakulia	Paralegal/Licensing & Permits
Sergo Gviniashvili	Procurement/Finance Specialist
Maia Dvali	Translator/Interpreter

#### SHORT TERM STAFF DURING THE REPORT PERIOD

NAME	POSITION
David Sharashenidze	Home Office Coordinator
James Gallup, P.E. PhD	Environmental Specialist
Karen Menczer	Environmental Specialist
Guram Soselia	WWW Engineer
Ivane Manigaladze	Infrastructure Engineer
Giorgi Avsajanishvili	Housing Engineer
Otar Maghalashvili	Irrigation Engineer
David Girgvliani	Environmental Consultant
Mamuka Gvilava	Environmental Consultant

#### HOME OFFICE STAFF

To ensure efficient project management Tt is mobilizing expats to support local team in different directions providing consultancy on field and remotely through conferences. List of expats participating in the MIP project covering different area are being defined as follows:

NAME	POSITION
Firouz Rooyani	A&E IQC Program Manager
Thomas Chicca	Task Order Manager & QA/QC
Thomas Abdella	Contract Specialist
Shelly Rice	Subcontract Specialist
Renee Valentino	Contract Manager

## **ADMINISTRATIVE & ADDITIONAL STAFF ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS**

Tetra Tech established its office close to MDF to ensure efficient cooperation with them.

Establishment of a Regional office in Kutaisi is under discussion with USAID. Tt staff housed in a regional office will be able to manage field activities on a more cost-efficient basis during construction works beginning in 2012. This issue looms quite large in the planning of project management due to the potential assumption of a wider range of construction management activities than originally contemplated in an “oversight” role.

Tt has made arrangements with subcontractor Autorent Ltd for provision of auto services for the staff. At this stage, 3 vehicles are serving the project and one more additional car is planned after the start of construction works.

The Tetra Tech office IT support is provided by IT Fix Ltd.

Tt has an agreement with Magti-Comm to provide corporate mobile communication service.

Permanent training activities for Tt staff as well as for MDF staff are planned for entire duration of project. An initial training activity in Procurement Integrity has been organized.

## 5. FINANCIAL REPORT

---

Tetra Tech EMI						
Reporting Period: May 24, 2011 - Sep 30, 2011						
Funding to Date: \$2,800,000						
			<b>Tetra Tech EM</b>			
	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Previous Periods</b>	<b>Current Period</b>	<b>Cumulative To Date</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>% Expended</b>
<b><u>SALARIES WORKDAYS ORDERED</u></b>	\$43,703	\$0.00	\$2,778.19	\$2,778.19	\$40,925	6.36%
<b><u>FRINGE/OVERHEAD</u></b>	\$38,515	\$0.00	\$2,448.49	\$2,448.49	\$36,067	6.36%
<b><u>OTHER DIRECT COSTS/TRAVEL</u></b>	\$4,751	\$0.00	\$126.25	\$126.25	\$4,625	2.66%
<b><u>INTERCOMPANY/SUBCONTRACTORS</u></b>	\$4,368,581	\$0.00	\$212,030.40	\$212,030.40	\$4,156,551	4.85%
<b>G&amp;A</b>	\$9,306	\$0.00	\$572.66	\$572.66	\$8,733	6.15%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	\$4,464,856	\$0.00	\$217,956.00	\$217,956.00	\$4,246,900	4.88%
<b><u>FIXED FEE</u></b>	\$312,540	\$0.00	\$15,256.79	\$15,256.79	\$297,283	4.88%
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	<b>\$4,777,396</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$233,212.79</b>	<b>\$233,212.79</b>	<b>\$4,544,183.22</b>	4.88%

## **6. REPORTS AND DELIVERABLES OR OUTPUTS**

---

The following reports and deliverables were prepared during the report period:

<b>Report</b>	<b>Date</b>
A. Rapid Appraisal Report & Presentation	10 June
B. First Year Work Plan	7 July
C. Bi-Weekly Meetings and Reporting	As Required
D. Quarterly Progress Reports	10 July
E. Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) for Component 3	26 August
F. Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP)	7 July

Additional reports submitted in furtherance of project oversight are listed in Annex A.

## **ANNEX A ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT REPORTS**

From-To	Type	#	Name	Sent by
Tt-USAID	Letter	0009	Project Description	I. Eloshvili
Tt-USAID	Letter	0010	GEO Review	Dean S White
Tt-USAID	Letter	0011	KAV Review	Dean S White
Tt-USAID	Progress Report	0020	USAID _J_ RE-KAV 30 Jun 11	Jeffrey Fredericks
Tt-USAID	Progress Report	0021	USAID _J_ RE- GEO_30 Jun 11	Jeffrey Fredericks

The following reports were submitted on “Kavgiprotransi-MG” Ltd Deliverables:

Component	Name	Date Sent
A	1.Subcontractor Scope of Work (D. White) 2.Subcontractor Scope of Work (J. Fredericks)	6 August 30 June
B	1.Work Plan Outline (I. Eloshvili) 2.Contractor Work Plan Guidelines (I. Eloshvili) 3. Kavgiprotransi MG Review (D. White) 4. Recommendations on both Contractors (I. Eloshvili)	14 June 14 June 8 June 15 June
C	1.Report Outline/Table of Contents for Environmental Scoping and Technical Assessment of Irrigation and Municipal Infrastructure (I. Eloshvili)	22 June
D	1.To asphalt Internal roads in Oni; Report on technical and feasibility study (J. Fredericks) 2. KAV Gori Water Supply and Waste Water Network Rehabilitation Project (T. Levanishvili) 3. KAV Project Revision Time schedule (T. Levanishvili) 4. KAV Technical condition of channel and distribution center of Tiriponi (T. Levanishvili) 5. KAV Working schedule (T. Levanishvili) 6. KAV Report on Railway settlement in Gori (T. Levanishvili)	15 July 25 July 18 July 22 June 26 July 10 August
E	1.Rehabilitation of municipal infrastructure and irrigation systems in several districts of Shida Qartli region (T. Levanishvili) 2. Rehabilitation of internal water supply system for buildings in Gori; Feasibility study (T.	16 June 26 July

	<p>Levanishvili)</p> <p>2. Report on investigating working site (G. Soselia)</p> <p>3. KAV Improving infrastructure capacity of Saltvisi irrigation system (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>4. KAV Improving irrigation systems Tiriponi Saltvisi and Tezi-Okami (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>5. KAV Improving Infrastructure of Tiriponi (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>6. KAV Report on Oni roads (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>7. KAV Report on Dusheti roads (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>8. KAV Report on Mtskheta roads (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>9. Kav Report on Gori Roads (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>10. KAV Report on Kareli roads (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>11. Report Water System Gori Assessment (J. Fredericks)</p>	<p>23 June</p> <p>26 July</p> <p>7 July</p> <p>7 July</p> <p>10 August</p> <p>10 August</p> <p>10 August</p> <p>14 August</p> <p>11 August</p> <p>11 August</p>
F		
G	1. KAV SS Tiriponi Irrigation System Comments (J. Fredericks)	13 July
H	<p>1. KAV 3 Irrigation and 8 Municipal Project Environmental Feasibility Study (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>2. KAV Answers on Gori Water Supply and Waste Feasibility Study Report (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>3. KAV Dusheti Gorge Rehabilitation feasibility Study (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>4. KAV Dusheti Road Rehabilitation Feasibility Study (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>5. KAV Gori Road Rehabilitation Report Feasibility Study (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>6. KAV Mtskheta Road Rehabilitation Report Feasibility Study</p> <p>7. KAV Oni Road Rehabilitation Project, Feasibility Study Report (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>8. KAV Report on Tiriponi Irrigation Project Feasibility Study (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>9. KAV Response on Gori Water Network Feasibility Study Report (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>10. KAV Sagolasheni-Dvani Road Rehabilitation Report Feasibility Study (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>11. KAV Saltvisi Irrigation System Feasibility Study Report (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>12. KAV Technical Feasibility Study on 3 Irrigation Projects (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>13. KAV Tezi-Okami feasibility study of the project Report (T. Levanishvili)</p> <p>14. KAV Tiriponi Irrigation System Rehabilitation</p>	<p>16 June</p> <p>4 August</p> <p>25 July</p> <p>19 July</p> <p>25 July</p> <p>21 July</p> <p>13 July</p> <p>7 July</p> <p>4 August</p> <p>21 July</p> <p>26 July</p> <p>7 July</p> <p>24 July</p> <p>21 July</p>

	Feasibility Study Report (T. Levanishvili) 15. KAV Tiriponi feasibility study of the project Report (T. Levanishvili)	21 July
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

The following reports were submitted on “GEO” Ltd Deliverables:

Component	Name	Date Sent
A	1.Subcontractor Scope of Work (D. White)	8 June
	2.Subcontractor Scope of Work (J. Fredericks)	30 June
B	1.Work Plan Outline (I. Eloshvili)	14 June
	2.Contract Work Plan Guidelines (I. Eloshvili)	14 June
	3.GEO Review (D. White)	8 June
	4. <u>Recommendations on both Contractors</u> (I. Eloshvili)	15 June
C	1.Report Outline/Table of Contents for Environmental Scoping and Technical Assessment of Irrigation and Municipal Infrastructure (I. Eloshvili)	22 June
	2. Comments on Existing Environmental Information for GEO C Deliverable (M. Shaorshadze)	28 June
D	1.Building to be rehabilitated - 117 Vazha Pshavela Street, Kareli, Georgia (T. Levanishvili)	13 June
	2.Update on rehabilitation of building in Qareli 117, Vazha Pshavela Street, ‘Geo’ Ltd (J. Fredericks)	6 July
	3.GEO Review of problematic issues on cottage settlement (T. Levanishvili)	6 July
	4. GEO Shida Kartli and Mtskheta-Mtianeti Cottage Improvement Ways (T. Levanishvili)	28 June
	5. GEO Teliani Settlement Improvement Ways (T. Levanishvili)	23 June
	6. Gori (Internal WS) Report (J. Fredericks)	9 September
E	1. Recommendations on the Report Submitted by “Kavgiprotrans-MG” Ltd Deliverable E (T. Levanishvili)	16 June
	2. Report on Deliverable E (M. Shaorshadze)	27 June
	3. 10 Album Reports (T. Levanishvili)	8 August
	4. GEO Compact housing of IDP study of Teliani residents (T. Levanishvili)	23 June
	5. GEO Discussion of Problematic Issues for Cottage Settlement (T. Levanishvili)	6 July
	6. Final Rehabilitation List Discussion (T. Levanishvili)	20 July
	7. GEO IDP Building Rehabilitation Discussion (T. Levanishvili)	18 July
	8. GEO Kareli V. Pshavela Building Rehabilitation	4 July

	(T. Levanishvili) 9. GEO Letter on Comments of BoQ (T. Levanishvili) 10. GEO Rehabilitation of Dusheti Gorge, Feasibility study (T. Levanishvili) 11. GEO Review list of IDP houses and buildings to be rehabilitated (T. Levanishvili) 12. GEO Review the list of IDP houses and buildings to be rehabilitated (T. Levanishvili) 13. GEO Reviewing rehabilitation houses and buildings for IDPs (T. Levanishvili) 14. GEO Schedule for issuing recommendations on project activities (T. Levanishvili) 15. GEO Submitting the project documentation for IDP houses Heating (T. Levanishvili) 16. GEO One Album Reports (T. Levanishvili) 17. GEO II Cottage settlement Report (T. Levanishvili) 18. 93 Buildings Matrix (J. Fredericks) 19.	16 June 25 July 18 July 20 July 11 July 27 June 27 July 12 August 16 August 28 September
F		15 July
G	1. <u>Tetra Tech Comments on GEO SS Report</u> (J. Gallup) 2. Georgia Housing Scoping Statement Final (J. Fredericks) 3. Georgia Housing Scoping Statement Comment Summary (J. Fredericks)	10 July 16 August 16 August

The following miscellaneous and additional reports were submitted in furtherance of project management:

From-To	Type	#	Name	Sent by
Tt-USAID	Status Report	0030	USAID Status Report on Contract KAV GEO 22 Jul 11	Jeffrey Fredericks
Tt-USAID	Status Report	0086	USAID Status Report 10.08.2011	Jeffrey Fredericks
Tt-USAID	Weekly Report	0095	Weekly report_23 Sep 11 rev 1	Jeffrey Fredericks

**US Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

**[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)**