



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**NEO**

New Economic Opportunities Initiative  
ახალი ეკონომიკური შესაძლებლობების ინიციატივა

# NEO FY 2012 MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT

**Project Results September 30, 2012**

**CONTRACT NO. AID-114-C-11-00001**

**October 30, 2012**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Chemonics International Inc.

## ACRONYMS

AIC	Abkhazintercont
AYEG	Association of Young Economists in Georgia
CBO	Community-based Organization
CHCA	Charity Humanitarian Center Abkhazeti
CIDA	Civil Development Agency
EDP	economic development plan
EPI	USAID/Economic Prosperity Initiative
ERC	environmental review checklist
FTF	Feed the Future
FY	fiscal year
GEL	Georgian Lari
GMIP	USAID/Municipal Infrastructure IDP Housing Rehabilitation Project
HOA	homeowners' association
IDP	internally displaced person
JUC	joint-use center
LED	local economic development team
LOP	life of project
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MDF	Municipal Development Fund
MEDP	municipal economic development plan
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MRA	Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees
NEO	USAID/New Economic Opportunities Initiative
NGO	nongovernmental organization
PPE	personal protection equipment
PMP	performance monitoring plan
RFP	request for proposal
TA	tenants' association
WWM	webworm moth
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USG	U.S. Government

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	2
INDICATOR TARGETS AND ACTUAL RESULTS.....	2
NEO PERFORMANCE MONITORING INDICATORS .....	7
A. USAID Indicators.....	7
B. NEO Internal Indicators.....	24
NEO OUTCOME INDICATORS.....	38
Annex A: NEO Identified Infrastructure Projects by Status (as of 10/30/12).....	45
Annex B: NEO Sector Assessments .....	47
Annex C: LED events in FY2012.....	49
Annex D: NEO-Issued Grants .....	52
Annex E: evaluation Options for perception of efficiency and responsiveness of local self-government ..	55

### DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

## INTRODUCTION

NEO aims to achieve its objectives through four components: community-level economic development planning, rural economic development, assistance to strengthen highly vulnerable households and individuals, and promoting the sustainability of IDP houses being rehabilitated with support from the USG. In addition to these four components, NEO has a built-in disaster response mechanism valued at up to [REDACTED] per year.

This report provides information on NEO's results and accomplishments against each indicator, as well as its approach to tracking and measuring results. The report covers activities from the start of the project in April 2011 through September 30, 2012.

Based on the analysis of M&E data collected in FY 2012, in its first year of implementation, NEO provided support to 6,313 households. The project achieved the following milestones during the reporting period:

### Component 1

- Formed working groups in 65 communities
- Finalized 55 Economic Development Plans
- Involved 1,556 community members in the EDP process
- Provided 1,154 beneficiaries with improved infrastructure services, through two completed quick-impact infrastructure projects.

### Components 2 and 3

- Benefitted 955 individual through grants and sub-awards
- Provided 305 individuals with vocational education training
- Created 265 jobs through NEO activities
- Trained 1,076 individuals in modern techniques of agricultural production.

### Component 4

- Established 7 Home Owners Associations (HOA) and 2 Tenants Associations (TA) in pilot IDP residences
- Supported 1,374 IDPs through establishment of HOAs and TAs and capacity building training.

This document has been divided by PMP indicators to facilitate review. Each section provides the tables with the indicator, project target(s) and actual results.

## INDICATOR TARGETS AND ACTUAL RESULTS

No	Indicator Name	Comment	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
			FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>PERFORMANCE MONITORING INDICATORS</b>									
<b>USAID Indicators</b>									
4.4.8	Number of beneficiaries receiving improved infrastructure services due to USG assistance	Initial Targets	0	8,827	--	13,240	13,240	1,765	37,072
		Revised Target	0	--	1,154	20,880	13,240	1,765	37,039
4.5.2-13	Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions	Initial Targets	0	17,189		22,429	16,872	3,084	59,574
		Revised Targets	0		6,075	28,543	21,872	3,084	59,574
4.5.2-5	Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Initial targets	0	106	--	701	1,062	255	2,124
		Revised Target	0	--	816	6,286	1,824	1,230	10,156
4.5.2-2	Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Initial targets	0	183	--	216	120	0	519
		Revised Target	0	--	1,501	4,099	1,250	1,062	7,912
4.5.2-7	Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training	Initial targets	0	7,467	--	11,069	6,782	0	25,318
		Revised Target	0	--	1,076	13,860	9,782	600	25,318
			0	--	892	1,485	1,300	600	4,277
			0	--	184				
	Trainings via multimedia	0	--	0	12,375	8,482	0	20,857	
4.5.2	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	Initial Targets (including only FTF jobs)	0	220	--	340	207	0	767
		Revised Target (including all types of jobs)	0	--	265	1,078	180	84	1,607

4.5.2.11	Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producer organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community based organizations (CBOs), receiving USG assistance	Initial targets	0	18	--	52	83	35	188
		Revised target	0	--	75	29	30	0	134
4.5.2-38	Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation	Initial targets		352,432	--	399,672	217,137	0	969,241
		Revised target	0	--	142,859	122,051	120,000	0	384,910
4.6.3-4	Number of persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs	Initial targets	0	240	--	360	0	0	600
		Revised target	0		305	292	100	0	697
4.6.3-2	Number of people receiving new or better employment (including better self-employment) as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development project	Initial targets	0	120	--	180	0	0	300
		Revised target	0	--	116	250	70	0	436
4.7.3-4	Total number of microenterprises receiving business development services from USG assisted sources	Initial targets	0	4,170	--	9,578	10,941	2,717	27,406
		Revised target with revised definition	0		892	1,962	1,520	684	5,058
4.7.5-11	Number of sector assessments	Initial targets	0	55	--	38	9	0	102
		Revised target	0	--	68	30	0	0	98
4.6.3-6	Number of workforce development initiatives created through USG assisted public-private partnerships	Recommended to remove	0	10	--	30	10	0	50
4.6.2-7	Number of SMEs receiving USG assistance to access bank loans or private equity	Initial targets	0	150	--	220	230	50	650
		Revised target	0		0	230	100	0	330
4.6.2.-3	Number of firms receiving USG assistance to improve their management practices	Recommended to merge with 4.7.3.4 to eliminate double-counting	0	158	--	225	225	0	608

No	Indicator Name	Comment	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
			FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>NEO Internal Indicators</b>									
<b>Component 1</b>									
3.3.1.2	Number of EDPs developed/updated	Initial targets	0	40	--	35	9	0	84
		Revised Target	0		55	30	0	0	85
3.3.1.3	Number of MEDPs updated	Recommended to remove	0	0	0	5	5	0	10
3.3.1.4	Number of local government staff trained in EDP development/implementation	Initial targets	0	30	--	0	0	0	30
		Revised Target (both-government staff & community members trained)	0		275	235	0	0	510
3.3.1.5	Number of working groups formed/revitalized	Initial targets	0	55	--	29	0	0	84
		Revised Target			65	20	0	0	85
3.3.1.6	Number of community members involved in LED planning	Initial targets	0	1320	--	1056	516	336	3228
		Revised Target	0		1556	940	120	340	2956
3.3.2.1	Amount/percentage of funding leveraged from government /other donor/private sector	--	0	15%	32%	15%	15%	15%	15%
3.3.2.2	Number of LED events held	Initial targets		40	--	35	9	0	84
		Revised Target	0		68	20	0	0	88
3.3.2.3	Number of small-scale infrastructure projects implemented	Initial targets		20	--	30	30	4	84
		Revised Target	0		2	48	30	5	85

Components 2&3									
3.2.3.1	Number of grants awarded	Initial targets (only C2 grants)	0	20	--	22	12	0	54
			0	234	955	518	264	84	1821
	C2 individual grants	Revised Targets (including grants & sub-awards)	0	20	19	81	114	0	1026
	C2 sub-award grants		0		812				
	C3 livelihood packages		0	70	0	247	120	84	451
	C3 toolkits		0	144	124	172	0	0	296
C4 grants	0	0	0	18	30	0	48		
3.4.1.1	Number of micro-grants awarded	Recommended to merge with 3.2.3.1	0	70	0	247	120	84	451
3.2.3.3	Number of special funds/loans facilitated	Initial targets	0	15	--	15	15	15	60
		Revised Target	0		3	27	15	15	60
3.2.2.5	Number of clients using the joint center services	--	0	0	0	400	1200	1200	2800
Component 4									
3.3.2.5	Number of HOAs established	Initial targets	0	6	-	30	50	14	100
		Revised Target	0		7	0	30	0	37
3.3.2.6	Number of Tenants Associations (TAs) established	Initial targets	0	2	2	2	18	16	38
		Revised Target	0		2	9	0	0	11
3.3.2.7	Number of IDPs organized in HOAs	Initial targets	0	420	--	2,100	3,500	980	7,000
		Revised Target	0		516	0	2,200	0	2,716
3.3.2.8	Number of IDPs organized in TAs	Initial targets	0	910	--	910	8,190	7,280	17,290
		Revised Target	0		858	6,253	0	0	7,111
3.3.2.10	Number of local government officials trained in housing services	Initial targets	0	10	--	25	20	0	55
		Revised Target	0		20	20	15	0	55

Indicator Name	Comment	Actual	Target			
		FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
70,000 households supported through NEO activities		6,313	--	--	--	70,000
7,000 IDP households supported through component four activities	Indicator was revised	663	--	--	--	3500
A long-term sustainable approach/management system to manage and maintain approximately 100 IDPs rehabilitated buildings and 38 IDP new settlements is in place and has existed for at least one year of unsubsidized operations.	Targets were revised	2 TAs 7 HOAs	--	--	--	11 TAs 37 HOAs
A sustained increase of at least 20% in the number of adult individuals that perceive that the local government understands and is responsive to their needs over initial benchmark levels.	Baseline conducted (See Annex E)	2.4966	--	--	--	2.9959
A sustained increase of at least 25% in the average value of household production (income + market value of agricultural or other production obtained but not sold) of targeted households.	Baseline survey is planned in FY13	--	--	--	--	25%
A sustained increase of at least 15% in the average value of household production (income + market value of agricultural or other production obtained but not sold) of targeted households.	Baseline survey is planned in FY13	--	--	--	--	15%
25% of targeted vulnerable households and individuals raised to the official subsistence level.	Indicator revised; baseline survey is planned in FY13	--	--	--	--	25%

## NEO PERFORMANCE MONITORING INDICATORS

### A. USAID INDICATORS

#### 4.4.8. Number of beneficiaries receiving improved infrastructure services due to USG assistance

This indicator calculates the number of people who benefit from improved infrastructure services due to project assistance. During the life of the project (LOP), NEO plans to implement one infrastructure project in each of the 85 target communities. Based on projections from the quick impact infrastructure projects implemented in FY 2012, it is estimated that each small-scale infrastructure project will directly benefit 97 households per community. Targets were estimated by multiplying the number of projects by the average number of beneficiary households, times the average number of persons per household<sup>1</sup>; we then added 30 percent of the total to estimate the number of indirect beneficiaries.

The progression of the infrastructure projects completed was planned as follows: FY2012 – 20 projects; FY2013 – 30 projects; FY2014 – 30 projects; FY2015 – 5 projects. Due to implementation delays in the infrastructure programs, of the 20 identified small-scale infrastructure projects, only two were completed in FY 2012; the remaining 18 projects will be completed in FY 2013. The table below indicates the actual number of beneficiaries from the two completed infrastructure projects from FY 2012 and includes revised targets for the following years.

**Table 1. Number of beneficiaries – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	8,827	-	13,240	13,240	1,765	37,072
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>1,154</b>	20,880	13,240	1,765	37,039

The distribution of direct and indirect beneficiaries in each village for the two completed projects is shown in Table 2 below. For a list of all identified NEO infrastructure projects and their current implementation status, please see Annex A.

<sup>1</sup> Baseline targets used a multiplier of 3.5 individuals per household; actuals will use 3.7, as this constitutes the average household occupancy rate in NEO target areas as determined by the NEO baseline survey, and confirmed by the Banyan Global external impact baseline assessment.

**Table 2. Beneficiaries of NEO infrastructure projects**

Municipality	Community	Village	Project Name	Number of Beneficiary Households			Number of Beneficiaries *
				Direct	Indirect	Total	
Kareli	Dirbi	Dirbi	Water Supply System Rehabilitation in Dirbi Village	156	44	200	740
Gori	Tirdznisi	Brotsleti	Water Supply System Rehabilitation in Brotsleti and Ergneti Villages	35	60	95	351
Gori	Tirdznisi	Ergneti		11	6	17	63
<b>Total</b>				<b>202</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>1154</b>

**4.5.2-13. Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions**

A beneficiary household contains at least one individual who has benefited from a NEO project activity. An individual is a beneficiary if s/he is engaged with a project activity or s/he comes into direct contact with the set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. The actual results and targets are presented below.

**Table 3. Rural households benefiting from USG interventions – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	17,189		22,429	16,872	3,084	59,574
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>6,075</b>	28,543	21,872	3,084	59,574

NEO did not achieve the FY 2012 targets due in part to the delay in the implementation of the infrastructure projects noted above, as well as the delay in launch of media training programs. While the total target of 59,574 households is not expected to change; the FY 2013 and 2014 targets have been adjusted to account for the 18 remaining FY 2012 infrastructure projects slated for completion in FY 2013 and the media training which are planned to begin in March/April 2013 and run through the early part of FY 2014.

The table below identifies the number of rural households participating in and benefiting from NEO activities in FY 2012.

**Table 4. Types of rural beneficiary households**

Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions <sup>2</sup>	Direct	Indirect	Total
	4,280	1,795	6,075
Community members involved in LED planning	1,530		1,530
IDPs organized in TAs (Berbuki and Khurvaleti) <sup>3</sup>	264		264
Beneficiaries receiving improved infrastructure services	202	110	312
Farmers trained by EPI/USAID and delivered the toolkits by NEO	802		802
Individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity training (direct and indirect)	1,076	1,500	2,576
Grantees (including, direct and indirect beneficiaries)	165	185	350
Persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs	260		260

#### 4.5.2-5. Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as result of USG assistance

This indicator measures the total number of farmers and value chain actors (e.g., input suppliers, consolidators, traders, processors and service providers), who have applied new or improved technologies as a result of USG assistance. This includes innovations such as input supply delivery, production efficiency, value-addition, post-harvest management, marketing, sustainable land and water management and managerial practices.

To introduce new or improved technologies and management practices, NEO has delivered classroom, demonstration plots, nurseries and multimedia trainings. NEO's calculations are based on the number of individuals trained, as well as those who receive toolkits for improvement of technologies.

In FY 2012, NEO coordinated with the USAID/EPI project on EPI/AgriGeorgia Hazelnut training activities. While EPI provided training for over 802 hazelnut farmers in Samegrelo-Zemo Svanti (including over 200 NEO farmers), NEO provided toolkits, including: pruning equipment, knapsack sprayers and personal protection equipment to enable all farmers to implement the new techniques and technologies learned during the training. Based on the reach of this training, actual results for FY 2012 exceeded our targets. In addition, 10 strawberry farmers and 4 tourism grantees have applied new technologies as a result of USG assistance.

Targets for FY 2013-2015 have been revised to reflect updated Component 2 value chains and target activities identified in FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> There are 19 cases in which more than one person in a household participated in or benefitted from a NEO activity. To avoid double-counting, duplicate cases have been deducted, therefore total number of direct beneficiaries does not equal to the sum of sub-indicators.

<sup>3</sup> IDPs organized in HOAs have been excluded from these indicators due to the fact that the FY 2012 pilot apartment buildings are located in urban areas of Kutaisi, Senaki, and Rustavi.

**Table 5. Number of beneficiaries applying new/improved technologies – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	106	--	701	1,062	255	2,124
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>816</b>	6,286	1,824	1,230	10,156

New/improved technologies can be disaggregated by the following four types:

- *Mechanical and Physical*: New or improved land preparation, production, harvesting, post-harvest handling and processing technologies.
- *Biological*: New or improved livestock breeds, plant varieties, soil management practices, and livestock feed practices and health services;
- *Chemical*: Fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides sustainably and applied in an environmentally safe manner, integrated pest management and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;
- *Management and cultural practices*: Sustainable water management practices, sustainable land management practices; information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information and energy efficiency.

Table 6 below shows disaggregation of beneficiaries by type of new technology.

**Table 6. Number of beneficiaries by types of new technology applied**

Sector	New/Improved Technologies				
	Mechanical/ physical	Biological	Chemical	Management & cultural	Total
Hazelnuts	802	0	0	0	<b>802</b>
Strawberry	9	10	0	10	<b>10</b>
Tourism	0	0	0	4	<b>4</b>
<b>Total</b>	811	10	0	14	<b>816</b>

#### **4.5.2-2. Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance**

This indicator measures the area (in hectares) of land brought under new or improved technology as a result of USG assistance. This may include agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). As mentioned above, relevant technologies include Mechanical and Physical, Biological, Chemical, and Management and Cultural Practices.

If more than one of the above technologies is applied to the same land, the hectares will be counted only under the main technology application to avoid double counting.

The actual number of hectares under improved technologies for FY 2012 includes the 1,499 hectares of land belonging to hazelnut farmers who received toolkits through the EPI/AgriGeorgia Hazelnut training detailed above; as well as the 2.45 hectares of strawberry demonstration plots developed under the *Strawberry Association of Samegrelo-Zemo Svanti* grant. Not all technology or management improvements facilitated by NEO activities will be measureable in terms of hectares, for example, improvement in livestock breeds, livestock health services, modern beekeeping practices, and tourism service provision will only be reflected in beneficiary numbers.

**Table 7. Number of hectares under improved technologies – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	183	--	216	120	0	519
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>1,501</b>	4,099	1,250	1062	7,912

Targets for FY 2013-2015 have been revised to reflect Component 2 value chains and target activities identified in FY 2012.

#### **4.5.2-7. Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training**

This indicator tracks the number of individuals who receive NEO-sponsored agricultural training or extension services to improve their knowledge or skills. This includes farmers and value chain actors who receive training in a variety of best practices in production methods, post-harvest management, market linkages, business management, and other related topics.

The indicator captures the number of participants who attend agribusiness trainings in classrooms, nurseries, demonstration plots, as well as recipients of trainings delivered via multimedia or magazine. In FY 2012, 892 farmers received classroom or demonstration plot training, 184 received information from and requested additional assistance from NEO-sponsored articles in the *Agrarian Journal*, an agricultural magazine.<sup>4</sup> As multimedia trainings have been delayed until FY 2013, the actual number of beneficiaries is significantly less than the original FY 2012 target. Therefore beneficiary estimates have been moved into FY13-15 targets.

<sup>4</sup> NEO distributes 1000 magazines per month to NEO target beneficiaries, which contain articles on new agricultural technologies. Readers can submit questions on the articles or other agricultural queries to NEO via a form included in the magazine. 3000 magazines had been distributed by the end of September, and the project received 184 requests for additional information.

**Table 8. Number of farmers receiving short-term agricultural training – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets (total)</b>	<b>0</b>	7,467	--	11,069	6,782	n/a	25,318
<b>Revised targets (total)</b>	<b>0</b>	--	<b>1,076</b>	13,860	9,782	600	25,318
Trainings in classroom and on demo- plots		--	<b>892</b>	1,485	1,300	600	4,277
Agriculture magazine responses		--	<b>184</b>	--	--	--	184
Multimedia trainings		--	<b>0</b>	12,375	8,482	0	20,857

Agricultural trainings began in April 2012 and intensity increased in the summer period. The table below shows the number of individuals trained by quarters in each region.

**Table 9. Number of training participants by regions and quarters**

Region	Training participants FY 2012				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total
Mtskheta-Mtianeti	0	0	42	67	<b>109</b>
Shida Kartli	0	0	128	367	<b>495</b>
Racha-Lechkhumi	0	0	0	69	<b>69</b>
Samegrelo	0	0	172	143	<b>315</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>988*</b>

\* The total includes participants who took part in more than one training course.

NEO staff and consultants led agricultural trainings in eight different sectors in relevant regions. The selection of sectors and regions was based on sector assessments done by the NEO team. The table below presents distribution of training participants by regions and training area.

**Table 10. Number of agricultural training participants by value chain and region**

Value Chain	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Shida Kartli	Samegrelo	Racha-Lechkhumi
Beekeeping	15	0	0	22
Cane Berry	0	99	0	0
Fruit	0	232	0	0
Greenhouses	0	0	122	0
Strawberry	0	0	122	0
Potato	94	31	0	47
Open Field Vegetable	0	133	0	0
White web worm	0	0	119	0

Table 11 below shows the disaggregation of training participants by gender. From the table we see there was a higher percentage of female participants in the greenhouse and open field vegetable sectors, compared with female participants in beekeeping (5%) and web worm moth (13%) trainings.

**Table 11. Gender disaggregation of agricultural training participants by value chain**

Value Chain	Male	Female	Total*	Male %	Female %
Beekeeping	35	2	37	95	5
Cane Berry	66	33	99	67	33
Fruit	187	45	232	81	19
Greenhouse	56	66	122	46	54
Strawberry	53	21	74	72	28
Potato	119	53	172	69	31
Open Field Vegetable	52	81	133	39	61
White web worm	104	15	119	87	13

\* The total includes participants who took part in more than one training course.

The gender disaggregation by region also reveals the lowest level of female participation in training occurred in the Racha-Lechkhumi region (15 percent), compared to female participation of 31-36 percent in the other three NEO target regions.

**Table 12. Gender disaggregation in agricultural training by region**

Region	Number of participants (without duplications)				
	Male	Female	Total*	Male %	Female %
Mtskheta-Mtianeti	70	39	109	64	36
Shida Kartli	310	153	463	67	33
Racha-Lechkhumi	57	10	67	85	15
Samegrelo	174	79	253	69	31
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>892</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>32%</b>

\* The total includes participants who took part in more than one training course.

#### 4.5.2. Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation

While the original PMP indicator included all types of employment opportunities created in the agricultural sector, it omitted project-facilitated jobs creation in non-agriculture-related enterprises such as tourism. For this reasons, NEO has proposed to expand this indicator to track both agriculture and non-agricultural employment generated by the project.

In the future, NEO will disaggregate jobs by employment terms: occasional (those lasting less than one month), short-term (1 to 3 months), and long-term (more than 3 months), in order to show the full picture of job creation through the project activities. However, for this reporting

period, this disaggregation by employment term was not feasible, since not enough time has passed to accurately assess the length of employment for vocational education graduates who completed training in September 2012.

**Table 13. Number jobs created – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets (only FTF jobs)</b>	<b>0</b>	220	-	340	207	0	767
<b>Revised targets (including all types of jobs)</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>265</b>	1,078	180	84	1,607

The number of jobs created in FY 2012 consists of 149 jobs created through Component 2 grant beneficiaries—seasonal field workers<sup>5</sup> on the strawberry demonstration plots and service personnel (guides, guesthouse/campground personnel, cooks) in the tourism sector—and 116 Component 3 vocational education graduates who have found jobs. More precise disaggregation is shown below.

**Table 14. Number jobs by gender and sectors in FY 2012**

Sector	# of jobs	Male	Female
<b>Component 2</b>			
Strawberry	71	63	8
Greenhouses	0	0	0
Meteorological Stations	0	0	0
Tourism	78	68	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Component 3</b>			
Plumbing	14	14	0
Beekeeping	26	19	7
Grafting	11	11	0
Welding	5	5	0
Apparel making	17	0	17
Hair dressing	43	0	43
<b>Total</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>67</b>

As for disaggregation according to agriculture/non-agriculture related jobs, it is the following:

<sup>5</sup> During this reporting period, the seasonal jobs were limited to land preparation and planters for the strawberry seedlings. Employment levels may increase in the spring and summer during the harvest periods.

**Table 15. Number agriculture/non-agriculture jobs**

Sector	# of jobs	Male	Female
<b>Agriculture</b>			
Strawberry	71	63	8
Beekeeping	26	19	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Non-agriculture</b>			
Plumbing	14	14	0
Tourism	78	68	10
Grafting	11	11	0
Welding	5	5	0
Apparel-making	17	0	17
Hair-dressing	43	0	43
<b>Total</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>70</b>

#### 4.5.2-11. Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producer organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community based organizations (CBOs), receiving USG-assistance

This indicator captures the total number of private enterprises, cooperatives, producers, service provider organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, service providers, sector associations, community-based and other organizations, that received USG assistance related to food security during the reporting year. This assistance includes support that aims at improving organizational functions such as: member services, production, storage, processing and other downstream techniques; management, marketing and accounting; and community mobilization.

This indicator includes the number of groups formed or assisted through the capacity building (grant or training). Indicators are calculated by adding the number of Community Working Groups (Component 1), HOAs and TAs (Component 4), and other types of associations or organizations assisted in other components. In the case of training or assistance to farmer's association or cooperatives, producers' organizations, sector associations, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity.

**Table 16. Number of organizations receiving USG assistance – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	18	-	52	83	35	188
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>75</b>	29	30	0	134

**Table 17. Type of CBOs, HOAs, TAs or Associations assisted by NEO by municipality**

Location	Component 1	Component 4		Component 2	Total
	Community Working Groups	Home Owners Associations	Tenants Associations	Agricultural Association	
<b>Mtskheta-Mtianeti</b>	11	0	0	0	11
Dusheti	8				8
Kazbegi	3				3
<b>Shida Kartli</b>	23	0	2	0	25
Gori	9		2		11
Kareli	7				7
Khashuri	7				7
<b>Racha-Lechkhumi</b>	11	0	0	0	11
Oni	4				4
Tsageri	5				5
Lentekhi	2				2
<b>Samegrelo</b>	20	3	0	1	24
Zugdidi	14			1	15
Tsalenjikha	6				6
Senaki		3			3
<b>Kvemo Kartli</b>	0	2	0	0	2
Rustavi		2			2
<b>Imereti</b>	0	2	0	0	2
Kutaisi		2			2
<b>TOTAL</b>	65	7	2	1	75

#### **4.5.2-38. Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation**

Investment is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production levels, improve the sustainable use of agriculture-related natural resources (soil, water, etc.), or improve water or land management. “Private sector” includes any privately-led agricultural activity managed by a for-profit company, although community-based organizations’ or NGO resources may be included if the entity engages in for-profit agricultural activities. “Leveraged by FTF implementation” means that the new investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by the FTF initiative. Investments reported should not include funds received by the investor from USG as part of any grant or other award.

Targets for this indicator are calculated as the sum of the cost share provided by Component 2 and 3 grantees. On average, the cost share is about 20-25 percent for Component 2 grantees and 5 percent from Component 3 vulnerable beneficiaries. As it is not possible to project private sector investment levels, targets are estimated based on expected grant contributions only.

**Table 18. Value of private sector investment – targets vs. actuals**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	\$352,432	-	\$399,672	\$217,137	0	\$969,241
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>\$142,859</b>	\$122,051	\$120,000	0	\$384,910

#### 4.6.3-4. Number of persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs

This indicator tracks the total number of people who have benefitted from USG-funded workforce development projects, including graduates of vocational education courses, as well as beneficiaries completing on-the-job training programs.

NEO is working with a number of vocational education centers which provide courses in demand-based trades. The table below shows the initial/revised targets and actual results for FY 2012.

**Table 19. Number of persons completing workforce development programs – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	240	-	360	0	0	600
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>305</b>	292	100	0	697

Workforce development programs were implemented under NEO Components 2, 3 and 4, mostly in the form of vocational training under Component 3. Component 4 activities include the training and formation of Maintenance Teams for HOAs and TAs—five from each HOA/TA. Under Component 2, a tourism grantee provided job training for 6 guides. The table below shows disaggregation by trade.

**Table 20. Number of persons completing workforce development programs by component, trade and gender**

Type of training	Component 2			Component 3			Component 4		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Rafting-Kayaking	6		6						
Electricity				11		11			
Plumbing				51		51			
Beekeeping				35	26	61			
Grafting				11		11			
Welding				11		11			
Apparel making					28	28			
Hair dressing				1	80	81			
Maintenance							45		45
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>		<b>47%</b>	<b>53%</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	

**Table 21. Gender disaggregation of workforce development programs by region**

Region	Gender of participants by region		
	Male	Female	Total
Mtskheta-Mtianeti	13	8	<b>21</b>
Shida Kartli	46	41	<b>87</b>
Racha-Lechkhumi	16	19	<b>35</b>
Samegrelo	76	66	<b>142</b>
Imereti	10	0	<b>10</b>
Kvemo Kartli	10	0	<b>10</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>305</b>
<b>Percent Total</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>44%</b>	

The table below shows the number of training participants in each region by types of training.

**Table 22. Disaggregation of workforce development programs by trade**

Type of training	Region						Total
	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Shida Kartli	Racha-Lechkhumi	Samegrelo	Imereti	Kvemo Kartli	
Rafting-Kayaking	6						<b>6</b>
Electricity		11					<b>11</b>
Plumbing	6	13		32			<b>51</b>
Beekeeping			35	26			<b>61</b>
Grafting		11					<b>11</b>
Welding				11			<b>11</b>
Apparel making		13		15			<b>28</b>
Hair dressing		37		44			<b>81</b>
Maintenance		11		14	10	10	<b>45</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>305</b>

#### 4.6.3-2. Number of people gaining employment or better employment as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development programs

This indicator measures the total number of people gaining employment or improving their employment status within six months of participation in USG-funded workforce development projects. Improved employment status is based on the participant’s perception of improvement, whether through higher income, increased number of clients, promotion, or improved work schedule.

NEO held workforce development trainings/courses in fourth quarter of FY 2012, despite the short period of time following the training, 116 training beneficiaries have gained or improved their employment status compared to baseline levels of employment and incomes at the start of the training. To measure the results, NEO interviewed the training beneficiaries one month after training completion with a follow-up questionnaire, asking them if they had started a new job or improved their employment status due to NEO training courses.

**Table 23. Number of people gaining new or better employment – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	120	-	180	0	0	300
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>116</b>	250	70	0	436

The share of trainees who gained/improved employment in FY 2012 is 38 percent, however, this rate is expected to increase in FY 2013, as NEO continues to track the employment and income improvement of beneficiaries who participated in FY 2102 workforce development initiatives. Based on the survey results, women account for a higher percentage of graduates gaining employment or improving their employment status following the training program—49 percent of all women trained have improved their employment status, and account for 57 percent of the total beneficiaries who have improved their employment status.

**Table 24. Number of people gaining new or better employment by gender and region**

Region	Gender of employed trainees by region		
	Male	Female	Total
Mtskheta-Mtianeti	0	2	<b>2</b>
Shida Kartli	17	26	<b>43</b>
Racha-Lechkhumi	0	0	<b>0</b>
Samegrelo	33	38	<b>71</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total Trained</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>305</b>
<b>Percent Employed</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>38%</b>

**Table 25. Number of trainees gaining/improving employment by regions and trade**

Sector	Region						Total
	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Shida Kartli	Racha-Lechkhum	Samegrelo	Imereti	Kvemo Kartli	
Plumbing	0	5	0	9	0	0	14
Beekeeping	0	0	0	26	0	0	26
Grafting	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
Welding	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
Apparel making	0	6	0	11	0	0	17
Hair dressing	2	21	0	20	0	0	43
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>116</b>

Of the 305 persons completing NEO-funded workforce development programs in FY 2012, 124 individuals<sup>6</sup> were also provided with toolkits specific to their trade to facilitate obtaining employment opportunities.

**Table 26. Number of trainees provided with toolkits vs. employed**

Sector	Number of trained	Number of toolkit beneficiaries	Number of employed	% of employed out of trained
Rafting-Kayaking	6	0	0	0
Electricity	11	0	0	0
Plumbing	51	15	14	27
Beekeeping	61	26	26	43
Grafting	11	11	11	100
Welding	11	5	5	45
Apparel making	28	19	17	61
Hair dressing	81	48	43	53
Maintenance	45	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>38%</b>

#### 4.7.3-4. Total number of microenterprises receiving business development services from USG-assisted sources

This indicator measures the number of microenterprises (including individual entrepreneurs, farmers, and SMEs) receiving business development services through the NEO project, including consultations, trainings (business skills, access to finance/loans, agriculture sector productivity and new technologies), awards and sub-awards (livelihood packages, micro-grants, grants, toolkits).

In order to avoid double-counting, in the recent PMP update, NEO suggested to merge indicators 4.7.3-4 and 4.6.2-3 “Number of firms receiving USG assistance to improve their

<sup>6</sup> There are a number of beneficiaries from the trainings who will receive their toolkits in October – including the remaining 35 beekeeping trainees and the IDP HOA/TA maintenance teams.

management practices”, which both focus on improvements to business, management and productivity skills and training in access to finance, since based on the FY 2012 sector selection, the bulk of NEO business development and management service training will be targeted to small-hold farmers, individual entrepreneurs, micro- and start-up enterprises.

In addition, video training beneficiaries have been excluded from target counts, as changes to management/business skills are not verifiable for this group. Thus the actual number for FY 2012 only accounts for the number of farmers receiving business development services through direct training in agriculture sector productivity and the application of new technologies.

**Table 27. Number of microenterprises receiving business development services – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	4,170	-	9,578	10,941	2,717	27,406
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>892</b>	1,962	1,520	684	5,058

Of the 892 farmers assisted, 32% were women. Gender disaggregation is shown below.

**Table 28. Number of agricultural training participants by gender**

Region	Number of participants				
	Male	Female	Total	Male %	Female %
Mtskheta-Mtianeti	70	39	<b>109</b>	64	36
Shida Kartli	310	153	<b>463</b>	67	33
Racha-Lechkhumi	57	10	<b>67</b>	85	15
Samegrelo	174	79	<b>253</b>	69	31
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>892</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>32%</b>

#### 4.7.5-11. Number of sector assessments

Number of sector assessments conducted by NEO over the LOP includes Economic Development Plans (EDPs) developed under Component 1, as well as sector assessments conducted in Component 2 and Component 4.

Under Component 1, one EDP will be developed for each of the 85 target communities, including a review of their social, infrastructure, agriculture and non-agriculture sectors. In FY 2012, USAID and NEO agreed to increase the EDP development process to finalize 55 EDPs in 2012, and 30 in 2013. In addition, Component 2 will cover a total of nine value chains for which assessments have been completed.

Actual results for FY 2012 include 57 draft EDPs, 10 sector assessments<sup>7</sup> under Component 2 and 1 sector assessment for Component 4. For the specific list of sector reviews, please see Annex B.

**Table 29. Number of sector assessments – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	55	-	38	9	0	102
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>68</b>	30	0	0	98

**Table 30. Sector assessments by quarters and component**

Sector	Oct-Dec Q1 FY12				Jan-March Q2 FY12				April-June Q3 FY12				July-Sept Q4 FY12				FY 2012			
	Component				Component				Component				Component				Component			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Draft EDPs	8				22				23				4				57			
Value Chain Assessments		2				6				1								9		
Legal Review				1																1
Financial Sector Review		1																1		
<b>Total</b>	8	3		1	22	6			23	1			4				<b>57</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>68</b>																			

#### 4.6.3-6. Number of workforce development initiatives created through USG-assisted public private partnerships

Pending USAID approval of the revised PMP update, and based on USAID’s 2011 Performance Plan and Report this indicator is scheduled to be eliminated, as it is not an accurate measure of job creation. The indicator only counts companies with which the project works – but a greenhouse that creates 5-10 seasonal jobs, a hairdresser who hires one vocational training beneficiary full-time, and a clothing factory which may hire 50 part-time seamstresses would all be weighted equally (i.e. = 3). Instead, NEO will track the actual level of job creation under indicator 4.6.3-2, to better reflect the actual results of workforce development activities.

<sup>7</sup> This includes nine value chain assessments and an access to finance assessment completed at the start of the project.

#### 4.6.2-7. Number of SMEs receiving USG assistance to access bank loans or private equity

This indicator refers to training activities that improve enterprises' (individuals, farmers, small and medium enterprises) ability to understand, apply for, or utilize financing opportunities from banks or microfinance organizations.

CHCA will initiate access to finance training in FY 2013 and FY2014. Revised targets for this indicator are presented below.

**Table 31. Number of enterprises receiving assistance to access bank loans/private equity – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	0	150	-	220	230	50	650
<b>Revised targets</b>	0	-	0	230	100	0	330

#### 4.6.2-3. Number of firms receiving USG assistance to improve their management practices

To avoid double counting, NEO has merged Indicator 4.6.2-3 with Indicator 4.7.3-4 (Total number of enterprises receiving USG support to improve their business development services and management practices from USG assisted sources). See detailed results above.

## B. NEO INTERNAL INDICATORS

### 3.3.1.2. Number of EDPs developed/updated

The community-level EDPs outline community economic development priorities in the agricultural, non-agricultural (business), infrastructure and social sectors. NEO developed an EDP model, and began implementation of EDP activities by September 2011; intensive work with communities began shortly thereafter. Over the LOP, NEO plans to develop and/or update EDPs in each of the 85 target communities.

In FY 2012, at the request of USAID, NEO expedited the EDP development process to target 55 EDPs in FY 2012 and 30 in FY 2013.

**Table 32. Number of EDPs developed – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	0	40	-	35	9	0	84
<b>Revised targets</b>	0	-	55	30	0	0	85

In addition to the 55 finalized EDPs, drafts of 2 additional EDPs were also completed, 8 EDPs are in currently in development, and another 20 will be finalized in FY 2013. For the complete list FY 2012 EDPs, please see the Sector Assessment List in Annex B.

**Table 33. EDP development status by region**

Region/ Municipality	EDPs Development Status - FY12			
	To be Initiated	In Process	Draft Completed	Finalized
<b>Mtskheta-Mtianeti</b>	0	2	2	7
Dusheti		2	2	4
Kazbegi				3
<b>Shida Kartli</b>	12	0	0	23
Gori	7			9
Kareli	2			7
Khashuri	3			7
<b>Racha-Lechkhumi</b>	3	2	0	9
Oni	1			4
Tsageri				5
Lentekhi	2	2		0
<b>Samegrelo</b>	5	4	0	16
Zugdidi	3	4		10
Tsalenjikha	2			6
<b>TOTAL</b>	20	8	2	55

### 3.3.1.3. Number of Municipal Economic Development Plans (MEDPs) updated

Each MEDP outlines the economic development and priorities of the municipality and includes an implementation plan outlining the steps for achieving goals set forth in the plan. Community-level EDPs are intended to be integrated into the development of their municipality’s economic development plant.

**Table 34. Number of MEDPs updated - targets**

Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
0	0	0	5	5	0	10

As NEO is not working with all communities in the 10 target municipalities, nor is the project directly working with municipalities on the MEDPs with the exception of the EDP presentations and community level training, NEO has no direct influence over the municipalities to update their MEDPs to include priorities from NEO community EDPs. Therefore, in the recent PMP update which is pending USAID approval, NEO has suggested removing this indicator.

### 3.3.1.4. Number of local government staff trained in EDP/MEDP development/implementation

This indicator accounts for the number of local government staff trained in EDP development/implementation. Local government staff refers to individuals employed by the government at the municipal or community level. To ensure the sustainability and community ownership of the EDPs, in addition the local government representatives, NEO also included community members (individuals involved in EDP planning - members of working/focus groups) in these training.

NEO has revised the overall targets to include the number of community members trained in EDP development, but will disaggregate the results by local government staff and community representatives. During FY 2012, NEO trained in total 275 individuals, 73 local government staff and 202 community representatives.

**Table 35. Number of local government staff and community members trained – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	0	30	-	0	0	0	30
<b>Revised targets</b>	0	-	275	235	0	0	510

The table below shows the disaggregation of local government and community representatives trained by gender and regions/municipalities. In total there is almost equal representation in terms of gender (58% - male, 42% - female).

**Table 36. Number of local government staff and community members trained by regions**

Region/ Municipality	Local Government Representative			Community Representatives			Total - local government staff & community representatives		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Mtskheta-Mtianeti</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>60</b>
Dusheti	5	7	12	17	13	30	22	20	42
Kazbegi	0	0	0	14	4	18	14	4	18
<b>Shida Kartli</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>127</b>
Gori	3	11	14	15	17	32	18	28	46
Kareli	9	7	16	16	10	26	25	17	42
Khashuri	4	5	9	16	14	30	20	19	39
<b>Racha-Lechkhumi<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Oni	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Tsageri	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Lentekhi	0	0	0	0	0	0			
<b>Samegrelo</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>88</b>
Zugdidi	7	4	11	31	14	45	38	18	56
Tsalenjikha	9	2	11	14	7	21	23	9	32
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>275</b>

### 3.3.1.5. Number of working groups formed/revitalized

This indicator shows the number of working groups—groups comprised of community members formed to work on an EDP—established or revitalized by the NEO project. Working groups include private sector, local government, and community members. By the end of the project, the number of working groups should equal the number of NEO target communities (85). During FY 2011-2012, 65 working groups were established in NEO communities.

<sup>8</sup> EDP trainings in Racha-Lechumi planned for September 2012 were rescheduled at the request of the municipality for late October after the elections.

**Table 37. Number of working groups formed – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	55	-	29	0	0	84
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>65</b>	20	0	0	85

After forming working groups, focus groups were tasked with identifying development priorities in four sectors: infrastructure, social, agriculture, and business. The working group members and other community members are sub-divided into the four sectoral focus groups. Under this indicator, NEO attributes one working group and one focus group per community.

**Table 38. Number of working groups and focus groups formed by regions and quarters**

Region/ Municipality	Working Groups						Focus Groups					
	Q4 FY11	FY 12				Total	Q4 FY1 1	FY 12				Total
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
<b>Mtskheta-Mtianeti</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>
Dusheti	1	3	4			8		4	4			8
Kazbegi		3				3			3			3
<b>Shida Kartli</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>
Gori	1	3	3	2		9		4	3	2		9
Kareli	1	3	2	1		7		4	2	1		7
Khashuri		4	2	1		7		4	2	1		7
<b>Racha-Lechkhumi</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>
Oni			4			4			4			4
Tsageri			3	2		5			3	2		5
Lentekhi				2		2				2		2
<b>Samegrelo</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>
Zugdidi		6	4		4	14		6	4		4	14
Tsalenjikha		4	2			6		3	3			6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>65</b>

### 3.3.1.6. Number of community members involved in LED planning

LED Planning is the process which results in development of the EDPs. The number of community members involved in LED planning varies from community to community. Therefore approximate targets have been set.

Targets in FY 2013-2015 have been revised to reflect the expedited EDP development process. The community members (working group/focus group members) involved in LED planning during FY 2012 is 1,556.

**Table 39. Number of community members involved in LED planning – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	1,320	-	1,056	516	336	3,228
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>1,556</b>	940	120	340	2,956

The percentage of female representatives varies between 33-39 percent in NEO target regions, with an average of 36 percent female participation in LED planning during FY 2012.

**Table 40. Number of community members involved in LED planning by gender and municipality**

Region / Municipality	Male	Female	Female %	Total
<b>Mtskheta-Mtianeti</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>254</b>
Dusheti	116	78		194
Kazbegi	53	7		60
<b>Shida Kartli</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>549</b>
Gori	146	83		229
Kareli	99	70		169
Khashuri	90	61		151
<b>Racha-Lechkhumi</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>253</b>
Oni	48	18		66
Tsageri	82	43		125
Lentekhi	36	26		62
<b>Samegrelo</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>500</b>
Zugdidi	210	119		329
Tsalenjikha	109	62		171
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>1556</b>

### 3.3.2.1. Amount of funding leveraged from government, other donor, or private sector

This indicator measures the funding leveraged in support of NEO activities within the target communities. Funding sources may include government, other donors, and/or the private sector for coordinated actions aimed at improving community infrastructure.

NEO targets are estimated based on the required 15 percent municipal cost-share for each of the 85 community-level infrastructure projects (approximately ██████████ per project). Looking ahead to FY 2013 and beyond, NEO will also aim to leverage funding from other stakeholders such as CARE, United Georgian Water Company and other stakeholders for joint projects in the future; however, these amounts will only be defined at the time of project identification.

Only two of the planned small-scale infrastructure projects for FY 2012 were completed; cost-shares for the additional 18 projects to be completed have been reallocated to FY 2013 targets. The percentage of local government cost-share for two completed infrastructure projects in FY 2012 totaled 32 percent.

**Table 41. Amount of funding leveraged – target vs. actual**

FY	Old format of targets	New format of targets	Actual	Percentage Leveraged	Notes
2012	15%	██████████	██████████	32%	15% of 20 planned projects
2013	15%	██████████			15% of 30 planned projects
2014	15%	██████████			15% of 30 planned projects
2015	15%	██████████			15% of 5 planned projects

Amounts and percentage of funding leveraged from local government for infrastructure projects completed in FY12 is the following:

**Table 42. Funding leveraged in infrastructure projects completed during FY12**

Municipality	Community	Village	Project Name	Project Budget (in GEL)				
				NEO Input	Municipal cost-share	Other Donor	Private Sector	Total Budget
Kareli	Dirbi	Dirbi	Water Supply System Rehabilitation in Dirbi	██████████	██████████	0	0	██████████
Gori	Tirdznisi	Brotsleti	Water Supply System Rehabilitation in Brotsleti and Ergneti	██████████	██████████	0	0	██████████
Gori	Tirdznisi	Ergneti		██████████	██████████	0	0	██████████
<b>Total amount</b>				██████████	██████████	0	0	██████████
<b>% of cost sharing</b>				68%	32%	0%	0%	100%

### 3.3.2.2. Number of LED events held

An LED event is an event which aims to coordinate, promote, or improve local economic development planning through such events as community meetings, EDP presentations or MOU/LOI signing. This indicator measures the effectiveness of NEO’s efforts to promote LED planning and EDP development. The target number of LED events was set according to the number of communities, based on one community meeting in each community.

**Table 43. LED events – target vs. actuals**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	40	-	35	9	0	84
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>68</b>	20	0	0	88

Below is a list of the type of events per region/municipality. A full list of events is included in Annex C.

**Table 44. LED events by region and type**

Region/ Municipality	LED Event Types - FY12			
	Community Mtg.	MOU/LOI signing	EDP Presentation	Total
<b>Mtskheta-Mtianeti</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>
Dusheti	7	1		
Kazbegi	3			
<b>Shida Kartli</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>
Gori	8	1		
Kareli	6	1		
Khashuri	7			
<b>Racha-Lechkhumi</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>
Oni	4	1		
Tsageri	5			
Lentekhi	2			
<b>Samegrelo</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>
Zugdidi	14	1		
Tsalenjikha	6		1	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>68</b>

### 3.3.2.3. Number of small-scale infrastructure projects implemented

This indicator highlights the number of infrastructure projects implemented in NEO target communities. This includes infrastructure projects prioritized in an EDP, emergency rehabilitation initiatives, or grant-funded development programs.

Under NEO's contract, one small-scale infrastructure project will be implemented in each community. In FY 2012, only 2 of the 20 planned small-scale infrastructure projects were completed; the remaining 18 projects are now scheduled for completion in FY 2013. A complete list of completed, active, and planned infrastructure projects identified to date are included in Annex A.

**Table 45. Small-scale infrastructure projects –targets vs. actuals**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	20	-	30	30	4	84
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>2</b>	48	30	5	85

**3.2.3.1. Number of grants awarded**

The number of grants awarded includes the cash or in-kind grant assistance provided by NEO to support business productivity, employment, income generation and/or food security activities. To account for all types of grants, NEO has recommended including sub-awards, as well as prime grants in this indicator. Sub-awards include funding or in-kind assistance delivered to NEO beneficiaries by a NEO sub-contractor or grantee. To avoid double counting, the indicator 3.4.1.1 (Number of micro-grants awarded) has been included here.

Revised targets include grant and sub-award estimates for Components 2, 3 and 4. The actual number of grants/sub-awards in FY 2012 includes 19 Component 2 individual grants, 1 association based grant for 10 farmers, 122 toolkits delivered to workforce development program beneficiaries in frame of Component 3, and 802 toolkits provided to hazelnut trainees in coordination with the USAID/EPI project. A complete list of NEO grants is included in Annex D.

**Table 46. Number of grants/sub-awards –target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets (only C2 grants)</b>	<b>0</b>	20	-	22	12	0	54
<b>Revised targets (including grants &amp; sub-awards)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>1821</b>
C2 individual grants		20	<b>19</b>	81	114	0	1,026
C2 sub-award grants*			<b>812</b>				
C3 livelihood packages		70	<b>0</b>	247	120	84	451
C3 toolkits		144	<b>124</b>	172	0	0	296
C4 grantees			<b>0</b>	18	30	0	48

\*Includes provision of 802 hazelnut toolkits and 10 strawberry demonstration plot farms

Female representation among Component 2 grantees is relatively low (17 percent), while among Component 3 beneficiaries who received the toolkits, women are represented with 60 percent.

**Table 47. Component 2 grants/sub-awards by gender, sector and regions**

Value Chain	Region	Number of grants/sub-awards	Male	Female
Strawberry	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	10	7	3
Greenhouses	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	11	11	0
Meteorological Stations	Shida Kartli	1	1	0
Tourism	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	7	5	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Percentage</b>			<b>83%</b>	<b>17%</b>

**Table 48. Component 3 sub-awards by gender, sector and regions**

Sector	Region	Number of Toolkit Awards	Male	Female
Beekeeping	Samegrelo	26	19	7
Grafting	Shida Kartli	11	11	0
Welding	Shida Kartli	5	5	0
Plumbing	Samegrelo, Shida Kartli	15	15	0
Apparel-making	Samegrelo, Shida Kartli	19	0	19
Hair dressing	Samegrelo, Shida Kartli	48	0	46
<b>Total</b>		<b>124</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Percentage</b>			<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>

### 3.4.1.1. Number of micro-grants awarded

Micro-grant is defined as any grant valued under ██████. As many of these micro-grants will be issued as sub-awards by NEO grantees, NEO has suggested to merge this indicator with above indicator 3.2.3.1 (Number of grants/sub-awards) to avoid double counting across these two indicators.

### 3.2.3.3. Number of special funds/loans facilitated

The number of special funds/loans facilitated includes loans or microloans from banks, microfinance institutions, and other lending organizations, as well as any type of special funding from a donor or government agency, such as a grant, which was supported through project assistance, provided via training, capacity building delivered through team members, and/or grant.

NEO is tracking the number of individuals trained in access to finance (indicator 4.6.2.7), but to measure the effectiveness of the capacity building activities, the amount of funding secured should also be tracked. Values will be tracked, but cannot be estimated as targets. During FY 2012, three tourism grantees obtained loans due to NEO grant support. NEO's facilitation of

no- and low-interest loan programs for vulnerable and IDP beneficiaries will begin in FY 2013.

**Table 49. Number of special funds/loans facilitated – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	0	15	-	15	15	15	60
<b>Revised targets</b>	0	-	3	27	15	15	60

### 3.2.2.5. Number of clients using the joint center services

A Joint-use/extension center (JUC) is an entity designed to support economic growth in a community through multiple types of uses. Clients are individuals receiving any kind of service at the joint-use/extension center. NEO activities to establish or strengthen an existing JUC will begin in FY 2013, thus targets for this indicator had been set for FY 2013 and relevant activities are accordingly planned.

**Table 50. Number of clients using the joint center services - targets**

Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
0	0	0	400	1200	1200	2800

### 3.3.2.5: Number of HOAs established

NEO’s Component 4 aims to ensure the sustainability of IDP housing by establishing HOAs in USG-rehabilitated IDP apartment buildings. The number of HOAs established is conditional on the number of apartment buildings scheduled for rehabilitation under the USAID/GMIP and MDF projects. As these target buildings have yet to be finalized, targets are estimated based on the pilot program and FY 2013 projections.

**Table 51. Number of HOAs established – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	0	6	-	30	50	14	100
<b>Revised targets</b>	0	-	7	0	30	0	37

**Table 52. HOAs established in FY12**

#	Region	City	Building Address
1	Kvemo Kartli	Rustavi	Dosaaf, 2 Graneli st
2	Kvemo Kartli	Rustavi	Turbaza, 28 Tbilisi st
3	Samegrelo	Senaki	Railway, 26 Uridia st, Building 1
4	Samegrelo	Senaki	Railway, 26 Uridia st, Building 2
5	Samegrelo	Senaki	Agro-Economic College#194, Mshvidoba St
6	Imereti	Kutaisi	Avtomshenebeli st
7	Imereti	Kutaisi	Nikea, 19

**3.3.2.6: Number of Tenants Associations (TAs) established**

Similar to indicator 3.3.2.5 –NEO is establishing Tenants’ Association (TAs) in IDP cottage settlements. The number of TAs established is conditional on the number of settlements scheduled for rehabilitation under the USAID/GMIP and MDF projects. As these settlements have yet to be finalized, indicator targets are estimates based on the pilot program and FY 2013 projections.

**Table 53. Number of TAs established – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
Initial targets	0	2	-	2	18	16	38
Revised targets	0	-	2	9	0	0	11

**Table 54. TAs established in FY12**

#	Region	Municipality	Settlement
1	Shida Kartli	Gori	Khurvaleti
2	Shida Kartli	Gori	Berbuki

**3.3.2.7: Number of IDPs organized in HOAs**

Tracking the number of IDPs organized in HOA is important to show NEO’s reach and the size of the HOAs. The size of HOAs will vary by the size of the apartment building size. Targets use the minimum number of 20 households per apartment building.

**Table 55. Number of IDPs organized in HOAs – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			Total
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	420	-	2,100	3,500	980	7,000
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>516</b>	0	2,200	0	2,716

During FY 2012 the number of IDPs organized in seven HOAs established in the pilot buildings in Rustavi, Senaki and Kutaisi include 516 residents. The table below indicates two types of household counts, a) active households in the HOA, which means that these households include one representative on the HOA, and b) all households covered by HOA (active and non-active), which means the total number of households residing in the building where HOA is operating. These numbers are not equal because several households refused to participate in the HOA. The total number of IDPs was determined by NEO's subcontractor CHCA and this is the actual number of residents in the building. Due to movement of some households/individuals to other place from time to time, this numbers might change slightly.

**Table 56. Number of IDPs per HOA**

#	Region	City	Building Address	Active HHs in HOAs	All HHs covered by HOA	Total # of IDPs
1	Kvemo Kartli	Rustavi	Dosaaf, 2 Graneli st	30	30	101
2	Kvemo Kartli	Rustavi	Turbaza, 28 Tbilisi st	20	20	76
3	Samegrelo	Senaki	Railway, 26 Uridia st, Building 1	37	52	135
4	Samegrelo	Senaki	Railway, 26 Uridia st, Building 2			
5	Samegrelo	Senaki	Agro-Economic College #194, Mshvidoba St	18	19	51
6	Imereti	Kutaisi	Avtomshenebeli st	20	21	80
7	Imereti	Kutaisi	Nikea, 19	19	23	73
<b>Total</b>				<b>144</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>516</b>

### 3.3.2.8: Number of IDPs organized in TAs

Tracking the number of IDPs involved in TAs is important to show NEO's reach and the size of the TAs. The size of TAs will vary by size of the IDP settlements. In FY 2012 NEO established 2 TAs (Khurvaleti and Berbuki) with IDP 858 residents. Revised targets represent the number of residents in the 11 GMIP settlements currently targeted for rehabilitation.

**Table 57. Number of IDPs organized in TAs – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	910	-	910	8,190	7,280	17,290
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>858</b>	6,253	0	0	7,111

During FY 2012 the number of IDPs organized in the TAs established in the two pilot IDP settlements is 858. Because several households refused to participate in the TA the table below indicates two types of household count – a) active households in HOA, which means that these households have one representative in TA, and b) all households covered by TA (active and non-active), which means the total number of households residing in the settlement. The actual number of IDPs per settlement was determined by CHCA mobilizers. Due to movement of some households/individuals to other place, this numbers might change slightly from time to time.

**Table 58. Number of IDPs per TA**

#	Region	Municipality	Settlement	Active HHs in HOAs	Total HHs covered by HOA	Total # of IDPs
1	Shida Kartli	Gori	Khurvaleti	108	130	404
2	Shida Kartli	Gori	Berbuki	106	134	454
<b>Total</b>				<b>214</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>858</b>

### 3.3.2.10: Number of local government officials trained in housing services

This indicator tracks the number of government officials working at the regional or community level who participated in a housing Services training. (Housing service is defined as a service provided by local government, which directly supports upkeep or maintenance of public housing).

Since the number of regions in which NEO HOA/TA activities will be ongoing is conditional on the USAID/GMIP and MDF rehabilitation programs, current targets are based on the municipalities where the eight pilot IDP settlements and FY 2013 projected buildings/settlements are located.

**Table 59. Number of local government officials trained – target vs. actual**

	Actual	Target	Actual	Target			
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	FY2013 (Oct-Sep)	FY2014 (Oct-Sep)	FY2015 (Oct-Apr)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	<b>0</b>	10	-	25	20	0	55
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	-	<b>20</b>	20	15	0	55

NEO Component 4 team led a 3-day training in June 2012 for 21 local government officials. There were no female representatives at the training.

**Table 60. FY 2012 HOA/TA government training participants**

#	Position	Region
1	Deputy Head of Gori Sakrebulo	Shida Kartli
2	Major Specialist	
3	Deputy Head of IDP Department	
4	Head of Sakrebulo Commission	
5	Head of Sakrebulo financial Commission	
6	Major Specialist	Imereti
7	Major Housing Specialist	
8	Chief of Housing Department	
9	Leading Specialist	
10	IDP Department Representative	Kvemo Kartli
11	Sakrebulo Member	
12	NP Corps chief	
13	Head of Economic Commission	Samegrelo
14	Head of Economic & Infrastructure	
15	Head of Abkhazia Government in Exile	
16	Head of Public Relations	
17	Specialist	
18	Major Specialist	Tbilisi
19	Head of Department	
20	Head of IDP Department	
	USAID/GMIP, DCOP	

## NEO OUTCOME INDICATORS

### 70,000 households supported through NEO activities

NEO is charged with supporting 70,000 households<sup>9</sup> over the LOP in target municipalities. This indicator identifies the number of households receiving assistance directly or indirectly through the NEO project. In addition to households supported in NEO's 85 target communities, this also includes IDP households supported under Component 4, who may reside outside of the 10 target municipalities.

During FY 2012, NEO supported 6,358 households through different project activities.

**Table 61. Number of households supported through NEO**

Actual	Target
FY2011-2012	Total for LOP
6,313	70,000

The table below lists the activities conducted by NEO, which account for the actual total number of NEO beneficiary households in to date.

**Table 62. Calculation of beneficiary households**

Number of households supported through NEO activities	Direct	Indirect	Total
	4,518	1,795	6,313
Community members involved in LED planning (excluding those household where members are counted as beneficiaries under other project activities)	1,530		1,530
Local government staff trained in EDP development/implementation	73		73
IDP households organized in TAs	264		264
IDP households organized in HOAs	165		165
Beneficiaries receiving improved infrastructure services	202	110	312
Farmers trained by EPI/USAID and delivered the toolkits by NEO	802		802
Beneficiaries who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity training (direct & indirect)	1,076	1,500	2,576
Component 2 beneficiaries and beneficiaries	165	185	350
Persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs	260		260

\* There are 19 cases, where more than one person from one household is benefiting from NEO activities. To avoid double-counting, these cases have been deducted from the total number of direct beneficiaries.

<sup>9</sup> For statistical purposes, in NEO target areas, the average size of a household is 3.7 individuals.

### 3,500 IDP households supported through Component 4 activities

Over the LOP, NEO is charged with supporting 3,500 households in HOAs and TAs to support the maintenance, repair and management of rehabilitated IDP apartments and new IDP settlement infrastructure. However, since there are also IDPs residing in NEO target regions participating in other project activities, NEO has suggested revising the PMP indicator to “IDP households supported through NEO activities.” This will allow NEO to track all IDPs supported by the project.

Target IDP apartment buildings and settlements are contingent on USAID/GMIP and MDF rehabilitation plans which are not yet finalized. Revised target has been estimated based on FY 2013 projections.

**Table 63. Number of IDP households supported through NEO activities**

	Actual	Actual	Target
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	Total for LOP
<b>Initial targets</b> <sup>10</sup>	--	--	7,000
<b>Revised targets</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>663</b>	3,500

\* Includes IDPs under Component 4, as well as those participating in other NEO project activities.

**Table 64. Number of IDP households by NEO activity**

Component	Type of beneficiary	Number of IDP beneficiaries
1	Working Group and Focus Group members and local government staff trained	96
2	Agriculture training participant	101
2	Employed by C2 grantee	9
3	Workforce development program participant	28
4	IDP households in HOA	165
4	IDP households in TA	264
	<b>Total</b>	<b>663</b>

<sup>10</sup> The initial IDP target has been revised to account for a decrease in the number of buildings/settlements targeted for USG-rehabilitation.

## A long-term sustainable approach/management system to manage and maintain USG-rehabilitated IDP buildings and IDP settlements

The goal of NEO’s Component 4 activities is to establish sustainable management systems through which the HOAs/TAs can maintain rehabilitated IDP housing infrastructure. As noted above, target IDP apartment buildings and settlements are contingent on USAID/GMIP and MDF rehabilitation plans which are not yet finalized. Revised target has been estimated based on FY 2013 projections.

**Table 65. Number of HOAs and TAs supported through NEO activities**

	Actual	Actual	Target
	FY2011 (Apr-Sep)	FY2012 (Oct-Sep)	Total
<b>Initial targets</b>	-	-	<b>38 TAs 100 HOAs</b>
<b>Revised targets</b>	-	<b>2 TAs 7 HOAs</b>	<b>11 TAs 37 HOAs</b>

## A sustained increase of at least 20% in the number of adult individuals that perceive that the local government understands and is responsive to their needs over initial benchmark levels

This indicator assesses the impact of Local Economic Development Planning (Component 1). The change in perception will be measured and assessed by based the three-rounds of household surveys results NEO’s subcontractor for the household surveys, GORBI, completed the baseline survey in April 2012 and will conduct the mid-term evaluation in spring 2013.

Calculation of the index is based on assessing the local government related questions<sup>11</sup> using a 5-point scale, where 0 indicates that local self-government bodies are working very inefficiently and the public does not look to their local government for resolution of either socio-economic or legal problems; and 5 indicates that residents feel that their local self-government bodies are working very effectively to resolve problems and that their authority

<sup>11</sup> The index calculates responses to the household survey questions:

- M10. In terms of addressing social and economic problems, what level of government should act in order to receive the best results?
- M11. In terms of addressing legal/rule of law problems, what level of government should be addressed to receive the best results?
- M12. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree:(Local self-government has a lot of authority and it is necessary to reduce it, Local self-government has a lot of authority and it is desirable to reduce it, Local self-government has sufficient authority and there is no need to change it, Local self-government has little authority and it is desirable to increase it, or Local self-government has insignificant authority and it is necessary to increase it)
- M13. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree:(Local self-government works very effectively, Local self-government works somewhat effectively, Local self-government works somewhat ineffectively, Local self-government works very ineffectively, Local self-government doesn’t work at all?)

should be increased. GORBI provided two options by which to calculate the index to measure perception of government responsiveness (see Annex E). Based on their proposals, the second option which provided a more comprehensive and complex assessment of values was selected.

The baseline calculation of the index and target for the LOP 20 percent increase in perception are provided below. Questionnaire responses, from which this index is calculated, are found in Annex E.

**Table 66. Baseline Index of Public Perception of Local Government Responsiveness**

	Baseline Index	LOP Target
	FY2012	20% increase
Index (out of 5)	2.4966	2.9959

**A sustained increase of at least 25% in the average value of household production (income + market value of agricultural or other production obtained but not sold) of targeted households**

To evaluate the effectiveness of Component 2 activities, this indicator tracks the increase in average value of household production of grantees benefiting from Component 2 activities. The baseline survey for this indicator has not yet been conducted since there were not enough sufficient active beneficiaries in FY 2012 to complete the survey. Baseline survey of for this indicator will be completed in spring 2013 with the mid-term household survey.

**A sustained increase of at least 15% in the average value of household production (income + market value of agricultural or other production obtained but not sold) of targeted households.**

To evaluate the effectiveness of Component 3 activities, this indicator tracks the increase in average value of household production of beneficiaries supported through Component 3 activities. The baseline survey for this indicator has not yet been conducted. Component 3 vocational education programs began only in July 2012 and livelihoods programs are scheduled to begin in early FY 2013, therefore there have not yet been sufficient beneficiaries to be surveyed. The baseline survey for this indicator will be completed in spring 2013 with the mid-term household survey.

## **25% of targeted vulnerable households and individuals raised to the official subsistence level**

NEO's Component 3 supports those households, who are registered with SSA, have scores below 100,000, or have been recommended by the community groups as vulnerable. NEO is tasked with decreasing the poverty level of targeted vulnerable households and individuals against the official subsistence level.

Given that the formulation of the indicator is not measurable—SSA scores are not calculated based on subsistence levels of income, and SSA is no longer willing to share information on beneficiaries in target communities – in the recent PMP update submitted to USAID, NEO has recommended amending the indicator to “25% of targeted vulnerable households have decreased their poverty level as calculated according to incomes, against the official subsistence minimum.” The baseline survey of beneficiaries is planned to be carried out in early 2013.

## CONCLUSION

In summary, in FY 2012—the project’s first full year of implementation, NEO benefited a total of 6,313 households—6,075 of which are considered rural households. While this is below the FY 2012 target of 17,189 rural households, the disparity is due primarily to the delay in implementation of FY 2012 infrastructure projects and launch of media training programs; both of which are expected to be implemented in the spring of 2013. Thus, the LOP target of 59,574 rural beneficiary households is expected to be met.

In regards to local economic development planning activities, all PMP targets were achieved, and in some cases, exceeded the targets—specifically NEO finalized 55 EDPs (target 40), formed 65 working groups (target 55), involved 1,556 community members in the EDP process (target 1,320), and trained 73 local government representatives in EDP development (target 30). Where the project fell short in FY 2012, was in terms of implementation of small-scale infrastructure projects. Due to both internal and external delays, only 2 of the 20 planned projects were completed. This also meant that the actual number of beneficiaries provided with improved infrastructure services (1,154) fell short of the target (8,827). However, the remaining 18 FY 2012 projects are all approved and in various states of contracting and implementation, as well the majority of the 30 FY 2013 projects have been identified and will be submitted to USAID for approval over the winter; bringing the project back on track.

Under Component 2, 1,076 individuals received short-term agricultural sector productivity training (classroom, demonstration plots, agricultural magazine), while this falls short of the FY 2012 target of 7,467, the gap is due to the lack of multimedia training beneficiaries. The project decided to delay the development of multimedia training materials until FY 2013, to coincide with demo-plot activities in greenhouse, open-field, potato, strawberry and fruit nursery activities. Therefore, these beneficiary numbers have been moved into FY 2013 and early FY 2014.

In comparison, 955 individuals benefitted from NEO grants and sub-awards in Component 2 and Component 3 activities, which significantly exceeded the targets of 20 grants and 70 micro-grants. Part of the disparity comes from how the initial target was set, which only counted for direct grants. However, as many of the micro-grants will be provided as sub-awards under NEO grant/service provider activities (i.e.: livelihoods programs, vocational training toolkits, association-based grants), NEO has requested to revise the PMP indicator to account for all projected beneficiaries and awards.

NEO also exceeded FY 2012 targets for work force development beneficiaries (240) enabling 305 individuals to participate in vocational education training. Despite the fact that the first vocational training sessions were only completed in mid-September—to date, 116 individuals have already received new or better employment, which is on par with the FY 2012 target of 120, with actuals expected to climb in the coming months. In total, NEO grant and vocational education activities have contributed to the creation of 265 jobs in FY 2012.

In addition, Component 4 targets for FY 2012 were fully achieved for the pilot programs in terms of HOAs/TAs established and number of IDPs benefited. HOA/TA targets for FY 2013/2014 have been revised to align with the USAID/GMIP and MDF IDP housing rehabilitation schedules, by including IDPs in work force development programs—especially construction trades to gain employment in their building rehabilitation projects—agricultural trainings and access to finance programs. Nevertheless, NEO still expects to benefit at least 3,500 IDP households over the life of the project.

Therefore, while not all FY 2012 PMP indicators were achieved as planned, as noted above; solid project impact has been measured during the first full year of project implementation. And with promising previews for early FY 2013 results, which should make up the difference in many of the indicators were not fully achieved in FY 2012. Furthermore, the mid-term household study is planned for spring 2013, which will provide both NEO and USAID with mid-term indicators for increases in household production and income levels, and the next benchmark for local government perception indexes following the change in the administration.

## ANNEX A: NEO IDENTIFIED INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS BY STATUS (AS OF 10/30/12).

#	Region	Municipality	Community	Village	Project Name	Beneficiaries	Status/Notes
<b>Completed</b>							
1	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Dirbi	Dirbi	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Dirbi	740	Complete
2	Shida Kartli	Gori	Tirdznisis	Brotsleti	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Brotsleti and Ergneti Villages	351	Complete
	Shida Kartli	Gori	Tirdznisis	Ergneti		63	Complete
<b>Under Implementation</b>							
3	Shida Kartli	Gori	Akhalubani	Akhrisi	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Akhrisi	370	Design
4	Shida Kartli	Gori	Nikozi	Kvemo Nikozi	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Kvemo and Zemo Nikozi Villages	148	Design
	Shida Kartli	Gori	Nikozi	Zemo Nikozi		241	
5	Shida Kartli	Gori	Dzevera	Dzevera	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Dzevera	1,739	Design
6	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Osiauri	Zemo osiauri	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Zemo Osiauri	1,584	Pre-NTP
7	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Tskhramukha	Tskhramukha	Internal Road Rehabilitation for the Tskhramukha	1,665	Design
<b>RFP</b>							
8	Racha-Lechkhumi Kvemo Svaneti	Oni	Glola	Glola	Rehabilitation of Sports Field	407	RFP Closed; Contract in Negotiation
9	Racha-Lechkhumi Kvemo Svaneti	Oni	Kvashkhieti	Kvashkhieti	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Kvashkhieti	204	RFP Closed; Contract in Negotiation
10	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Bazaleti	Bazaleti	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Bazaleti	167	RFP Posted
11	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Mchadijvari	Mchadijvari	Rehabilitation of the irrigation system in Mchadijvari community	2,035	RFP Posted
12	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Ananuri	Tsikhisdziri	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Tsikhisdziri	204	RFP Posted
13	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Kvishkhieti	Kvishkhieti	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Kvishkhieti	259	RFP Posted
14	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Surami	Surami	Rehabilitation of public square in Surami settlement	3,700	RFP Posted
15	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Khtsisi	Khtsisi	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Khtsisi	622	RFP Posted

Environmental approval received							
16	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Kazbegi	Stepantsminda	Gergeti	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Gergeti	629	RFP failed – rebid pending
17	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Dvani	Dvani	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Dvani Village and irrigation system in Takhtidziri village	370	RFP failed – rebid pending
	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Dvani	Takhtisdziri		592	RFP failed – rebid pending
18	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Avlevi	Knolevi	Water Supply System Rehabilitation for Knolevi and Tseronisi villages	185	RFP failed – rebid pending
	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Avlevi	Tseronisi		259	RFP failed – rebid pending
19	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Breti	Breti	Rehabilitation of Internal road for the Breti village	259	RFP failed – rebid pending
20	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Tsaishi	Tsaishi	Rehabilitation of Kindergarten	777	RFP drafted
21	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Didi Nedzi	Didi nedzi	Rehabilitation of Kindergarten	155	RFP drafted
22	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Akhali Abastumani	Akhali Abastumani	Rehabilitation of Internal road for Akhalabastumani	2,938	
23	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Muzhava	Muzhava	Rehabilitation of Kindergarten	148	
24	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Pakhulani	Tskoushi	Rehabilitation of Kindergarten	204	RFP drafted
25	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Chale	Chale	Rehabilitation of Kindergarten	414	RFP drafted
26	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Chonkadze	Aragvispiri	Rehabilitation of gabions for Aragvispiri village	222	
27	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Magharoskari	Magharoskari	Rehabilitation of gabions for Magaroskari village	555	
<b>Project Selected</b>							
28	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Kvesheti	Kvesheti	Organize public market for Kvesheti community	370	
29	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Choporti	Choporti	Organize public market for Choporti community	370	
30	Racha-Lechkhumi Kvemo Svaneti	Oni	Utsera	Utsera	Rehabilitation water supply and organizing stadium	222	
<b>Project assessment in process</b>							
31	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Shatili	Shatili	Water Supply and Sewage System Rehabilitation	93	
32	Racha-Lechkhumi Kvemo Svaneti	Oni	Ghari	Ghari	Rehabilitation of drainage system for village Ghari	111	

## ANNEX B: NEO SECTOR ASSESSMENTS

#	Description of Particular Assessment	Component				Completion Date	
		1	2	3	4	Month	Year
1	Tirdznisi ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				12	2011
2	Dzevera ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				12	2011
3	Dirbi ED Plan, Kareli Municipality	x				12	2011
4	Avlevi ED Plan, Kareli Municipality	x				12	2011
5	Dvani ED Plan, Kareli Municipality	x				12	2011
6	Surami ED Plan, Khashri Municipality	x				12	2011
7	Khtsisi ED Plan, Khashri Municipality	x				12	2011
8	Ananuri ED Plan, Dusheti Municipality	x				12	2011
9	Tourism Value Chain Assessment in Stepantsminda Municipality		x			11	2011
10	Tourism Value Chain Assessment in Dusheti Municipality		x			11	2011
11	Access to Finance		x			10	2011
12	Legal Overview of HO/TA Related Georgian Legislation				x	10	2011
13	Nikozi ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				2	2012
14	Akhalubani ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				2	2012
15	Breti ED Plan, Kareli Municipality	x				2	2012
16	Kvishkheti ED Plan, Khashuri Municipality	x				1	2012
17	Tskhramukha ED Plan, Khashuri Municipality	x				2	2012
18	Kvesheti ED Plan, Dusheti Municipality	x				1	2012
19	Bazaleti ED Plan, Dusheti Municipality	x				1	2012
20	Mchadijvari ED Plan, Dusheti Municipality	x				1	2012
21	Didinedzi ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				1	2012
22	Orulu ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				2	2012
23	Tsaishi ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				3	2012
24	Octomberi ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				2	2012
25	Ergeta ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				3	2012
26	Chkhorvia ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				2	2012
27	Pakhulani ED Plan, Tsalenjikha Municipality	x				1	2012
28	Chale ED Plan, Tsalenjikha Municipality	x				2	2012
29	Mujava ED Plan, Tsalenjikha Municipality	x				2	2012
30	Jvari ED Plan, Tsalenjikha Municipality	x				3	2012
31	Glola ED Plan, Oni Municipality	x				3	2012
32	Utsera ED Plan, Oni Municipality	x				3	2012
33	Ghari ED Plan, Oni Municipality	x				3	2012
34	Kvashkheti ED Plan, Oni Municipality	x				3	2012
35	Hazelnut VC assessment (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti)		x			1	2012
36	Livestock VC assessment (in all four regions)		x			2	2012
37	Potato VC assessment (Mtskheta-Mtianeti, Shida-Kartli and Racha-Lechkhumi and Kvemo Svaneti)		x			2	2012

38	Fruit VC assessment (in all 4 regions)		x			3	2012
39	Beekeeping VC assessment (in all four regions)		x			3	2012
40	Vegetables VC assessment (Mtskheta-Mtianeti, Shida-Kartli and Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti)		x			3	2012
41	Bay Leaves VC assessment		x			5	2012
42	Shavshvebi ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				5	2012
43	Shindisi ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				4	2012
44	Variani ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				4	2012
45	Bredza ED Plan, Kareli Municipality	x				4	2012
46	Gigani ED Plan, Kareli Municipality	x				4	2012
47	Osiauri ED Plan, Khashuri Municipality	x				4	2012
48	Tsromi ED Plan, Khashuri Municipality	x				4	2012
49	Choporty ED Plan, Dusheti Municipality	x				5	2012
50	Magaroskari ED Plan, Dusheti Municipality	x				4	2012
51	Stepantsminda ED Plan, Stepantsminda Municipality	x				4	2012
52	Sioni ED Plan, Stepantsminda Municipality	x				4	2012
53	Sno ED Plan, Stepantsminda Municipality	x				4	2012
54	Kortskheli ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				5	2012
55	Narazeni ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				5	2012
56	Akhalsopeli ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				5	2012
57	Akhalabastumani ED Plan, Zugdidi Municipality	x				5	2012
58	Nakipu ED Plan, Tsalenjikha Municipality	x				5	2012
59	Tsalenjikha ED Plan, Tsalenjikha Municipality	x				6	2012
60	Tvishi ED Plan, Tsageri Municipality	x				5	2012
61	Lasuriashi ED Plan, Tsageri Municipality	x				5	2012
62	Lailashi ED Plan, Tsageri Municipality	x				5	2012
63	Chkumi ED Plan, Tsageri Municipality	x				6	2012
64	Gvirishi ED Plan, Tsageri Municipality	x				6	2012
65	Zegduleti ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				9	2012
66	Mejvriskhevi ED Plan, Gori Municipality	x				9	2012
67	Kekhijvari ED Plan, Kareli municipality	x				9	2012
68	Gomi ED Plan, Khashuri Municipality	x				9	2012

## ANNEX C: LED EVENTS IN FY2012

	Name of Event	Location			Number of Participants
		Region	Municipality	Community / Venue	
<b>Quarter 1 FY12</b>					
1	Community meeting in Dzevera	Shida Kartli	Gori	Dzevera	21
2	Community meeting in Nikozi	Shida Kartli	Gori	Nikozi	47
3	Community meeting in Akhalubani	Shida Kartli	Gori	Akhalubani	64
4	Community meeting in Avlevi	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Avlevi	27
5	Community meeting in Dvani	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Dvani	42
6	Community meeting in Breti	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Breti	49
7	Community meeting in Surami	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Surami	50
8	Community meeting in Kvishkheti	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Kvishkheti	41
9	Community meeting in Khtsisi	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Khtsisi	42
10	Community meeting in Tskhramukha	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Tskhramukha	54
11	Community meeting in Kvesheti	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Kvesheti	58
12	Community meeting in Bazaleti	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Bazaleti	45
13	Community meeting in Mchadijvari	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Mchadijvari	32
14	Community meeting in Stepantsminda	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Kazbegi	Stepantsminda	45
15	Community meeting in Sioni	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Kazbegi	Sioni	30
16	Community meeting in Sno	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Kazbegi	Sno	26
17	Community meeting in Didinedzi	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Didinedzi	132
18	Community meeting in Orulu	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Orulu	39
19	Community meeting in Tsaishi	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Tsaishi	54
20	Community meeting in Oktomberi	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Oktomberi	47
21	Community meeting in Ergeta	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Ergeta	66
22	Community meeting in Chkhorია	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Chkhorია	46
23	Community meeting in Pakhulani	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Pakhulani	208
24	Community meeting in Chale	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Chale	46
25	Community meeting in Muzhava	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Muzhava	72
26	Community meeting in Jvari	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Jvari	60

Quarter 2 FY12					
27	MOU Signing and community Working Group meeting to discuss priorities	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Giganti	27
28	MOU Signing and community Working Group meeting to discuss priorities	Shida Kartli	Gori	Shavshvebi	39
29	MOU Signing / community Working Group meeting to discuss priorities	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Governor's office /Didinedzi	40
			Tsalenjikha	Governor's office	
30	Community meeting in Magaroskari	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Magharoskari	32
31	Community meeting in Shatili	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Shatili	35
32	Community meeting in Chonkadze	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Chonkadze	30
33	Community meeting in Choporti	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Choporti	34
34	Community meeting in Variani	Shida Kartli	Gori	Variani	62
35	Community meeting in Shavshvebi	Shida Kartli	Gori	Shavshvebi	47
36	Community meeting in Shindisi	Shida Kartli	Gori	Shindisi	61
37	Community meeting in Bredza	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Bredza	61
38	Community meeting in Giganti	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Giganti	50
39	Community meeting in Osiauri	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Osiauri	64
40	Community meeting in Tsromi	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Tsromi	55
41	Community meeting in Glola	Racha-Lechkhumi	Oni	Glola	33
42	Community meeting in Kvashkhieti	Racha-Lechkhumi	Oni	Kvashkhieti	23
43	Community meeting in Utsera	Racha-Lechkhumi	Oni	Utsera	38
44	Community meeting in Ghari	Racha-Lechkhumi	Oni	Ghari	40
45	Community meeting in Lailashi	Racha-Lechkhumi	Tsageri	Lailashi	32
46	Community meeting in Lasuriashi	Racha-Lechkhumi	Tsageri	Lasuriashi	56
47	Community meeting in Tvishi	Racha-Lechkhumi	Tsageri	Tvishi	28
48	Community meeting in Akhali Abastumani	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Akhali Abastumani	51
49	Community meeting in Akhalsopeli	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Akhalsopeli	58
50	Community meeting in Kortskheli	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Kortskheli	66
51	Community meeting in Narazeni	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Narazeni	79
52	Community meeting in Tsalenjikha	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Tsalenjikha	43
53	Community meeting in Nakipu	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Nakipu	53

Quarter 3 FY12					
54	MOU Signing/ Utsera community Working Group meeting to discuss priorities	Racha-Lechkhumi	Oni	Ambrolauri/Bugeuli wine factory	33
			Tsageri		
			Lentekhi		
55	Community meeting in Chkumi	Racha-Lechkhumi	Tsageri	Chkumi	53
56	Community meeting in Gvirishi	Racha-Lechkhumi	Tsageri	Gvirishi	67
57	Community meeting in Rtskhmeluri	Racha-Lechkhumi	Lentekhi	Rtskhmeluri	40
58	Community meeting in Choluri	Racha-Lechkhumi	Lentekhi	Choluri	36
59	Community meeting in Zegduleti	Shida Kartli	Gori	Zegduleti	76
60	Community meeting in Mejvriskhevi	Shida Kartli	Gori	Mejvriskhevi	61
61	Community meeting in Kekhijvari	Shida Kartli	Kareli	Kekhijvari	61
62	Community meeting in Gomi	Shida Kartli	Khashuri	Gomi	49
Quarter 4 FY12					
63	Community meeting in Ingiri	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Ingiri	48
64	Community meeting in Kakhati	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Kakhati	47
65	Community meeting in Shamgona	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Shamgona	55
66	Community meeting in Chkaduashi	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Zugdidi	Chkaduashi	55
67	Mujava, Pakhulani, Chale and Jvari EDP presentations to Tsalenjikha municipality Gangebali and Council Chair	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Tsalenjikha	Tsalenjikha	36
68	Dusheti and Kazbegi MOU and LOI signing / Ananuri and Kvesheti EDP presentations to Dusheti municipality leaders	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	Dusheti	Dusheti	34
			Kazbegi		

## ANNEX D: NEO-ISSUED GRANTS

Grant #	Component	Grant Type	Grantee			Status in FY 2012	Project Costs - Planned				Start Date		End Date	
			Name of Grantee / Organization	# of sub-awards (under prime grant)	Region		Grant Awarded by NEO (in-kind & cash)	Match Contribution (in-kind & cash)	Leverage Funding	Total	Month	Year	Month	Year
001	2	Toolkits for Hazelnut Trainees	AIC	802	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Completed					5	2012	6	2012
002	2	Tourism	LTD Aragvi Adventure	0	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	In Progress					5	2012	10	2013
003	2	Tourism	LTD Combimap	0	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	In Progress					3	2012	6	2014
004	2	Tourism	NGO Kazbegi MTH	0	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	In Progress					5	2012	10	2013
005	2	Tourism	LTD Mountain Travel Agency	0	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	In Progress					5	2012	10	2013
006	3	Vocational Education	Erqvani Vocational College Ambrolauri	0	Racha-Lechkhumi Kvemo Svaneti	In Progress					7	2012	7	2013
007	2	Strawberry	Strawberry Producers' Association	10	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	In Progress					7	12	7	2013
008	3	Vocational Education	Khidistavi vocational college "Orienti"	47	Shida Kartli	In Progress					7	2012	10	2012
009	3	Vocational Education	Lakada College Jvari	21	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	In Progress					7	2012	10	2012
010	3	Vocational Education	Association of Disabled Women and IDPs Tsalenjikha	51	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	In Progress					7	2012	7	2013

011	3	Vocational Education	Zugdidi Meskhia University	5	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	In Progress		7	2012	7	2013
012	2	Tourism	IE Gugua Marsagishvili	0	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	In Progress		5	2012	10	2013
013	2	Greenhouses	Anatoli Gadilia	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
014	2	Greenhouses	IE Ruslan Absnadze	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
015	2	Greenhouses	Elguja Belkania	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
016	2	Greenhouses	Giuli Akirtava	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
017	2	Greenhouses	Vakhtang Gochua	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
018	2	Greenhouses	Giorgi Bigvava	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
019	2	Greenhouses	Mamuka Toloraia	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
020	2	Greenhouses	Revaz Svirava	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
021	2	Greenhouses	Temur Asatiani	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
022	2	Greenhouses	Antipho Bukia	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
023	2	Greenhouses	Murman Shengelia	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti	Signed		7	2012	9	2013
024	2	Tourism	IE Berdia Tsiklauri	0	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	In Progress		5	2012	12	2013
025	4	Access to Finance	CHCA - IGBI	0	All	In Progress		9	2012	2	2014
026	2	Tourism	LTD Zeta	0	Mtskheta-Mtianeti	In Progress		7	2012	9	2013

027	2	Meteo Station	LTD Agrokartli	0	Shida Kartli	Signed		9	2012	9	14	
028	4	HOA Toolkits	Agrocollege Apartment Building	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti (Senaki)	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
029	4	HOA Toolkits	Former Concrete Factory Administration Building	0	Imereti (Kutaisi)	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
030	4	HOA Toolkits	Berbuki Cottage Settlement	0	Shida Kartli	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
031	4	HOA Toolkits	Dosaaf Apartment Building	0	Kvemo Kartli (Rustavi)	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
032	4	HOA Toolkits	Khurvaleti Cottage Settlement	0	Shida Kartli	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
033	4	HOA Toolkits	Former Kindergarten #19 Building	0	Imereti (Kutaisi)	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
034	4	HOA Toolkits	Railway Boarding School Building #1	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti (Senaki)	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
035	4	HOA Toolkits	Railway Boarding School Building #2	0	Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti (Senaki)	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
036	4	HOA Toolkits	Turbaza Apartment Building	0	Kvemo Kartli (Rustavi)	Pending		10	2012	4	2013	
037	3	Livelihoods	AIC	0	West Georgia	Signed		9	2012	12	2012	
038	3	Livelihoods	CIDA	0	East Georgia	Signed		9	2012	12	2012	
<b>Total GEL</b>												
<b>Total USD</b>												

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION OPTIONS FOR PERCEPTION OF EFFICIENCY AND RESPONSIVENESS OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Based on the NEO household survey questions, GORBI and NEO collaborated to two methods for calculating a method by which to benchmark and measure the NEO outcome indicators of “A sustained increase of at least 20% in the number of adult individuals that perceive that the local government understands and is responsive to their needs.” Two options below were provided by GORBI as alternate methods to calculate the perception changes. NEO has selected Option 2, as it provides a more realistic and tempered assessment of perception changes in the NEO target populations.

A detailed description of both calculation methods and the baseline results from NEO’s initial household survey are provided below.

### Option 1

In order to evaluate efficiency of local self-government - C1 indicators), we will use simple scaling of questions M10, M11, M12 and M13, based on the following principle:

- M.10. In terms of addressing social and economic problems, what level of government should act in order to receive the best results?**
1. Local self-government (trustee) - 5 points
  2. Municipal self-government; (gamgebeli) - 4 points
  3. Regional government (governor) - 3 points
  4. Central government (ministry, department) - 2 points
  5. The highest government body (president, prime-minister, parliament) - 1 point
  6. None of above mentioned - 0 point
- M.11. In terms of addressing legal/rule of law problems, what level of government should be addressed to receive the best results?**
1. Local self-government (trustee) - 5 points
  2. Municipal self-government; (gamgebeli) - 4 points
  3. Regional government (governor) - 3 points
  4. Central government (ministries, line-departments) - 2 points
  5. The highest governmental body (president, prime-minister, parliament) - 1 point
  6. None of above mentioned - 0 point
- M.12. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree?**
1. Local self-government has a lot of authority and it is necessary to reduce it; - 1 point
  2. Local self-government has a lot of authority and it is desirable to reduce it; - 2 points
  3. Local self-government has sufficient authority and there is no need to change it; - 3 points
  4. Local self-government has little authority and it is desirable to increase it; - 4 points
  5. Local self-government has insignificant authority and it is necessary to increase it; - 5 points
- M.13. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree?**
1. Local self-government works very effectively; - 5 points
  2. Local self-government works somewhat effectively; - 4 points
  3. Local self-government works somewhat ineffectively; - 3 points
  4. Local self-government works very ineffectively; - 2 points
  5. Local self-government doesn’t work at all; - 1 point

Distribution of frequencies for each of these questions is as follows:

**M10. In terms of addressing social and economic problems, what level of government should act in order to receive the best results?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Local self-government (trustee)	20999	28.5
Municipal self-government; (gamebeli)	7322	9.9
Regional government (governor)	4234	5.7
Central government (ministry, department)	4880	6.6
The highest government body (president, prime-minister, parliament)	11390	15.5
None of above mentioned	24816	33.7
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

**M11. In terms of addressing legal/rule of law problems, what level of government should be addressed to receive the best results?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Local self-government (trustee)	22355	30.4
Municipal self-government; (gamebeli)	7362	10.0
Regional government (governor)	4440	6.0
Central government (ministries, line-departments)	5905	8.0
The highest governmental body (president, prime-minister, pa	12787	17.4
None of above mentioned	20793	28.2
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

**M12. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
NR (No Response)	279	.4
Local self-government has a lot of authority and it is necessary to reduce it	12667	17.2
Local self-government has a lot of authority and it is desirable to reduce is	11919	16.2
Local self-government has sufficient authority and there is no need to change it	16188	22.0
Local self-government has little authority and it is desirable to increase it	16476	22.4
Local self-government has insignificant authority and it is necessary to increase it	16113	21.9
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

**M13. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
NR (No Response)	120	.2
Local self-government works very effectively	12877	17.5
Local self-government works somewhat effectively	30308	41.2
Local self-government works somewhat ineffectively	13361	18.1
Local self-government works very ineffectively	10486	14.2
Local self-government doesn't work at all	6490	8.8
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

Based on the abovementioned scaling principle, frequency of distribution of indicated variables, presented on a single scale, will be as follows:

**M10. In terms of addressing social and economic problems, what level of government should act in order to receive the best results?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
0.00	24816	33.7
1.00	11390	15.5
2.00	4880	6.6
3.00	4234	5.7
4.00	7322	9.9
5.00	20999	28.5
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

**M11. In terms of addressing legal/rule of law problems, what level of government should be addressed to receive the best results?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
0.00	20793	28.2
1.00	12787	17.4
2.00	5905	8.0
3.00	4440	6.0
4.00	7362	10.0
5.00	22355	30.4
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

**M12. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
0.00	279	0.4
1.00	16113	21.9
2.00	16476	22.4
3.00	16188	22.0
4.00	11919	16.2
5.00	12667	17.2
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

**M13. With which statement among those listed below do you most agree?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
0.00	120	0.2
1.00	6490	8.8
2.00	10486	14.2
3.00	13361	18.1
4.00	30308	41.2
5.00	12877	17.5
<b>Total</b>	73642	100.0

After this, the average index of answers to all four questions is calculated, the content of which is as follows:

- 0 means that local self-government bodies are working very inefficiently and no one addresses them for resolution of either economic or legal/rule of law problems and that their authority should be diminished.
- 5 means that local self-government bodies are working very effectively and the population addresses them, first of all, for resolution of problems and that their it is necessary to increase their authority.

All of the scores in-between mean where the perception of local self-government’s work by the population is at. Meanings of indexes themselves are as follows:

	<b>Index</b>
<b>M10</b>	<b>2.2831</b>
<b>M11</b>	<b>2.4326</b>
<b>M12</b>	<b>2.8332</b>
<b>M13</b>	<b>3.4377</b>
<b>Baseline index</b>	<b>2.7467</b>
<b>Forecasted index after the project (20 percent increase)</b>	<b>3.2960</b>

### **Option 2**

One complex variable is formed based on the abovementioned questions. Variable formation takes place in two stages. At the first stage, complex variable is formed based on the questions M10, M11 and M13, specifically:

- 5 points – when the answers to the questions M10, M11 and M13 are 1 or 2 – i.e. when in case of economic and legal problems citizens address local or municipal bodies and evaluate their work as efficient or more or less efficient;
- 4 points – when the answer to the question M10 is 1 or 2, the answer to question M11 is anything except for formulation 6 and the answer to the question M13 is 3 or 4, i.e. when citizens address local or municipal bodies in case of economic problems, but they may go elsewhere for resolution of legal problems, although they do evaluate work of these bodies as inefficient or more or less inefficient – i.e. the answers are 3 or 4;
- 3 points – when the answers to the questions M10 and M11 are 3 or 4 or 5 and the answer to the question M13 is 1 or 2, i.e. when citizens do not address local or municipal bodies in case of economic or legal problems, although the do evaluate work of these bodies as efficient or more or less efficient – evaluation made is purely a matter of attitude and is not based upon real experience;
- 2 points – when the answer to the questions M10 and M11 is 6, i.e. when they do not address any body in case of legal or economic problems, but they still evaluate work of local self-government bodies as efficient – meaning that this evaluation is based on real practice even less than in the previous case;
- 1 point – all the other cases apart from the case when the answer to the questions M10 and M11 is 6, while the answer to the question M11 is 5, i.e. when they do not address anyone and consider that bodies of local self-government are not doing any work at all.
- 0 points – when the answer to the questions M10 and M11 is 6, while the answer to the question M11 is 5, i.e. when they do not address anyone and consider that bodies of local self-government are not doing any work at all.

At the second stage, the identified complex variable is scaled while taking into account the answers to the question M13, where:

- 5 points – awarded when complex evaluation of work of local self-government is 3, 4 or 5, i.e. average or higher, while the answer to the question M13 is number 3, meaning when the population rates work of local self-government as average or higher and considers its authority adequate;
- 4 points – awarded when complex evaluation of work of local self-government is 3, 4 or 5, i.e. average or higher, while the answer to the question M13 is number 4 or 5, meaning when the population rates work of local self-government as average or higher and considers it desirable or necessary to increase its authority;
- 3 points – awarded when complex evaluation of work of local self-government is 3, 4 or 5, i.e. average or higher, while the answer to the question M13 is number 1 or 2, meaning when the population rates work of local self-government as average or higher, but nevertheless considers it desirable or necessary to diminish its authority;
- 2 points – awarded when complex evaluation of work of local self-government is 1 or 2, i.e. lower than average, while the answer to the question M13 is number 4 or 5, meaning when the population rates work of local self-government as lower than average, but considers it desirable or necessary to increase its authority, in other words: they do not like the status quo but have hope in future perspective;
- 1 point – awarded when complex evaluation of work of local self-government is 1 or 2, i.e. lower than average, while the answer to the question M13 is number 1, 2 or 3, meaning when the population rates work of local self-government as lower than average and does not consider it desirable or necessary to increase its authority, in other words: they do not like the status quo and have no hopes for its improvement either;
- 0 points – awarded when complex evaluation of work of local self-government is 0, while the answer to the question M13 is any of the options, i.e. evaluation of work efficiency is zero, alteration of the limits of authority notwithstanding.

Evaluations received based on such approach are given in the table below, which shows that 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of scaling is recommended, since it ensures correction of distribution and makes the index more dynamic, because it awards a dynamic component to the statistical index – evaluation of efficiency of work of self-government bodies, which is expressed in alteration of the limits of their authority.

	Scaling phase 1		Scaling phase 2	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	3532	4.8	3692	5.0
1.00	27976	38.0	14661	19.9
2.00	7861	10.7	21016	28.5
3.00	8999	12.2	17765	24.1
4.00	5416	7.4	8671	11.8
5.00	19857	27.0	7837	10.6
Total	73642	100.0	73642	100.0

As to the extreme values of the index of evaluation of efficiency, similarly to the previous case:

- 0 means that local self-government bodies are working very inefficiently and no one addresses them for resolution of either economic or legal problems and that their authority should be diminished.
- 5 means that local self-government bodies are working very effectively and the population addresses them, first of all, for resolution of problems and that their it is necessary to increase their authority.

Meanings of indexes themselves are as follows:

	<b>Scaling phase 1</b>	<b>Scaling phase 2</b>
<b>Baseline index</b>	<b>2.6024</b>	<b>2.4966</b>
<b>Forecasted index after the project (20 percent increase)</b>	<b>3.1229</b>	<b>2.9959</b>