USAID | WESTBANK/GAZA

FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM II (CEP II)

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

DECEMBER 2008

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

Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development,
USAID Contract Number DFD-I-04-05-00218-00

Implemented by:
ARD, Inc.
P.O. Box 1397
Burlington, VT 05402

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM II (CEP II)

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

DECEMBER 2008

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

CBO	Community Based Organization
CEP	Civic Engagement Program
OP	Operational Plan
FACTS	Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System
STTA	Short Term Technical Assistance
SOW	Scope of Work
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CBRPM	Capacity Building and Reporting Program Manager
DGO	Democracy and Governance Office
GIS	Geographic Information System
III	Initial Impact Indicator
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PA	Palestinian Authority
PIRS	Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
SO	Strategic Objective
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) for the Civic Engagement Project (CEP II) has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Contract DFD-I-00-05-00218-00 between ARD, Inc. and USAID/West Bank and Gaza. CEP II supports U.S. foreign policy objectives in the West Bank and Gaza through grants and technical assistance to civil society, local governments, and offices of the Palestinian Authority. The CEP II program builds on interventions managed under the CEP I program from December 2007 to date.

The CEP II program seeks to provide a rapid, flexible grant mechanism focused on visibly improving the quality of life for Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza and to bolster prospects for peace in the region. USAID has defined two strategic objectives for CEP II:

- Support initiatives and processes that support a democratic, peaceful, and prosperous Palestinian state; and
- Strengthen reform-minded Palestinian leaders and institutions in support of improved service provision and increased responsiveness to citizen needs.

The PMP is designed to be an integral part of the project management structure, providing data to assist program-level decision making as well as providing analysis to USAID on overall program and contract performance.

Part of the performance monitoring process includes the design and selection of performance indicators. Because of the rapid response character of CEP II, indicators selected for the PMP are predominantly output-level; that is, they measure direct results (input to output) at the project level for every grant. These indicators, shaped and informed by contract objectives, enable comparable data to be collected over time, providing a comprehensive understanding of coverage by activity type, target group, or institution.

CEP II proposes to complement this output data with regular analysis at the outcome/impact level through two additional processes. First, CEP II will develop Initial Impact Indicators for each individual grant to more closely capture and assess the achievements of grant-specific goals and objectives. Second, CEP II proposes to undertake regular and rapid evaluation of program performance using non-standard indicators based on direct engagement with beneficiaries to provide USAID with an evolving understanding of what has happened as a result of CEP II assistance.

Program-level monitoring indicators have been designed and selected to capture the widest range of CEP II-funded activities as sensitively as possible, in a timely fashion and at reasonable cost. The indicators are measurable with data easily obtained from reliable sources. Targets (where required by USAID) have been set. Indicators will include both custom indicators based on CEP II's technical approach as well as USAID Operational Plan and FACTS reporting indicators.

The PMP presents the program-level monitoring indicators and targets (Table 1 and Table 2, Annex A), details the process for Initial Impact indicators, and discusses the proposed approach for impact evaluation.

The PMP also describes how quantitative and qualitative data will be collected, monitored, analyzed, and reported that will tell the story of the overall program. It comprises four elements:

- A *project level monitoring and evaluation system* designed to report against output/outcome-level performance indicators and provide regular and continuous feedback into project process and design;
- A *process for accommodating longer-term capacity-building goals* by customizing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans for each capacity-building initiative linked, where appropriate, to project-level indicators;
- A *rolling impact evaluation process* designed to provide a regular and evolving understanding of the impact of CEP II activities, linked to a Rolling Assessments regime to provide periodic and structured input into ongoing program design; and
- *An M&E Toolkit* delineating the range, purpose, and use of information-gathering mechanisms in place for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on results, outcomes, and impacts.

2.0 PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

CEP II will build on already established methods and systems in place in the current M& E system. These methods emphasize direct feedback on a grant-by-grant basis to facilitate program oversight and accountability. Given the quick-response nature of the program, review of performance for each grant is important to help the program continually adapt and evolve. Existing guidance documents describing the M&E system, process, and methodology will be modified as appropriate and made available to all staff.

2.1 PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Monitoring and evaluation of project progress enhances program management by providing managers and field staff with timely solutions to problems faced during project implementation. Project monitoring also measures the achievement of project objectives and generates lessons learned that can be applied to other projects and the overall grant-making process. Monitoring and evaluation at the project level will be carried out by program staff. Performance indicator selection will be effected during project development in consultation with the Reporting Manager who manages the M&E process.

Monitoring of grant activities and the implementation process will be done on the basis of a series of standard questions (e.g., Is the grantee engaging the community around project activities? Did materials delivered match the technical specifications? Are the planned activities on time and within budget?). Monitoring data in the form of regular grant notes will be entered into the dynamic, interactive CEP II database. In this way, a complete picture of the program at the project level is continually updated, facilitating program management oversight and mid-stream adjustments to the grant in question. The database system also allows all program staff to observe and interact with program implementation across the West Bank and Gaza, providing the opportunity for continuous learning across the program.

At the completion of project activities, program staff will conduct a final evaluation of each grant against a series of standard questions (e.g., Did the grant achieve its objectives? Was the grant design the correct response?). The evaluation will include a final site visit and interviews with the respective grantee and project beneficiaries. The grantee submits a separate Recipient Performance Report which feeds into the overall grant evaluation. Each final evaluation, including reporting against indicators developed during project design, is reviewed by the Reporting Manager, and lessons learned are distilled and circulated to the Program List. The lessons learned feed back into the programming cycle so that best practices are captured for future project design.

2.2 INITIAL IMPACT INDICATORS

CEP II's monitoring and evaluation system builds on the methods used under CEP I, emphasizing direct feedback on a grant-by-grant basis in order to facilitate program review and adaptation. Given the rapid response nature of the program, review of performance for each grant is important in order to help the program adapt and evolve.

In addition, because the program is reactive, with project interventions scattered over a wide geographical scope, strategies for intervention and specific activities undertaken are varied. Consequently, program-level indicators are often not sensitive enough to capture and assess the results and achievements of grant-specific goals and objectives.

To accommodate these program characteristics, CEP II will develop the current use of Initial Impact Indicators (IIIs) to more clearly link the results of interventions with the original project objectives. IIIs capture specific measurable outputs and initial outcomes that each individual grant will achieve. These more tailored indicators help the grantee and CEP II program staff to develop a clear consensus on anticipated project results and how they will be achieved. Whenever practical and relevant, IIIs will bridge project performance with program-level performance indicators. CEP II will develop generic IIIs across the program as possible that will function as program-level outcome indicators additional to those defined in the PMP list of indicators.

2.3 DATA COLLECTION

CEP II uses established, standardized forms and templates for documentation and data collection. The CEP II dynamic and interactive database is capable of storing large amounts of programmatic and implementation data at the project level. Monitoring and evaluation data is gathered by program staff from grantees and beneficiaries during regular site visits, establishing consensus on and discussing project outputs and outcomes of project interventions. Quantitative data is gathered through project documents (work plans, budgets, time sheets, participant lists, etc.) and then entered into the program database. Qualitative data obtained from engagements with grantees, beneficiaries, and observation is also entered into the program database in the form of grant notes, final evaluation notes, and success stories.

The database will be modified to house the new CEP Performance Indicators as well as the initial impact indicators for individual grants. The Performance Reference Sheets (Annex B) detail the analysis required, per indicator. These reference sheets also provide clear definitions for each indicator.

2.4 REPORTING

The CEP II dynamic, interactive database is at the heart of the program's reporting system. In addition to aggregating all programmatic information and assisting with monitoring and evaluation, the database also facilitates immediate reporting to USAID by objective, grantee, and location among other fields. CEP II will provide regular reporting against performance in several ways over the contract period. Regular reporting against project outputs and targets will be effected through the USAID Web-based geographic information system. Periodic reporting will also be done on a weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annual basis.

2.4.1 Periodic Reporting

Weekly bullet points on project progress are submitted every week for inclusion with the Mission's bullet points. Monthly reports providing a brief description of activities, impacts, issues and constraints encountered, suggestions for additional actions, and up to three one-page success stories will submitted five days after the end of each month.

Two types of reports will be produced on a quarterly basis. An impact evaluation report, detailing the results of the previous quarter's rolling impact assessments, will be submitted and presented for discussion during the quarterly Rolling Assessments meetings. In addition, quarterly reports, submitted within 15 days of the end of the project quarter, will report against the work plan and include summaries of activities, highlights or results and achievements, performance reporting against the PMP, problems encountered in implementation, and proposed remedial actions. The fourth quarterly report of each fiscal year will also include a section summarizing the activities, achievements, and challenges of the previous year. This will serve as the Contract's Annual Report.

2.4.2 USAID GIS

Once modified to include all new indicators, the database will facilitate entry of data directly into the USAID web-based geographic information system (GIS) to report against performance. Regular reporting against project outputs and targets will be effected through the USAID web-based geographic information system at two points in the project cycle: immediately upon approval of a grant, CEP II will input GIS baseline information on the intervention, and again at the time of project completion to capture outputs.

The GIS provides spatial data on the project's intervention sites, type of project being implemented, partner information, and performance measures at the output level.

2.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE

Quality of data entering the database for analysis will be assured in several ways. During project development, program staff refer to the extensive guidance provided through USAID GIS for standard definitions of data and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for clear definitions of the indicators. Other standard tools for assessing the quality of data are referenced when necessary. For example, population estimates are taken from the Palestinian Bureau of Statistics, and estimates of numbers of people receiving information through Radio and TV spots are taken from updated media statistics provided through Internews.

The Reporting Manager will provide overall oversight of data quality through verification of the selection of indicators and other programmatic data during the final stages of project development and project evaluation to ensure accuracy, consistency, reliability, and currency of data entered into the database. This oversight will help to bring consistency to indicator and data selection and definition, facilitating effective reporting against performance. As noted above, intervention strategies and project activities are varied. Results of project interventions will be linked as closely as possible to the project objectives through a careful selection of the most appropriate indicator.

3.0 EVALUATING LONG-TERM CAPACITY-BUILDING PERFORMANCE

The CEP II M&E system will accommodate longer-term capacity-building goals by customizing M&E plans for each capacity-building initiative linked, as appropriate, to program-level indicators.

As institutions are identified for long-term capacity assistance, institutional assessment tools will be identified and administered by organizational development experts. Parallel assessments will be carried out with relevant stakeholders (end users of services) using questionnaires and focus groups. The findings of these two linked assessments will be used to develop an action plan that will set clear objectives for the assistance, expected results and outcomes, and a time frame. At this point, a tailored M&E framework to measure progress towards the objectives will be designed, incorporating the use of program documents, institutional staff, and stakeholders as data sources.

The M&E plan will be implemented progressively as the assistance packages roll out using a range of tools including spot checks, report cards, mystery service end users, questionnaires, and focus groups. Results against expected outcomes will be reported as they become available and will form a component part of the performance reporting in the Quarterly Report. At USAID’s request, special periodic reports could be generated covering progress around specific issues based on the evaluation techniques employed—for example, the extent to which stakeholders have developed a higher level of trust with their institution as a result of the improvement in services produced by the capacity enhancement.

4.0 IMPACT EVALUATION

Monitoring and reporting on a rapid and responsive program such as CEP II poses several challenges for program decision makers in understanding the impact of grant interventions. Establishing baseline data for such geographically dispersed and cross-sectoral interventions is highly problematic. In addition, program-level indicators are often insufficiently sensitive to capture impact-level information.

To address this challenge, CEP II will explore the possibility of periodic and rapid out-sourced surveys linked to the Rolling Assessment cycle, which could answer key impact questions around the most common project type. For CEP II, this could likely be those projects that aim to improve local services and infrastructure. The results of such surveys could be integrated into the Rolling Assessment process itself, allowing the identification of opportunities to be informed by the documented impact of interventions. In this way, a valuable dialogue on a rolling basis between “needs” and “impact” could be established, providing a more robust and evidence-based understanding of evolving lessons learned to enhance CEP II programming and provide USAID with timely and regular information on “what happened as a result of our assistance.”

Impact questions could include:

- To what extent do people identify with the project (do they have knowledge, awareness, involvement)?
- How, and to what extent, were people’s attitudes and perceptions changed by the project?
- What behaviors’ were changed as a result (increased levels of participation in democratic process)?
- Are these changed dynamics being preserved (what kind of sustainability is being built)?
- How are these changes linked by beneficiaries to the institution/leader facilitating the project?
- To what extent have levels of mutual trust been established?
- What drives satisfaction and popular confidence around these types of projects?

In the process of getting to these answers, CEP II would also obtain an objective view of the project process itself, the context in which it operates, and other impact issues around availability, equity of access, and scope of coverage. In addition, CEP II would be able to begin to make links between impact achieved, project type, project location, target group, and intervention strategy. By focusing on projects that aim to provide services and develop infrastructure, CEP II would have a significant pool of projects for rapid sampling on a regular basis. As CEP II develops around 18 grants per quarter, many of these focused on infrastructure and service provision, a sample of three projects for impact evaluation every quarter would be adequate to draw valid inferences about impact.

CEP II proposes a fairly standard methodology for such an approach to minimize costs and level of effort. The evaluation framework would be designed in a collaborative manner with USAID and CEP II using an experienced local social science research institute with solid experience of work around democracy and governance issues in the Palestinian context. Research tools would include focus groups and semi-structured questionnaires to build up a case study for each project targeted. Reports would be produced and presentations of findings made to coincide with the Rolling Assessments. A scope of work (SOW) for the study would be developed and submitted to USAID for approval. A regular service contract would be signed with experienced local short-term technical assistance (STTA) to include the assessment itself, the production of a report, and a presentation of findings to USAID and CEP II staff at the Rolling Assessment meeting.

ARD has past experience of using beneficiary engagement as a measure of contract performance.[1] Using this approach, USAID will be able to gain a simple yet rich understanding of CEP II performance across project types that form a significant proportion of program interventions, without having to compare differing project outputs or attempt to account for contextual changes during implementation. In addition, CEP II will be able to gather impact evaluation data that can be used to enhance program management and implementation.

1 ARD's focus on beneficiary attitudes and perceptions as a measure of performance – complementing quantitative or project-specific indicators – is based on two successful assessments of beneficiary satisfaction with rapid-response humanitarian interventions under the USAID-funded Emergency Assistance Program in the West Bank and Gaza between 2002 and 2008.

5.0 CEP II M&E TOOLKIT

CEP II will develop an M&E Toolkit delineating the range, purpose, and use of information-gathering mechanisms in place for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on results, outcomes, and impacts. This tool, included in the PMP as an illustrative draft, will assist program staff in understanding the range of tools available, and the functions and purpose of each tool. As new M&E tools are developed, the toolkit will be expanded.

By providing an alternative route into the understanding of overall monitoring and impact which is grounded in and linked to daily program tasks, program staff will gain confidence in the purpose and use of the tools, develop a greater understanding of how M&E is integrated into the project cycle, and internalize the importance of feeding lessons learned into program design.

ANNEX A: INDICATORS AND TARGETS

Project data collected will be measured against established project indicators (see Table 1 overleaf). CEP II Indicators were chosen by CEP II staff in collaboration with USAID. CEP's indicators are predominantly output indicators—they measure the direct results of project activities.

Most grant activities are request-driven, conducted at the behest of the USG and do not lend themselves to conventional program planning and setting of targets. However, targets have been set for Operational Plan indicators at USAID's request. These are appended as Table 2. CEP II will continue to utilize the Initial Impact Indicator methods for review and evaluation on a grant-by-grant basis.

Longer-term capacity-building interventions will be subject to a customized and separate M&E framework that will be developed in tandem with long-term action plans for discrete packages of institutional assistance combining grants and Short-Term Technical Assistance.

Table 1: CEP II Indicators

Indicator Type	Indicator	Data Collection		Management Utility
		Source and Method	Frequency	
Strategic Objective 1: Support Initiatives and Processes that Support a Democratic, Peaceful, and Prosperous Palestinian State				
Output (OP) Democratic Process	*1.1 Number of CSOs using USG Assistance to promote political participation*	*Program Records*	*Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly*	*Demonstrates efforts to increase public participation in democratic proces and practice in favour of positive change within communities.*
Output (OP) Democratic Process	*1.2 Number of USG assisted CSOs that engage in advocacy and watchdog functions*	*Program Records*	*Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly*	*Demonstrates expansion of CSO advocacy and watchdog activities to enhance the accountability and responsiveness of local and national government*
Output (CUSTOM) Prosperity	1.3 Person days employment generated	Program Records (time sheets,payroll records) of construction &rehabiliation projects	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported, GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates increased availability of economic opportunity
Output (FACTS) Peace	1.4 Number of USG supported activities that demonstrate the positive impact of a peace process through the demonstration of tangible, practical benefits	Program records, observation and interviews	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates increased public knowledge, awareness, results of and opportunities for positive engagement with Israelis.
Output (FACTS) Democratic Process	1.5 Number of local mechanisms supported with USG assistance for citizens to engage their sub-national government	Program Records	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates increased opportunities for articulation of citizens needs and concerns to local representatives around issues of accountability.
Strategic Objective 2: Strengthen Reform-Minded Palestinian Leaders and Institutions in Support of Improved Service Provision and Increased Responsiveness to Citizen Needs				
Output (CUSTOM) Improved Service Provision	2.1 Number of community-based reconstruction/rehabilitation/humanitarian/informal education and training projects completed	Program Records, observation	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates increased availabilty of services and improved infrastructure.
Output (CUSTOM) Increased Responsiveness	2.2 Number of reform-minded leaders assisted to increase outreach to their constituents	Program Records	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates expanded efforts of reform-minded leaders to unerstand the issues and concerns of their consitutents
Output (FACTS) Institution Support	2.3 Number of executive office operations supported by USG assistance	Program records	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates efforts to improve the internal functioning of offices of the President, Cabinet and Prime Minister

Indicator Type	Indicator	Data Collection		Management Utility
		Source and Method	Frequency	
Outcome (CUSTOM) Institution Support	2.4 Number of program assisted insitutions with measurable increased capacity	Institutional Capacity Building Tool	Base line data from time of program assistance provided compared to increase in capacity after technical assistance provided (STTA/Grant); reported as available	Demonstrates increased capacity of institutions (CSOs, Ministries, Local Governments and Associations) to provide better quality, more efficient services
Output (OP) Institution Support	*2.5 Number of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal capacity*	*Program records*	*Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly*	*Demonstrates increased efforts to improve effectiveness and efficiency of local service provision*
Cross-Cutting Indicators to be used for all projects				
Output (CUSTOM) Coverage	3.1 Number of CSO Benefitting	Program records	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS/ Quarterly	Demonstrates program coverage by CSOs
Output (CUSTOM) Coverage	3.2 Number of GOs benefitting	Program records	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates program coverage by Government entities
Output (CUSTOM) Coverage	3.3 Number of LGUs benefitting	Program records	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates program coverage by Local Government Unit
Output (CUSTOM) Coverage	3.4 Number of people benefitting	Program records; participant lists and observation	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates program coverage in terms of population and location type, dissagregated by gender and location
Output (CUSTOM) Coverage	3.5 Value of grants provided over time	Program financial records	Rolled up and reported quarterly	Demonstrates a rapid response capacity and progress towards financial targets
Output (CUSTOM) Coverage	3.6 Number of grants approved over time	Program records	Quarterly	Demonstrates project ability to maintain rapid response grants management/implementation
Output (CUSTOM) Effectiveness	3.7 Number of workshops, events, or community forums conducted	Program and grantee records	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates the extent to which participatory methods are used in project design and implementation
Output (CUSTOM) Effectiveness	3.8 Number of TV/media campaigns/messages developed and conducted	Program records; people reached will be reported on for projects using media as a key project	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates the extent to which we use media as an outreach tool to expand public knowldege and awareness around CEP activities
Output (CUSTOM) Effectiveness	3.9 Number of volunteers engaged	Program records; observation	Rolling basis as grants are completed. Reported GIS, Quarterly	Demonstrates use of civic engagement skills in project design and improved insitutional sustainability

Table 2: CEP Targeting Table

Indicator	Target Year One	Target Year Two	Target Year Three
Number of CSOs using USG Assistance to improve internal capacity	5	5	4
Number of CSOs using USG Assistance to promote political participation	10	12	8
Number of USG-assisted CSOs that engage in advocacy and watchdog functions	2	2	2

ANNEX B: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS (PIRS)

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 1.1 Number of CSOs using USG Assistance to promote political participation. **Date Established:** December 2008 (FACTS Indicator)
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): This indicator applies to post conflict situations, including the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Participation is defined as voluntary public participation or involvement in democratic process and practice in favor of positive and peaceful change within communities. Typical activities may include awareness campaigns on issues of local concern; voluntary campaigns aimed at improving the quality of life of the community (clean ups; olive harvesting; road safety etc); locally-driven conflict resolution activities and non-violence promotion; participatory activities aimed at involving key constituencies (youth, women etc) in civic awareness and action (Ramadan platforms, theatre-for-change) It is comprehensive and represents the notion that political involvement and participation goes far beyond the act of voting. **Unit of Measure:** Number (institutions) **Disaggregated by:** type and location. **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator speaks to the increased development of a politically active civil society and measures CEP's efforts to increase public participation in actions that promote positive and peaceful democratic change within communities.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After the method and type of assistance has been identified and conducted, program staff will enter data into the CEP database. Program staff will also dialogue with project stakeholders to assess the success of CEP's assistance. **Data Source(s):** Project field staff discussions with staff of institutions, participants and beneficiaries; project records, documents and reports, program staff observation **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are approved, implemented, evaluated and closed out. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project Field Staff; CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, and, as appropriate, in brief narrative anecdotes. Due to the relatively small number of project interventions, no high-level statistical analysis will be performed. **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID GIS system as projects are approved and again when activities are completed. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): This indicator does not speak to the impact of increased levels of civic engagement on citizens' attitudes and behavior. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Through use of the Initial Impact indicators, program staff will gather anecdotal information to assess the initial impact of the intervention on citizen's attitudes and behavior through interviews with the grantees, participants and beneficiaries. Project monitoring and final evaluations may also generate project-specific success stories and lessons learned, which CEP will roll up and report out on a quarterly basis to USAID.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 1.2 Number of USG-assisted civil society organizations that engage in advocacy and watchdog functions **Date Established:** December 2006 (FACTS Indicator) **Revised :** December 2008
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Civil Society Organizations are community-based, non-governmental organizations that are membership-based and focus on service provision and/or information exchange and/or advocacy with and for their constituencies. In order for CSOs to intervene effectively in the policy formulation or reform process, they must gain or strengthen the advocacy skills of their organizations. Such skills range from simply gathering information on the subject at hand to other tasks as obtaining or allocating human and fiscal resources to advocacy functions, coalition and network building, taking actions to influence policy, and monitoring implementation once a policy decision has been made. CSOs must be actively engaged in these functions/activities described above and be able to demonstrate that they are so engaged through the effective implementation of grant activities. **Unit of Measure:** Number (CSOs) **Disaggregated by:** Types of CSOs and type of advocacy and/or watchdog functions **Justification/Management Utility:** Advocacy and 'watchdog' functions are essential aspects of democratic policy making, citizen participation, and oversight of all branches of government. Strengthening of advocacy skills of CSOs will lead to more transparent and accountable government.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After the method and type of assistance has been identified and conducted, and output data obtained, the field project staff will dialogue with the grantee and stakeholders to assess the success of CEP's assistance. CSOs that receive assistance from CEP more than once to engage in advocacy and watchdog functions will only be counted once per this target. **Data Source(s):** Grantee and Project records; observation **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are approved, implemented, evaluated and closed out. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** Project Field Staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form and, due to the relatively small number of project interventions, no high-level statistical analysis will be performed. **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID GIS when project is approved and again on completion of project activities. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The indicator does not speak to the efficacy of the advocacy and/or watchdog functions implemented by the CSOs. Measuring the impact of CEP's assistance in this area may therefore be limited. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Through the use of initial impact indicators, program staff obtain qualitative, anecdotal data on outcome-level impact. Engagement with key informants, and grant stakeholders may generate qualitative data in anecdotal form on grant success and lessons learned.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 1.3 Person Days employment created **Date Established:** December 2006
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of days of employment created by CEP II construction and rehabilitation projects (schools, roads, parks, community centers etc). Only first tier employees paid for by CEP II funds are counted under this indicator. These would typically include skilled and unskilled workers on site, technicians working on or examining the site. No employment will be counted for activities that were not paid for directly by USAID funds **Unit of Measure:** Person Days **Disaggregated by:** Gender **Justification/Management Utility:** Construction and renovation activities generate employment at various levels. This indicator demonstrates the increased availabilty of economic opportunity created by CEP II activities.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter estimated number of working days created into database and again at completion of project activities. **Data Source(s):** Program records (time sheets) of construction and rehabilitation projects. **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, disaggregated by gender. **Presentation of Data:** Text with numbers **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 1.4 Number of USG-supported activities that demonstrate the positive impact of a peace process through the demonstration of tangible, practical benefits. **Date Established:** December 2006 (FACT Indicator)
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): USG-supported results-based activities that can demonstrate the positive impact of a peace process or event. Activities could include forums, results-based studies, joint activities with Israelis, public dialogues that discuss the positive benefits of the two-state solution. Tangible and practical benefits may include, for example, increased public knowledge and awareness of the positive impact of engagement with Israelis, increased levels of advocacy for and Israeli government accountability in regard to agreements on the reduction of movement and access constraints, greater availability of goods and services, improved security. **Unit of Measure:** Activities **Disaggregated by:** Type of activities **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator shows how USG assistance is used to mitigate violent conflict by demonstrating to communities – in particular to potential spoilers – that there are positive tangible benefits to peace.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After the method and type of assistance has been identified and conducted, program staff will enter data into the CEP database. Program staff will also dialogue with project stakeholders to assess the success of CEP's assistance and observe project activities. **Data Source(s):** Project records and stakeholders, and CEP Project field staff **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are approved and activities completed. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project Field Staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form and, due to the relatively small number of grants interventions, no high-level statistical analysis will be performed. Project monitoring and final evaluations may also generate project-specific success stories and lessons learned, which CEP will roll up and report out on a quarterly basis to USAID. **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID GIS system as projects are approved and again on completion of project activities. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The indicator counts the number of activities and not the impact of those activities. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Through the application of Initial Impact Indicators, program staff will attempt to collect attitudinal outcome data through interviews with beneficiaries as part of the final evaluation of the grant.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 1.5 Number of local mechanisms supported by USG assistance for citizens to engage their sub-national government **Date Established:** December 2006 (FACTS Indicator)
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Mechanisms include town hall meetings (municipality-driven), public forums for debating community issues/concerns, websites, report cards, hearing and citizen review boards. **Unit of Measure:** Number (local mechanism) **Disaggregated by:** Type of mechanism **Justification/Management Utility:** Local government is essentially a service operation. As such, transparency and openness by the local government administration to citizen inputs, expressed priorities, and accountability are essential elements of democratic local self-governance.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After the method and type of assistance has been identified and conducted, program staff will enter data into the CEP database. Program staff will dialogue with project stakeholders to assess the success of CEP's assistance and observe project activities. **Data Source(s):** Project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are approved and implemented. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project Field staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form and, due to the relatively small number of project interventions, no high-level statistical analysis will be performed. Project monitoring and final evaluations may also generate project-specific success stories and lessons learned, which CEP will roll up and report out on a quarterly basis to USAID. **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID GIS system when project is approved and again on completion of project activities. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): While this indicator tracks the numbers of local mechanisms used, it does not measure the efficacy of the mechanism itself in introducing or improving outreach of LGUs to their constituents or enhancing accountability. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** These types of interventions may form component parts of project in groups selected for rolling impact assessments to engage beneficiaries and grantees directly in assessing the efficacy of service provision projects, where these mechanisms are used as a key project tool in impacting citizens' attitudes, behaviors and evolving levels of trust in their elected representatives around the project. In addition, through the use of Initial Impact Indicators, project staff will gather data linking outputs to outcomes/impact based on beneficiary interviews and anecdotal stories.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 2.1: Number of community-based reconstruction/rehabilitation/humanitarian/service projects completed. **Date Established:** December 2008
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of project activities which result in the improved availability of infrastructure and services at the community level. Services may include humanitarian assistance packages (blankets, food packages, school bags and stationary), informal education and training provision (after-school and remedial sessions, training courses, recreational programs). Community-based infrastructure may include schools, classrooms, sports facilities, roads, public parks. **Unit of Measure:** Number of projects **Disaggregated by:** Project type and location **Justification/Management Utility:** One of the key objectives of CEP II is to improve service provision in communities that is focused on visibly improving the quality of life for citizens. This indicator will measure the number of projects which result in the increased availability of community-based infrastructure and services over the program period. This objective embraces a second and complementary element – to increase the responsiveness of local institutions to citizen needs. By involving beneficiaries in the evaluation of the impact of a sample of these projects, an evolving understanding will be obtained as to the capacity and ability of local institutions to identify and respond to their constituents needs.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After the method and content of project activities have been approved and conducted, output data will be obtained from observation and project/grantee records**.** CEP Project field staff guided by Initial Impact Indicators will then dialogue with project stakeholders (grantees and beneficiaries) to assess the outcomes of CEP's assistance. **Data Source(s):** Project stakeholders (grantee, beneficiaries), project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are approved, implemented, evaluated and closed out. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** While the project budget includes the costs of regular monitoring by program staff, outside costs for outcome/impact level data collection will be covered by a service contract which targets random samples of these types of projects on a rolling basis. **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Field Program staff, CBRPM, technical experts **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities. Impact data will be aggregated and reported on a quarterly basis in the form of reports.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form. Higher-level statistical analysis will be linked to the data obtained through rolling impact assessment reports. [Through rolling impact assessments, complementary, evidence-based impact data will be analyzed to provide an understanding of the extent of beneficiary identification with the project, changes in attitudes and perception as a result of the project, how the beneficiaries link these changes to the institutions facilitating the project and to what extent levels of mutual trust between citizens and their institutions have been established and developed s a result.] **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables, impact reports against themes defined in the evaluation framework **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GIS system as projects are approved and again on completion of project activities. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report and in the form of impact reports.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The indicator does not speak directly to the efficiency or effectiveness of the enhanced infrastructure and services that the projects generate. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations**. Program staff will glean anecdotal evidence of the extent of beneficiary satisfaction with the resulting infrastructure and services in the form of success stories. In addition, the rolling impact reports which analyze the project effects on targeted beneficiaries will provide an evolving understanding of what has happened as a result of the assistance

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 2.2 Number of reform-minded leaders assisted to increase outreach to constituents. Date Established: December 2008
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Reform-minded leaders are those politically moderate individuals, in some cases elected officials, in some cases heads of organizations, whose discourse and practice promote broad democratic change in favor of equitable access to resources, broader participation of citizens in governance and a two-state solution. Outreach consists of project-assisted activities that directly serve to introduce or enhance contact between the leader and the public (in this context, constituents). Examples of outreach include, but are not limited to, service delivery opportunities, educational and issues-oriented forums, public dialogues, etc. Constituents are citizens residing in the area governed, represented, or otherwise served by the leader. **Unit of Measure:** Number (leaders) **Disaggregated by:** Gender of leader **Justification/Management Utility:** Increased outreach to constituents leads to expanded dialouge between constitutents and leaders, and therefore greater citizen input into the political process.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After the reform-minded leader has contacted CEP II and the method and type of assistance has been identified and conducted, program staff will enter the data into the CEP database. The field project staff will discuss the activity with the individual and beneficiaries to assess the success of CEP's II assistance. (Reform-minded leaders that received assistance from CEP II more than once to increase outreach to constituents will only be counted once per this target.) **Data Source(s):** Project field staff dialoguing with leaders; program staff observation; project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are approved, implemented, evaluated and closed. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project Field Staff and CPRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, and due to the relatively low number of anticipated interventions, no high-level statistical analysis will be performed. Data will be disaggregated by gender. Follow-up and feedback from both the constituents and leaders, may result in a lesson learned and/or success story. Qualitative data will be collected and incorporated into the quarterly report as relevant **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Monitoring data will be entered into the USAID GIS as projects are approved and again when projects are completed. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): This indicator does not speak to the efficacy of the outreach. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Through the use of Initial Impact Indicators, program staff will attempt to elicit citizen assessments of the quality and impact of the outreach undertaken through informal interviews and anecdotal stories.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 2.3 Number of executive office operations supported by USG assistance **Date Established:** December 2006 (FACTS Indicator)
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Executive office refers to the office of the president, prime minister or cabinet. Operations could include, for example, public communications, strategic planning, improved decision-making processes, communication protocols within the executive office, communication procedures with and among ministries, communication procedures with media, scheduling systems, financial management, introduction of information technology and equipment, and monitoring and evaluation systems. **Unit of Measure:** Number (operations) **Disaggregated by:** Type of operations, Type of Executive Offices **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator attempts to measure the efforts of CEP interventions that work with the executive office on services, policies, and/or capacities to respond to problems, needs, and opportunities, in order to improve the functioning of those offices.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After the method and type of assistance has been identified and conducted, the field project staff will dialogue with stakeholders to assess the success of CEP's assistance. **Data Source(s):** Project records; stakeholders at executive offices; program staff observation. **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects approved, implemented, evaluated and closed out. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project Field Staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAIDS's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, and due to the relatively small number of anticipated grants to executive office operations, no high-level statistical analysis will be performed. Engagement with project stakeholders may generate anecdotal evidence of project success or lessons learned. **Presentation of Data:** Narrative report with tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID GIS as projects are approved and again on completion of activities. Data, success stories and lessons learned will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The indicator does not measure the outcomes of this support: whether the institution and/or system actually implements positive changes. Rather the indicator will demonstrate CEP's capacity to respond rapidly to pressing requests from the executive office for equipment and technical assistance. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Through the use of Initial Impact Indicators, program staff will obtain qualitative data on outcome-level impact in the form of anecdotes through interviews with grant stakeholders.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 2.4 Number of program assisted institutions with measurable increased capacity **Date Established:** December 2008
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Number of program-assisted CSOs, PA Ministries, associations and/or other institutions targeted by CEP for long term capacity building development which demonstrate increased capacity to deliver services which may be faster (more efficient), of higher quality (more effective), serve more people (more coverage), satisfy end users (more satisfaction). **Unit of Measure:** Institution **Disaggregated by:** Type (CSO, Ministry, Other) **Justification/Management Utility:** A key objective for CEP II is strengthening Palestinian institutions in support of improved service provision and insitutional responsiveness to end-user needs. This indicator seeks to measure the extent to which long term capacity building assistance to targetted institutions in the form of facility development, training, technology and internal systems development results in the provision of better services by these insitutions. The concept of " better" will be typically analysed across the dimensions of efficiency, effectiveness, coverage and end-user satisfaction. Capacity building assistance will be provided in the form of grants and technical support.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: When each institution is identified for assistance, an Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool and parallel stakeholder assessments will be administered to provide base-line data in the form of a comprehensive Action Plan. Measurable increases in capacity will be identified on a periodic basis as grants and technical assistance packages are rolled out against the base-lines established in the Action Plan developed during the assessment stage. **Data Source(s):** Institutional staff , service end users, other institutional stakeholders as appropriate, project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** As per Action Plan developed per targeted institution, **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Costs of data collection and analysis will be covered in institution-specific Short Term Technical Assistance service contracts. Complementary data from monitoring of grant activities will be included in the relevant grant budget. **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM, technical experts. **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database and project files. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: The Action Plan will guide and determine the timing and content of specific analysis to be conducted during and post-assistance. **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables. **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed as obtained. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report, otherwise annually. Date will be entered into the USAID GIS system as it becomes available.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The monitoring and evaluation frameworks developed as part of the institutionally-tailored Action Plans will not capture the evolving context of implementation. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Limitations imposed on implementation of capacity building assistance through contextual challenges (movement restrictions of technical staff, lack of availability of required equipment on the market, political volatility etc) will be documented separately and rolled up into the overall reports.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 2.5 Number of CSOs using USG assistance to improve internal capacity. **Date Established:** December 2008 (FACT Indicator)
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Number of Palestinian CSOs assisted by CEP to establish transparent and accountable financial systems, internal democratic mechanisms and processes, and better ability to represent constituents'/members' interest. This indicator captures the number of CSO's who receive grants and technical support on a short-term, ad-hoc basis as well as those CSOs who are targets of longer term capacity building assistance component of CEP II. Illustrative activities would include provision of equipment, renovation and refurbishment of facilities, training in establishment and management of internal systems (personnel records, fund raising and participatory planning strategies, knowledge management systems etc). **Unit of Measure:** Number (CSO) **Disaggregated by:** None **Justification/Management Utility:** Even with the best of intentions, CSO effectiveness is often severly limited by lack of capacity. In the Palestinian context, where disposable income is low and the bulk of donor funding for capacity builidng is directed at nascent PA institutions, the capacity of CSOs to leverage funds and provide services at reasonable cost is often key to their survival as service providers. This indicator is a measure of how many CSOs are using USG funds to improve internal capacity.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: CEP project staff dialoguing with CSO stakeholders and service end-users, project records. **Data Source(s):** Project records; CSO stakeholders, technical experts, and service end-users where appropriate and possible. **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project interventions are identified and implemented. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the grant budget or in the Short Term Technical Assistance service contract. **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project field staff, CBRPM, technical experts **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be provided in numeric form. Project monitoring and final evaluations may also generate project-specific success stories and lessons learned, which CEP will roll up and report out on a quarterly basis to USAID. **Presentation of Data:** Text report with tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into the USAID GIS system as projects are approved and again as activities are completed. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The indicator measures the number of CSOs assisted and not the subsequent anticipated outcome/impact of the support. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Through the use of Initial Impact Indicators, program staff will gather data that links grant/technical outputs to outcomes/ impact through interviews with grantee staff and other anecdotal stories.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.1 Number of CSOs benefitting. **Date Established:** December 2006
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Number of CSO's who receive USG assistance in the form of grants or technical assistance. **Unit of Measure:** CSO **Disaggregated by:** Type of CSO (community-based, national, charitable, professional) **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates the absolute coverage of CSOs by CEP II
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter number of CSOs benefitting into database. **Data Source(s):** Project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, disaggregated by CSO type. **Presentation of Data:** Charts and/or tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.2 Number of GOs benefitting. **Date Established:** December 2006
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Number of Government Offices (ministries, executive office, legislative office) who receive USG assistance in the form of grants or technical assistance. **Unit of Measure:** GO **Disaggregated by:** Type (ministry, executive office, legislative) **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates the coverage of GOs by CEP II
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter number of GOs benefitting into CEP database. **Data Source(s):** Project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, **Presentation of Data:** Charts and/or tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.3 Number of Local Government Units benefitting. **Date Established:** December 2006
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Number of municipalities or village councils who receive USG assistance in the form of grants or technical assistance. **Unit of Measure:** LGU **Disaggregated by:** Type of LGU (municipality, local councils, village councils/project committees) **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates the coverage of LGUs by CEP II
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter number of LGUs benefitting into database. **Data Source(s):** Project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, disaggregated by LGU type. **Presentation of Data:** Charts and/or tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.4 Number of people benefitting. **Date Established:** December 2006
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Number of people (citizens, grassroots, constituencies) who are direct, first tier beneficiaries of the project intervention as per USAID GIS standard definitions: **Schools**: number of students and teachers benefitting in one year **Parks, Clinics, Community and/or Youth Centers**: number of people potentially benefitting from the services of the facility in one year, not the number of residents in the catchment area. **Roads:** **1.** Access roads: estimated number of regular commuters (not vehicles) that use the road over one year **2.** Agricultural roads: estimated number of farmers or commuter to land using that road over one year. Not to include numbers of people using the road as general access road. **3.** Interior roads: estimated number of people using the road over one year. Number could be total number of residents in a village or neighborhood, if the road serves them all. **Training courses, workshops, campaigns:** participants in the actual event, and trainers/organizers if they are paid. **Provision of equipment through grants:** staff of institution including board members. If equipment used by membership, then also include estimated number of users over one year. **Technical Assistance**: staff being trained **Humanitarian:** number of family members in the receiving household either targeted by the assistance, or whose members are employed during the implementation**.** **Unit of Measure:** Person **Disaggregated by:** Gender, Location **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates program coverage in terms of population, dissagregated by gender and location.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter estimated number of people benefitting into database and again at completion of project activities. **Data Source(s):** Project and grantee records. **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, disaggregated by gender. **Presentation of Data:** Charts and/or tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.5 Value of grants provided over time. **Date Established:** December 2008
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Total dollar value of grants approved per quarter **Unit of Measure:** US Dollar **Disaggregated by:** project type, location, partner type **Justification/Management Utility:** One of the key requirements of the CEP II Contract is that the Contractor will maintain a rapid and flexible response capacity to emerging needs. On average, CEP II grants – once approved – are implemented within a 6-week period. Every quarter, an average of 18 grants are developed, approved and move into impelmentation, with an average value of $52,600 per grant. This indicator demonstrates the rapid-response capacity of the program in terms of the volume of funds obligated each quarter and progress towards financial targets.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter estimated and actual grant value into database. **Data Source(s):** Project financial records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Every quarter. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, disaggregated by project type, location and partner type. **Presentation of Data:** Charts and graphs **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Estimated grant values will be entered into USAID GIS for each individual project as approved and a reconciled value on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.6 Number of grants approved over time. **Date Established:** December 2008
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Total number of grants approved per quarter **Unit of Measure:** US Dollar **Disaggregated by:** project type, location, partner type **Justification/Management Utility:** One of the key requirements of the CEP II Contract is that the Contractor will maintain a rapid and flexible response capacity to emerging needs. On average, CEP II grants – once approved – are implemented within a 6-week period. Every quarter, an average of 18 grants are developed, approved and move into impelmentation with an average value of $52,600 per grant. This indicator demonstrates the rapid-response capacity of the program in terms of the number of grants approved each quarter .
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter grant number into database. **Data Source(s):** Project records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Every quarter. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form, disaggregated by project type, location and partner type **Presentation of Data:** Charts and graphs **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Every approved grant is entered into USAID GIS as approved.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.7 Number of workshops, events or community forums conducted. **Date Established:** December 2006
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): Workshops, events and community forums are those mechanisms identified as key components of grant design which facilitate and promote public participation in the design and implementation of activities. This indicator does not capture the number of training workshops held to provide discreet technical training. **Unit of Measure:** Number **Disaggregated by:** Type of Mechanism **Justification/Management Utility:** One of the requirements of the CEP II Contract is the use – to the extent possible -- of participatory processes with the grantee or local community in grant design and implementation. This indicator demonstrates the extent to which participatory methods and processes are used as a key part of grant design and implementation.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved and conducted, program staff will enter number of workshops, events, community forums into database. **Data Source(s):** Project records, observation, grantee records **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved and again on completion of project activities. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form. **Presentation of Data:** Charts, graphs and tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): n/a **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.8 Number of media (TV, Radio, Print) campaigns/messages developed and conducted. **Date Established:** December 2006
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of media campaigns/messages developed by CEP II as key components of project design intended to provide the necessary outreach to citizens to promote their essential participation in the project's activities and benefits. Types of project activities would be TV/Radio spots to advertise an upcoming event dependent on public support for its success; TV/Radio spots and print adverts to promote awareness around a particular community/national issue or concern; or promote public availability and use of specialized services (safe shelter for women-at-risk, blood banks, organ donor banks etc.) **Unit of Measure:** Number of media campaigns/messages **Disaggregated by:** Type **Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates the extent to which CEPII uses media as a key outreach tool in project design to expand public knowledge and awareness of events and issues in the public interest, and essential and specialized services which require sensitive and active promotion to facilitate citizen uptake.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved and then conducted, program staff will enter number of media campaigns into the CEP database. **Data Source(s):** Project and grantee records, spot checks and participant observation **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form. **Presentation of Data:** Charts and/or tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): This indicator does not measure the extent to which citizens listen to, see or read the media message. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Program staff will generate estimated figures for the numbers of people who watch or listen to the different local media outlets using standard measurement tools taken from the periodically updated Internews surveys on the percentage of populations who watch or listen to the local media. An estimate can then be done for time of day - afternoons for radio and evenings for TV. These figures will be reported on a quarterly basis as appropriate.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator (#): 3.9 Number of volunteers engaged in project activities **Date Established:** December 2008
a. Description
Precise Definition(s): The number of people engaged in the implementation of project activities that are not paid for doing so. The numbers can typically include unpaid staff and members of CSOs and members of the general public in the project area**.** Being engaged in the implementation of project activities is understood to mean participating in project activities for a measurable or planned length of time. Types of project activities could include – but are not limited to – clean up campaigns; olive harvesting campaigns; awareness campaigns; getting signatures on petitions; helping to organize public events such as theatre performances, community forums , Ramadan evenings, conflict resolution and non-violence activities. In short, any voluntary participation in CEP II funded activities which assist and bring value to project implementation. **Unit of Measure:** Person **Disaggregated by:** Gender **Justification/Management Utility:** The strategic and creative engagment of volunteers by CSO's in pursuit of improved performance in the provision of services to their constituencuies is a key strategy for CSO sustainability and expanded civic engagement. As funding for core CSO operating costs in Palestine continue to dwindle, the strategic use of volunteers is excellent evidence of sustainable use of available resources and commitment to good civic engagement practices.
b. Plan for Data Collection
Data Collection Method: After project has been approved, program staff will enter estimated numbers of volunteers into the CEP database based on discussions with grantees. **Data Source(s):** Project records, grantee records, observation **Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as project is approved. **Estimated Cost of Collection:** Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection **Responsible Organization/Individual(s):** CEP Project staff, grantees, CBRPM **Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)
Data Analysis: Data will be presented in numeric form. **Presentation of Data:** Charts and/or tables **Review of Data:** CBRPM will conduct periodic data audit to ensure rigorous data quality **Reporting of Data:** Data will be compiled and analyzed on a quarterly basis. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (if relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report. Data will be entered into USAID GIS as project is approved and again on completion of project activities.
d. Data Quality Issues
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The impact of volunteering on behavior and attitudes of the volunteers themselves is not captured by this indicator. In addition, Grantee records for a final tally of numbers may be underreported as informal and spontaneous participation by the members of the general public may not always be formally recorded. **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Program staff will, through the use of Initial Impact Indicators, document the attitudinal changes experienced by the volunteers through interviews and anecdotes.

ANNEX C: M&E TOOLKIT

The M&E toolkit presented below delineates the range, purpose, and use of information-gathering mechanisms in place for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on results, outcomes, and impact. This tool will assist program staff in understanding the range of tools available and the functions and purpose of each tool.

As new M&E tools are developed, the toolkit will be expanded.

Table 3 – CEP M&E Toolkit

CEP II M&E TOOLKIT				
Tool	**Timing**	**Purpose**	**Implementer**	**Use**
Grant Notes	During grant design and implementation	Allows a better understanding of grant process efficiency	GMS, PS	• Results are used to improve process efficiency (for grants teams and program managers) • Results are used to make adjustments during implementation to allow objectives to be best met (for program managers and grants teams) • Quantitative data used for reporting (QR and GIS)
Initial Impact Indicators	During grant design	Allows better focus on and monitoring of results expected	GMS	• Qualitative analysis used for reporting (Success Stories, Rolling Assessments, QR)
Grant Final Evaluation and Lessons Learned	Post Implementation	Measures impact of intervention and Lessons Learned through reflection on III's, beneficiary feedback and anecdotal data	GMS, PS	• Qualitative analysis used for reporting (Success Stories, Rolling Assessments, QR) • Provides regular input into project design
Assumption Analysis	Periodic	Allows project hypothesis and results to be linked,	DCOP/P, GMS	• Feeds into project design
Rolling Impact Assessments	Every quarter, presented at the quarterly Rolling Assessment meeting	Allows for an evolving understanding of impact across project type, location, target group, intervention strategy	All Staff	• Feeds into program design
Capacity-Building Assessment Tool	Pre Design of Capacity Assistance Package	Allows identification of gaps in institutional capacity	STTA	• Report forms one component of overall recommendations for institutional assessment
Stakeholder Assessments	Pre Design of Capacity Assistance Package	Allows triangulation of data from institutional self assessment	STTA	• Report forms one component of overall recommendations for institutional assessment
Action Plan	End Result of Institutional Assessment and Consultation.	Provides a clear and sequenced Road Map of long-term capacity assistance incorporating an M&E framework and overall implementation plan	STTA	• Forms overall implementation, monitoring, and evaluating plan for each targeted institution
Spot Checks	During implementation of Assistance Package	Allows ad hoc progress towards results to be monitored	STTA, GMS	• Qualitative analysis used for keeping Road Map on track
Training Evaluation	Pre Training	Allows initial assessment and identification of knowledge and awareness of target group for training package design	Trainer	• Results are used a baseline to demonstrate impact of training on target group
Training Evaluation	Post Training	Indicates impact of training on target groups knowledge and awareness	Trainer	• Results are compared to the pre-training to identify impact and lessons learned • Quantitative analysis used for reporting (QR and GIS)

U.S. Agency for International Development
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523
Tel: (202) 712-0000
Fax: (202) 216-3524
www.usaid.gov