

Program Monitoring Plan (PMP)
**EMERGENCY RELIEF ITEMS TO COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY FLOODS IN
PAKISTAN**

Cooperative Agreement No. 391-A-00-10-01187-00



Monitoring and Evaluation Section
Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN)
ISLAMABAD

August 25, 2010

1. Introduction

This documents presents the Program Monitoring Plan for the implementation of the USAID funded flood relief project “Emergency Relief Items to Communities affected by Floods in Pakistan (Cooperative Agreement No. 391-A-00-10-01187-00).” The project was approved by USAID with a budget of US \$2,299,998.

2. The Scope and objective of the project

The project aims to provide emergency relief items to a total of 34,361 floods affected households with an approximate population of 230,219 people in the 18 selected districts across Pakistan. The relief items are packaged into food and non-food items that sustain immediate needs of household comprising 6-7 members.

The project is focussed on the 18 worst hit flood affected districts of Pakistan. The selected districts include 2 from Punjab, 8 from Khyber Pukhtunkhwa, 5 from Sindh and 3 from Balochistan (District wise list of households is given in Annex -1).

The project is being implementing by four of the RSPN partners, Sarhad Rural Support Programme (SRSP) in Khyber Pukhtunkwa, Balochistan Rural Support Programme (BRSP) in Balochistan, Punjab Rural Support Programme (PRSP) in Punjab and Sindh Rural Support Organization (SRSO) in Sind for implementation of the project. RSPN will supervise and guide these RSPs to undertake relief distributions in the assigned worst hit flood affected districts.

3. Program Monitoring Plan

This Program Monitoring Plan is based on the RSPN’s Quality Assurance and Control Policy, for the project which is *“To provide quality emergency relief items to targeted households in a timely manner”*

The results achieved under this objective are categorized in the following four areas:

- i. Ensure transparent and timely process of procurement
- ii. Ensure highest possible quality of the relief packages
- iii. Ensure timely distribution of the relief packages
- iv. Ensure high quality, effective and efficient distribution process

3.1. Programme Monitoring Frame work

Based on the objective of the program the monitoring indicators framework is presented in Table 1. Based on this framework a performance measurement framework is presented in Annex-II; weekly progress report in Annex -III; monitoring checklist Annex- IV; and registration list/beneficiary lists Annex V.

Table 1: Monitoring Indicators Framework

OUTCOME RESULT: <i>To provide the quality and adequate emergency relief items to the targeted households timely.</i>			
Output Result 1.0 Ensure transparent and timely process of procurement	Output Result 2.0 Ensure highest possible quality of the relief packages	Output Result 3.0 Ensure high quality, effective and efficient implementation process	Output Result 4.0 Ensure timely distribution of relief items
Monitoring Indicators	Monitoring Indicators	Monitoring Indicators	Monitoring Indicators
1.1. Proper and timely procurement announcement made 1.2. Proper and timely Bid evaluation process followed 1.3. Relief items timely procured	2.1. Standardized specification of quality and quantity of food and non-food items made 2.2. Compliance of the food and non-food items to the specification is made. 2.3. Standardized and safe packing made	3.1. Work plan with clear timeline developed 3.2. Logistic plan developed and followed 3.3. Distribution Plan developed and followed	4.1. Worst effected locations with in the selected districts identified 4.2. Highly deserved household identified in the selected location 4.2. Proper Registration of the beneficiary made 4.3. Relief packages timely distributed

3.2. Organisation and Coordination of Monitoring

Given the nature of the project the monitoring activities will be at two stages. At the first stage the project staff at RSPN will monitor the pre-distribution activities with the partner RSPs. In order to facilitate the objective monitoring, the project staff will provide the partner RSPs with guidelines for packaging and specification of relief items and will regularly follow-up with the partner RSPs on the process and progress of procurement¹.

The second stage of the monitoring activities will start with distribution of the relief packages. The day to day progress monitoring will be conducted by RSP focal persons at the district level and RSPs will fill the registration form attached in Annex V. The two M&E officer at RSPN will pay random visits to field, and monitor the whole process of distribution, its efficiency, quality and timeliness. They will indentify the loopholes (if any) and provide real time feedback to the field staff, the RSP and RSPN management.

3.3. Reporting and Review of Progress

The project coordinator will prepare weekly progress update, and give informal feedback on minimum indicator of project achievement against its target with a short narrative on constraints or challenges faced in the implementation of the program if any.

The monitoring officer(s) in addition to highlighting the loopholes in the project implementation will also highlight the success of the project in the form of short success stories.

RSPN will prepare a Program Completion Report (PCR) with in 30 days after the completion date of the Agreement which will include: an executive summary of the program accomplishments in achieving results and conclusions about areas in need of future assistance; an overall description of the program activities and attainment of results during the life of the Cooperative Agreement. The report will also highlight the program achievement and lesson learnt for future programming.

¹ As Section 42 Companies each RSP has its own procurement rules and procedures, however for this project the requirement posited by RSPN is receipt of minimum three (3) quotations.

Annex – I: List of selected district and number of target households

Name of Province	Name of Partner RSP	Name of District	Number of targeted households
Punjab	PRSP	Muzaffargarh	2,400
		Layyah	3,011
		Sub-Total	5,411
Khyber Pukhtunkhwa	SRSP	Nowshera	4,000
		Peshawar	600
		Charsadda	4,500
		Chitral	600
		Swat	1,500
		Dir	500
		Shangla	500
		Kohistan	1,250
		Sub-Total	13,450
Sindh	SRSO	Kashmore	3,000
		Shikarpur	2,000
		Sukkar	1,500
		Khairpur	500
		Larkana	500
		Sub-Total	7,500
Balochistan	BRSP	Sibi	2,000
		Naseerabad	3,000
		Jafferabad	3,000
		Sub-Total	8,000
Grand Total			34,361

Annex-II: Performance measurement matrix

OUTCOME RESULT: <i>To provide the quality and adequate emergency relief items to the targeted households timely.</i>			
Performance and Quality Control Indicators	Reach	Data Sources/Collection Method/Frequency of data collection	Responsible Party/Person
1. Ensure transparent and timely process of procurement			
1.1 Proper and timely procurement announcement made 1.2 Proper and timely Bid evaluation process followed 1.3 Relief items timely procured	RSP Head Office	RSP focal person Within 2 days after release of funds to partner RSPs.	RSPN Project Coordinator
2. Ensure the highest possible quality of the relief packages			
2.1. Standardized specification of quality and quantity of food and non-food items made 2.2. Compliance of the food and non-food items to the specification is made. 2.3. Standardized and safe packing made Relief items timely procured	RSPN Office Packaging points Packing points	RSPN Project Coordinator Once before procurement announcement made Randomly selected packaging points once during packaging Randomly selected packing point once during packaging	RSPN Project Coordinator Project M&E officer Project M&E officer
3. Ensure high quality, effective and efficient implementation process			

<p>3.1. Work plan with clear timeline and responsibility matrix developed</p> <p>3.2. Logistic plan developed and followed</p> <p>3.3. Adequate and logistic deployed</p> <p>3.4. Distribution Plan developed and followed</p>	<p>RSPs Head office</p>	<p>RSPs focal persons and RSPN Project Coordinator</p> <p>Follow up the project M&E officer during the monitoring visit</p>	<p>RSPs focal persons and RSPN Project Coordinator Project M&E officer</p>
<p>4. Ensure timely distribution of the relief items</p>			
<p>4.1. Worst effected locations with in the selected districts identified</p> <p>4.2. Highly deserved household identified in the selected location</p> <p>4.3. Proper Registration of the beneficiary made</p> <p>4.4. Quality Relief packages timely distributed</p> <p>4.5. Number of Target household achieved</p>	<p>RSPs District Office</p>	<p>RSPs focal persons at district level in consultation with the local community</p> <p>Opinion of the beneficiary and observation of the project M&E officer during the monitoring visits</p> <p>Select RSP district office</p> <p>Weekly progress report</p>	<p>RSPs District officers Project M&E officer RSP focal person at district and RSPN project coordinator</p>

Tehsils															
Number of households provided with relief packages distributed in the identified locations															
Beneficiary list is collated and compiled (taking thumbprints of registered beneficiaries)															
RSP share the beneficiary list with RSPN															



RURAL SUPPORT PROGRAMMES EMERGENCY RELIEF ITEMS TO COMMUNITIES

Name
Home Address
Present Address
Number of
Household
members
TOKEN ID

Recipient Signature

RSP representative signature

Rural Support Programme Network (RSPN)
EMERGENCY RELIEF ITEMS TO COMMUNITIES AFFECTED BY FLOODS IN PAKISTAN
Field Monitoring Checklist

1. Name of Monitor / Observer:	
2. Designation Monitor / Observer:	
5. Visit Date:	
6. Name of RSP	
7. Name of District:	
8. Name of Tehsil:	
9. Location of Distribution:	

Distribution Process - Observations

1. What is the process of Distribution?				
	Good = 1	Adequate (some problems) =2	Poor (major problems) =3	No comment =9
2. How effective is the registration process (Everyone has an equal chance of being registered)?				
3. Were adequate number of registration points made for timely registration?				
4. Is the Registration Venue appropriate overall?				
5. How well the registration record is made?				
6. Proper date/time of distribution and place of distribution communicated to the registered beneficiary?				
7. Additional Information, issue problems (if any)				
8. Suggestion for improvement (if any)				

Distribution Venue and Environment - Observations

	Good = 1	Adequate (some problems) =2	Poor (major problems) =3	No comment =9
1. Where is the distribution being held?				
3. Is the Registration accessible to the the registered beneficiaries?				
4. How the distribution is managed?				
5. Is the distribution point appropriate for women and children?				
6. Additional Information				

Beneficiaries

1. How many household provided relief packages during your visit (Own observation)	Total HHs..... Male: Female:			
2. How deserved the beneficiaries were (own observation)?	All deserving=1, Some deserving =2, Non-deserving =3			
3. Did any registered member fail to turn up, or leave in the midway during the distribution process? (check the number of registered members of the date and time and actual present or received)				
4. Details or Additional Information (if any):				
5. Opinion of the beneficiary (ask randomly selected beneficiary about their satisfaction about:	All satisfied	Mostly satisfied	Few satisfied	None-satisfied
Overall distribution process				
Quality of the relief package				
Quantity of the relief package				
Accessibility of the relief package				
Any additional Information (if any)				

Relief Package

1. Relevancy of relief package (ask randomly selected beneficiaire)	Yes=1	No = 2	Usefulness: Essential=1, Useful=2, No Use=3	Quality: Good=1, Fair=2, Poor=3	Quantity: Adequate=1, inadequate=2
2. Any comments on the relief package?					

Logistic

	Yes = 1	No = 0	No Comment = 9
1. Does the District team have safe place for the the stock of relief packages?			
2. Have they deployed proper logistic in terms of human resource and vehicles etc			
3. Do they have clear distribution SoP in place?			
4. Observation/comments			

Overall Assessment

	Yes, good =1	Adequate =2	Less than adequate =3	Poor = 0	No opinion = 9
1. Overall do you think the distribution process was adequate according to the local needs?					

ANY OTHER OBSERVATIONS:

--

