



**USAID** | **WESTBANK/GAZA**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# WEST BANK AND GAZA CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM YEAR 3 WORKPLAN

NOVEMBER 2010

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development by Tetra Tech ARD.

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

Implemented by:

Tetra Tech ARD, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1397  
Burlington, VT 05402

# WEST BANK AND GAZA CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

NOVEMBER 2010

## **DISCLAIMER**

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

# Table of Contents

<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Tetra Tech ARD Civic Engagement Program</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Introduction and Background</b> .....	<b>8</b>
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES .....	8
<b>CEP II Work Planning and Training Workshop</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>SESSION RESULTS</b> .....	<b>12</b>
SESSION: PROGRAM BY NUMBERS .....	12
SESSION: CONSTRUCTING A RESULTS FRAMEWORK.....	12
SESSION: CAPACITY BUILDING PRESENTATION.....	13
SESSION: RAPID ASSESSMENT OF PAST YEAR PROGRAM INTERVENTIONS .....	13
PROGRAM – MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS .....	13
PROGRAM – SETBACKS/OBSTACLES .....	14
TRENDS IMPACTING WORK.....	14
NEW DIRECTIONS/TARGETS OF OPPORTUNITY .....	15
SESSION: YEAR THREE FUNCTIONAL UNIT WORK PLANNING.....	15
<b>SESSION RESULTS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
STANDARD/INGO GRANTS .....	16
Achievements/Accomplishments .....	16
Setbacks/Obstacles .....	16
Trends Impacting Work .....	16
New Directions/Targets of Opportunity.....	16
IN-KIND GRANTS .....	17
Achievements/Accomplishments .....	17
Setbacks/Obstacles .....	17
Trends Impacting Work .....	17
New Directions/Targets of Opportunity.....	17
GRANT COMPLIANCE & PROCUREMENT.....	17
Achievements/Accomplishments .....	17
Setbacks/Obstacles .....	18
Trends Impacting Work .....	18
New Directions/Targets of Opportunity.....	18
M&E/REPORTING .....	19
Achievements/Accomplishments .....	19
Setbacks/Obstacles .....	19
Trends Impacting Work .....	19
New Directions/Targets of Opportunity.....	20
IMPACT ASSESSMENT .....	20
ADMINISTRATIVE/FINANCE.....	20
Achievements/Accomplishments .....	20
Setbacks/Obstacles .....	20

Trends Impacting Work .....	20
New Directions/Targets of Opportunity .....	21
<b>CEP PROGRESS GRANT CHART .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>SESSION: TEAMBUILDING &amp; COMMUNICATION .....</b>	<b>29</b>
PHONE COMMUNICATION - .....	29
WRITTEN COMMUNICATION – .....	30
SESSION: PROCUREMENT PLAY & DISCUSSION.....	30
SESSION: REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE REGULATIONS .....	30
SESSION: PROCESS MANUAL DISCUSSION .....	30
SESSION: CEP II TIMELINE .....	31
<b>ANNEX .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN .....</b>	<b>34</b>
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....	34
2.0 PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM .....	35
2.1 DATA COLLECTION .....	35
2.2 REPORTING .....	36
2.2.1 PERIODIC REPORTING .....	36
2.2.2 USAID GEO/MIS .....	36
2.3 QUALITY ASSURANCE .....	36
3.0 IMPACT EVALUATION .....	37
CEP's Capacity Building Component.....	39
INDICATORS AND TARGETS.....	40
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS (PIRS) .....	42

# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>ACS</b>	Accounting Specialist
<b>APS</b>	Annual Program Statements
<b>AS/IG</b>	Administrative Specialist/International Grants
<b>BOQ</b>	Bills of Quantity
<b>CB</b>	Capacity-Building
<b>CBI</b>	Capacity-Building Items
<b>CBRM</b>	Capacity-Building and Reporting Manager
<b>CBS</b>	Capacity-Building Specialist
<b>CBO</b>	Community Based Organization
<b>CEP</b>	Civic Engagement Program
<b>CLA</b>	Coordination and Liaison Administration
<b>CO</b>	Contracting Officer
<b>COGAT</b>	Coordinator for Government Activities in the Territories
<b>COP</b>	Chief of Party
<b>COTR</b>	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
<b>CSO</b>	Civil Society Organization
<b>D&amp;G</b>	Democracy and Governance
<b>DCOP/GC</b>	Deputy Chief of Party/Grants and Compliance
<b>DCOP/P</b>	Deputy Chief of Party/Programs
<b>DFA</b>	De Facto Authority
<b>DGO</b>	Democracy and Governance Office
<b>DGRPM</b>	Deputy Gaza Regional Program Manager
<b>DQA</b>	Data Quality Audits
<b>EAB</b>	Executive Advisory Board
<b>ER</b>	Early Recovery
<b>ES</b>	Engineering Specialist
<b>FACTS</b>	Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System
<b>FAM</b>	Finance & Administration Manager

<b>FI</b>	Food Items
<b>FTS</b>	Facilitation and Training Specialist
<b>Geo/MIS</b>	Geographic Management Information System
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic Information System
<b>GMS</b>	Grants Management Specialist
<b>GO</b>	Government Office
<b>GRPM</b>	Gaza Regional Program Manager
<b>GSS</b>	Grants Systems Specialist
<b>GUC</b>	Grants under Contract
<b>HA</b>	Humanitarian Assistance
<b>HRS</b>	Human Resources Specialist
<b>IGM</b>	International Grants Manager
<b>IMS</b>	Information Management Specialist
<b>IEE</b>	Initial Environmental Examination
<b>IS</b>	Impact Specialist
<b>ITS</b>	Information Technology Specialist
<b>LGU</b>	Local Government Unit
<b>LS</b>	Logistics Specialist
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MIS</b>	Management Information System
<b>NFI</b>	Non-Food Items
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>OCM</b>	Office of Contract Management (USAID)
<b>OP</b>	Operational Plan
<b>PA</b>	Palestinian Authority
<b>PARD</b>	Pre Award Responsibility Determination
<b>PIRS</b>	Performance Indicator Reference Sheets
<b>PM</b>	Procurement Manager
<b>PMP</b>	Performance Monitoring Plan
<b>PO</b>	Purchase Order
<b>PS</b>	Procurement Specialist

<b>PSS</b>	Program Support Specialist
<b>RFA</b>	Request for Application
<b>RFP</b>	Request for Payment
<b>RFQ</b>	Request for Quotations
<b>RPM</b>	Regional Program Manager
<b>RS</b>	Reporting Specialist
<b>SACS</b>	Senior Accounting Specialist
<b>SA</b>	Service Agreement
<b>SG</b>	Standard Grant
<b>SIS</b>	Senior Impact Specialist
<b>SOW</b>	Scopes of Work
<b>SO</b>	Strategic Objective
<b>STAM</b>	Senior Technical Advisor/Manager
<b>STTA</b>	Short Term Technical Assistance
<b>TA</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development
<b>USG</b>	United States Government
<b>VAT</b>	Value after Taxes
<b>WB/G</b>	West Bank and Gaza
<b>WS</b>	Warehouse Supervisor

# TETRA TECH ARD CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

## Jerusalem Staff

**Chief of Party**  
Mark Levenson

**Deputy Chief of Party/Compliance**  
Peter LaRosa

**Deputy Chief of Party/Programming**  
Kirsty Wright

**Procurement Manager**  
Diala Khalaf

**International Grants Manager**  
Razan Abdallah

**Information Management & GIS Specialist**  
Rana Handal

**Impact Specialist**  
Razan Yacoub

**Administrative and Finance Manager**  
Samia Masad

**Grant System Specialists**  
Ahlam Daqaq  
Shada Jabary

**Grant Management Specialists**  
Ramiz Younis  
Johnny Bassil

**Engineering Specialists**  
Raja Tutunji  
Ala'a Turshan

**Procurement Specialists**  
Basel Obaid  
Cathy Hamed  
Jihad Siam  
Sami Azar

**Reporting Specialist**  
Nabeel Muaddi

**Capacity-Building Specialist**

Mazen Hashweh

**Senior Accounting Specialist**

Bana Abdeen

**Accounting Specialist**

Ruba Nassrallah

**Human Resources Specialist**

Houda Abu Shanab

**Information Technology Specialist**

Hassan Khraim

**Logistic Specialists**

Amjad Sulieman

Rami Freij

Khaled Dadu

**Warehouse Supervisor**

Wael Al Kharouf

**Administrative Assistant**

Abla Sinokrot

**Receptionist/Administrative Specialist**

Nour Sa'adeh

## **Gaza Staff**

**Gaza Regional Program Manager**

Manal Elbashiti

**Deputy Gaza Regional Program Manager**

Amani Rizq

**Grants Management Specialist**

Hashim Al Hussaini

**Procurement Specialists**

Dareen Al-Sheikh Ali

Nadin Badereddin

## **Tetra Tech ARD Home Office**

**Senior Technical Advisor/Manager**

Kathy Stermer

**Facilitation & Training Specialist**

Rebecca Kanaan

# INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Civic Engagement Program II (CEP II) is a 36-month contract between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Tetra Tech ARD of Burlington, Vermont, signed on 29 September 2008. The project seeks to engage and promote moderate voices in the West Bank and Gaza (WB/G) to further the prospect for peaceful political solutions and economic development. In addition, the program provides capacity building support to a range of institutions in the WB/G. Over the past year, the program has also provided over \$36,002,918 dollars in assistance to Gaza with associated costs of \$2,260,047 in transportation and warehousing services. This assistance includes CEP's early recovery grants for a total of \$14,742,722, Relief and Assistance for a total of \$21,022,313 and local grants for a total of \$237,883.

Due to a number of factors, including the requirement of submitting a Year 3 Work Plan as well as the contract requirement to hold off-site workshops and teambuilding meetings twice per year, the decision was made to hold a workshop not only to discuss work planning and conduct teambuilding, but also to fine-tune some administrative and programmatic procedures at the start of the third year of program execution.

The workshop was held in Caesarea, and was attended by the entire CEP II team, as well as the Home Office Senior Technical Advisor/Manager (Kathy Stermer) and a Facilitation & Training Specialist (Rebecca Kanaan). The participation of members of the home office project management team enhanced the workshop, not only by bringing in ARD home office information, procedures and ideas, but also by allowing for teambuilding between the US and WB/G staff.



## WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

- Comprehensively discuss and internalize the CEP II Annual Work Plan, including Year 3 objectives, activities/tasks, timeline and responsibilities
- Focus on monitoring and evaluation processes and close-out of program.
- Clarify roles and responsibilities with an emphasis on team management principles, within a CEP II team approach (including improving communications)
- Review and clarify procurement and payment procedures and processes
- Identify good project management, monitoring and reporting practices
- Clarify personnel policies and performance evaluation methods and identify improved management responsiveness functions
- Review safety and security procedures within an escalating conflict zone

# CEP II WORK PLANNING AND TRAINING WORKSHOP

Dan Caesarea Hotel, October 19 through 21, 2010

## AGENDA

### Tuesday, October 19th

- 09:00 Jerusalem and Gaza staff departs from Jerusalem Office to Dan Caesarea Hotel, Caesarea.
- 11:00 Arrival at Dan Caesarea Hotel.
- 12:00 Staff Registration and Check-In (This will be confirmed later with the hotel as the usual check-in time is 3 pm)
- 12:30 Lunch
- 02:00 Icebreaker, Welcome, Objectives, Schedule and Logistics (COP & Rebecca)
- 02:30 Program by Numbers: Brief Overview of Achievements (COP)
- 03:00 Coffee Break
- 03:15 Constructing a Results Framework for the Program (DCOP/P)
- 04:15 Capacity-Building Presentation
- 05:00 End of Workshop Session



## Wednesday, October 20th

- 8:00 Breakfast
- 9:00 Rapid Assessment of Past Year of Program Interventions (teamwork – modified SWOT analysis)
- 10:30 Coffee Break
- 10:45 Year 3 Goals – in teams, define the goals for final year of the project, then discuss in plenary
- 12:00 Teambuilding Activity – a series of activities to focus on communications
- 1:00 Lunch
- 1:45 Presentation of CEP Achievements and Future Opportunities
- 2:30 Year 3 Activity Matrices – fill out
- 3:30 Coffee Break
- 3:45 Present Activity Matrices
- 5:00 End of Workshop Session



## Thursday, October 21<sup>st</sup>

- 8:00 Breakfast
- 9:00 Teambuilding
- 12:30 Lunch
- 1:30 Procurement Play & Discussion
- 2:00 Review of Compliance Regulations
- 2:30 Process Manual – Issues and Discussion
- 3:00 CEP II Timeline Activity
- 4:00 End of Workshop Session



## SESSION RESULTS

Following are brief descriptions of each session, along with the results of those sessions.

### SESSION: PROGRAM BY NUMBERS



The first session at the workshop was a brief presentation by Mark Levenson, CEP Chief of Party (COP). The objective of this session was to present an overview of CEP II accomplishments over the past year and to highlight some of the upcoming activities, opportunities and challenges for year 3 of the program. This session set the stage for the year 3 work plan, which was created on day 2 of the workshop. The COP was able to quickly point out some key accomplishments of the team, which served to motivate the team as they moved into the work planning phase of the workshop. He also provided an

overview of program outcomes over the past year, emphasizing CEP staff's accomplishment of meeting the year 2 work plan goals.

### SESSION: CONSTRUCTING A RESULTS FRAMEWORK

CEP is somewhat distinct from many USAID-funded programs in that it does not fit neatly within a Mission-defined results framework. Kirsty Wright, the Deputy Chief of Party for Programs (DCOP/P), felt that it was important for the team to understand the logic of a results framework so that they could see how the on-going grants activities actually contribute to the contract objectives as stated in the scope of work (SOW).



The DCOP/P started the session by explaining the concept of a results framework. Once everyone understood the logic, she presented the 2 program objectives and the 4 program goals, as defined by USAID in the contract SOW. CEP staff was asked to complete the rest of the framework – defining two levels of “outcomes” as well as the “activity” level of the framework. In this way, the team was able to see how their distinct activities fed into higher level goals and objectives. Ideas for whom to talk to when evaluating the impact of grant activities were then shared.

## SESSION: CAPACITY BUILDING PRESENTATION

Mazen Hashweh, the new Capacity-Building Specialist (CBS), presented his approach to capacity-building. While discussing the meaning of “*capacity-building*”, the CBS presented his framework which highlighted how capacity-building objectives must respond to socio-economic realities. Mazen further explained how he would be implementing his current SOW with the CEP staff.



## SESSION: RAPID ASSESSMENT OF PAST YEAR PROGRAM INTERVENTIONS



This session, which will feed directly into the Year 3 Work Plan, was meant to highlight the key accomplishments, setbacks, and trends impacting CEP over the past year of implementation. It was a chance for the staff to look back over the past year and think about what they have achieved, both regarding internal processes and program impacts.

After looking back over the past year, the staff had the opportunity to look forward to new directions for CEP. In this portion of the session, the staff considered new directions and points of focus for year 3, but also thought

about possibilities beyond year 3. This allowed them to think about their best practices and what sets CEP apart from other contractors and INGOs. It also enabled them to think about what they *could* achieve, were the time and resources made available. The session results follow:

### PROGRAM – MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Scores of 4 & 5 throughout CPR
- Humanitarian aid provided to approximately 700,000 Gazans with a total of 21 million dollars.
- CEP the first to create an original transport system into Gaza and has delivered 6,000 pallets of commodities on 500 trucks with a total of 1.2 million dollars spent in transportation support.
- A new Process Manual for in-kind grant making has been developed to improve the grant making process.
- CEP has raised environmental awareness and compliance among its partners/grantees (IEE).
- Ensured implementation in a very difficult environment

- CEP has maintained a high visibility and positive image in the Gaza Strip, and has been recognized for its rapid and effective response in this region.
- Robust Democracy and Governance Program continue in the West Bank, while CEP simultaneously spends over 36 million dollars in assistance in Gaza.
- Excellence in compliance and internal systems with a near perfect USAID review.
- Over 14 million dollars in early recovery have been programmed.
- Goals of Year 2 work plan have been achieved.
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system and tools have been greatly improved.
- CEP has been able to successfully absorb 40 million dollars in new funds.
- Staff retention remains high.
- Internal reorganization has been effective.
- Role model in MIS & GIS reporting.
- CEP has been able to complete 101 grants in 2 years with 27,506,782 million dollars in obligations.
- Excellent responsiveness to unsolicited USAID proposals.
- CEP now has 2 staff members taking on the M&E Process. The IMS is tasked with monitoring while evaluation is covered by the IS.
- CEP has acquired the consulting services of a specialist to provide technical guidance in impact evaluation.

## **PROGRAM – SETBACKS/OBSTACLES**

- The DFA in Gaza continues its attempts to intervene in CEP’s work.
- The closures between Gaza and the West Bank have led to the lack of materials being transferred into the Gaza Strip.
- VAT problems with vendors.
- Limitation of funds (money has been programmed/obligated).
- COGAT approval/security procedures delay transport of commodities into Gaza.
- Fluctuation in value of currency.
- Ceiling on amount we can spend on construction projects.
- Difficulty managing INGOs which follow their own rules/guidelines.
- In some cases (ARDWBG 327, ARDWBG381, ARDWBG483), the OCM revision process for subcontracts took over a month for approval, affecting the bidding validity and requiring that CEP restart the procurement process.

## **TRENDS IMPACTING WORK**

- Interference by DFA caused delays in project implementation as CEP sought USAID guidance in how to prevent such interferences.
- Greater teamwork/cohesiveness between teams and units at CEP (as noted by the DCOP/P).
- DFA intervention increasing/ becoming more sophisticated in intervention methods.
- COGAT has eased some of their restrictive policies.
- New USAID projects starting-up – could create confusion.

- Morale of CEP staff has significantly increased.
- Political landscape is not stable and *could* change greatly.

## NEW DIRECTIONS/TARGETS OF OPPORTUNITY

- We can do anything. CEP is a very flexible mechanism, able to immediately act to help USAID fulfill its mission.
- CEP can successfully and effectively conduct impact reporting rather quickly.
- A prime target of opportunity is the re-focus on civil society to empower and support democratic initiatives.
- Compliment other programs that are conducting training and capacity-building with in-kind, tangible grants.
- Return to “community self-help,” a normal post-OTI type program.
- Make USAID successes more visible by strengthening reporting, public relations and increasing community contact, etc. (more than INGOs typically do)
- Develop “*snapshots*” of current situations in West Bank & Gaza in all of the areas (technical) in which CEP works.
- Build local institutions’ capacity to achieve their long-term goals (CBOs)
- Enhance consultative processes with Mission, community and stakeholders to define program activities.



## SESSION: YEAR THREE FUNCTIONAL UNIT WORK PLANNING

The process for coming up with Functional Area Work Plans for Year 3 was a four step process, which is outlined below:

- Reflection on major accomplishments and pitfalls/obstacles from the past year, and trends impacting the work and targets of opportunity and new directions that we might follow as we look forward to Year Three (analysis).
- In five groups (one for each functional unit), define the overall Year Three goals for each unit (units were: In-Kind Grants, Standard/INGO Grants, Grants Compliance & Procurement, Monitoring & Evaluation/Reporting, and Administration, Finance & Logistics).
- Functional Unit teams elaborated matrices of activities/tasks to reach the goals set in the previous activity. Matrices include activities, timeline, and STTA resources required.
- Presentations of year 3 activity plans by CEP teams and refinement based on CEP staff input.

## SESSION RESULTS

Rapid Assessment of the Current Situation by Functional Unit Teams

## STANDARD/INGO GRANTS

### Achievements/Accomplishments

- CEP created a transportation system and transport processes to efficiently keep it running.
- Awarded 44 grants to INGOs for \$35,765,035 dollars (\$14,742,722 under early recovery and \$21,022,313 under relief and assistance).
- Ensured that these grants were implemented with compliance.
- All program requirements of these grants were met with three staff members.
- Kept due diligence, M&E and compliance adherence from INGO partners who were unfamiliar with rules and regulations.

### Setbacks/Obstacles

- COGAT approval of items needed for implementing grants in Gaza.
- Crossing points requirements and security procedures
- DFA interference continues.
- Uncooperative attitudes from INGO hindering activities.
- Unfamiliarity of USAID rules and regulations by grantees/partners.



### Trends Impacting Work

- Loosening of COGAT and border restrictions.
- An increase in commodities, materials and goods being shipped to Gaza.
- The successes of CEP resulted in new projects soliciting CEP ideas, mentoring, advice, guidance and training.

### New Directions/Targets of Opportunity

- By providing Cash for work employment opportunities in Gaza via grant activities, CEP hopes to lessen the need for humanitarian assistance (in year 3) as part of a return to democracy & governance initiatives.
- Construction projects
- Continuation of relief and assistance
- Increasing CEP visibility in quick response projects and mission-directed grants
- Complement future projects
- Utilizing the flexibility and institutional knowledge of CEP staff
- Local Gaza team-building

## **IN-KIND GRANTS**

### **Achievements/Accomplishments**

- IEEs never rejected
- Approximately 87 in-kind grants completed
- Process Manual
- Improvement on M&E tools
- Responding to seasonal critical events

### **Setbacks/Obstacles**

- Gaza siege and intervention of DFA
- Fixed-price subcontracts for construction projects
- A, B and C geographical classification
- Fluctuation in exchange rates
- Low capacities of grantees

### **Trends Impacting Work**

- Great team
- DFA
- COGAT approval (Gaza grants)
- New USAID projects
- Harmony & effectiveness of systems
- Following USAID regulations

### **New Directions/Targets of Opportunity**

- Identify needs on the ground
- Capacity building – future focus
- Empowerment of civil community (training, education)
- Leverage CEP resources
- Complement other projects
- Focus on sustainability of projects
- Peace process

## **GRANT COMPLIANCE & PROCUREMENT**

### **Achievements/Accomplishments**

- Unveiling of the new Procurement Database
- New Procurement Specialist (PS) – Sami
- Weekly Work Plans (new planning tool)
- Closeout of checklist
- New Grants Systems Specialist (GSS) – Shada
- Audit review – no material findings

- PS/GMS/FS teams improved (grant management)

## Setbacks/Obstacles

- **COGAT/Customs**
- **End dates (PSs/SCs)** - It has been noted that in some cases, due to modifications or general expanded contract terms, some contracts under a grant agreement ran longer than the formal end of the grant period; this needs to be avoided in year 3.
- **Clerical entries** - During a year 2 compliance audit, it was discovered that the monthly sub-award report contained some mistaken clerical entries and typographical errors that need to be avoided during year 3.
- **Subcontract return signature**
- **Final filing check**
- **Payment issues/coordination**
- **VAT Exemption** – CEP has faced problems receiving VAT exemption letters for vendors and contractors, particularly in the Southern West Bank areas of Bethlehem and Hebron Governorates. This problem has caused CEP to engage in discussions with the VAT Dept. to solve supplying and contracting problems.
- **Chain of Custody** – CEP faced obstacles in procuring from Gaza partners due to the lack of Chain of Custody documents which proved that such commodities were legally procured. This forced CEP to shift its procurement actions from Gaza to the West Bank which also caused delays in obtaining COGAT approval, requiring extend time and effort.

## Trends Impacting Work

- Systems and processes for procurement have been enhanced due to creation of new procurement database and grants teams have improved communication among each other, increasing their work efficiency.
- More regulations/changes in:
  - Area: A, B, C – Regarding the procurement of construction materials w/COGAT approval for projects in Areas A, B, C of the West Bank.
  - How reported – procedures for the documentation of grants activities and implementation
  - Contact – adhering to strict USAID no-contact policy with DFA in Gaza and insuring that implementing partners abide by these policies as well.

## New Directions/Targets of Opportunity

- More inter-office outreach for compliance regulations (training).
- TraiNet outreach expanded
- Best Practices Report for Compliance & Procurement
- Humanitarian assistance oversight to normal programming in Gaza
- Better bi-regional coverage by Procurement team.
- Team visit to home office

## M&E/REPORTING

### Achievements/Accomplishments

- Improved M&E process/system
- Streamlined and enhanced reporting process/improved visibility
- GIS – increased accuracy, efficiency and validity
- Revamped/approved PMP
- Streamlined & reactivated project evaluation formats and methodologies for outcomes
- Hire of new Impact Specialist
- CEP II PMP was revised by identifying new indicators, setting new targets as appropriate and developing a technical approach for the impact assessment described in the PMP.
- CEP II developed a more efficient and comprehensive processes for project-level evaluations to better obtain the input of all grants team members. In support of the upcoming impact assessment, the Impact Specialist also initiated an analysis of the CEP II project process across all grants.

### Setbacks/Obstacles

- Lack of supporting documents
- Evolution of realities on the ground resulted in the delay of the PMP approval.
- Lack of outcome indicators – Most CEP II grant activities were request-driven (conducted at the request of the USG) and were not compatible with conventional program planning and setting of targets.
- The CEP system and process for collecting M&E data was only finalized in March 2010. Over the next 6 months, the system and process was streamlined to make it more efficient for reporting purposes. As a result, there was a period of time when guidance was evolving, and as result, some inconsistencies in understanding resulted.
- Lack of approved PMP – CEP II's PMP wasn't compatible with the Geo/MIS system and did not address the programmatic shift that occurred in CEP II (addition of 2 objectives to address changes on the ground), requiring revision and approval.

### Trends Impacting Work

- Evolving interest in outcome reporting
- Final year (CEP)
- Political process impacts reporting
- Better reporting processes & outcomes from grant teams



## **New Directions/Targets of Opportunity**

- Outcome/impact reporting
- Review capacity building
- Providing situation analysis to improve USAID/ARD consultative decision-making process
- Best practices/lessons learned quarterly & special reports

## **IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- CEP II proposes to conduct a series of evaluative activities per objective that will help it document for USAID the impact achieved by its interventions through the words, stories, perceptions, and opinions of beneficiaries of the program. This objective-level assessment will complement the ongoing identification of project output and fulfill the impact measurement plans laid out in its PMP.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE/FINANCE**

### **Achievements/Accomplishments**

- Effective new arrangements for the Logistics Specialists
- Hiring new Accounting Specialist (AS)
- Hiring Receptionist/Admin Specialist
- Hiring Information Technology Specialist (ITS)
- Changes in the organization structure of the Finance/Admin/Personnel Departments
- Full staffing of CEP II (doubled) from 15 to 35 people)
- Spending more than \$33 million in grants under CEP II to date and updating to financial requirements of INGO grants
- Providing logistical support to the increased program staff

### **Setbacks/Obstacles**

- Noncompliance of ARD admin and personnel policies.  
Ex: leaves, work hours, timesheets, etc.
- Lack of communication between the field staff and logistics
- Lack of coordination between GMSs/PSs and grantees/vendors regarding obtaining docs, invoices, etc.
- Vendors direct connection with logistics and finance – pending payments

### **Trends Impacting Work**

- Increased accuracy of financial projections
- Increased reporting requirements with a very close due dates.
- Less money requested/billed by partners and less requests for payment received.
- Receiving incomplete payments

## **New Directions/Targets of Opportunity**

- Periodic, consistent meetings between admin, finance, Logistics Specialists
- Spending more money and meeting projections
- Keep the good work running
- Better communication with all staff

# CEP PROGRESS GRANT CHART

		Work Plan				Resources Required
		October 2010 – September 2011				
FUNCTIONAL UNIT: IN-KIND GRANTS						
GOALS	ACTIVITIES	Q1 (Oct-Dec)	Q2 (Jan-Mar)	Q3 (Apr-Jun)	Q4 (July-Sept)	
A. Ongoing grants are completed & closed	A1. Construction projects					
	A2. After school activities					
	A3. Furnishing & equipment					
	A4. Training & educational activities					
B. Capacity of ten NGOs is improved	B1. Technical support to Executive Advisory Board (EAB) to ensure organizations are capable of maintaining improved services/capabilities					
	B2. Furnishing and equipping institutions					
	B3. Construction projects					
	B4. Assess needs, create training materials, training plans					
	B5. Training of staff					
	B6. Outreach activities					
C. Remaining funds programmed & implemented	C1. Developing grants and getting green light					
	C2. Implementing & evaluating					
	C3. Completing and closeout					

		Work Plan				Resources Required
		October 2010 – September 2011				
FUNCTIONAL UNIT: INGO GRANTS						
GOALS	ACTIVITIES	Q1 (Oct-Dec)	Q2 (Jan-Mar)	Q3 (Apr-Jun)	Q4 (July-Sept)	
A. Nine ER grants are completed and closed out	A1. Keep due diligence, monitoring and evaluation and compliance adherence					
	A2. Mentor, advise and guide INGO partners to implement ER grants compliantly					
	A3. Complete ER grants					
	A4. Collect all M&E information & forms					
	A5. Close out ER grants, getting final financial reports, sub-awardee reports and other related documents					
B. Six WR grants are completed & closed out	B1. Award & sign six WR grant agreements					
	B2. Start the implementation and mentor INGO partners during the implementation phase					
	B3. Get all six grants completed					
	B4. Collect all M&E information and forms					
	B5. Close out WR grants and collect all information and reports needed.					
C. Two transportation & warehousing grants are completed and closed out	C1. Utilize the warehousing services including warehouse spaces, laborers & trucking services to transport commodities needed to Gaza to implement ER & WR grants					
	C2. Complete the delivery of commodities needed					
	C3. Close out					



		Work Plan October 2010 – September 2011				Resources Required	
FUNCTIONAL UNIT: ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE							
GOALS	ACTIVITIES	Q1 (Oct-Dec)	Q2 (Jan-Mar)	Q3 (Apr-Jun)	Q4 (July-Sept)		
A. Financial obligations met	A1. Disburse all RFPs and advance requests						
	A2. Request revised monthly projections of grants						
B. USAID & Home Office financial requirements successfully met	B1. Prepare all financial reports on time						
C. CEP effectively supported	C1. Continue supporting the program through our resources (admin, personnel, finance, logistics)						
D. All grants successfully closed out	D1. Process payments on time before the start of project closeout						

Goals	Activities	Q1 (Oct-Dec)	Q2 (Jan-Mar)	Q3 (Apr-Jun)	Q4 (July-Sept)	October 2011
	E2. Prepare final financial report*					
	E3. Hire financial consultant to process end of project expenses and closeout of bank account*					
	E4. Ship all project files back to ARD home office*					
<b>Admin/Finance</b>						
	E5. Acquire USAID approval for disposition of CEP inventory & the dispose of inventory*					
F. CEP staff assisted in transition to new jobs	F1. Issuing recommendation letters to staff					
	F2. Assisting staff with preparing their CVs					
	F3. Assisting staff in completing bio-data sheets accurately					

\*Note: All anticipated costs to be incurred, post-program, will be presented to COTR for review and will be implemented following approval by CO.

		Work Plan				Resources Required
		October 2010 – September 2011				
FUNCTIONAL UNIT: M&E/REPORTING						
GOALS	ACTIVITIES	Q1 (Oct-Dec)	Q2 (Jan-Mar)	Q3 (Apr-Jun)	Q4 (July-Sept)	
A. Impact assessment approved and conducted	A1. Draft scope of work					
	A2. Get scope of work approved					
	A3. Hire consulting company					
	A4. Implement assessment CEP will be hiring outside consulting firms through a competitive bidding process to conduct a comprehensive impact assessment of CEP activities as per the PMP.					Hiring of Consulting Company
	A5. Present final document to USAID					
B. GIS/PMP results targets realistic, achieved and reported	B1. Review targets and revise as necessary with grants team					
	B2. Submit new targets to USAID					
	B3. Report the results					
C. Timely and comprehensive information/knowledge management products	C1. Write success stories, weeklies, focus reports., etc.					

delivered (USAID/ARD) and archived	C2. Submit more documents/reports to USAID/ARD					
D. Final evaluation reports on all grants completed	D1. Send evaluation grants packages to grant teams for completion					
	D2. Draw out lessons learned/compile best practices					
E. Final report delivered	E1. Write the final report					
	E2. Submit to USAID/ARD					
F. Timely and accurate M&E closeout done (documents, reports)	F1. Review all M&E documentation					

# SESSION: TEAMBUILDING & COMMUNICATION

One of the needs identified in the months leading up to the workshop was better communication both within and between the various CEP functional units. The DCOP/P wanted to focus on the “*ideal*” form of communication (face to face) and what makes email communication difficult in many cases. We wanted to reflect on the *tone* in email, and what to do if one receives an email that he or she perceives as being negative and/or antagonistic. We carried out a series of 3 activities – one focusing on verbal communication, one on written communication, and one via email.

## ***The reflections and key lessons learned – Studies have shown that...***

- 7% of what is communicated is done with words
- 38% is communicated with tone of voice
- 55% is communicated through nonverbal cues
- 18% is communicated through words
- 82% is communicated through tone of voice

## **PHONE COMMUNICATION -**

### **Lessons Learned**

- Use of body language helps you express your ideas/mood, etc.
- Give big picture before details.
- Think before you speak.
- Trust helps communication.
- Understand that different people have different perceptions (i.e. what is “big” to one person is not to another).
- Preconceived ideas can hinder (or help).
- Ask for clarification if you don’t understand something.
- Know that people have different skills – some are better communicators while others are better listeners.
- Eye contact is very important.
- Take your time (don’t rush) when trying to understand.
- One person speaking at a time is less confusing.

## WRITTEN COMMUNICATION –

### Lessons Learned

- In many cases, it is not better to use email/written communication, especially if providing instructions.
- If written communication is the best method, be as precise as possible.
- Emails have tone, and the tone is easily misunderstood
- If you receive an email and think you read a negative tone, either go talk to the person to clarify the meaning, or call them (if you can't walk over to their office)

## SESSION: PROCUREMENT PLAY & DISCUSSION

On the third day of the retreat, the procurement team presented a reenactment of a bid conference that highlighted some serious procurement transgressions. After the play, the procurement team held a discussion, led by the PM (Diala Khalaf). CEP staff was asked to identify the problems/transgressions from the play. The transgressions included:

- Accepting a bid after the deadline (even a few minutes after the deadline)
- Corruption in the decision-making process
- Influence due to personal relationships with bidders
- Acceptances of incomplete bid documents (called one bidder after the fact to ask for 600 pages of missing documents)

*The Procurement Play can be viewed on the CEP Y Drive: [Click here](#).*

(Must be logged into CEP Network)

## SESSION: REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE REGULATIONS

This session was a clear, concise PowerPoint presentation by the DCOP/C (Peter LaRosa). It covered the details of Mission Order 21, and allowed Peter to answer all of the CEP staff's questions.

## SESSION: PROCESS MANUAL DISCUSSION

The DCOP/P (Kirsty Wright) led a discussion on the new *Process Manual*, which outlines the entire CEP grant making process in fine detail. DCOP/P asked CEP staff why this resource was useful and highlighted some areas that have been recently updated, as this document will be regularly modified as needed. The CEP staff was asked to raise questions regarding areas that were unclear or that could use improvement in the manual, so that the document can be revised.

## **The Process Manual is a useful tool because it...**

- Helps identify problems and provides a course of action for solving them.
- Provides a clear roadmap for processes and procedures.
- Helps ensure that appropriate staff members are involved.
- Provides easy and concise guidelines from task to completion.
- Ensures consistency and compliance of procedures.
- Helps the flow of information to the right channels.
- Clarifies roles of staff in the grant making process.
- Can be used as a marketing tool (CEP have clearly defined processes that work).

## **SESSION: CEP II TIMELINE**

The final workshop session was focused on CEP II milestones and major events. Toward the end of the Rafeed project, a timeline was created that both highlighted the project's achievements (in terms of internal processes and systems as well as programmatic events) and motivated staff and others. USAID proudly displayed the timeline in their offices for some time, and it was a nice, graphic way to show the major happenings during the life of the Rafeed contact.

This was the very first attempt to gather CEP II milestones. Staff will continue to add milestones, and others will be pulled from quarterly reports and elsewhere to form a complete "story." Once an appropriate number of milestones have been collected, CEP RS will create a timeline for CEP II.

<b>QUARTER 1</b> <b>Oct-Dec</b> <b>2008</b>	<b>QUARTER 2</b> <b>Jan-Mar</b> <b>2009</b>	<b>QUARTER 3</b> <b>Apr-Jun</b> <b>2009</b>	<b>QUARTER 4</b> <b>Jul-Sep</b> <b>2009</b>	<b>QUARTER 1</b> <b>Oct-Dec</b> <b>2009</b>	<b>QUARTER 2</b> <b>Jan-Mar</b> <b>2010</b>	<b>QUARTER 3</b> <b>Apr-Jun</b> <b>2010</b>	<b>QUARTER 4</b> <b>Jul-Sep</b> <b>2010</b>
CEP II started working on capacity building component (Nov 2008) – Johnny	Cast lead operation at Gaza – Manal	Humanitarian assistance to Gaza - Manal	American International School in Gaza – Nadine	Chain of custody for local Gaza procurement (Nov 2009) - Nadine	Early recovery grants at Gaza – Manal	Fully staffed with engineers (June 2010) – Kirsty	Process Manual first edition launched (Oct 2010) – Kirsty
	Initial emergency response to cast lead medical goods - Mark		Expanding procurement purchases in Israel market (July 2009) – Basel	Approval of COGAT list for Gaza procurement from West Bank (Dec 2009) – Dareen	Increased contract \$20 million – Mark	Procurement Gaza rules/regulations change	Freedom Flotilla (July 2010)
	Start of standard grants mechanism (Jan 2009) – Abla		Recreational Workshops for 2400 women affected by the war (Oct 2009) – Amani	Tourism P?? Festival – Beit Sahour (Dec 2009) – Johnny	Establishment of engineering unit (Jan 2010) – Ala’a	Shift in M&E – DCOP Kirsty Wright hired	RFA round 5 launched for Gaza (Sept 2010) – Kirsty
	Established transportation system ARD/CEP (Feb 2009) – Wae’l			Moved to new office (Oct 2009) – Samia		New procurement procedures at Gaza “Chain of custody” – Amani	New USAID Mission Director Mike Harvey (Aug 2010)
	Increased disbursements of grants - \$320,000 to \$4 million before January 2009			Staff increased from 15-35 Oct 2009-Oct 2010) – Samia		Contract modification takes contract to \$62.5 million (Sept 2010) – Kirsty	Launching procurement database (Sept 2010) – Diala
						Part 2 of capacity building (April 2010) - Johnny	Palestinian/Israeli direct talks begin (Sept 2010)

							More restrictions imposed by DFA for INGO work in Gaza – Manal
							Imposing new requirements requested by DFA from NGOs in Gaza (Aug 2010) - Amani
							ARD distributed 2000 food and non-food items after a contracted international partner failed to do so (Oct 2010) - Hashim

# ANNEX

## PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

### I.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The first Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) for the Civic Engagement Project (CEP II) was prepared and submitted in December 2008 in accordance with the requirements of Contract DFD-I-00-05-00218-00 between ARD, Inc. and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/West Bank and Gaza. However, since the submission of the December 2008 PMP, significant changes have occurred to the technical and financial scope of the program, necessitating an updated PMP. Two particular events occurred in the last 18 months that significantly influence performance monitoring.

Although CEP II's December 2008 PMP was approved by the client, the performance indicators used to measure the success of the project was not congruent with USAID/West Bank Gaza's internal monitoring system (GEO MIS). CEP II was asked to adopt and report on new performance indicators that more closely matched USAID internal reporting requirements, leaving most of the previously approved PMP performance indicators obsolete. Also during this time, USAID increased the number of objectives of the project from:

- 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.

To (revised on April 1, 2009):

- Support initiatives and processes that support a democratic, peaceful, and prosperous Palestinian state.
- Strengthen reform-minded Palestinian leaders and institutions in support of improved service provision and increased responsiveness to citizen needs.
- Supply basic humanitarian commodities to disadvantaged groups, to preserve hope and moderation among impoverished populations.
- Distribute food and relief items directly or through work and training, to preserve hope and moderation among impoverished populations.

The increase in the numbers of objectives was also adopted to facilitate more accurate reporting by CEP II on the significant portion of humanitarian activities that were initiated in response to the Cast Lead Operation. The programmatic and objective-level changes also affected the relevancy of previously approved indicators such as “*number of executive office operations supported by USG assistance*” as well as “*number of reform minded leaders assisted to increase outreach to their constituents.*” As humanitarian assistance increases, these public sector strengthening indicators become less of a focus of the overall project goal.

As a result of the humanitarian crisis from Operation Cast Lead, USAID increased CEP II's contract ceiling from \$20 million to \$60.5 million. While CEP II will continue to implement conventional in-kind grant activities across the West Bank and Gaza, the majority of grant funds are devoted to the Gaza Strip. This is diametrically opposite to the previous year's geographic and programmatic objectives. Operation Cast Lead has been a "game changer" in terms of the scope and breadth of CEP II activities, affecting both programmatic results and operational functions.

To accurately and reliably measure program performance in light of the changes mentioned above, CEP II's PMP is modified (hereby in this document) to reflect the changes in the social, financial, and programmatic environment with which CEP II is now working. This PMP will reflect the most up-to-date Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems used by the CEP II program. The PMP is a living document and, as key assumptions or programmatic and technical focus shift, performance monitoring must reflect those changes. This is not to say that the PMP should be updated continuously—that would be impossible given the nimbleness and flexibility of CEP II's work; however, programmatic and technical shifts do warrant a thoughtful review of performance metrics.

## **2.0 PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM**

To create a flexible and interactive PMP, CEP II has built on, and enhanced, sound and tested methodologies and systems from CEP I. 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. The foundation of the PMP is the performance indicators. Performance indicators are the fundamental metric of success for the project, and allow stakeholders and decision makers to assess progress, and redesign activities and interventions as needed. In an attempt to align program activities and USAID-required reporting, CEP II has developed performance indicators that are responsive to USAID's Geo/MIS.

In an effort to consolidate results, the CEP II staff carefully reviewed the Mission's Sector and Sub-sector performance indicators to develop a list of CEP II performance indicators that would respond to the greatest number of USAID Mission indicators. In consultation with USAID, a list of 21 CEP II performance indicators were developed (Table 1). CEP II's final performance indicators are predominantly output-level indicators that directly coincide with USAID's GEO MIS.

### **2.1 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. Data are gathered by program staff from grantees, subcontractors, stakeholders, and beneficiaries during regular site visits. Data collection techniques include but are not limited to project documents (work plans, budgets, time sheets, participant lists, etc.), focus groups, key informant interviews, and surveys. As these data are collected, they are audited to ensure accuracy and reliability before being entered into the program database. Qualitative data obtained from engagements with grantees and beneficiaries as well as from observation are entered into the program database in the form of grant notes, final evaluation notes, and success stories. The Performance Reference Sheets (Annex B) detail the analysis required, per indicator. These reference sheets also provide clear definitions for each indicator.

## **2.2 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.

### **2.2.1 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 be submitted five days after the end of each month.

### **2.2.2 USAID Geo/MIS**

CEP II's database has been modified to include all new indicators. The database facilitates entry of data directly into the USAID web-based geographic information system (Geo/MIS) to report performance. Regular reporting against project outputs and targets will be effected through the USAID web-based geographic information system throughout the life of each grant. As results are met per grant, these data are inputted into the Geo/MIS for real-time review of CEP II results by USAID. CEP II provides GIS data for construction activities allowing stakeholders to review the spatial data on the project's construction sites.

## **2.3 QUALITY ASSURANCE**

Quality of the data entered into the database for analysis will be assured in several ways. During project development, program staff refers to the extensive guidance provided through USAID GEO MIS for standard definitions of data and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for clear definitions of the indicators.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist supported by the DCOP Program 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.

### 3.0 IMPACT EVALUATION

While the CEP II PMP captures the quantity of effort and achievement of outputs, the monitoring framework does not capture the successes of the program at the outcome level such as changes in attitudes and practices, or improvements in capacities of people, institutions, and systems. With that in mind, CEP II proposes a series of evaluative activities under each objective that will help CEP II convey our story to USAID through the words, stories, perceptions, and opinions of beneficiaries of the program.

ARD has past experience using beneficiary engagement as a measure of contract performance. 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. CEP II will evaluate impact under each of its four objectives and under its Capacity-Building component. This process is described in detail below.

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

In order to assess the impact of our activities under CEP II’s objectives 1 and 2, we will hold focus groups with stakeholders (local government officials, NGO and community leaders, and other community members such as youth and women) who were involved in the development and/or implementation of CEP II projects under these objectives. In the broadest sense, these focus groups will measure “customer satisfaction”—an important outcome within objectives 1 and 2 of CEP II.

CEP II’s objective 1 and 2 projects have been implemented across nine governorates in the West Bank. These projects engaged moderate-minded community and local government leaders in the process of project development and implementation. CEP II will conduct focus groups in each of these governorates:

<b>North</b>	Nablus	Jenin	Salfit	Qaliqalia
<b>Center</b>	Jericho	Jerusalem	Ramallah	
<b>South</b>	Bethlehem	Hebron		

CEP II will select 12 stakeholders in each governorate to participate in each focus group. In each targeted governorate, CEP II will hold two focus groups to discuss CEP II project impact by sector, such as youth activities, and infrastructure and construction projects (school, parks, roads, etc). Beyond specific project impact discussions, CEP II will also evaluate the impact of the CEP II participatory project development process on the stakeholders. CEP II engages in extensive collaborative dialogue with community members and government officials on project identification and on the project’s sustainability. Most CEP

II projects have a large community cost share where the community provides labor, goods, land, or cash for the CEP II projects. This cost share is in addition to the assistance that USAID/CEP II provides. In this way, the CEP II project is used as a tool to gather citizens and local government together to take ownership in the development of their community.

The focus groups will be comprised of approximately 12 persons each, and participants will be selected from a pool of stakeholders identified by the CEP Grants Management Specialist who is responsible for activities in that governorate. Focus groups will be run by a trained facilitator, assisted by a silent note taker to capture data and comments. The activity, limited to 90 minutes, will focus on six to eight key questions, where the primary questions will be answered by either development of lists or characteristics, or a show of hands, and then followed by a discussion period for participant comments. Each question will be ended by finding consensus on what should be reported.

The stakeholders will be asked to generate a list of CEP II projects/activities that have happened in their community. The stakeholders will be asked about their attitudes towards community ownership of these projects, local government participation, and the impact these projects might have had of their community and, if applicable, their organization. The focus group administration will be guided by the principles of:

- *Objectivity* – ensuring that there is no conflict of interest.
- *Relative Simplicity* – focusing on “telling the story” over complicated survey methodologies and statistical treatment, resulting in learning that is easy to understand.
- *Time Efficiency* – getting the studies done in a short timeframe so as not to disrupt ongoing programming.
- *Management Efficiency* – ensuring the surveys do not over-burden staff or administrative or logistical systems.

A scope of work for the study will be developed and submitted to USAID for approval. CEP II will utilize an unbiased Palestinian organization to implement the focus group activities. The use of CEP II staff could create a bias in the findings and would take them away from their work in the final year of the project. This will be tendered through a RFP or RFA to local organizations or one of the larger universities. 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.

CEP II will conduct initial focus groups over the summer of 2010 to gather impact, develop a baseline, and follow up with another round of focus groups a year later to further assess impact in these communities.

## CEP’s Capacity Building Component

This component seeks to support local institutions in the West Bank that positively impact the Palestinian community. CEP II activities are developed to strengthen the managerial and technical capabilities of 10 targeted Palestinian institutions. CEP II assists each organization to thoughtfully prepare a baseline self-assessment through CEP II’s Organizational Capacity Self-Assessment Tool. This assessment tool enables organizations to identify the areas requiring further development and training. This tool is administered at the beginning of CEP II’s engagement with the local institution as a baseline and done again at the end of the assistance as a capacity impact evaluation tool. This tool evaluates the following organizational areas:

Institutional Resources	Institutional Performance	Institutional Sustainability
Planning	Constituency and Target Audience	Relationship with others
Management & Governance	Managing Activities	Monitoring and Evaluation
Human Resources		
Managing Resources		

**3. Supply basic humanitarian commodities to disadvantaged groups, to preserve hope and moderation among impoverished populations.**

**4. Distribute food and relief items directly or through work and training, to preserve hope and moderation among impoverished populations.**

CEP II objectives 3 and 4 relate to the humanitarian assistance and early recovery grants that focus on assisting Palestinians in Gaza, specifically providing basic needs after the IDF operation “Cast Lead.” In order to evaluate the impact of these activities on the beneficiaries, CEP II will survey a sample of the total number of beneficiary families from ongoing or planned projects for the next year. The beneficiaries will be asked questions from a simple standard questionnaire to evaluate how receiving CEP II goods impacted their lives. CEP II will also gather impact data on the benefits of the trainings and workshops conducted under these objectives, specifically the early recovery grants. CEP II will consolidate and analyze this information as part of an overall report for USAID.

## INDICATORS AND TARGETS

Project data collected will be measured against established project indicators (Table 1). CEP II performance indicators were chosen by CEP II staff in collaboration with USAID. CEP II's performance 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 and Managerial Plan indicators at USAID's request (see Table 1). 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 Performance Indicators**

Sector	Sub-Sector	Indicator Number	Performance Indicator	Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Target	Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Actual	Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Target	Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Actual
1. Education/Basic Education	Construction/renovation of classrooms and related facilities	1.1	Number of educational rooms constructed/renovated/rehabilitated	150			
2. Education/Youth	Construction/renovation of facilities for youth	2.1	Number of youth facilities constructed(built)/renovated/rehabilitated	7			
		2.2	Number of youth facilities furnished/ equipped	9			
3. Water	Provision of emergency water related services	3.1	Number of water/ roof tanks provided	0			
4. Roads/Other Infrastructure	Construction/improvements of interior and connecting roads (non-agricultural)	4.1	Number of square meters of sidewalks, fences, school fences, retaining walls, terraces, shades, balconies, roofs, constructed, renovated, rehabilitated, or painted	14,500			
5. Humanitarian Assistance	Supply of basic humanitarian commodities to disadvantaged groups	5.1	Number of community centers constructed/ renovated/ equipped	5			
		5.2	No. of public parks/ recreational areas constructed/ renovated	4			
		5.3	Number of students/children and individuals from disadvantage groups benefiting from humanitarian assistance (uniforms, bags, clothing, hot meals, household items, medical aids, coupons, stationary supplies, CBI kits, other)	356,914			
		5.4	Number of households benefiting from humanitarian assistance	43,210			
		5.5	Metric tons of food commodities distributed	701			
6. Democracy & Governance /Civil Society	Support needy institutions to deliver better services (NGO, CSO, private, etc...)	6.1	Number of CSO/NGOs, GOs and LGUs benefiting from TA/CB/infrastructure activities	50			
		6.2	Number of workshops/events/media campaign/ TV messages and informal education conducted	243			
7. Health/ Psychological	Provision of CBI training and basic psycho-social support	7.1	Number of participants in psycho-social activities.	7,870			
8. Economic Growth /Agriculture	Assistance to small farmers and households	8.1	Number of farmers and fisher folk benefiting	1,818			
Cross Cutting		9.1	Number of people employed in short-term jobs as a result of USG-supported social assistance programming	574			
		9.2	Number of grants provided	89			
		9.3	Person-Days of employment generated	55,162			
		9.4	Number of people benefiting through CSO/NGO/LGU/HA activities (i.e., total beneficiaries)	462,369			

## PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS (PIRS)

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
<b>Indicator (#):</b> 1.1 Number of educational rooms constructed/renovated/rehabilitated	
<b>Date Revised:</b> December 2009	
<b>a. Description</b>	
<p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Educational rooms include all rooms of a schoolhouse that are used for educational purposes. Schools include both sector and religious institutions. The program will also count rooms that although not directly part of a school, do provide educational facilities to children as its focus. Constructed are those rooms that are built (new structures). Renovated are rooms that are restored to their earlier condition; and rehabilitated are rooms that are "reused". For example a building that had rooms that were not used for educational purposes but now are. Keeping the building the same but change the use.</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Educational Rooms (Number)</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Type room change (constructed, renovated, rehabilitated) and location.</p> <p><b>Justification/Management Utility:</b> The more educational rooms, provide more space for learning and more children to be taught. Children may have to travel less distance to school, and classrooms with fewer students, facilities a more educated and aware society.</p>	
<b>b. Plan for Data Collection</b>	
<p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Site observations from CEP II staff, (construction) contractors, and grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms); as well as grantee and contractor monitoring and evaluation forms.</p> <p><b>Data Source(s):</b> Contractors, Grantee, CEP II GMS, CEP II M&amp;E representative (as relevant and available)</p> <p><b>Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:</b> Rolling basis as projects are implemented and activities completed.</p> <p><b>Estimated Cost of Collection:</b> Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection</p> <p><b>Responsible Organization/Individual(s):</b> CEP II Project Field Staff (GMS)</p> <p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.</p>	
<b>c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)</b>	
<p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be presented in numeric form, and, as appropriate, in brief narrative anecdotes.</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, contractor, beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&amp;E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS, they are verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.</p> <p><b>Reporting of Data:</b> Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.</p>	
<b>d. Data Quality Issues</b>	
<p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p>	

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet****Indicator (#): 2.1** Number of youth facilities constructed(built)/ renovated/rehabilitated

Date Revised : December 2009

**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Youth facilities are any building or structure that are designed specifically for and/or accommodate youth. Youth are considered male and females between the ages of 13-25. Constructed are those rooms that are built (new structures). Renovated are rooms that are restored to their earlier condition; and rehabilitated are rooms that are "reused". For example, a building that had rooms that was not used for educational purposes but now are. Keeping the building, the same but change the use.

**Unit of Measure:** Youth Facilities (Number)

**Disaggregated by:** Type room change (constructed, renovated, rehabilitated) and location.

**Justification/Management Utility:** Providing constructive and safe environments for youth is essential fact for reducing violence by and against youth. The more new and upgraded youth facilities will mean that more youth have constructive, and supervised outlets for their creative, intellectual, and physical energy. These are also places where youth can interact, dispelling differences among groups, as well as socialize.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from CEP II staff, (construction) contractors, and grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms); as well as grantee and contractor monitoring and evaluation forms.

**Data Source(s):** Contractors, Grantee, CEP II GMS, CEP II M&E representative (as relevant and available)

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, contractor, beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS, they are verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** N/A

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A

<b>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</b>	
<b>Indicator (#): 2.2</b> No. of youth facilities furnished/ equipped	
Date Revised: December 2009	
<b>a. Description</b>	
<p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Youth facilities are any building or structure that are designed specifically for and/or accommodate youth. Youth are considered male and females between the ages of 13-25. Furnished refers to the successful procurement of furniture; equipped refers to the successful procurement of equipment (computers, sporting goods, learning material, etc) that is not furniture that contributes to providing leisure and activities for youth.</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Youth Facilities (Number)</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Location, whether youth facility was furnished or equipped.</p> <p><b>Justification/Management Utility:</b> If CEP II was just to provide structures for youth facilities, and did not help to furnish and equip them, they would not be utilized to their full capacity. CEP II realizes that many of the communities where we work are disadvantaged and people don't have the resources to properly furnish and equip these facilities, therefore CEP II can fill that role, making these facilities a place where youth can engage with each other, learn, and dialogue about important issues, and most importantly be a place where they want to go.</p>	
<b>b. Plan for Data Collection</b>	
<p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Site observations from CEP II staff with local contractor and/or grantee to ensure that material were successfully delivered. Photographs. Program documents (invoices of procured goods)</p> <p><b>Data Source(s):</b> Contractors, Grantee, CEP II GMS, CEP II M&amp;E representative (as relevant and available); beneficiaries (youth that use the facility)</p> <p><b>Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:</b> Rolling basis as projects are implemented and activities completed.</p> <p><b>Estimated Cost of Collection:</b> Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection</p> <p><b>Responsible Organization/Individual(s):</b> CEP II Project Field Staff (GMS)</p> <p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.</p>	
<b>c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)</b>	
<p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be presented in numeric form, and, as appropriate, in brief narrative anecdotes.</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, contractor, beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&amp;E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS, they are verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.</p> <p><b>Reporting of Data:</b> Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report</p>	
<b>d. Data Quality Issues</b>	
<p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p>	

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet****Indicator (#): 3.1** No. of water/ roof tanks provided

Date Revised: December 2009

**a. Description****Precise Definition(s):** Tanks are locally and USG approved container that store water for households during times of water scarcity. Provided means successfully installed and working.**Unit of Measure:** Water/Roof Tanks (Number)**Disaggregated by:** Location**Justification/Management Utility:** Water is a necessity of life, therefore providing water storage is a human right.**b. Plan for Data Collection****Data Collection Method:** Site observations from CEP II staff with local contractor and/or grantee to ensure that material were successfully delivered and is functioning. Photographs. Program documents (invoices of procured goods)**Data Source(s):** Contractors, Grantee, CEP II GMS, CEP II M&E representative (as relevant and available); beneficiaries (household members that have received a water storage container)**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.**Review of Data:** GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, contractor, beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS, they are verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** N/A**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A

<b>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</b>
<p><b>Indicator (#):</b> 4.1 Number of square meters of sidewalks, fences, school fences, retaining walls, terraces, shades, balconies, roofs, constructed, renovated, rehabilitated, or painted</p> <p><b>Date Revised:</b> December 2000</p>
<p><b>a. Description</b></p> <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Shades are any of various devices used to reduce or screen light or heat. Constructed are new structures. Renovated are structures and/or objective that are restored to their earlier condition; and rehabilitated are structure that are converted from one purpose to another such as recycled material used to create a school fence.</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Square Meters (M2) (Number)</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Type of structure (sidewalk, fence, school fence, retaining wall, terrace, shades, balcony, roof); type of improvement (construction, renovation, rehabilitation, painted)</p> <p><b>Justification/Management Utility:</b> Upgrades and construction of infrastructure helps restores asthetic and functional value.</p>
<p><b>b. Plan for Data Collection</b></p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Site observations from CEP II staff, (construction) contractors, and grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms); as well as grantee and contractor monitoring and evaluation forms.</p> <p><b>Data Source(s):</b> Contractors, Grantee, CEP II GMS, CEP II M&amp;E representative (as relevant and available)</p> <p><b>Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:</b> Rolling basis as projects are implemented and activities completed.</p> <p><b>Estimated Cost of Collection:</b> Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection</p> <p><b>Responsible Organization/Individual(s):</b> CEP II Project Field Staff (GMS)</p> <p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.</p>
<p><b>c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)</b></p> <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be presented in numeric form, and, as appropriate, in brief narrative anecdotes.</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, contractor, beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&amp;E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS, they are verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.</p> <p><b>Reporting of Data:</b> Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.</p>
<p><b>d. Data Quality Issues</b></p> <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):</b> The metric is squared meters, and for some of these structures upgraded and/or construction above (i.e. sidewalks) the square meter figure is often not provided by the contractor but its rather expressed in linear meters.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations.</b> All calculations that are not in square meters must be converted. The CEP II engineer will work with staff and contactors to ensure that square meters for all work done is provided.</p>

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet****Indicator (#):** 5.1 No. of community centers constructed/ renovated/ equipped**Date Revised:** December 2009**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Community centers are any structural pleases, acknowledged by the community as a whole, where all community members (no exclusionary practices) are able to gather for social, physical, and educational activities.

Constructed are new structures. Renovated are rooms and/or buildings that are restored to their earlier condition.

Equipped refers to the successful procurement of equipment (computers, sporting goods, learning material, etc) that is not furniture that contributes to providing leisure and activities for the community center.

**Unit of Measure:** Community Centers (Number)

Disaggregated by: Location

**Justification/Management Utility:** Similar to the need for youth facilities, community centers provide space for all members of the community to gather for social, physical, and educational related activities. Where members of the community can strengthen bonds among community members.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from CEP II staff, (construction) contractors, and grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms); as well as grantee and contractor monitoring and evaluation forms. Program documents (invoices of procured goods)

**Data Source(s):** Contractors, Grantee, CEP II GMS, CEP II M&E representative (as relevant and available)

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, contractor, beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS, they are verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** N/A

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A

<b>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</b>
<b>Indicator (#):</b> 5.2 No. of public parks/ recreational areas constructed/ renovated <b>Date Revised:</b> December 2009
<b>a. Description</b> <b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Public parks and recreational areas are spaces created, established, designated, maintained, provided or set aside by a local government unit, for the purposes of public rest, play, recreation, enjoyment or assembly, and all buildings, facilities and structures located thereon or therein. <b>Unit of Measure:</b> Public parks/recreational areas (Number) <b>Disaggregated by:</b> Location; constructed/renovated <b>Justification/Management Utility:</b> Providing more and upgraded public space where the community can interact, enjoy nature, and have a safe and productive environment is critical to an individuals well being. Creating these places increases and strengthens the aspect of community.
<b>b. Plan for Data Collection</b> <b>Data Collection Method:</b> Site observations from CEP II staff, (construction) contractors, and grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms); as well as grantee and contractor monitoring and evaluation forms. <b>Data Source(s):</b> Contractors, Grantee, CEP II GMS, CEP II M&E representative (as relevant and available) <b>Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:</b> Rolling basis as projects are implemented and activities completed. <b>Estimated Cost of Collection:</b> Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection <b>Responsible Organization/Individual(s):</b> CEP II Project Field Staff (GMS) <b>Location of Data Storage:</b> Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.
<b>c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)</b> <b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be presented in numeric form, and, as appropriate, in brief narrative anecdotes. <b>Presentation of Data:</b> Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs. <b>Review of Data:</b> GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, contractor, beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS, they are verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents. <b>Reporting of Data:</b> Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.
<b>d. Data Quality Issues</b> <b>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):</b> N/A <b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Indicator (#):** 5.3 Number of students/children and individuals from disadvantage groups benefiting from humanitarian assistance (uniforms, bags, clothing, hot meals, household items, medical aids, coupons, stationary supplies, CBI kits, other)

**Date Revised:** December 2009

**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** These projects provide essential items to both children and adults to allow them basic needs like food, clothing, and medical supplies, as well as educational items to help children succeed in school. Uniforms are school uniforms; Bag are considered school bags or educational bags that will help the student bring educational material to and from school/class; household items are all items that are regularly used in an average household and include diapers, cleaning supplies, soap, and laundry supplies, medical aids are all and any item that promotes and improves health and hygiene. Coupons are vouchers that can be exchanged for goods and services. Stationary supplies are materials that help support educational learning such as pens, paper, erasers, etc. Most of CEP II projects that are humanitarian in nature are in Gaza

**Unit of Measure:** Individuals (Number)

**Disaggregated by:** Location, gender, youth, disability, fisherfolk, farmers, vulnerable

**Justification/Management Utility:** For those suffering as the result of the lock down of Gaza, these supplies are critical. Many of these families don't have the resources to provide these materials on their own, and desperately need these supplies to have healthy, educated and happy families.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from grantee (and sub-grantee if appropriate). Program documents (designed CEP II data collection forms including signed/dated beneficiary lists); these data are also triangulated with grantee budgets and invoices.

**Data Source(s):** Grantee, CEP II GMS, beneficiaries

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** Sometimes these items are provided to a household, and the entire household benefits. It's nearly impossible from a data collection standpoint to get all of the household members to sign that they have received assistance (that can be counted towards this indicator) in a timely manner.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** For items that benefit the entire household CEP II will require that the head of the household/recipient of the package sign their name that they have received the package. By signing off that they have received this package it will be assumed that the entire family will benefit (for packages that are intended to help the entire family, medical supplies, hot meals, in some cases clothes, etc), and for each household the project will multiple by 7 (the average number of people per household) to determine the number of beneficiaries for this indicator.

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet****Indicator (#): 5.4** No. households benefiting from humanitarian assistance

Date Revised: December 2009

**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Household is a domestic unit consisting of the members of a family who live together along with nonrelatives. The averages household in Gaza has seven (7) members, therefore if household supplies are given to a household (per Indicator 5.3) one household is benefiting (per this indicator 5.4) and 7 individuals are also benefiting that contributes to indicator 5.3 "*Number of students/children and individuals from disadvantage groups benefiting from humanitarian assistance (uniforms, bags, clothing, hot meals, household items, medical aids, coupons, stationary supplies, CBI kits, other)*"

Humanitarian assistance is promotes the stability of human welfare.

**Unit of Measure:** Household (Number)

**Disaggregated by:** Location

**Justification/Management Utility:** Same utility as indicator 5.3; however this indicator addresses the number of households rather than individuals benefiting.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from grantee (and sub-grantee if appropriate). Program documents (designed CEP II data collection forms including signed/dated beneficiary lists); these data are also triangulated with grantee budgets and invoices.

**Data Source(s):** Grantee, CEP II GMS, beneficiaries

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** More than one family receives assistance. From a common distribution point it's hard to determine if there are multiple people are from the same household.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Beneficiary list will help minimize this, as well as distributors asking if they represent one family (household)

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Indicator (#):** 5.5 Metric tons of food commodities distributed

**Date Revised:** December 2009

**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Food commodities include both liquid and solid nutritional sustenance.

**Unit of Measure:** Metric Tons (food commodities)

**Disaggregated by:** Location, type of food

**Justification/Management Utility:** People are not able to provide the needed caloric and nutrient requirement due to poverty, and other social factor. The project is supplementing these individuals with vital food that they need for their families to grow and prosper.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from grantee (and sub-grantee if appropriate). Program documents (designed CEP II data collection forms including signed/dated beneficiary lists); these data are also triangulated with grantee budgets and invoices.

**Data Source(s):** Grantee, CEP II GMS, beneficiaries

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** Sometimes the food is delivered to the grantee in pallets that don't specify the specific weight of each food stuff (e.g. X cans of tuna fish), thereby making a weight calculation impossible.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** The grantee and distributing sub-grantee will be asked to provide documentation whenever possible and applicable to the weights of food stuff so that the project is able to calculate results towards this indicator

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Indicator (#): 6.1** No. of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)/Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), Government Offices (GOs), and Local Government Units (LGUs), benefiting from technical assistance (TA) /capacity building (CB)/infrastructure activities

**Date Revised:** December 2009

**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Civil Society Organizations are...those nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), community based organizations (CBOs), scientific, professional and cultural societies and clubs working in different fields with the common objective of helping out where the national and local authorities help is not sufficient, as in humanitarian assistance, or in subjects that are not for governmental authorities to deal with, as in conflict resolution, civic participation and watchdog functions.

Governmental Offices are those entities that are central government offices and ministries.

Local Governmental Units are Municipalities and village councils.

NGOs are private voluntary organizations

Technical assistance is any human or financial support that is normally in the form of training and mentoring.

Capacity Building are those events where the final, intended result is to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, scope, and/or custom satisfaction of the organization/individual

**Unit of Measure:** Number (CSOs, NGOs, GO, and LGUs)

**Disaggregated by:** Type of entity (CSO, NGO, GO, and/or LGU), Location

**Justification/Management Utility:** Even with the best of intentions, CSO/NGO/GO, and LGU effectiveness is often severely limited by lack of capacity. In the Palestinian context, where disposable income is low and the bulk of donor funding for capacity building is directed at nascent PA institutions, the capacity of these entities and organizations 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/NGOs/GOs and LGUs are receiving assistance to improve their performance.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from CEP II staff, grantees and when applicable and relevant sub-grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms such as service agreements for technical experts, sign-in lists for trainings and workshops, etc).

**Data Source(s):** Grantee, Sub-grantee (when applicable), CEP II GMS, CEP II M&E representative (as relevant and available)

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** Data for this indicator is strictly at the output level and measures the amount of assistance provided. However the indicator does not measure how the technical assistance improved the CBO/NGO, GO, and/or LGU. These outcome level data are not part of this indicator

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Whenever possible, CEP II's GMSs will follow up with CBOs/NGOs, GOs and LGUs that have received technical assistance to assess the impact of the assistance provided.

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet****Indicator (#):** 6.2 Number of workshops/events/media campaign/ TV messages and informal education conducted**Date Revised:** December 2009**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator measures the number of workshops, events, and media campaigns/messages developed by CEP II as key components of project to promote participation in the project's activities and benefits. The project is not counting the number of times that CEP II activities are highlighted in the media (e.g., an article in the local paper about an CEP II event) as these are independent of the activity. CEP II will only count media message that have been developed by the project such as media campaign, radio spots, etc.

**Unit of Measure:** Number (workshops/events/media campaigns, TV messages)

**Disaggregated by:** Location, venue of message (i.e., workshop, event, etc)

**Justification/Management Utility:** One of the requirements of CEP II is to facilitate participatory processes for the local community. This indicator demonstrates the extent to which participatory methods and processes are used as a key part of grant design and implementation. This indicator demonstrates the extent to which CEP II 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:** Site observations from CEP II staff, grantees and when applicable and relevant sub-grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms such as service agreements for technical experts, sign-in lists for trainings and workshops, etc).

**Data Source(s):** Grantee, Sub-grantee (when applicable), CEP II GMS, CEP II M&E representative (as relevant and available)

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** N/A

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Indicator (#):** 7.1 No. of participants in psycho-social activities.

**Date Established:** December 2008

**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator measures the number of workshops, activities, and trainings developed by CEP II to teach women and youth strategies to deal with trauma, especially feelings of stress and helplessness.

**Unit of Measure:** Number (individuals)

**Disaggregated by:** Location, gender, youth, vulnerable.

**Justification/Management Utility:** Years of war and hardship have led to symptoms of trauma in the Palestinian population. These symptoms are particularly evident in women and children and have increased since the IDF Operation "Cast Lead". Psycho-social activities seek to alleviate some of the effects of this trauma and assist the participants to become more active and engaged in society.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from CEP II staff, grantees and when applicable and relevant sub-grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms such as service agreements for technical experts, sign-in lists for trainings and workshops, etc).

**Data Source(s):** Grantee, Sub-grantee (when applicable), CEP II GMS, CEP II M&E representative (as relevant and available).

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 staff, CBRPM, Grantee

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP's database and in M&E files.

**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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** n/a

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** n/a

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet****Indicator (#):** 8.1 Number of farmers and fisher folk benefiting**Date Revised:** December 2009**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Farmers are both men and women that would self describe themselves as working primarily in agriculture. Fisher folks are both men and women that would self describe themselves as working primarily within the fishing sector. Benefiting in this context refers to technical and financial assistance including but not limited to training (both formal and informal), mentoring, as well as the procurement of material.

**Unit of Measure:** Number (individuals of fisher folk)

**Disaggregated by:** Location, gender, youth, disability, vulnerable, famers, fisher folk

**Justification/Management Utility:** Both farmers and fisher folk are in a particularly vulnerable group in terms of economic growth. These sectors face considerable constraints in from imports, thereby jepordizing their livelihoods. These two groups technical and financial support to increase production and reduce loss to better compete in the value chain.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Site observations from grantee (and sub-grantee if appropriate). Program documents (designed CEP II data collection forms including signed/dated beneficiary lists).

**Data Source(s):** Grantee, CEP II GMS, beneficiaries

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** N/A

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Indicator 9.1** No. of people employed in short-term jobs as a result of USG-supported social assistance programming  
**Date Revised:** December 2009

**a. Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Short terms jobs are jobs less than three months. Employed means that they received salary for work conducted. Jobs for all CEP II projects will be counted towards this indicator (not solely infrastructure projects).

**Unit of Measure:** Individual (number)

**Disaggregated by:** Location, gender, youth, disability, vulnerable, fisher folk, farmer.

**Justification/Management Utility:** Unemployment is a significant problem in the PA. Therefore CEP II aims to help provide economic growth through job creation. Job creation will help keep families from descending lower into poverty by providing income.

**b. Plan for Data Collection**

**Data Collection Method:** Timesheets from workers (construction) contractors, and grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms); as well as grantee and contractor monitoring and evaluation forms.

**Data Source(s):** Workers will provide timesheets to the Contractors who will provide these data to the Grantee and CEP II GMS; who will in turn provide these data to CEP II M&E representative

**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)

**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.

**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.

**Review of Data:** Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.

**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** Getting signed timesheets from employees has proven difficult. CEP II GMS's tell the contractors as well as staff that these names are necessary and not shared with any governmental entity. It appears that workers are afraid that if they provide their name, other assistance they receive will be cut off.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Signed document/memo from the contractor overseeing the workers detailing the number and worker days for each project. This should be signed off by the grantee and the GMS as well.

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

Indicator (#): 9.2 Number of grants provided

Date Revised: December 2009

**a. Description****Precise Definition(s):** Total number of grants approved**Unit of Measure:** Grants (number)**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. This indicator demonstrates the rapid-response capacity of the program in terms of the number of grants approved .**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 II Grants staff as well as the CEP II Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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:** Numerical;**Review of Data:** data will be kept on when the grant was signed, implemented and closed out. Also data will be kept on other grant status changes, such as if a grant is canceled, or is pending.**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS when the grant is signed.**d. Data Quality Issues****Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A

<b>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</b>
<p><b>Indicator (#):</b> 9.3 Person-Days of employment generated  <b>Date Revised:</b> December 2009</p>
<p><b>a. Description</b></p> <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator measures the number of days of employment created by all of CEP II activities that are a result of CEP II grant funding  Only 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.  <b>Unit of Measure:</b> Person Days (Number)  <b>Disaggregated by:</b> Location, gender, youth, disability, fisher folk, farmer, vulnerable  <b>Justification/Management Utility:</b> Project activities generate employment at various levels. This indicator demonstrates the increased availability of economic opportunity created by CEP II activities.</p>
<p><b>b. Plan for Data Collection</b></p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Timesheets from workers (construction) contractors, and grantees. Program documents (per designed CEP II data collection forms); as well as grantee and contractor monitoring and evaluation forms.  <b>Data Source(s):</b> Workers will provide timesheets to the Contractors who will provide these data to the Grantee and CEP II GMS; who will in turn provide these data to CEP II M&amp;E representative  <b>Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:</b> Rolling basis as projects are implemented and activities completed.  <b>Estimated Cost of Collection:</b> Data collection is included in the project budget, no outside costs for data collection  <b>Responsible Organization/Individual(s):</b> CEP II Project Field Staff (GMS)  <b>Location of Data Storage:</b> Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS to provide analysis and reporting on geographic distribution of project interventions and activities.</p>
<p><b>c. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, and Review (schedule, methodology, responsibility)</b></p> <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be presented in numeric form, and, as appropriate, in brief narrative anecdotes.  <b>Presentation of Data:</b> Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.  <b>Review of Data:</b> Whenever possible, the GMS will conduct periodic on-site audits of project activities. The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&amp;E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.  <b>Reporting of Data:</b> Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. Data will be presented to USAID and other stakeholders and decision-makers (as relevant) on quarterly basis per the Quarterly Report.</p>
<p><b>d. Data Quality Issues</b></p> <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):</b> Getting signed timesheets from employees has proven difficult. CEP II GMS's tell the contractors as well as staff that these names are necessary and not shared with any governmental entity. It appears that workers are afraid that if they provide their name, other assistance they receive will be cut off.  <b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Signed document/memo from the contractor overseeing the workers detailing the number and worker days for each project. This should be signed off by the grantee and the GMS as well.</p>

**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet****Indicator (#): 9.4** No. of people benefiting through CSO/NGO/LGU/HA activities (i.e. total beneficiaries)**Date Revised:** December 2009**a. Description****Precise Definition(s):** Number of people (citizens, grassroots, constituencies) who are direct beneficiaries of the project intervention as per USAID GEO MIS 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 the life of the project. 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:** Individuals (number)**Disaggregated by:** Gender, Location, youth, vulnerable, disability.**Justification/Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates program coverage in terms of population, disaggregated by gender and location.**b. Plan for Data Collection****Data Collection Method:** Site observations from grantee (and sub-grantee if appropriate). Program documents (designed CEP II data collection forms including signed/dated beneficiary lists, timesheets, participant sign in list for meetings, etc).**Data Source(s):** Beneficiaries; this data is collected by Grantee (and sub-grantee as applicable) which then goes to the CEP II GMS; who will in terms provide these data to CEP II M&E representative**Timing/Frequency of Data Collection:** Rolling basis as projects are implemented 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 II Project Field Staff (GMS)**Location of Data Storage:** Data will be stored in CEP II's database. Data will also be input and stored in USAID's GEO MIS 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.**Presentation of Data:** Numerical; with qualitative data and photographs.**Review of Data:** The GMS will talk with the grantee, (sub-grantee is appropriate), beneficiaries and stakeholder to ensure that data are accurate and reliable. The CEP II M&E Specialist will ensure that before data are input into GEO MIS that they verified with accurate and reliable supporting documents.**Reporting of Data:** Data will be entered into USAID's GEO MIS as results are met, and not only at the closing of the grant/project. 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):** For some events supported by CEP II, beneficiary lists are difficult to impossible to calculate. For an example, an open town meeting in a park, where people are able to come to events throughout the day. As people come and go, in an open air event, precisely counting the number of direct beneficiaries is impossible.**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** The grantee, supported with photographs, must write up a memo for the files detailing the best estimate for the number of direct beneficiaries from the CEP II sponsored/assisted event. The justification must be logical and provide some background behind the estimate provided.

**U.S. Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

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