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### ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIP</td>
<td>Annual Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEE</td>
<td>Business Enabling Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>Contracting Officers Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCOP</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>European Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>Economic Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCR</td>
<td>Global Competitiveness Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOG</td>
<td>Government of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDFI</td>
<td>Institute for Development of Freedom of Information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Intermediate Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISET-PI</td>
<td>International School of Economics at Tbilisi University-Policy Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>Life of Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>Activity Monitoring, Evaluation, &amp; Learning Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVs</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLR</td>
<td>Policies, Laws, and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRS</td>
<td>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>Performance Monitoring Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPD</td>
<td>Public-Private Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Private Sector Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>United States Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEF</td>
<td>World Economic Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Work Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE USAID ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE PROGRAM

The purpose of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Economic Governance Program (the “Program”) is to stimulate and improve economic governance and leadership in Georgia. The Program will support the sustainability of the consultative economic reform-making process and promote the formulation, adoption, and implementation of priority economic reforms. USAID expects that with improved economic governance, Georgia will be recognized for its transparent, predictable, and inclusive business environment and will attract investments that can fuel the country’s journey to self-reliance in the future. The Program will leverage the private sector’s strong economic and business knowledge to inform policy decision-making and empower private sector associations (PSAs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) to contribute to the Government of Georgia’s (GOG) economic reform efforts in financially self-sustaining ways. The Program will provide technical assistance (TA) and training to support the adoption and implementation of reforms. This extends to working with GOG counterparts, PSAs, CSOs, and other nongovernment (NGO) stakeholders.

The Program will achieve its objectives through activities that not only reinforce and build on each other, but when combined can achieve the Program’s objectives to improve economic governance and leadership in Georgia. The three underlying intermediate results are:

1. Engage with key GOG institutions to strengthen the GOG’s capacity to lead the development, implementation, and enforcement of policies, laws and regulations (PLRs)
2. Engage selected PSAs, CSOs, think tanks, and academic institutions to improve analysis, communication, advocacy, and organizational capacity in support of economic reforms and create sustainable systems and processes for the engagement of public-private dialogue (PPD) among stakeholders
3. Support ongoing and future USAID-funded economic growth activities by analyzing and drafting PLRs to address key legal and regulatory constraints in various sectors of Georgia’s economy

The Program is funded by USAID and implemented by Deloitte & Touche LLC.
2. PURPOSE OF MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING (MEL) PLAN

The MEL plan is the Program’s activity monitoring approach to effectively capture and measure the expected outputs, outcomes, and high-level targeted results outlined in the Program Work Plan (WP). The MEL plan is a critical tool for the planning, managing, and documenting progress toward achieving the Program’s goals.

The MEL plan will track development in line with the Program’s performance-based management approach. The data collected and reported for each indicator will provide USAID with detailed information regarding the Program’s impact, as well as describe the progress achieved in accordance with defined indicators. The MEL plan also contributes to the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system by assuring that comparable and quality performance data is collected over time. The data collected is essential to the operation of a credible and useful performance-based management approach.

The MEL plan will parallel the annual WP submitted under separate cover and will deliver the data required to inform project management decisions, track activities, identify performance gaps, and set improvement goals. This document refers to the overall Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) with relevant performance indicators for activity outputs and outcomes.

The MEL plan is expected to monitor how progress, performance, programmatic assumptions, and the operational context will be monitored under the Program using performance indicators.

2.1 MEL CRITERIA

The Program’s approach to measuring and monitoring results is based on the following criteria:

1. Direct — Most MEL indicators are direct and clearly measure the intended result. Also, some indirect and aspirational indicators are linked to the Program’s results by one or more assumptions.

2. Objective — MEL indicators are measurable and data is comparable over time. The Program staff will be able to collect performance information for the same indicator and come to the same conclusions.

3. Useful for Management — MEL indicators provide meaningful measure of change over time, which can help Program management with decision-making.

4. Attributable — An indicator is attributable if it can be plausibly associated with USAID interventions. The MEL is based on the premise that Program outcomes are within the control of Program management, although the Program’s contributions to desired results are not in the Program’s direct control and may be influenced by other factors.

5. Practical and Cost Effective — Data for MEL indicators can be collected on a timely basis at a reasonable cost. The Program will identify interventions that lead to cost-effective impact evaluation.

6. Adequate — The MEL indicators are sufficient to measure the Program’s stated results.

7. Disaggregated as Necessary — The MEL indicators are appropriately disaggregated by gender, age, location, or other characteristics that are important to the Program.
8. Flexible — In line with the rolling nature of the WP, the MEL plan will remain a living
document that will be adjusted whenever changes are made to the WP.

2.2 REVISION POLICY

The MEL plan is a dynamic document that is expected to be revised and updated periodically
as a result of changing environments and conditions that affect Program activities, as well as
the experiences of Program staff directly involved in developing and using the MEL plan.

➢ MEL will be updated annually and presented as part of each annual WP.
➢ MEL indicator data will include actual results, updated targets, justifications, and deviation
  narratives to report to USAID once per fiscal year, no later than 30 days after the end of
  the fiscal year (i.e., September 30).

2.3 MEL CHANGE TRACKER TABLE AND PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
REFERENCE SHEETS (PIRS)

When changes are made to the MEL plan, the following required data fields should be
completed in the Change Tracker Table to document the changes in a single table as follows:

To facilitate tracking and learning, individual PIRSs (PIRS) were developed for each indicator
(see Annex II). PIRS is a comprehensive record that documents activity level performance
indicators tracked in the MEL plan and PMP. PIRS can capture the exact definition of an
indicator, how the data for that indicator will be collected, as well as source, quality, and other
details.

When changes are made to the MEL plan, the following required data fields should be
completed in the Change Tracker Table (internal tracking) to document the changes in a
single table as follows:

Figure 1: MEL Change Tracker Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source Document, Date, and Version</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Revision Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. PROGRAM RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The Program will contribute to USAID/Caucasus CDCS Development Objective 3 (DO3), aimed at achieving “inclusive high-value employment opportunities provided through increased economic growth.” The Program will organize its goals into a Result Framework to facilitate reforms in areas critical to the success of IR 3.1 - Last Gaps in Euro-Atlantic-Oriented Economic Reforms Addressed, which identifies two intermediate results. The Results Framework (see Figure 2) serves as the foundation for the Program’s strategies and informs all decisions to commit project resources.

Figure 2: The Program’s Contribution to USAID’s Results Framework

3.1 THE PROGRAM THEORY OF CHANGE AND LOGICAL MODEL

The Program is designed around the following theory of change:

IF the Program improves economic governance and leadership in Georgia by enforcing economic policies and regulatory reforms, and provides technical assistance (TA) and training that supports the adoption and implementation of reforms, THEN compliance with the Program objectives will promote new economic opportunities; will strengthen GOG and PSAs/CSOs capacity to become self-sustainable and that will fuel the country’s journey to self-reliance in the future.

AND IF successful policy reforms are implemented, AND IF key linkages between USAID, the Program, the GOG, and the private sector are used to address complex development
issues, THEN all stakeholders in the economic sector and beyond will benefit from the high-
value employment opportunities provided through increased economic growth and improved
economic and business environment.

In order to progress through the Program theory of change, program activities will be
structured around the following three components and outcomes:

**Figure 3: Logical Model of USAID Economic Governance Program**

![Figure 3: Logical Model of USAID Economic Governance Program](Image)

### 3.2 KEY ASSUMPTIONS AND CHALLENGES

Despite the efforts of the Program team to successfully implement Program activities and
meet Program targets, possible challenges may affect the successful delivery of a project
and hinder Program activities. The MEL plan is based on a number of key assumptions:

- **GOG Cooperation** — The Program’s success requires close engagement and
  collaboration with the GOG, without which it will not be possible to advance substantive
  reforms. This collaboration will be strengthened by close partnership with USAID, other
development partners, and the private sector.

- **Flexibility to Adapt to Changing Circumstances** — The MEL plan is built to respond to
  new inputs, reform progress, and shifting USAID and GOG priorities. The Program will be
  flexible and responsive to changing political and economic conditions. In case of
  unexpected economic and political changes, the Program may need to change
  counterparts and reform areas. To effectively meet its goals and objectives, the Program
  may also need to shift emphasis between and within components in consultation with the
contracting officer representative (COR). New (or canceled) activities will be added to (or removed from) the MEL plan in each report.

- GOG Stability — With elections in Year 2, leadership changes may occur within the GOG. These changes may affect reform progress and, therefore, may require changes to the current MEL plan.

- Counterpart Capacity — The Program will engage with and provide technical assistance to a wide range of public, private, and civil society stakeholders. With Program support, many of these institutions will need to be central drivers of reform to achieve results. The capacity of these organizations is uneven, however, and many will have only limited capacity to effectively absorb technical assistance capacity building efforts. The pace at which organizations can effectively adopt new knowledge, practices, or processes will affect the pace of the Program’s progress to facilitate reforms.

4. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

4.1 PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The performance indicators selected by the Program to detect and measure progress toward the Program goals are included in the Results Framework and the MEL plan. They were developed in consultations with USAID, Program staff, and using a variety of sources influencing the Program, including the Program contract and USAID indicators.

During the performance indicator selection process, data availability and the potential to collect accurate data were among the main criteria considered. Overall, the indicators are either quantitative or qualitative in nature and appropriately disaggregated by gender, age, location, or another characteristic deemed important for the Program. Performance indicators have been identified for every result in the Results Framework.

A list of the selected performance indicators and their corresponding baselines and targets is presented in Annex 1, “Performance Indicators, Baselines, and Illustrative Targets.”

Meaningful performance indicators are the foundation of effective measurement, assessment, and evidence-based decision-making. The Program used the following process to select the performance indicators:

1. Identify what to measure
2. Clarify the results
3. Identify possible indicators
4. Assess possible alternatives
5. Select the best indicators
6. Improve indicators, if necessary

The performance indicators established for the Program will measure changes in the results identified in the Results Framework and provide objective evidence that intended changes and results occur.
4.2 TYPES OF INDICATORS

The MEL plan includes three main types of indicators:

1. Context Indicators — These third-party indicators must be tracked to measure aspirational goals. Context indicators are beyond the direct influence of USAID and the Program.

2. Agency-Wide Reporting Requirements — As part of USAID’s regular reporting requirements, the Program will collect information on standardized indicators assigned by USAID.

3. Tailored Program Impact and Performance Indicators — These indicators measure the performance and impact of the Program, as well as the benefits of each reform addressed by the Program.

4.3 BASELINE AND TARGETED VALUES

The Program’s MEL performance targets can be optimistically achieved within the stated timeframe, which are presented in Annex 1, “Performance Indicators, Baselines, and Illustrative Targets.”

Since most of the indicators measure new or additional impact due to the Program’s activities, the baseline value is zero. The Program will establish baseline data through data collection from primary and secondary sources. For context, the targets and baselines for outcome levels have been defined according to the latest data sources. During the implementation phase, these indicators and the planned target values may be modified due to practical experience and baseline studies that will be available later.

4.4 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The Program framework facilitates permanent consultation and cooperation with the Program stakeholders — GOG, CSOs and PSAs.

The Program team will engage stakeholders as learning partners, sharing data analysis and results to jointly identify best practices, what should be replicated and scaled, and what should be changed.
5. MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING

The MEL plan describes how the implementation team will track progress against all indicators, evaluate Program performance, and improve Program delivery and outcomes by learning and adapting to challenges.

Figure 4: MEL Life Cycle for the USAID Economic Governance Program

The Program staff will review the MEL plan and make necessary changes to improve Program implementation in subsequent cycles on an annual basis. This review will include:

- Reviewing assumptions underlying the indicators and the results framework
- Ensuring that reported progress corresponds to performance targets
- Assessing the likely reasons why performance targets may not be met
- Recommending changes to the structure of the results framework
- Recommending changing, editing, or dropping performance indicators, if needed
- Recommending changes to MEL processes in order to improve performance-based decision making

In addition, the following methods and tools will be used to track and monitor performance:

- Microsoft Excel and other tools will be used to monitor indicators throughout the Program life cycle
- Standardized forms and checklists for field staff to use to periodically report on progress
- Annual findings will be disseminated to the entire Program team and USAID
Regular monitoring and evaluations will ensure that the MEL plan effectively captures and measures the expected outputs, results, outcomes, and high-level targeted results outlined in the WP.

5.1 COLLABORATING, LEARNING, AND ADAPTING (CLA)

The plan will use the following CLA principles to support and enhance the Program’s performance management goals:

- Collaborate — Coordinate activities to increase synergy and reduce duplication of efforts
- Learn — Draw on a wide range of knowledge sources and perspectives to learn what does and does not work
- Adapt — Based on learning, make iterative course corrections to improve overall effectiveness

Collaboration, learning and adaptive management are at the heart of the Program’s implementation strategy. Without accurately understanding institutional dynamics, improving the environment and strengthening public-private sector engagement and capacities—and putting all that understanding to good use—it will be impossible to achieve the Program’s aims in terms of economic governance and leadership.

The Program’s MEL will emphasize participatory approaches to collaboration, activity design, implementation, learning, and adaptation. This is essential as the Program involves multiple stakeholders working on sensitive issues, such as legislative and policy reforms; capacity building and improved institutions; implementation; and management. Strong CLA will strengthen the Program’s ownership, coordination, and implementation.

CLA is in line with the WP and Knowledge Management (KM) Plan and its communication tools.

The Program, prior to engaging in policy and regulatory reforms, will conduct systems approach assessments. The systems approach includes comprehensive assessment and validation with national stakeholders to create a shared understanding of the reform key conditions/constraints, their causes, and potential actions. The assessment is based on different tools (such as policy value chain analyses, political economy analyses (PEA), root cause analyses, and stakeholder mapping) that will allow the team to identify real needs and activities that could have a lasting impact. As systems approach is an iterative process, the Program will periodically revisit the assessments to confirm the identified issues, stakeholders’ relations, and planned interventions and will revise as needed. This process will further embed collaboration, learning, and adaption in the Program’s operations.

CLA involves a set of practices that will help improve the Program’s effectiveness by ensuring that coordination with other stakeholders is grounded in strong evidence and is iteratively adapted to remain relevant throughout implementation. The Program will make necessary adjustments in the quarterly report and annual work plan according to the lessons learned and received feedback.

To foster and promote a CLA culture, including accountability and self-analysis, several internal and external coordination mechanisms will be used to ensure that knowledge transfer and progress tracking remain dynamic processes throughout the Program.

The structure of CLA in the Program:

Figure 5: CLA in the Program Cycle
**External Collaboration**

1. Identify and prioritize key stakeholders for strategic collaboration (stakeholder mapping).
2. Decide how to engage key stakeholders (various platforms used: EPAC, ReforMeter, etc.).
3. Collaborate with key stakeholders based on decisions reached (capacity building: assessments/action plans).
4. Follow KM Plan and use communication tools (newsletters, social media, etc.).
5. Hold ad hoc stakeholder meetings (GOG, PSAs, CSOs).
6. Arrange public-private discussions and conferences (PPD events, trainings, etc.).
7. Organize donor coordination-quarterly meetings with other USAID/Georgia activities to identify priority policy areas for support.
8. Proactively reach out to media outlets to improve reporting on economic news and help build the capacity of Georgian media professionals (including study visits, coffee & conversation sessions, and trainings).
9. Engage in private sector outreach, including meetings with PSAs and individual businesses to engage them in the reform process.

**Technical Evidence Base**

1. Shared Drive (Internal Data Repository).
2. Automated program management system.
3. Program-funded studies and technical reports.
5. Development Data Library (DDL).

**Theories of Change**

1. Transitioning from diagnosis to theory of change as defined by Work Plan (systems approach assessments, root cause analysis, policy value chain, political economy assessment, assessment of organizational and institutional capacities).
2. Testing and consideration of theories of change (ex: systems approach results will be regularly updated and modified as needed and program interventions will be updated accordingly).
3. Raising awareness among stakeholders about theories of change and the learning that results from testing.

**Pause & Reflect**

1. Pause & reflect as a bridge between learning and decision-making (ex: after action reviews and lessons learned, stop and think).
2. Regular times of reflection such as connectivity events, including Pause & Reflect sessions.

**Adaptive Management**

1. Hold strategic review meetings (including revisions of the reforms).
2. Analyze lessons learned from implementation.
3. Follow through on decisions reached to manage adaptively. (Quarterly, annual changes).

**Scenario Planning**

1. Identify risks, key assumptions, and opportunities through scenario planning.
3. Respond to and apply learning from monitoring.

**M&E for Learning**

1. Ensure the relevance of monitoring data to decision-making (MEL, PMP).
2. Design and conduct evaluations to inform ongoing and future programming (MEL Lifecycle, data sources & tools).
3. Align monitoring, evaluation, and learning efforts across the Program goal and target levels.

**Openness**

1. Be open and promote creative ideas on reform implementation and public outreach.
2. Use various PPD platforms (EPAC and ReforMeter) to conduct evidence-based discussions.

**Knowledge Management**

1. Source various types of knowledge from stakeholders, including public and business surveys.
2. Share knowledge with stakeholders, including public presentations of survey results.

**Relationships & Networks**

1. Develop relationships based on trust within EPAC, journalist platform, and youth and women stakeholder networks.
2. Provide up-to-date information (regular newsletters, FB, Web, etc.)
3. Use networks in the economic reform implementation.

**Decision-Making**

Promote evidence- and consensus-based processes through EPAC, think tanks and the journalist platform will be promoted.

**Continuous Learning & Improvement**

1. PPD tracking system implementation.
2. Learning based on PPD results.
3. Regular revision of systems approach assessments and reflections of the changes.
6. DATA COLLECTION, MANAGEMENT, AND REPORTING

To actively monitor the Program’s conditions and implementation activity, quantitative and qualitative methods to monitor context may be necessary, including indicator tracking, qualitative interviewing, expert panels, and administrative recordkeeping.

6.1 DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION METHODS

Key data sources include the following:

- Performance Indicators, Baselines, and Illustrative Targets (Annex I) — The performance indicators, baselines, and annual targets presented in Annex I are based on USAID’s requirements and existing secondary data.

- Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) (Annex II) — The PIRS in Annex II describes the sources and methods of data collection for each performance indicator. The Program team will ensure the timely, consistent, and comparable collection of data throughout the Program, with any changes documented.

- Data Collection Forms (Standard Templates) — The Program will develop data collection and documentation forms to standardize data collection efforts and ensure the quality of the data. Technical staff will fill out the forms and attach relevant means of verification (MOV). The value of a performance indicator will be limited by the means available to verify the indicator. Verification of some performance indicators may require only a review of the Program’s official records, while other performance indicators may require sophisticated data collection and analysis for verification. The data will be integrated into the Program’s performance indicator database, and scanned copies of the forms and MOVs will be kept on file. For example, for training session on PLRs, a form will be filled out to document the nature of the learning event, including characteristics of the participants (i.e., gender, age), dates of the event, results, and other information. Attendance lists will then be attached to the form, and after validation, the form and attachment will form the MOV for that performance indicator. Thus, the forms will be used for data collection and quality assurance.

- Surveys — The Program will conduct its own surveys, with USAID approval, to determine the baseline and actual data needed.

- Subcontractors and counterparts.

- Official reports, statistics, and other data sources the Program will rely upon include:
  - Government and official data (e.g., Geostat, National Bank, Ministry of Finance)
  - International agencies (e.g., World Bank, OECD, World Economic Forum (WEF), Global Competitiveness Report (GCR))
  - Quality tracking system for PPD managed by the Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI)
  - ReforMeter managed by the International School of Economics at Tbilisi University-Policy Institute (ISET-PI)
  - Other reliable sources

6.2 DATA QUALITY STANDARDS

MEL indicators will be in line with the following data quality standards:

- Validity — Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result.
- Reliability — Data should reflect consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time.
- Timeliness — Data should be frequently collected and timely enough to influence decision-making.

### 6.3 DATA SECURITY STANDARDS

The most appropriate ways to protect, secure, store, and handle data include:

- Collect and report only the minimal amount of data necessary for an explicit purpose. Personally Identifiable Information (PII) is not something to be collected for convenience purposes.
- Securely store data, both in hard and soft copies, and restrict access to the data only to relevant personnel.

This MEL plan is in line with these data security standards.

### 6.4 DATA PRESENTATION AND REPORTING

Across the life of the Program many data points will be collected to facilitate analysis and decision-making. To illustrate trends and relationships in the data, Program staff will use data visualization techniques. Some common forms of data visualization that can be used to analyze and present data include:

- Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
- Graphs, charts, and tables

The Program will consider using existing data visualization tools such as Tableau, which is used extensively in the business intelligence industry. Tableau helps simplify raw data into an easily understandable format. Data analysis can be completed very quickly with Tableau, and the visualizations created are in the form of dashboards and worksheets. The Program may also develop a new tool to track Program activities, monitor progress, and visualize data.

The Program will report to USAID on the progress against all applicable MEL and PMP indicators:

- On a quarterly basis, the Program will provide USAID with periodic progress reports on the PMP. The reports will be due 15 days after the end of each quarter, except for the fourth quarter report, which is included in the annual report not due until 30 days after fiscal year-end (i.e., September 30).
- PMP progress data and status for the fiscal year (i.e., October 1 – September 30) will be included in the Program's Annual Report submitted to USAID in October.
- The MEL plan will be updated annually and presented as part of each annual WP.
- MEL indicator data, including actual results, updated targets, justifications, and deviation narratives, will be reported to USAID once per fiscal year, no later than 30 days after fiscal year-end (i.e., September 30).
- GIS data will be reported to USAID semiannually on April 15 and October 15.
7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following people and entities will play key roles in the Program’s performance monitoring system:

- **Chief of Party (COP)/Deputy Chief of Party (DCOP)** will be responsible for the implementation of MEL activities. They will guide and supervise the overall M&E system, liaise with staff on MEL needs, ensure the compilation of performance indicators for annual reports, and coordinate the accomplishment of MEL activities in the annual WP.

- **RIA/ME&L Advisor** will be responsible for data collection and analysis on a day-to-day basis, including the preparation of PIRS and other forms, maintenance of an internal database, and data analysis for the annual reports. The RIA/ME&L advisor will work with relevant counterparts to ensure high-quality data collection and maintenance, as well as identify success stories and qualitative evidence of the Program’s impact and facilitate learning activities during staff retreats and annual WP reviews.

- **Component Leads** will be in charge of implementing activities under each Program objective, including ensuring performance indicators are implemented and the MEL plan is integrated into general activity implementation. The RIA/ME&L Advisor and relevant component leaders will also sign the PIRS and other forms, as well as ensure that staff and focal points assigned to each activity are trained to use the applicable forms for data collection and documentation and contractors have sufficient capacity and resources to collect the data needed to measure the Program’s performance. Component Leads will also take into account overall indicators in the design of activities.

- **Data Analysts** will be responsible for data collection and analysis for periodic and annual reports. Data Analysts will scrutinize the numbers, trends, and data and come to new conclusions based on the findings. Data Analysts must present their findings by transforming the data into understandable documents with visual elements. The RIA/ME&L Advisor and Data Analysts will be in charge of designing appropriate monitoring mechanisms and supervising their implementation.

- **Subcontractors** may be obliged to collect data for certain performance indicators, as needed. They will work in close coordination with the RIA/ME&L Advisor and component leaders. They will include qualitative information on results and impact in periodic reporting.

Ongoing data collection will be the joint responsibility of all Component Leads and staff. Component Leads are responsible for incorporating performance indicators into activity planning and implementation. RIA/ME&L Advisor will coordinate, analyze, and consolidate data into a MEL report submitted annually to USAID. RIA/ME&L Advisor will manage a database system to permanently collect and store program results. RIA/ME&L Advisor also will be in charge of quality control related to data collection.
Table I outlines performance indicators, baselines, and targets for the lifetime of the Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>FY2020 Target</th>
<th>FY2021 Targets</th>
<th>FY2022 Targets</th>
<th>FY2023 Targets</th>
<th>FY2024 Targets</th>
<th>Cumulative Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Georgia’s higher score in the 11th pillar in the GCI/business dynamism/administrative requirements: 11.03 Insolvency recovery rate</td>
<td>43,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Georgia’s higher score in the 11th pillar in the GCI/business dynamism/administrative requirements: 11.04 Insolvency regulatory framework</td>
<td>68,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increasing Georgia’s sovereign credit rating scores for Moody’s</td>
<td>Ba2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ba1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increasing Georgia’s ranking in the World Bank Regulatory Quality Index (World Bank Governance Report)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator Name</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>FY2020 Target</td>
<td>FY2021 Targets</td>
<td>FY2022 Targets</td>
<td>FY2023 Targets</td>
<td>FY2024 Targets</td>
<td>Cumulative Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> The overall score (6 out of 10 on the Reform Meter) measuring the performance, progress and outcome per targeted reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td>≥6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of PLRs developed and implemented by the GOG as a result of assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of PLR operational mechanisms for effective enforcement implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of economic operators who view targeted reforms (i.e., those supported by USAID), including PLRs, as consistently and predictably implemented and enforced. Short clarification: Broad survey measuring progress toward the Program’s purpose will be conducted in 2024 to measure final results.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator Name</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>FY2020 Target</td>
<td>FY2021 Targets</td>
<td>FY2022 Targets</td>
<td>FY2023 Targets</td>
<td>FY2024 Targets</td>
<td>Cumulative Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Number of PLRs drafted, approved, and implemented through a PPD process. Short clarification: Data will be collected by an independent party (e.g., IDFI, a local NGO, issues a Quality of PPD index) to measure PPD effectiveness and uptake of policy recommendations developed through the PPD process.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of PSAs and CSOs with increased financial sustainability (e.g.: increase membership and clients),</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Number of organizations formally engaging the GOG on BEE policy reform issues. Short clarification: The indicator will count the number of CSOs and PSAs engaged in policy reforms.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Number of quality services/products provided by professional business associations and think tanks to their clients as a result of the Program assistance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator Name</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>FY2020 Target</td>
<td>FY2021 Targets</td>
<td>FY2022 Targets</td>
<td>FY2023 Targets</td>
<td>FY2024 Targets</td>
<td>Cumulative Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> A cumulative PPD quality score measured by Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI) Public-Private Dialogue Quality Tracking in Georgia for policies, regulations and laws utilizing the PPD process. Short clarification: Target will measure PPD quality score for each targeted reform</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of CSOs or private sector associations with improved analytical capacity as a result of the Program assistance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of independent analyses of policy, law or regulation undertaken by a CSO or private sector associations through grants.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of operational peer review platform exists through Program assistance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Indicator Name</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>FY2020 Target</td>
<td>FY2021 Targets</td>
<td>FY2022 Targets</td>
<td>FY2023 Targets</td>
<td>FY2024 Targets</td>
<td>Cumulative Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of CSOs or PSAs that will pass independent corporate governance and financial assessments.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of inclusive and constructive policy dialogues and consultations led by CSOs and PSAs held between government, the private sector, and civil society at the national, subnational, and municipal levels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td><strong>Contract deliverable:</strong> Number of reform areas identified in conjunction with other USAID-funded activities analyzed, drafted and/or implemented.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td><strong>EG.2-1 Person hours of USG-supported training completed in trade and investment. (USAID Indicator)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td><strong>YOUTH-1 Number of youths trained in social or leadership skills through USG assisted programs.</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX II – PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET**

**Context Indicator 1:** Georgia’s higher score in the 11th pillar in the GCI/business dynamism/administrative requirements: 11.03 Insolvency Recovery Rate.

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** GCI Index is defined by the World Economic Forum. It is a set of institutions, policies, and factors that determine the level of productivity of a country, conditions of public institutions and technical conditions. The Global Competitiveness Index provides a comparative overview of the economic and business potential of countries.

This indicator tracks the score of the country development in 11th pillar: business dynamism, component administrative requirements, sub-component: 11.03 Insolvency Recovery Rate.

- Recorded as cents on the dollar recovered by secured creditors through judicial reorganization, liquidation or debt enforcement (foreclosure or receivership) proceedings | 2018; The calculation takes into account the outcome - whether the business emerges from the proceedings as a going concern or the assets are sold piecemeal. Then the costs of the proceedings are deducted (1 cent for each percentage point of the value of the debtor’s estate). Finally, the value lost as a result of the time the money remains tied up in insolvency proceedings is taken into account.

A country’s performance on the overall GCI results as well as each of its components is reported as a ‘progress score’ on a 0-to-100 scale, where 100 represents the ‘frontier’, an ideal state where an issue ceases to be a constraint to productivity growth. Each country should aim to move closer to the frontier on each component. An ideal—and hypothetical—situation where a country achieves the perfect score on every component of the index.

**Unit of Measure:** Country - Georgia's score in sub-component 11.03 Insolvency Recovery Rate.

**Scores** - The economy’s progress score on a 0 to 100 scale following normalization; Scores are on a 0 to 100 scale, where 100 represents the optimal situation or ‘frontier’. Arrows indicate the direction of the change in score from the previous edition, if available. Each indicator, or “pillar” uses a scale from 0 to 100, to show how close an economy is to the ideal state or “frontier” of competitiveness in that area.
Disaggregated by: Geographic location (national level)

Type of Indicator: Impact indicator

Justification & Management Utility Information will be used by USAID to monitor country performance. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: GCI Ranking/scores uses publicly accessible (statistic) data's (UN, WB, IMF, etc.) and results of findings made by World Economic Forum.

Data Source(s): The Global Competitiveness Report; World Bank Group, Doing Business. 

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: N/A

Responsible Individual(s) in the Program: RIA/ME&L Advisor and Data Analysts.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: International Report by WEF with the support of partner institutions (research institutions and business centers).

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

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

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Annually

Presentation of Data: Annual reports

Review of Data: Annually

Reporting of Data: Annually

BASELINE

Baseline data: In 2019: Georgia’s score is 43.3.

OTHER NOTES

More details about the methodology can be found at http://www.doingbusiness.org/Methodology/Resolving-Insolvency.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The USAID Economic Governance Program – MEL Plan
Context Indicator 2: Georgia’s higher score in the 11th pillar in the GCI/business dynamism/administrative requirements: 11.04 Insolvency Regulatory Framework.

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): GCI Index is defined by the World Economic Forum. It is a set of institutions, policies, and factors that determine the level of productivity of a country, conditions of public institutions and technical conditions. The Global Competitiveness Index provides a comparative overview of the economic and business potential of countries.

This indicator tracks the score of the country development in 11th pillar: business dynamism, component administrative requirements, sub-component 11.04 - Insolvency Regulatory Framework:

- Score on an index that measures the adequacy and integrity of the legal framework applicable to liquidation and reorganization proceedings. Scores range from 0 to 16, with higher values indicating insolvency legislation that is better designed for rehabilitating viable firms and liquidating non-viable ones. | 2018; the index is calculated as the sum of the scores on the commencement of proceedings index, management of debtor’s assets index, reorganization proceedings index and creditor participation index.

A country’s performance on the overall GCI results as well as each of its components is reported as a ‘progress score’ on a 0-to-100 scale, where 100 represents the ‘frontier’, an ideal state where an issue ceases to be a constraint to productivity growth. Each country should aim to move closer to the frontier on each component. An ideal—and hypothetical—situation where a country achieves the perfect score on every component of the index.

Unit of Measure: Country - Georgia’s score in sub-component 11.04 Insolvency Regulatory Framework.

Scores - The economy’s progress score on a 0 to 100 scale following normalization; Scores are on a 0 to 100 scale, where 100 represents the optimal situation or ‘frontier’. Arrows indicate the direction of the change in score from the previous edition, if available. Each indicator, or “pillar” uses a scale from 0 to 100, to show how close an economy is to the ideal state or “frontier” of competitiveness in that area.

Disaggregated by: Geographic location (national level).

Type of Indicator: Impact indicator
**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor country performance. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** GCI Ranking uses publicly accessible (statistic) data's (UN, WB, IMF, etc.) and results of findings made by World Economic Forum.

**Data Source(s):** The Global Competitiveness Report; World Bank Group, Doing Business


**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annually

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** RIA/ME&L Advisor and Data Analysts

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** International Report by WEF with the support of partner institutions (research institutions and business centers)

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Annually

**Presentation of Data:** Annual reports

**Review of Data:** Annually

**Reporting of Data:** Annually

**BASELINE**

**Baseline data:** In 2019: Georgia’s score is 68.8.

**OTHER NOTES**

More details about the methodology can be found at http://www.doingbusiness.org/Methodology/Resolving-Insolvency.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

**Context Indicator 3:** Increasing Georgia’s sovereign credit rating scores for Moody’s.

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Moody’s Investor Service is among the world’s most respected, widely utilized sources for credit ratings, research and risk analyses. Credit ratings and research help investors analyze the credit risks associated with fixed-income securities. Such independent credit ratings and research also contribute to efficiencies in fixed-income markets and research obligations, such as insurance policies and derivative transactions, by providing credible and independent assessments of credit risk.

**Moody’s long-term rating definitions:** ratings are opinions of the relative credit risk of fixed-income obligations with an original maturity of one year or more. They address the possibility that a financial obligation will not be honored as promised. Such ratings reflect both the likelihood of default and any financial loss suffered in the event of default. **Ba long term rating definition:** Obligations rated Ba are judged to have speculative element and are subject to substantial credit risk. Georgia’s sovereign credit rating scores for Moody’s baseline Y2019 Ba2 and target Ba1is under Non-Investment Grade by Moody’s Rating scale.

**Unit of Measure:** Country - Georgia’s credit rating scores for Moody’s

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national)

**Type of Indicator:** Impact indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor the country performance. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** Moody’s ratings and analysis track debt covering more than: 100 sovereign nations, 12000 company issuers, 29,000 public finance issuers, 96,000 structured finance obligations.

**Data Source(s):** Moody’s default and in-depth research studies, credit opinion handbooks https://tradingeconomics.com/georgia/rating; https://www.economy.com/georgia/indicators

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annually
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: N/A

Responsible Individual(s) in the Program: RIA/ME&L Advisor and Data Analysts

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: Moody’s default studies validate predictive ratings.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

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

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Annually

Presentation of Data: Annual reports

Review of Data: Annually

Reporting of Data: Annually

BASELINE

Baseline data: In 2019 Georgia ranks Ba2

OTHER NOTES

More details about the methodology and scale can be found at https://www.moodys.com/sites/products/productattachments/ap075378_1_1408_ki.pdf; Special Emphasis will be placed on governance-related indicators.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>Ba1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: February, 2020
## Context Indicator 4: Increasing Georgia’s ranking in the World Bank Regulatory Quality Index (World Bank Governance Report)

### Description

**Precise Definition(s):** The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) reports aggregate individual governance indicators for six dimensions of governance: Voice and Accountability; Political Stability and Absence of Violence; Government Effectiveness; Regulatory Quality; Rule of Law; Control of Corruption. The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) are a research dataset summarizing the views on the quality of governance provided by a large number of enterprises, citizen and expert survey respondents in industrial and developing countries.

**WB Regulatory Quality definition:** Regulatory quality captures perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development.

**Unit of Measure:** Country - Georgia’s ranking in WB Regulatory Quality Index

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national)

**Type of Indicator:** Impact indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor country performance. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making.

### Plan for Data Acquisition

**Data Collection Method:** Reports aggregate and individual governance indicators for over 200 countries.

**Data Source(s):** WGI report; These data are gathered from a number of survey institutes, think tanks, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and private sector firms.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annually

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** RIA/ME&L Advisor and Data Analysts

### Data Quality Issues

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** WGI report.

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### Plan for Data Analysis, Review, & Reporting

**Data Analysis:** Annually

**Presentation of Data:** Annual reports
**Review of Data:** Annually

**Reporting of Data:** Annually

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** Year 2018; Georgia ranks 83.

### OTHER NOTES


### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** February, 2020
## Component I Indicator 1.1: The overall score (6 out of 10 on the Reform Meter) measuring the performance, progress and outcome per targeted reform.

### Description

**Precise Definition(s):** The indicator will measure progress toward identification and enactment of targeted reforms related to the component as measured by ReforMeter measured by ISET. This indicator tracks the overall score of performance, progress and outcome per targeted reform.

A tool "ReforMeter" has been developed under USAID's G4G activity.

**Unit of Measure:** Overall Score per targeted reform. Scores are measured on scale from 0 to 10.

Target ≥6 Score indicates that it will be equal to 6 or greater.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national Level)

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

### Plan for Data Acquisition

**Data Collection Method:** ISET Reports; data collection/monitoring forms

**Data Source(s):** ISET; [https://reformeter.iset-pi.ge/en](https://reformeter.iset-pi.ge/en)

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** Data Analysts and Component staff; RIA/ME&L Advisor will review and aggregate data.

### Data Quality Issues

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### Plan for Data Analysis, Review, & Reporting

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly
**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y2)

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>≥6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Component I Indicator 1.2: Number of PLRs developed and implemented by the GOG as a result of the Program assistance.

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Number of PLRs specific pieces of legislation or implementing regulations proposed, adopted, and implemented by GOG and that positively affect potential policy area.

A PLRs should be reported if it – directly or indirectly – strengthens the policy area. The indicator will count the total number of PLRs, agreed with or initiated for adoption by GOG stakeholders related to the Program. The Program will work with GOG to strengthen their ability to lead the development, implementation, and enforcement of PLRs that promote economic competitiveness and fair market competition as it is essential for Georgia’s self-reliance.

This indicator tracks the Number of such PLRs. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward the Program goals.

Unit of Measure: Number of pieces of PLRs; Each new or revised policy, law or regulation should be counted as one unit. Multiple amendments to the same PLRs should not be counted separately.

Legislative Milestone Scale: Common qualitative indicator that utilize quantified data collection method is milestone indicators, which measure progress along a path, such as steps it takes to pass a law through the legislature (see Table for an example).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Legislative Milestone Scale</th>
<th>Name of PLR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Studies/research are conducted on the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legislation is drafted by relevant committee or ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public hearing or forums are held on the draft legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislation is submitted to the legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislation is passed by full approval process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregated by: Geographic location (national Level)

Type of Indicator: Outcome indicator

Justification & Management Utility Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Reports of Component staff; Data collection/monitoring forms.

Data Source(s): The Program staff and reports; GOG reports

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: N/A
### Responsible Individual(s) in the Program

The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### Data Quality Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment</th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plan for Data Analysis, Review, & Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Data</td>
<td>Quarterly and Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Data</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting of Data</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Baseline

| Baseline data | 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y1) |

### Other Notes

### Performance Indicator Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Component I Indicator 1.3:** Number of PLR operational mechanisms for effective enforcement implemented.

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of implemented procedures and operational mechanisms which will form the basis for addressing effective enforcement of those PLRs.

Number of procedures and operational mechanisms should be reported if it – directly or indirectly – strengthens the PLRs implementation. The indicator will count and tracks the total number of procedures and operational mechanisms related to the PLRs. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals. This indicator is related/linked to indicator 1.2.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of procedures and operational mechanisms; Each new or revised procedure and operational mechanism should be counted as one unit. Multiple amendments to the same units should not be counted separately.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national Level)

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Reports of Component staff; data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; official reports

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: Quarterly
Presentation of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports
Review of Data: Quarterly
Reporting of Data: Quarterly

**BASELINE**

Baseline data: 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y1)

**OTHER NOTES**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Component I Indicator 1.4:** Percentage of economic operators who view targeted reforms (i.e., those supported by USAID), including PLRs, as consistently and predictably implemented and enforced.

**Description**

**Precise Definition(s):** Percentage of economic operators who view targeted reforms including PLRs are consistently and predictably implemented and enforced.

This indicator will be counted according to a subset of questions of a broad survey measuring progress towards the Program’s purpose, the results of which will be analyzed in conjunction with RIAs prepared by implementing partners or a third party for individual economic reforms.

**Unit of Measure:** The indicator will count and tracks the percentage of economic operators who view targeted reforms.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, municipality level), age, gender, sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Impact indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track progress of the reform implementation.

**Plan for Data Acquisition**

**Data Collection Method:** Broad survey measuring progress toward the Program’s purpose will be conducted in 2024 to measure final results. Survey will be conducted and data will be collected by an independent contractor.

**Data Source(s):** Implementing partner; special survey and its results.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Baseline and Final Surveys.

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** RIA/ME&L Advisor; Data Analysts and Component staff.

**Data Quality Issues**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Baseline and Final Surveys will be conducted at the beginning and end of the Program.

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Plan for Data Analysis, Review, & Reporting**

**Data Analysis:** Baseline and Final Surveys
**Presentation of Data:** Baseline and Final Surveys

**Review of Data:** Baseline and Final Surveys

**Reporting of Data:** Baseline and Final Surveys

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 33% (The baseline is defined based on survey results conducted in 2019).

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Component I Indicator 1.5: Number of PLRs drafted, approved, and implemented through a PPD process.

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of specific pieces of policy, legislation or implementing regulations drafted, approved, and implemented through a Public-private Dialogue process. A PLRs should be reported if it – directly or indirectly – strengthens the policy area. The indicator will count the total number of PLRs drafted, approved with or implemented for adoption by GOG stakeholders through a PPD. The Program will support PPD process to strengthen their ability to lead the development and enforcement of PLRs that promote economic reforms as it is essential for Georgia’s self-reliance.

This indicator tracks the Number of such PLRs. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of pieces of PLRs; Each new or revised policy, law or regulation should be counted as one unit. Multiple amendments to the same PLRs should not be counted separately.

**Legislative Milestone Scale:** Common qualitative indicator that utilize quantified data collection method is milestone indicators, which measure progress along a path, such as steps it takes to pass a law through the legislature (see Table for an example).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Legislative Milestone Scale</th>
<th>Name of PLR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Studies/research are conducted on the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legislation is drafted by relevant committee or ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public hearing or forums are held on the draft legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislation is submitted to the legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislation is passed by full approval process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregated by: Geographic location (national level), sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to the key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** Data will be collected by an independent party (e.g. IDFI, a local NGO, issues a “Quality of PPD” index) to measure PPD effectiveness and uptake of policy recommendations developed through a PPD process.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; implemented partner/independent party (e.g. IDFI, a local NGO, issues a “Quality of PPD” index).

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

- **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD
- **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A
- **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A
- **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly
- **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

- **Data Analysis:** Quarterly
- **Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports
- **Review of Data:** Quarterly
- **Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y2)

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Component II Indicator 2.1:** Number of PSAs and CSOs with increased financial sustainability (e.g.: increase membership and clients),

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**
The indicator will count and tracks the Number of PSAs and CSOs with increased financial sustainability (e.g.: increase membership and clients).

Financial sustainability remains a critical challenge for PSAs and CSOs organizations.

This indicator includes: membership services, governance, financial sustainability, analytical and research capacity development, community mobilization and other.

This indicator tracks the total number of PSAs and CSOs. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward the Program goals.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of PSAs and CSOs; each PSA and CSO should be counted as one unit.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, and municipality level), and sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** Reports of the Component staff; data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; Activity records/documents and other MoV; Implementing partners, Links.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly.

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A.

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD.

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A.

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly.

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.
## PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly

**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

### BASELINE

Baseline data: 0

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Component II Indicator 2.2:** Number of organizations formally engaging the GOG on BEE policy reform issues

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** The indicator will count total number of CSO/PSA engaging GOG in policy reforms. This approach will support reforms and PPD processes aimed at improving the BEE. If one CSO/PSA is engaged in several policy reforms, each engagement will be counted separately. This indicator tracks the total Cumulative number of organizations. The organization should have at least one PPD organized or policy paper, assessment, survey or other analytical documents produced. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of organizations.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, and municipality level), sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** Component staff reports; data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; activity records/documents.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly
**Baseline**

**Baseline data:** 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y1)

**Other Notes**

**Performance Indicator Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This sheet last updated on: February, 2020*
Component II Indicator 2.3: Number of quality services/products provided by professional business associations & think tanks to their clients as a result of the Program assistance.

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Total number of quality services or products provided by professional business associations & think-tanks to their clients during the reporting period as a result of the Program assistance.

As a result of the Program assistance each organization will develop at least one service/product. This quality services or products includes trainings, workshops, advocacy, tools, analysis and other.

This indicator will count the types of services/products. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward the Program goals.

Unit of Measure: Number of services/products; Each type of services/products should be counted as one unit.

Type of Indicator: Impact indicator

Disaggregated by: Geographic location (national, region, municipality level), sector

Justification & Management Utility Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Component leads will gather documentation and provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor; Data collection/monitoring forms.

Data Source(s): The Program staff and reports; activity records/documents and other MoV.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: N/A

Responsible Individual(s) in the Program: The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: TBD

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

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

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Quarterly

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Quarterly
**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y1)

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Component II Indicator 2.4

A cumulative PPD quality score measured by Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI) Public-Private Dialogue Quality Tracking in Georgia for policies, regulations and laws utilizing the PPD process.

### Description

**Precise Definition(s):** The indicator will measure PPD quality score measured by IDFI; IDFI began implementation of the "PPD Quality Tracking System" Program in 2015 under USAID G4G’s grant activity and developed the methodology of the PPD quality assessment during the lawmaking process. The cornerstone of the evaluation is the laws, i.e. reforms that have reached the stage of legislative initiative (draft laws which are submitted to the Parliament of Georgia within the auspices of an ongoing reform). In order to select the laws that will be evaluated in terms of extent and quality of PPD, IDFI sends Freedom of Information (FOI) request to the Parliament of Georgia, requesting a list of all legislative proposals submitted to the Parliament during the evaluation timeframe and/or monitors the website of the Parliament for draft laws initiated. Based on the received information, IDFI, with support of the Program, selects amendments to laws and draft laws to be evaluated in terms of quality and extent of the PPD process. The selection criteria for laws include the extent of economic impact, scale of the law or regulation, long-term vs. short-term impact and affected parties. The assessment focuses on four pre-identified stages of policy process. The stages are: (1) policy design and development; (2) legislation drafting and (3) circulation; public comments (before draft law is initiated in the Parliament) and (4) ex-ante RIA (which can be prepared at any time during early stages of policy process). Each criteria will be evaluated on the four-level scale system of None-Low-Medium-High. Each level of the criteria will have corresponding scoring, that is None – 0, Low – 1, Medium – 2 and High – 3. This indicator tracks the overall quality score and outcome per targeted reform. Target will measure PPD quality score for each targeted reform.

**Unit of Measure:** Overall PPD quality score for each targeted reform. Scores are measured on scale from 0 to 3

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national Level)

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

### Plan for Data Acquisition

**Data Collection Method:** IDFI Reports; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** Implementing partner IDFI; [https://idfi.ge/en/ppd_quality_tracking_in_georgia_continuation](https://idfi.ge/en/ppd_quality_tracking_in_georgia_continuation)

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** Data Analysts and Component staff; RIA/ME&L Advisor will review and aggregate data.

### Data Quality Issues

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Quarterly
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

Plan for Data Analysis, Review, & Reporting

Data Analysis: Quarterly
Presentation of Data: Quarterly and annual reports
Review of Data: Quarterly
Reporting of Data: Quarterly

Baseline
Baseline data: 0

Other Notes


Performance Indicator Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>≥2 (Medium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Component II Indicator 2.5:** Number of CSOs or private sector associations with improved analytical capacity as a result of the Program assistance.

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Total number of CSOs or PSAs with improved analytical capacity, developed methodology and research capabilities during the reporting period as a result of the Program assistance.

This indicator will ensure that the supported organizations will be able to develop and maintain their analytical and research capacity.

This indicator will count the unique number of organizations. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of CSOs or PSAs;

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, and municipality level), sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Component leads will gather documentation and provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; activity records/documents and other MoV.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly
**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y1)

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** February, 2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component II Indicator 2.6:</strong> Number of independent analysis of policy, law or regulation undertaken by a CSO or private sector associations through a grant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Total number of independent analysis of policy, law or regulation undertaken by a CSO or PSA through a grant during the reporting period as a result of the Program assistance.

The indicator will count each independent analysis of PLRs prepared by civil society organization or private sector associations that received grant assistance through the Program to enforce the targeted reforms. If the organization conducts different types of analyses, each will be counted separately.

This indicator will count the number of PLR analysis. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of PLR analysis prepared by CSOs or PSAs

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, and municipality level), sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Component leads will gather documentation and provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor; data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; activity records/documents and other MoV.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, if needed, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
**Data Analysis:** Quarterly

**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports

---

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y1)

---

### OTHER NOTES

---

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Component II Indicator 2.7: Number of operational peer review platform exists through Program assistance

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Total number of established, existing or institutionalized platforms for peer review and for the dissemination of RIAs and other analyses as a result of the Program assistance. The indicator will count each independent existing platform for analyses peer review developed by GOG, parliament, civil society organization or private sector associations that received assistance through the Program.

This indicator will count the number of analysis peer review platform. If the organization maintains different types of analyses peer review platforms, each will be counted separately. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of analysis peer review platforms

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, and municipality level), sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program’s implementation.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Component leads will gather documentation and provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; Activity records/documents and other MoV; implementing partners, links.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.
**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly

**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and Annual Reports

### BASELINE

Baseline data: 0

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

**Component II Indicator 2.8:** Number of CSOs or PSAs that will pass independent corporate governance and financial assessments.

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Total number of CSOs & PSAs that can provide transparent and accountable corporate governance, and ensure operational and financial sustainability. This approach will improve capacity of the organizations, supports to become self-sustaining organizations and provide more and better services to their members and other stakeholders.

Under corporate governance and financial assessments, the indicator undertakes: financial audit reports, accountability, fairness, transparency, assurance, leadership and stakeholder management tools and reports.

CSOs/PSAs: women’s groups, trade and business associations, service providers, sector associations and other organizations, that received assistance during the Program.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of CSOs/PSAs; Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, municipality level), Sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program's implementation.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Component leads will gather documentation and provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; Activity records/documents and other MoV; Implementing partners, Links

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.
### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly  
**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports  
**Review of Data:** Quarterly  
**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 0

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Component II Indicator 2.9:** Number of inclusive and constructive policy dialogues and consultations led by CSOs and PSAs held between government, the private sector, and civil society at the national, subnational, and municipal levels.

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Total number of inclusive and constructive BEE policy dialogues (public–private dialogue (PPD)) and consultations held between government, the private sector, and civil society at the national, subnational, and municipal levels.

A public–private dialogue (PPD) is a dialogue between the public sector and the private sector bringing together all stakeholders comprising of national, regional and municipality population and on other hand private sector with businesses and sectorial associations to improve understanding of the needs and advocacy capacity of the members to encourage economic development. This indicator tracks the number of such dialogues taking place at various geographic levels.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of events; Each event should be counted as one unit. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, municipality level), Sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program's implementation.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Reports of Component staff; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; Activity records/documents and other MoV; implementing partners, links

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.
## PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly

**Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports

### BASELINE

**Baseline data:** 0 (The baseline is zero as the Program will begin implementing activities for this indicator in Y1)

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component III Indicator 3.1:</strong> Number of reform areas identified in conjunction with other USAID-funded activities are analyzed, drafted and implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of reforms that are analyzed, drafted and implemented in conjunction with other USAID-funded activities and other donor-led initiatives, and that compliments on-going and future USAID/Georgia economic growth activities in analysis and drafting of laws, policies and regulations.

Number of identified reform areas should be reported if it – directly or indirectly – strengthens and is designed to enhance economic reforms and business enabling environment and the Program’s overall goals.

The indicator will count and tracks the total number reforms. Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of reforms in conjunction with other USAID-funded activities and other donor-led initiatives; Each new or revised reform should be counted as one unit.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national Level), sector.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. This indicator will be useful for program management and decision-making. It helps track overall progress of the Program's implementation.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Component staff’s reports; data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; official reports

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A

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

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Quarterly
## Presentation of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports

## Review of Data: Quarterly

## Reporting of Data: Quarterly

### BASELINE

Baseline data: 0

### OTHER NOTES

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Standard F Indicators/Crosscutting Indicator 4.1: EG.2-1** Person hours of USG-supported training completed in trade and investment. (USAID Indicator)

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s): USAID standard definition:** This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants:

\[
\text{Hours of USG supported training course} \times \text{Number of people completing that training course.}
\]

**Support from the USG:** This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay trainers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. **People:** Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. **Training:** Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training.

The indicator will count every person from GOG, CSOs or PSAs receiving the Program supported trainings on trade and investment capacity building. If one person receives several trainings on different issues, each instance will be counted separately. This indicator tracks the number of such trainings taking place at various geographic levels.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of Person hours; Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, municipality level), gender (female/male), sector

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Program training reports and participant lists; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; activity records/documents and other MoV; implementing partners, links.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The component lead will supervise this indicator and will provide to the RIA/ME&L Advisor who will review and aggregate data, assisted by Data Analysts and Component staff, if needed.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

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

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Quarterly

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

Data Analysis: Quarterly

Presentation of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports

Review of Data: Quarterly

Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports

**BASELINE**

Baseline data: 0

**OTHER NOTES**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Standard F Indicators/Crosscutting Indicator 4.2: YOUTH-1 Number of youths trained in social or leadership skills through USG assisted programs. (USAID Indicator)**

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of youth (15-29) [IM-level] participants in USG-assisted trainings designed to increase social or leadership skills.

*Youth* is a life stage when one transitions from the dependence of childhood to adulthood independence. The meaning of “youth” varies in different societies. Based on the Feed the Future youth technical guide, the 10-29 age range is used for youth while keeping in mind the concept of “life stages,” specifically 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, and 25-29 years as put forward in the USAID Youth in Development Policy. Feed the Future activities will primarily cover working age youth ages 15-29. Partners may have different age range definitions for youth based on their specific country contexts. Only youth participants who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator.

**Support from the USG:** This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay trainers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. **Training:** Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training.

The indicator will count every youth person from GOG, CSOs or PSAs receiving the Program supported trainings on social or leadership skills development. If one person receives several trainings on different issues, each instance will be counted separately. This indicator tracks the number of youth participating in trainings taking place at various geographic levels.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of youth (15-29) [IM-level]; Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, and municipality level), gender (female/male), age.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** Program training reports and participant lists; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; Activity records/documents and other MoV; implementing partners, links.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** The RIA/ME&L Advisor will review and aggregated data, if needed, supported by Data Analysts and Component staff.
DATA QUALITY ISSUES

- **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD
- **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A
- **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A
- **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** Quarterly
- **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

- **Data Analysis:** Quarterly
- **Presentation of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports
- **Review of Data:** Quarterly
- **Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and annual reports

BASELINE

- **Baseline data:** 0

OTHER NOTES

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** February, 2020
**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET**

**Standard F Indicators/Crosscutting Indicator 4.3: GNDR** - Number of persons trained with USG assistance to advance outcomes consistent with gender equality or female empowerment through their roles in public or private sector institutions or organizations. *(USAID Indicator)*

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of trained female participants in USG assisted programs designed to increase their roles and self-efficacy in public or private organizations with focus on gender equality and female empowerment.

Only female participants who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator.

**Support from the USG:** This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay trainers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. *(Training):* Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training.

The indicator will count every female participant from public or private sector institutions or organizations receiving the Program supported trainings on gender equality or female empowerment. If one person receives several trainings on different issues, each instance will be counted separately. This indicator tracks the number of female participants participating in trainings taking place at various geographic levels.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of female participants [IM-level]; Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward Program goals.

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (national, region, and municipality level), sex (female/male), age.

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome indicator

**Justification & Management Utility** Information will be used by USAID to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders. Training indicators account for the expenditure of USG funds to build country capacity. This indicator will be useful for the Program management and decision-making.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** Program training reports and participant lists; Data collection/monitoring forms.

**Data Source(s):** The Program staff and reports; Activity records/documents and other MoV; implementing partners, links.

**Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** N/A

**Responsible Individual(s) in the Program:** RIA/ME&L Advisor will review and aggregated data, if needed, supported by Data Analysts and Component staff.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A

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

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Quarterly

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: RIA/ME&L Advisor will complete random checks of data collected.

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

Data Analysis: Quarterly

Presentation of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports

Review of Data: Quarterly

Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports

**BASELINE**

Baseline data: 0

**OTHER NOTES**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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