

278028
2780260

PD-NAV-209

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES III AND IV
EVALUATION REPORT

JORDAN

Contract No:
PDC-1096-I-04-4164-00

Prepared By:
Dr. Alice L. Morton
Dr. Raymond Kitchell

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA	i
ACRONYMS	iii
EVALUATION SUMMARY	1
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	2
I. INTRODUCTION	5
A. Purpose of Evaluation	5
B. Project Background	5
C. Project Environment	6
II. FINDINGS	8
A. Current Project Status	8
1. Financial Statu	8
2. Sector/Funding Spread	10
3. Other Descriptive Data	11
B. Project Design	14
1. Definitions	14
2. Higher Level Goal	14
3. Project Purpose	15
4. Outputs	16
5. Other Design Elements	18
6. Overall Findings	18
C. Project Process	18
1. Selection Criteria and Operational Definitions	18
2. Management System for Approval	20
3. Management System for Implementation	21
4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback	21
III. CONCLUSIONS	24
A. Use of the TSFS Mechanism	24
1. Buy-ins	24
2. Development Administration	25
3. Linkage	27
4. Need for Guidelines	28

	<u>Page Number</u>
B. Relevance of TSFS Activities	29
1. Aggregate Data	30
2. Sector Allocations	30
3. Relation to Priorities	30
4. Informality/Flexibility	31
C. Need for Revised Project Design	31
1. Goal (higher level objectives)	31
2. Restatement of Purpose	32
3. Project Approach	32
4. Outputs	32
5. Indicators	33
D. Opportunities for Management Improvement	33
1. Programming and Approval Process	33
a. Ministry of Planning	33
b. Joint Programming	34
c. USAID	34
2. Implementation Process	36
a. GOJ	36
b. USAID	36
3. Evaluation and Feedback Process	37
4. Management Reporting	39
5. Management Capacity	41
E. Achievements and Outputs	42
1. Policy Dialogue/Policy Reform	42
2. Catalytic, Cutting-Edge Studies and Designs	44
3. Leverage of Other-Donor and Private Funds	44
4. Other Multiplier Effects and Linkages	45
F. Overall Effectiveness and Significance	46
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	
47	
A. Programming	47
B. Project Design	47
C. Management Improvement	48

APPENDICES

1.	Evaluation Methodology	51
2.	Statement of Work	54
3.	Projects/Studies Initiated Under TSFS by MOP	64
4.	The TSFS System - A Before and After Description	65
5.	Analysis of TSFS Evaluations	73
6.	Sectoral Breakdown Tables	75
7.	Preliminary Design of TSFS-DBMS	102
8.	TSFS Activity Completion and Assessment Report	113
9.	Criteria for Determining TSFS Activity Management Requirements	115
10.	TSFS Systems Manager - Job Description	118
11.	Financial Management and Contracting Actions	121
12.	Bibliography	124
13.	Matrix of TSFS Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	125

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Jordan
2. Project Title: Technical Services and Feasibility Studies III
3. Project Number: 278-0258 Grant
4. Project Dates:
 - a. First Project Agreement: May 2, 1982
 - b. Final Obligation: FY 87
 - c. Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD): June 30, 1987
5. Project Funding:
 - a. AID Bilateral Funding (Grant and/or Loan): \$5,000,000
 - b. Other Major Donors: n/a
 - c. Host Country Counterpart Funds: \$1,700,000

TOTAL: \$6,700,000
6. Mode of Implementation: (Host Country or AID Direct Contract?)
Both
7. Project Design:
8. Responsible Mission Officials: USAID/Amman, GOJ

Project Officer - formally PROG, now PDO

 - a. Mission Director(s): Bolinger, Gower, Reade
 - b. Project Officer(s): George Ishaq, Aylette Villemain
9. Previous Evaluation(s): Project-level: none
10. Cost of Present Evaluation:

	<u>Person Days</u>	<u>Dollar Costs</u>
a. Direct Hire:		
(1) AID/W TDY:	1	
(2) USAID Staff:	5	
b. Contract:	30	
c. Other:		

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Jordan
2. Project Title: Technical Services and Feasibility Studies IV
3. Project Number: 278-0260 Grant
4. Project Dates:
 - a. First Project Agreement: June 20, 1984
 - b. Final Obligation: FY 87
 - c. Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD): March 31, 1988
5. Project Funding:
 - a. AID Bilateral Funding (Grant and/or Loan): \$5,000,000
 - b. Other Major Donors: n/a
 - c. Host Country Counterpart Funds: \$1,700,000

TOTAL: \$6,700,000
6. Mode of Implementation: (Host Country or AID Direct Contract?)
Both
7. Project Design:
8. Responsible Mission Officials: USAID/Amman, GOJ
Project Officer - formally PROG, now PDO
 - a. Mission Director(s): Bolinger, Gower, Reade
 - b. Project Officer(s): George Ishaq, Aylette Villemain
9. Previous Evaluation(s): Project-level: none
10. Cost of Present Evaluation:

	<u>Person Days</u>	<u>Dollar Costs</u>
a. Direct Hire:		
(1) AID/W TDY:	1	
(2) USAID Staff:	5	
b. Contract:	30	
c. Other:		

ACRONYMS

AID	Agency for International Development
AID/W	Washington, D.C. Headquarters of AID
ANE	Bureau for Asia and the Near East
ARDO	Office of Agriculture and Rural Development
C&R	Communications and Records
CDSS	Country Development Strategy Statement
CIP	Commodity Import Program
CONT	Controller's Office
EEE	Engineering, Energy and Environment Office
GOJ	Government of Jordan
HG	Host Government
HPN	Office of Health, Population and Nutrition
JIM	Jordan Institute of Management
JTV	Jordan Television
MOP	Ministry of Planning
NPC	National Planning Commission
NRA	Natural Resources Authority
PACD	Project Activity Completion Date
PO	Project Officer
PDO	Project Development Office
PID	Project Identification Document
PIO/T	Project Implementation Order/Technical
PP	Project Paper
PROG	Program Office
RLA	Regional Legal Advisor
TA	Technical Assistance
TSFS	Technical Services and Feasibility Studies
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development/Field Mission
USG	Government of the United States
USGS	United States Geological Service
WAJ	Water Authority of Jordan

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Evaluation Abstract

TSFS Projects III and IV allow USAID/Amman and the Government of Jordan (GOJ) to program funds jointly for feasibility studies, project and program identification and design, technical advisory services, policy reform support, public sector support of private sector development, across sectors and in amounts ranging from \$2000 to \$ one million or more (e.g., for a package of assistance to develop policy and strategy for a new sector such as energy). The major evaluation's findings and conclusions are:

- Project management has improved significantly over time, but especially in the past six months, since a TSFS Review Committee has been established to set priorities, define selection criteria, and approve or disapprove requests from the GOJ in excess of \$10,000.
- With marginal improvements, project and activity management can be strengthened, especially in the areas of monitoring and evaluation and reporting, within the Mission, in the GOJ, and from USAID/Jordan to AID/W.
- Greater attention should now be given to outputs of activities and the project as a whole, rather than only to inputs, as has largely been the case in the past.
- No significant increase in management load is found for TSFS III and IV as against other types of projects; it may decrease with Mission adoption of the streamlining recommendations made by the evaluation team.
- Since TSFS III, IV and V are being programmed concurrently, it is suggested that funds remaining unearmarked or uncommitted in III and IV be eventually moved to V, using deob/reob authority, so that there will be one TSFS project which will subsequently be amended as needed to increase funding levels. Review of III and IV indicates a possible \$500,000 of earmarked but uncommitted and unexpended funds that can be made available for reprogramming under an expanded V.
- The project purpose should be restated, to make it more meaningful, to reflect the programmatic adaptation of the mechanism to changing Jordanian conditions and to relate it more closely to the selection criteria currently being applied.
- The Mission should decide beyond what funding level, duration and other criteria a proposed activity should be designed and funded as a discrete project, rather than as a package or activity under TSFS.
- Where geopolitical and developmental conditions warrant it, this kind of quick-reponse mechanism should be instituted for other country programs, if there is sufficient confidence in HG management ability and if economic and policy constraints can be relaxed using a flexible and fast-moving instrument such as this.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Requesting Office: A/ANE

Purpose of Activities Evaluated: To provide funding for jointly-programmed and Mission-programmed activities in project identification and design, feasibility studies, technical assistance, and evaluation in support of improved effectiveness and efficiency of public sector services and investments contemplated in the 1986-1990 Five Year Development Plan of the GOJ.

Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology Used: To ascertain whether this project mechanism is performing the functions for which it was designed, i.e., overcoming key GOJ constraints, assisting in creating linkages with other AID, GOJ and other-donor funding so as to have a multiplier effect while using relatively small amounts of funds for increased leverage. The Mission also wished assistance in creating a project data base and improving the management system which has recently been revised. The two-person team combined interviews, document review, and administration of 64 activity questionnaires to create the data base, assess activity relevance, utilization and significance, and to make suggestions for management improvements. The AID/W PD Project Officer assisted with financial and program management findings and recommendations, as he was on TDY with the team.

Findings and Conclusions: The team's overall assessment is that the TSFS project mechanism, as well as the majority of specific activities funded under TSFS projects III and IV, have been effective, and that utilization and relevance are good. The mechanism has been used to facilitate program and project identification, design, implementation and monitoring activities within the USAID—and involving the Ministry of Plan (MOP) and executing agencies of the GOJ—in meaningful and largely efficient ways. It has also been used to fund activities undertaken by the GOJ that have in turn played either a catalytic, bridging, institutional development or "cutting edge" role in technology development and transfer, development administration, planning, or in support of policy dialogue and policy reform.

In line with this assessment, however, the team recommends that there be some revision in project design and rationalization, closing out projects III and IV and moving remaining funds through deob/reob into an expanded project V, which would have a new and continuing purpose statement as follows:

To create opportunities for policy dialogue on important issues with the GOJ, maximize the use of limited AID funds through selective leverage, and seek cost-effective linkages with planned and on-going development projects in areas of current priority concern to the GOJ and the USG.

While the purpose would remain the same over time, the project approach, as developed in the Project Paper amendment justifying each new obligation of funds, could be revised to reflect changes in CDSS objectives, new problem areas selected for priority attention, etc.

Since this is an umbrella project—or even more accurately, a programming mechanism—indicators at the purpose level cannot be the same as EOPS for a more finite project. These indicators will depend on AID/W understanding and support of this kind of mechanism, and on a project information system that will provide data on activity outputs and their use on a regular, cumulative basis and sometimes after-the-fact. Indicators of outputs will involve the prior specification of the outputs at the earmarking stage in terms of their desired type, magnitude and quality, with measurement or verification of these features upon activity completion.

The evaluation team gave considerable attention to the management process for TSFS projects III and IV (and now, V) both within the USAID and in the MOP and executing agencies of the GOJ, as requested. Descriptions of the past and present management systems in the USAID, and a description of some of the main features of that characteristic of the MOP are given.

The evaluation reaches a number of conclusions and recommendations on the development of a project data base management system, activity and project monitoring, and appropriate planning for assessment and evaluation at the activity and project levels. Forms are included for data gathering at the approval, implementation, and completion stages, and for periodic reporting to AID/W.

Financial management is also given attention in the evaluation report, with suggestions made for improvements in monitoring and reporting, in addition to combining remaining project III and IV funds under an expanded project V. The review of existing financial records indicates that as much as \$500,000 may be made available for reprogramming using this approach.

Using the data base constructed with data from 64 activity questionnaires, as well as in-depth interviews with GOJ officials, the MOP, and executing agencies with Mission staff and contracted TA, the team concludes that the outputs of most activities funded under projects III and IV have been useful and used by the recipients as intended, that the flexibility of the mechanism is an important feature, but that improvements in financial and program management systems will make it more fast-moving than it is at present. These improvements will need to take place within the GOJ as well as in the USAID, and more timely support will be required from AID/W in some areas. Still, a major finding is that insufficient attention has been paid in the past to the nature and quality of outputs as against a stress on programming inputs, and that this should now change.

Selection criteria have changed over time, and the team recommends that with some modifications, those being applied now to requests received under project V be maintained, and that the Review Committee work with the GOJ to develop more clearly understood guidelines for the scope, duration, content, funding level and management of requests; that these be jointly reviewed and revised periodically, and communicated clearly to GOJ executing agencies.

The supposition outside the USAID that this mechanism is highly labor-intensive and burdensome was not borne out by the evaluation. If some of the team's recommendations for streamlining are accepted, and replicated in the GOJ, it is likely that it will become less management-intensive. The improvements already put in place by the USAID have helped in this area, especially delegating authority for approval of requests up to \$10,000 to the Project Officer (PO), and instituting monthly meetings of a Project Review Committee, with formal agenda and minutes.

The role of the TSFS Project Officer needs to be re-examined in terms of recent Mission-initiated improvements and of those suggestions of the evaluation report that are accepted. It should become a more active and substantive one in programming, monitoring and evaluation. The PO's position description should be reviewed once the proposed local-hire project assistant is on board, so that this PO role becomes more clearly that of systems manager and implementation monitor than is presently the case. At the same time, the grade/experience level and organizational location of the TSFS PO should also be reconsidered. Allocation of activity management among the technical offices and the PDO project officers should also be rationalized.

An attempt should be made to review the mechanism through which funds are jointly programmed so that the MOP is not put in the position of requesting approval and the USAID of approving or disapproving. The current mechanism goes against the spirit of joint programming under TSFS and also creates inefficiencies.

Lessons Learned: Mechanisms of this kind, which began as projectized PD&S funds, increase USAID's ability to respond flexibly and quickly to a range of requests from the host government (HG), and to maintain responsiveness as AID and HG priorities and needs change. As AID funding levels decrease, TSFS and similar projects may be the only or major form of this scarce resource to remain for programming. Project mechanisms of this type should be encouraged where geopolitical concerns and HG management capacity warrant this sort of flexibility.

Where flexibility and speed of funding disbursement are given high priority, attention to implementation monitoring and output assessment tend to suffer. A shift of attention to implementation and outputs may actually increase flexibility rather than reducing it, as is sometimes feared.

Attempting to introduce a project management data base and a system derived from it in the context of a three-week evaluation is not maximally efficient. The USAID and HG counterparts need more time to participate in data base development, and to review and adjust their concepts of data-related priorities and needs than is available in such a context.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Evaluation

This evaluation, which was requested by AID/W during the review of the USAID/Amman Action Plan for FY 1987, is intended to "improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Technical Services and Feasibility Studies (TSFS) and TSFS-like projects". It is anticipated that the evaluation results will be used to assist USAID/Amman and the Government of Jordan (GOJ) in measuring the effectiveness of the TSFS mechanism in:

"Delivering technical assistance versus providing the same through a discrete bilateral project;

"Providing technical assistance in support of other donors, particularly World Bank (IBRD) sector programs, in energy planning, urban transportation and private voluntary organizations (e.g., Catholic Relief Services); and

"Identifying weaknesses that need to be addressed in designing and implementing TSFS sub-projects (original evaluation scope of work)".

From the USAID/Amman point of view, the evaluation was intended to assist in refining improvements already undertaken by the Mission in management of the TSFS projects, and to propose additional modifications that might assist the Mission and the GOJ to improve project management while maintaining the characteristic flexibility of the TSFS project mechanism. The Mission was interested in assistance from the evaluation team in assessing the selection criteria that had in fact been used over the life of Projects III and IV (1982 to the present) in order to provide, if appropriate, for modification of these criteria given changes in Mission and GOJ policy objectives and in the project environment.

Both AID clients for the evaluation were interested in the team's assessment, on the basis of data gathering and analysis, of the utility of the TSFS mechanism in the context of declining GOJ and AID resources, set against the background of continuing geopolitical concerns and U.S. foreign policy objectives in Jordan and the region. This assessment would be helpful both for decisions about further funding for TSFS in Jordan and funding of similar project mechanisms in other AID programs. (See Appendices Nos. 1 and 2 for "Evaluation Methodology" and "Statement of Work".)

B. Project Background

TSFS-like projects exist in other AID country programs, including those in Pakistan, Philippines, Jamaica, and Tunisia. They began to be designed and approved in the 1970's in the Asia Bureau as a way of projectizing Project Design and Support (PD&S) funds so that Missions would have a flexible mechanism to fund project and program support activities, including short-term technical assistance (TA), pre-implementation studies and the like without having to engage in full-scale project design with attendant AID/Washington review and approval and concomitant delays in activity start-up.

Such projectizing of PD&S funds was and remains a way for Missions to ensure against declines in regional PD&S when AID appropriations are delayed, and resulting Continuing Resolutions limit these and other non-project funds. Similarly, with increasing shortages in Operation Expense (OE) funds available to the Agency across the board, and the recently-approved recourse to program funds to meet some of the attendant gaps, TSFS-like mechanisms can allow a Mission commensurately more flexibility even than before.

A further dimension of the approval of projectized PD&S by AID/W appears to be the foreign policy context and geopolitical significance of the USG-Host Country relationship of which a particular USAID's program is a part. In the case of Jordan, where geopolitical concerns are quite significant, the TSFS project allows the Mission to support foreign policy objectives on a flexible and timely basis using ESF funds for broadly-defined developmental purposes in support of key GOJ priorities. Historically, the TSFS mechanism for Jordan appears to have been approved at the time when it was thought that USAID assistance would be phased out, and the project and activities it was likely to fund were conditioned by that assumption for some time.

In the present, where a host country's national budgetary resources are declining, as is the case in Jordan, and where sometimes difficult policy reforms are newly required, TSFS-like projects can be used to fund focussed or catalytic activities in support of such reforms. This has been the case in TSFS III and IV, as will be seen below.

C. Project Environment

The USAID/Amman FY 1988 CDSS and the FY 1987 Action Plan stress project activities in support of key economic reorientations on the part of the GOJ, in an environment of growing balance of payments deficits, decreasing guest labor opportunities in the oil-producing countries of the Gulf, declining trade and exports due to the Iraq-Iran war, and related increases in unemployment within Jordan.

The policy orientation proposed by the Mission's analysis to assist the GOJ to mitigate the effect of these economic constraints is increased emphasis on, and development of, private sector initiatives, and privatization of some GOJ entities and activities. At the sector level, the Mission is shifting away from its long-term support of irrigated agriculture in the Jordan Valley, toward an increased emphasis on agricultural marketing, the coordination at the national and sub-national levels of applied agriculture research, and stress on rainfed agriculture in the highlands, a subsector heretofore largely neglected.

In human resources development, the objective is to assist the educational system to reorient toward new approaches that will enable young Jordanians leaving the formal educational system to have attained skills that will be marketable both at home and abroad. This includes efforts to improve the capabilities of Jordanian higher education to meet private sector requirements.

In population and health, the Mission is continuing to support policy change in the area of family planning through a modified approach focussing on birth spacing. This is done in the context of an emphasis on primary health care and maternal child health. Project activities have been in the area of health education and will continue in reinforcing nurses training in support of these reorientations of the

health care sector. Private sector orientations are being pursued here as well through support to the Jordanian National Family Planning Association from the Margaret Sanger Center.

A remaining emphasis of the program, on a more consolidated basis than in past years, is that on water and wastewater. The program has in the past been heavily involved in this area under a series of bilateral projects. To meet future needs, the Mission's strategy seeks to improve efficiency in the use of past investments through improvements in operations and maintenance, conservation, including through more economic water pricing, and expanding knowledge about ground and surface water resources.

Private sector initiatives, as well as forming a key policy dialogue agenda, and being integrated into other-sector activities, form the core of a new initiative under the Private Enterprises Technical Resources Assistance (PETRA) project. Together with the CIP program, funded under the 1985 Supplemental Appropriation, and some aspects of the Housing and Urban Development Program, PETRA provides significant funding and technical support for a wide variety of private sector activities and private sector development.

In this policy and project environment, TSFS III, IV and now V, provide a variety of types of assistance to the public sector in its efforts to deal more effectively with the growing private sector initiative, while at the same time maintaining some assistance to public sector agencies that have received bilateral project support in the past, and beginning assistance to other entities that are attempting cutting-edge or catalytic activities that can lead on to more significant activities funded by the GOJ or by AID and/or other donors. As will be seen in Chapters II and III of this report, activities funded under TSFS III and IV have in many instances played precisely this catalytic role, and have allowed the USAID—with relatively low-cost efforts—to stimulate successful, larger-scale projects and programs and to leverage large amounts of other-donor funding, as well as related business opportunities for U.S. private sector firms.

II. FINDINGS

A. Current Project Status

1. Financial Status

As of December 31, 1986 the financial status of the overall TSFS programs (projects III, IV and V), was as follows:

	<u>AUTHORIZED LOP</u>	<u>OBLIGATED TO DATE</u>	<u>MORTGAGE</u>	<u>CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>PIPELINE</u>	<u>% PIPELINE OBLIGATIONS</u>
TSFS III (0258)	5,000	5,000	-0-	4,680.5	319.4	6.39%
TSFS IV (0260)	7,150	7,150	-0-	5,077.6	2,072.3	28.98%
TSFS V (0266)	<u>7,000</u>	<u>6,723</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>100.1</u>	<u>6,014.5</u>	<u>98.51%</u>
TOTALS	19,150	18,873	277	9,858.2	9,014.5	47.76%

The three projects have, collectively, demonstrated an ability to rapidly expend funds. The figure below shows levels of unprogrammed funds to total obligations:

	<u>DATE AUTHORIZED</u>	<u>PACD</u>	<u>TOTAL OBLIGATIONS</u>	<u>TOTAL UNPROGRAMMED</u>	<u>% UNPROGRAMMED TO TOTAL OBLIGATIONS</u>
TSFS III (0258)	5/2/82	6/30/87	5,000	35,223.6	0.7%
TSFS IV (0260)	6/20/84	3/31/88	7,150	143,870.2	2.0%
TSFS V (0266)	6/30/86	6/30/90	6,723	1,457,129.0	21.6%

The rapid programming process reflects, at least superficially, aggressive implementation action on the part of the Mission to define priorities and secure GOJ agreement on them. However, these numbers mask a significant financial management problem. A cursory review of basic financial data might suggest a tightness of funding which could justify higher levels of obligation each year. On the other hand, an element-by-element review of the TSFS budget suggests delays in converting earmarks to actual commitments (e.g., contracts, grants, purchase orders, etc.), and reveals that there are numerous completed elements/activities against which actions should be taken to decommit leftover funding. Table I demonstrates this aspect more clearly.

TABLE I

	(A) <u>TOTAL</u> <u>OBLIGATIONS</u>	(B) <u>PACD</u>	(C) <u>TOTAL</u> <u>UNEARMARKED</u>	(D) <u>TOTAL</u> <u>UNCOMMITTED</u>	(E) <u>TOTAL</u> <u>UNEARMARKED</u>	(F) <u>TOTAL</u>	(G) <u>(F) AS</u> <u>% of (A)</u>
TSFS III (0258)	5 000,000	6/30/87	35,223.6	121,169.1	163,054.8	319,447.5	6.3%
TSFS IV (0260)	7 150,000	3/31/88	395,475.5	615,078.8	1,064,790.6	2,072,344.6	28.9%
TSFS V (0266)	<u>6,723,000</u>	6/30/90	<u>5,191,472.1</u>	<u>841,000.0</u>	<u>590,413.9</u>	<u>6,622,886.0</u>	<u>98.5%</u>
TOTAL	18,873,000		5,619,170.9	1,577,247.9	1,818,259.3	9,014,678.1	47.7%

*Includes unprogrammed amounts, plus programmed amounts yet to be earmarked in PIO/T or PII.

Table I, read in conjunction with the above two figures, suggests that substantial amounts of funding may actually be available from TSFS III and IV. The amounts may range from a minimum of \$180,000 in unprogrammed funds in the two projects to \$427,700 of as-yet-unearmarked funding, to as much as \$736,200 of funds which are earmarked but are not yet committed. To these amounts should be added a portion of the almost \$1.3 million in unexpended funds from those two projects.

Determining how much of the unexpended portion actually reflects funds in commitment instruments excess to need is a serious management problem facing the Mission. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that most of the contract/PASA instruments where this money may be found are managed in AID/W where they were executed. Mission requests for "scrubbing" these contracts to determine unexpended amounts, some of which are 18 months to two years old, have gone unanswered by M/SER/AAM. Overall, an aggressive decommitment exercise by the Mission for all expired contracts could recover, conservatively, about \$400,000. Thus, combining unprogrammed, all or part of unearmarked, and uncommitted amounts, and decommitting funds excess to specific contract needs, could yield TSFS resources for new programming of, roughly, an additional \$500,000.

2. Sector/Funding Spread

Appendix No. 6 contains the Controller's print-out of a sectoral breakdown of the programming of TSFS III and IV as requested by the team. In terms of total earmarking of funds, the financial data show a substantial shift in sectoral emphasis summarized as follows:

MAJOR INCREASES

<u>SECTOR</u>	<u>TSFS III</u>	<u>TSFS IV</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
Private and Mixed Sector Support	363,136	1,795,494	+ 494
Energy	90,000	1,577,857	+1,753
Housing and Urban Development	69,261	845,867	+1,221
Health and Population	74,731	502,432	+ 672

MAJOR DECREASES

Agricultural and Rural Dev.	1,341,368	563,419	- 58
Transportation	803,000	100,500	-1,251
Water and Waste Water	647,403	68,000	-1,050

The team is unable to determine how much of these shifts in emphasis reflects a determined programmed effort and how much is due to "happen-stance" or "targets of opportunity".

3. Other Descriptive Data

As part of the evaluation process, non-financial descriptive data were accumulated, some for the first time. As the checklist was not pre-tested, (there were some definitional problems and subsequent lack of answers) the results must be qualified accordingly. Nevertheless, the following information is deemed relevant and indicative, based on a sample of up to 66 activities.

PRIORITY AREAS

On an activity distribution basis, the following picture emerges:

<u>Priority Sectors</u>		<u>Priority Areas</u>	
Private Enterprise	4	Science and Technology	11
Agriculture	9	Energy	4
Water and Waste Water	7	Transportation	1
Human Resources	11	Women in Development	1
Health and Population	10	PVOs	0
Urban Development and Housing	1	Environment	0
		Other	3

For meaningful analysis, however, the distribution data must be combined with the cost of each activity. When this is done*, health and population is not within the five sector/areas exceeding \$1,000,000 and human resources and science and technology get lost in the breakdown.

If we apply retroactively the functional goals which first appeared in the TSFS V Project Paper, the following pattern emerges:

Technology Transfer	25
Policy Reform	1
Institutional Development	13
Private Sector Development	1
Address Program Evaluation Concerns	0
Fund Evaluation, Assessment, Financial Management or Audit Activities	0
Fund CDSS-related Studies and Sector Assessments	1
Facilitate Studies in Support of Policy Dialogue	0
Analyze Institutional or Technical Constraints	4
Provide for/Facilitate Project Design, Feasibility Studies, Operations, Research, Pilot Testing of Hypothesis, Finalization of Project Design	6
Allow for Pre-Implementation or Budgetary Activities	1

In this scenario, most activities are grouped under technology transfer and institutional development which, in combination with the above information, does not give the impression of a very focussed effort and/or clear objectives and definitions for operational purposes.

*A DBMS will permit display of many different combinations of data on demand.

TYPE OF ACTIVITY

The data on the types of activities financed under TSFS III and IV are more illuminating and perhaps surprising, as can be seen:

Prefeasibility Study	0	Evaluation	3
Feasibility Study	3	Tender Preparation	1
Pre-Investment Study	0	Sector/Subsector	
Technical Study	3	Assessment	4
Technical Advisory		Environmental/Social	
Services	31	Assessment	0
Management Study	0	Invitational Travel	8
Pre-Implementation	0	Commodities	2
Design	4	Other	3

It is noteworthy that 50% of the activities were devoted to technical advisory services and only three were concerned with studies of a pre-investment nature according to responses of activity monitoring staff.

LINKAGE

In the 45 responses received on this category, there were a total of 20 linkages to other projects reported. Of these 20, ten were concerned with preparation assistance, four were supplemental to on-going projects, and two concerned follow-up, both to "other donor" projects.

ACTIVITY SIZE

It is also interesting to note the distribution of TSFS activities by size, i.e., the amount earmarked:

\$0 - 10,000	16	\$100,000 - 250,000	13
\$10,000 - 50,000	11	\$250,000	11
\$50,000 - 100,000	10	\$500,000	5
		\$1,000,000	1

Thus, we see that 29 out of 66 activities in TSFS III and IV were earmarked at above \$100,000 while 37 were less, some appreciably so. Of this total, 46 have been completed. Also of note is the fact that 24 of these activities had received prior TSFS funding, six of them amounting to \$50,000 or more. Of equal interest is the fact that in 45 of these activities, additional TSFS funding is contemplated, indicating that once they've "gone to the trough", it's difficult to cut them off.

SOURCE OF REQUEST

Insofar as the USAID is concerned, most requests (35) originated or were facilitated by USAID/Amman. One case originated with the U.S. Ambassador, another from AID/W and four from other USG agencies. On the GOJ side, 28 originated in the technical ministries, five from independent authorities, one from the private sector and, of note, 11 from the MOP. (See Appendix No. 3 for list of projects or studies initiated by MOP.)

BENEFICIARIES

It is clear that the overwhelming majority (26) of direct beneficiaries of TSFS activity have been GOJ agencies. Six have concerned private sector organizations, 12 urban/rural organizations and 9 the economy in general.

MANAGEMENT

The data collected on the method of implementation are incomplete, but the USAID was the apparent agent in 30 activities with AID/W in nine. The GOJ implemented about the same amount, i.e., 36. Data on the selected instrument are poor, with IQC/8A, PASAs, PSC and purchase orders being most frequently used; in the case of the GOJ, of HC contracts and purchase orders were both used.

Attempts to obtain information on the manpower efforts required in each major step were even less successful, partly because of memory lapse or because the activity officer was no longer present (there were over 20 non-responses). However, the spread and "approximate time" in person-days is of some interest (Note: does not include "No" or "zero" entries).

Preparation of Request and Backup		Intervention/Support	
Spread	1.0-12 Days	Spread	1-2 Days
Average	8.5 Days	Average	5.9 Days
Securing GOJ Approvals		Reporting	
Spread	0.5-10 Days	Spread	1-2 Days
Average	4.5 Days	Average	1.4 Days
Securing USAID Approval		Evaluation	
Spread	1-7 Days	Spread	2-5 Days
Average	3.6 Days	Average	3.3 Days
Briefings		Follow-Up	
Spread	0.5-5 Days	Spread	.5-7 Days
Average	2.9 Days	Average	2.5 Days
Monitoring		Debriefings	
Spread	1-10 Days	Spread	1-3 Days
Average	4.9 Days	Average	1.5 Days

If we combine the average times shown above by the three major phases of TSFS management, we get the following:

Approval	16.6 Person Days
Implementation	15.1 Person Days
Completion	<u>7.3 Person Days</u>
 TOTAL	 39.0 Person Days

There is no way, at present, to relate this type of data to the size, duration or type of TSFS activity. Combined with the testimony of the current activity officers, however, there is no basis to conclude that, overall, the management effort required is excessive vis-a-vis any alternative methods. On the contrary, the important question is whether adequate management oversight is being maintained according to the requirements of a specific activity or "mini-project".

GENERAL FINDINGS

Based on the information collected, which is summarized above, the following statements may be made with some degree of confidence:

- The programming of activities under TSFS III and IV continued a long-time Mission concern with infrastructure and institutional development.
- In terms of type of activities financed, there has been a large proportion of use of the TSFS instrument for technical advisory services.
- Linkage with other projects has been good and the MOP is beginning to take a more active role in initiating requests according to national plan priorities.
- The use of programming data is limited because of definitional problems, lack of specification, and non-recording of useful data.
- Programming and management data analysis is also limited because the present information system does not: a) collect and record basic data; or b) permit manipulation and analysis of more than two variables.
- It is not uncommon for a TSFS activity to have received prior and/or subsequent TSFS funding, a phenomenon which may reduce the flexibility and responsiveness of the programming mechanism.

B. Project Design

1. Definition

"Project" is a management concept born in the attempt to plan and manage large and complicated research and development efforts in the post-World War II period. It permitted a manager to cross over functional break-downs, e.g., engineering, cost accounting, etc., and coordinate work activities to reach a specific objective on schedule and within allocated funds. Succinctly stated, a project involves the specification of a clear, one-time objective which is recognizable when achieved (i.e., it does not involve repetitive or continuous activity), which can be reached in a definite time-period, and within a given set of resources. As such, it has a beginning (baseline) and an ending, e.g., the missile system is ready for deployment.

There are many activities which, for administrative and accounting convenience, have been designated as projects. Problems arise when policy and procedures which were developed for "real" projects are applied, without adaptation, to these non-project activities. It is a major finding of this evaluation that such a situation exists with the TSFS "project".

2. Higher Level Goal

The TSFS III Project Paper does not include a specific goal statement. The subsequent project papers do, however, as follows:

TSFS IV

"The goal of this project is improvement in the GOJ's overall development performance, expansion of its economic and social development base, increase its development gains and, consequently, reduction in its dependence on foreign AID".

TSFS V

"To strengthen the Government of Jordan's ability to implement its proposed development program."

The first statement above represents flawed logic and an incorrect application of the logframe. The project has a purpose or objective not a goal. It is hypothesized to have some significant effect on a higher-level objective or goal but which is outside the project itself.

The TSFS V statement is an improvement in logic, if lacking in detail. It is so generic that, in effect, AID/W is being asked to accept the justification on faith, which is risky business in a context of increased competition for a declining level of resources.

3. Project Purpose

It is at the purpose level that one explains "what" the project itself is intended to accomplish, supported by statements of "how" it will be done. Ideally, the statement would be supported by baseline data, i.e., what the current conditions are, and by EOPS or success indicators of the conditions which should exist at project completion. The more open-ended the purpose statement is, the more difficult it is to demonstrate that the project is successful or significant or has just picked up a life of its own. The truth of this statement is demonstrated by the purpose statements included in the Project Papers, repeated as follows:

TSFS III

"The services to be provided are intended to assist the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (GOJ) with the identification, development, appraisal execution, and evaluation of priority development activities."

TSFS IV

"The purpose of this project is enhanced design and execution of the GOJ's development programs through the provision of consultants and experts on policy issues and transfer of technology."

TSFS V

To improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public sector services and investments contemplated in the Five Year Development Plan (1986-1990).

The first statement describes the type of activities to be funded, based on the activities usually included in PD and S funds. The TSFS IV statement adds the means. i.e., through the provision of consultants and experts

with circular rather than linear logic. The TSFS V statement is the first attempt to focus the purpose statement on GOJ goals. It is however, very broad and fails to refer, even indirectly, to U.S. objectives to which this "project" is a very important contributor.

4. Outputs

a. As Described in Project Papers

Outputs, i.e., the results of the work that has been funded by TSFS, are not mentioned in the TSFS III Project Paper. Only an illustrative list of proposed activities is included. In TSFS IV, under the "output" heading, a very brief description of the reports and recommendations which led to the development and implementation of larger activities is given. Meaningful information on outputs produced by TSFS-funded activities and their subsequent use is very sketchy and, because of this, somewhat unconvincing to the uninformed reader. A similar situation exists in the TSFS Project Paper V description. However, according to the PP, it differs from previous TSFS projects in that the Mission has more sharply defined "functional objectives." TSFS activities must now contribute to at least one of the following:

- Improve Jordan's knowledge of its physical and natural environment;
- Refine the policy and infrastructure environment to broaden private sector participation in the economy (including studies of potential opportunities for privatization);
- Upgrade development management capabilities to improve the quality and effective delivery of government goods and services;
- Policy analysis and dialogue;
- Development of projects (including feasibility studies, design and pilot activities) and evaluation.

In none of the three Project Papers are outputs/results actually described. Insofar as planned outputs are concerned, given the nature of this instrument this is understandable, and the proposed or illustrative list, couched more in terms of expected results, should be sufficient. The absence of descriptions of actual past results is more difficult to understand. TSFS V represents an attempt to add more precise selection criteria that more appropriately belong at the purpose level. Output statements show what was actually produced, or they should.

b. As May Be Derived

The data collection, monitoring, reporting and evaluation system used for TSFS from its inception has been input (e.g., budgets, contracts, consultants, international travel orders, commodities) and activity (e.g., work to be or being performed)-oriented with little apparent or

documented evidence of management concern with the type, magnitude or quality of the outputs or their eventual use. This is not, unfortunately, a phenomenon unique to TSFS and PD and S "projects", or to USAID/Jordan.

The absence of an appropriate data collection, monitoring, reporting and evaluation system, a major finding, will be discussed in the next section. The point to be made here is that the problem may be primarily one of documentation and not of deficient results. Within its scope of work, including time and staffing constraints, the evaluation team attempted to make a rapid assessment of output production and use by the intended recipients based on those activities which were: (1) included in the sample files reviewed; (2) managed by Jordanians who were interviewed; and (3) were subject to evaluation (see Appendix 5). Based on this sample, some examples of small-scale outputs produced under completed TSFS III and IV activities, include:

- (1) Needs assessment completed including a plan for a computerized data bank for the Water Authority of Jordan. Consultant also assisted WAJ in evaluating bid proposals for an IBRD - financed computer purchase.
- (2) Consultant performed a meter study for the Amman Water Supply Agency (AWSA) which identified a major problem leading to a subsequent important tariff study on user-charges.
- (3) International standards established for the review of design and technical specifications for water and sewer systems.
- (4) Model developed for analysis of North Jordan resources. Contractor also requested to evaluate proposal based on his recommendations. IBRD financed package which includes hardware, software, system design and training.
- (5) Input assessment and subsequent updating, of development in Jordan Valley for use by Ministry of Planning and JVA.
- (6) As pre-project activity through an invitational travel order, Director of Jordan Institute of Management (JIM) developed linkages with similar institutions in Asia and USA, received help in organizing the JIM and exchanged materials on training.
- (7) Computer specialist assisted JIM in developing requirements for a computer training program for industry. JIM did the market survey and specialist concentrated on hardware. Program instituted.

The more complicated and longer activities, sometimes called "mini-projects" usually contain a number of outputs. The more there are, the more likely their description may be confused with inputs and tasks. However, in most cases they can be derived from statements in the scope-of-work of contractors and job descriptions for consultants.

evaluation reports suggests a common problem, i.e., failure to describe outputs in meaningful terms and to construct them in terms of the activity function, i.e., institution-building, direct-support, etc. These problems only become significant in the management of "mini-projects". In the more limited, i.e., short-term and low-cost activities, it is primarily a completion reporting problem and is easily resolved.

5. Other Design Elements

According to the statements in the PPs for TSFS III and IV, "Given the wide range of activities which may be undertaken in support of Jordan's development efforts, it is impossible to identify and quantify project beneficiaries". TSFS V admits the process is difficult but inferentially agrees that immediate or direct beneficiaries can be identified. It also adds that TSFS activities are the Mission's principal vehicle for addressing women in development concerns.

Only in the TSFS IV PP was an attempt made to identify initial assumptions but this was done at the goal rather than the purpose level and, as such, was of little programming or operational significance.

6. Overall Finding

In the "Summary and Analysis" part of the Project Paper for TSFS IV, it is stated that at an August 3, 1983 meeting to review the status of on-going projects, it was agreed that the project does not lend itself to the standard FP format and should be designed along the lines of the TSFS III PP. As such, the economic and social analysis sections were deleted from the outline. (Note: Logframe matrices are not attached to any TSFS PP).

In the TSFS V PP, the Mission repeats previous statements about the difficulty in predicting the actual number of activities to be supported by TSFS and adds, consequently, the project does not lend itself to the standard logframe concept since USAID cannot define objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) and means of verification (MOV) for studies and services yet to be identified.

While this is very true, it does not explain why this attempt to identify OVI and the MOV, or their equivalent, is also missing from the approval and implementation stages when specific activities or "mini-projects" are identified. In short, not enough considered thought and consensus seems yet to have been given as to what elements of the logframe are relevant to TSFS, and how they can be applied in the approval, implementation and evaluation stages.

C. Project Process

1. Selection Criteria and Operational Definitions

One of the major issues articulated by AID/W in proposing this evaluation was whether the Mission had a sense of strategic priorities in programming TSFS resources. The image of the program, developed over time, is one of numbers of ad hoc activities justified under the general rubric of helping the Government of Jordan implement its development plan.

The progression of TSFS from III to V has afforded the Mission an opportunity to make its "agenda" for use of project resources more specific, and make more "operational" the criteria for funding specific activities. Under TSFS III, and for most of II, a written record was lacking (except for PILs) which created institutional "lose" of how funding decisions were arrived at. With the location of project management responsibility and coordination in a single Project Officer, the Mission has begun to modify its decision-making process and build a body of decision precedents. Although the process remains somewhat ad hoc, it is coming to grips with the need to make strategic choices for increasingly limited funding.

It is important to record here how the USAID has already modified its strategic priorities for using TSFS resources. It is also important to remember that III, IV and V are still being programmed concurrently. The Mission has identified five programmatic uses for TSFS V:

- Project Development, Pilot Projects and Project Evaluation
- Policy Studies
- Upgrade Development Management Capabilities
- Public Sector Support for Private Sector Development
- Improve knowledge of Jordan's Natural and Physical Environment

These statements do not fully articulate the scope of what USAID/Jordan has decided to exclude from its universe of funding priorities. A review of the minutes of the Review Committee and discussions with Mission staff reveal that the USAID has made some important decisions on prioritizing uses for TSFS V, which it should consider applying to resources remaining to be programmed under TSFS III and TSFS IV. They include:

- a. Activities funded should contribute to GOJ development planning and refinement of planning objectives.
- b. Activities which demonstrate technology transfer, especially as it relates to investment, productivity and employment (see below) and which link up with other USAID or other donor-funded activities are likely to receive higher consideration.
- c. Activities should seek ways to maximize use of local TA and training expertise. (This idea conforms with the Mission's overall programmatic effort to strengthen private sector services).
- d. Activities should demonstrate how they will contribute to productivity, investment and employment. This is particularly important for S&T efforts.
- e. Activities which assist the private sector directly will be funded from a separate project, PETRA. Activities to aid the private sector via improvements in public sector policy and regulation will be TSFS-funded. In the latter case, the public sector directly benefits.
- f. Activities should "add" to Jordan's institutional and technology base and not simply substitute for existing budget items and requirements.

- . Activities which enhance women's role in Jordan's economic development will receive high consideration.
- . Policy studies should be focussed on issues of improving the economy's efficiency and providing a regulatory and financial environment conducive to private sector growth.

The Mission has also determined to reduce dramatically or even exclude certain categories of activities from TSFS. These are straight U.S.-based training of public sector officials, and funding of invitational travel orders. In the latter case, the Mission has reduced use of ITOs substantially, funding 16 of them in TSFS III, five in IV (to date), with none programmed in TSFS V. No U.S.-based training or ITOs have been funded from TSFS since April 1986.

1. Management System for Approval

Appendix 4 includes a detailed description of the management system prior to September 1986 as well as one of the management system as it is now evolving. Here, we wish to stress only certain key changes or innovations in the management system—most of which appear to be improvements—which support the shift in selection criteria and policy support orientation described above.

Requests for funding come either from technical ministries or independent agencies, or through the MOP. Requests for use of Mission-Use funds usually come directly from inside the Mission—from particular technical officers who may be acting as a constituency for an idea or request from the GOJ—although not always. A request that originates as one for Jointly-Programmed funding may be converted into one for Mission-Use funding and vice versa, depending on the content, the policy relevance, and the political riskiness of the idea.

Formal request letters come to the Director's Office and are then routed by D&R to what appear to be the appropriate technical offices for initial review. This system poses problems, since the TSFS Project Officer in the PDO does not, therefore, have an initial log (i.e., data base input) of what is coming in. If a request has not been previously worked through by the requesting agency and the relevant technical office, it is possible that it will receive no attention from the technical officer for some days or weeks, while the PO is being asked what has happened by the proposing agency or by the IOP. Alternatively, where there has been prior communication between the technical office and the proposing agency, the PO is still left out of the loop and is more likely to have to present to the Review Committee something that is on the way to being regarded within the GOJ as a fait accompli.

Under the present review system, the PO acts as secretariat for the Review Committee for requests in excess of \$10,000. She reviews the request, often in a preliminary form, a revised form, and during discussions with the proposing agency and/or the Ministry of Plan, and then summarizes it for the agenda of the Review Committee, which is currently meeting about once a month. Where there are policy issues to be addressed in connection with a particular request, or a package of requests for a particular agency—e.g., energy or transportation—she will also note the policy issues she believes are involved. Supporting documentation, if any, is presented to the Review Committee along with the agenda.

The Review Committee members are the Mission Director, Deputy Director and all office heads. Individual technical officers attend when there are items on the agenda which involve their sectors. Others may attend if there are points on the agenda that interest them. The PO takes minutes of the meeting, which are then used as a formal record of Committee actions. The first use of the minutes is by the Controller, to establish project elements, the first significant financial action which is taken concerning a request once it has been approved. Concurrently, for those requests that have been rejected, the PO will draft a letter of rejection to the proposing agency and/or the MOP, which will be retained in the central project files, the only TSFS data base currently in existence.

For approved requests, there may be an intermediate step of fleshing out the description of the activity, revising the illustrative budget—or indeed, creating one for the first time—spelling out the scope of work for any technical assistance involved, and determining the procurement mode that will be adopted. This is an iterative process that involves the MOP, the proposing agency, the PO, the relevant technical officer if there is one, and PDO and PREG office heads where necessary, e.g., where evaluation is component of the request, or where there are still some issues arising about the appropriate funding category or programmatic relevance of the revised request.

3. Management System for Implementation

Once the request has been formally approved, and implementation begins, monitoring is assigned to a technical officer where one is appropriate, or else to an officer in the PDO. The Project Officer for TSFS at this point continues to serve as a "systems manager," and to track implementation start-up. In the system as it is operating up to now, the Controller is a primary resource person to the PO, since it is the Controller's reports that constitute the only body of codified information about activity implementation under TSFS, just as the Review Committee Minutes and the PILs constitute the only record of the approval process.

4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback

ON THE USAID SIDE

The collection and reporting of appropriate data, supported by on-site visits, briefings and debriefings, should provide the basis for monitoring. The principal weakness in most monitoring systems is the lack of substantive and result-oriented information. A January 1985 USAID report on a review of current projects reveals, as would be expected, a variation in the type of information presented but some intent is evident to discuss progress towards the production of outputs and achievement of project purpose. The information collected on TSFS III and IV activities, however, was either meaningless for substantive review purposes or related solely to the status of allocations, given the format available.

If monitoring and reviews do not provide the occasion to review substance then one would expect that evaluations, where cost-effective, would do so.

No mention of evaluation is made in the PP for TSFS III. Considerable attention, however, is given to this management function in the TSFS IV PP. Because of the many short-term and low-cost activities involved, the PP states that they do not lend themselves to formal evaluation and, therefore, that a comprehensive pre-determined evaluation plan and schedule is not appropriate to TSFS-type project. However, evaluation of individual TSFS activities is important and appropriate and will be conducted in a variety of ways, both formal and informal. Specifically, it was USAID's intention to evaluate "formally" all TSFS IV activities which involve AID funding in excess of \$250,000 or TA longer than one year. Guidelines for the evaluation of full-scale projects were to be followed. No mention was made about the evaluation of activities of a similar size funded under TSFS III but, in practice, it was applied to such activities if an extension was in process or likely.

The recognition of the importance of evaluation and the above approach is continued in the PP for TSFS V. In addition to the current external evaluation, a TSFS V evaluation is also planned for FY 1989 based on the methodology coming from, and the lessons learned in, the current exercise.

Five exercises labeled "evaluation" have been carried out. An analysis of them is included in Appendix No. 5. Three of the five were conducted by an individual USAID staff member, U.S. direct-hire or FSN. All except one (at \$200,000) involved activities of over \$500,000. One activity under TSFS III of \$500,000 was not scheduled, nor are three yet under TSFS IV. If the threshold is still \$250,000, there is still one additional activity eligible under TSFS III. (Jordan Ground Water Research Project - \$256,125) and two under TSFS IV which remain to be scheduled.

As can be seen in the analysis made, the purpose and quality of these "quick and dirty" evaluations varied considerably and those conducted in-house did not give due attention to the quality of the product or service being produced, its continued relevance and actual usage. Except where a recommendation to extend was obviously approved, there is no record of follow-up. In one case, the TSFS PO seemed unaware that an institution-building activity (CRS Income Generation Project for Rural Women in Jordan) was in trouble because of lack of a viable counterpart organization and termination was recommended unless specified remedial actions were taken.

These findings indicate that, while increasing attention is being given to evaluation of TSFS activities by the Mission, not enough attention has been given to monitoring and assessment of outputs or recording the use of outputs at completion. TSFS management needs to be thought through in the context of a total data collection, monitoring review and evaluation system appropriate for the mechanism and including increased GOJ participation.

ON THE GOJ SIDE

Most GOJ officials interviewed, both in the MOP and in the executing agencies, indicated that monitoring, evaluation and follow-up were not always given needed emphasis for TSFS (and other) activities. An exception at the executing agency level was the head of the Follow-up Division at the

WAJ, who has a staff of seven engineers, whom he rotates, trying to train all the staff eventually in the principles of follow-up and evaluation. At the MOP, there is a major effort underway in the area of project monitoring for all projects included in the current Five-Year Plan. This system is being developed with the help of German technical assistance, and TSFS GOJ-Use funds have just been approved for the procurement of a VAX computer system to support the effort. In discussing the system with the Director of the Computer and Monitoring Departments, it was agreed that the system as currently designed is very suitable for financial monitoring and for the monitoring of big construction or infrastructure projects, but that it is less well adapted, at present, to more complex or processual projects, such as are more common in economic/policy or social development projects. Since this system is still in the development stage, it is not yet applicable to TSFS activities. All executing agencies are said to receive periodic field visits, and to have been given questionnaires to complete for the monitoring system for some 100 of the biggest projects to date.

On the other hand, under the present system, TSFS activities and other projects are said to be monitored and reported on by the respective sectoral departments in the MOP, using non-computerized methods. The evaluation team was not able to get a clear indication from the TSFS Project Manager in the MOP whether this is being done routinely and/or successfully. At the ministry level, there are internal reviews, particularly of contractors and consultant reports. When problems arise, the tendency is to deal directly with the USAID Activity Officer on an informal basis, by-passing the MOP. As the MOP manager stated, his office is operationally oriented, and he himself doesn't like "to report on history". Except on the reallocation of de-earmarked funds, there seems to have been no attempt at joint reviews of "project" progress, relevance and impact, even covering only the so-called mini-projects.

Thus, if there is reporting, it is most likely to result from a reporting requirement included in the scopes of work of technical assistance advisors, study teams, or other contractors whose funding comes under some TSFS activity. At the executing agency level, the extent to which reporting requirements in TA advisor scopes of work—or other features of such scopes of work, for that matter—are taken seriously and monitored is variable. Some individuals interviewed seemed to think that this was more a function for USAID than for the GOJ agency. Others pointed out that TSFS itself has been used to provide assistance in evaluating the work of other advisors, who themselves may or may not have been funded under TSFS. This is particularly true where the advisor being evaluated has produced specifications or recommendations for some sort of procurement, especially of computer hardware and software.

For those GOJ agencies that have long-standing MOUs with other USG agencies, such as the USGS, there is a built-in evaluation function, as is also the case where TSFS has been used to buy into a centrally-funded project, such as the CTW or the SARSA buy-ins. How much the Jordanians are involved in the design of specific evaluation scopes of work under either centrally-managed or local activities is open to question. (In fact, the Secretary General of the MOP stated he was not informed of the external evaluation itself.)

III. CONCLUSIONS

A. Use of TSFS Mechanism

The last chapter (II) has outlined in some considerable detail the basis for the conclusions that will be presented here. Appendices also provide additional information on past TSFS evaluations (Appendix No. 5), the past and present project management system for approval and implementation, (Appendix No. 4). In this chapter, we will stress individual activities funded under TSFS projects III and IV (as well as follow-on activities under V) that seem most representative of their respective categories, whether functional or sectoral, as well as particularly successful in yielding linkages for project-level or policy-level multiplier effects. We will present conclusions about progress the Mission has recently made in improving the project management process, particularly in terms of applying selection criteria, institutionalizing the TSFS Review Committee mechanism, reallocating activity management among technical offices as the Mission's internal organization has evolved, and improving input-oriented reporting. We will point out areas in which we believe the Mission and the GOJ can make further progress, as in monitoring and evaluation, and in which the Mission and the MOP together may be able to improve coordination of requests and programming of funds under the project.

1. Buy-ins

One aspect of utilization that should be highlighted is use of TSFS funds for substantial "buy-ins" to ANE Bureau regionally-funded projects or to central bureau-funded projects in support of the technology development and transfer and institutional development objectives of GOJ agencies. This has, in some instances, complemented institutional arrangements negotiated between the GOJ agency and a "model" agency of the USG, such as the US Geological Survey or Federal Aviation Administration. Although better coordination between USAID and other USG agencies is badly needed to avoid implied commitments being made in memoranda of understanding where no funding is available, the GOJ feels that this kind of linkage is of great benefit for institutional development of agencies such as the National Resource Agency.

A good example of a fairly successful "buy-in" into an S&T centrally-funded project is the SARSA Cooperative Agreement activities in regional planning with the Ministry of Plan. Here, technical assistance from Clark University and the Institute for Development Anthropology was provided to the MOP to design and carry out a local level survey as a basis for decentralized planning activities, as well as for the development at the central MOP level of a plan and methodology for regional planning. Apparently, when this activity was being considered, the Ministry of Plan was unsure whether the TA should be provided to the municipalities or to the MOP itself. The decision to place it in the MOP was taken, according to MOP staff interviewed, because MOP was responsible for planning. This was said to be an exception to the usual policy of reserving TSFS primarily for executing agencies rather than using them for MOP activities per se*. Together, the buy-in amounts to over one

* As may be seen from Table II, MOP activities comprise some 31 % of all TSFS III and IV funding.

million dollars. Whether the USAID could have procured these same services from the same or other institutions at a lower cost outside the context of the cooperative agreement is difficult to assess. It may be argued that the two US implementing institutions were better placed to provide and backstop this assistance than they would have been absent the centrally-funded SARSA cooperative agreement. In terms of Mission management time and the GOJ's consistent desire for quick turn-around time on requests under TSFS, the buy-in mechanism is probably the more efficient, all other things considered.

An example of buy-in leveraging significantly more than could otherwise be funded is the Children's Television Workshop program regionally funded by ANE. Here, \$1.5 million of Mission funds have enabled JTV and JCTV to benefit from capacity building, TA, and the purchase and loan of sophisticated production equipment in order to produce 65 segments of an Arabic language program modelled on "The Electric Company" created by the Children's Television Workshop in the U.S.. The GOJ contributed a significant counterpart effort by providing 106 days of free studio time from JTV, as well as the salary of the Chief of Production of JCTV for nearly two years so that he could devote full time to this innovative production effort. To the extent that the production will be sold to, and aired in, a number of Arabic-speaking nations, the multiplier effect of the USAID/Amman contribution, when added to that of AID/W, is quite significant. The agreement provides JTV with a seven-year license to market and air the program.

An example of a somewhat similar type is the use of TSFS funds to support the design of a \$25 million Housing Investment Guarantee program for Jordan. Here, the major emphasis is on promoting outreach by private sector Jordanian real estate developers. Had the Mission not made this investment in the program design phase, it is possible that such additional support to the USAID's private sector program and policy reorientation might have been lacking in the ultimate design.

On the whole, discrete expenditures under the two projects have enabled the USAID, in an era of declining funding, to gain or maintain a "seat at the table" in a number of sectoral and policy areas, while at the same time supporting shifts in program and project emphasis in line with both revised AID and U.S. foreign policy objectives and changing GOJ priorities and resource levels.

2. Development Administration

As may be noted from Appendix No. 6, TSFS funding under projects III and IV has covered a range of sectors but has also been focussed to a considerable degree on what could be labelled "development administration" activities. Here, we have included all those activities which essentially provide support to central GOJ institutions in areas of management, and institutional or policy development. It is noteworthy that so much TSFS funding has been allocated to this area even at a time when there was a separate, bilateral Development Management Project which has now ceded place, in a sense, to the new Industrial Development Project. Both of the bilateral projects provide for training and/or consultancies from the Jordan Institute of Management (JIM) to other public-sector institutions and their staffs.

TABLE II
USAID ASSISTANCE TO MOP
(January 1985 through December 1986)

<u>TSFS</u>	<u>U.S. Dollars</u>	
Data Entry/Prog.		\$ 7,960
Infrastructure Advisor: Pat Johnson		8,137
ITO: Saif Zahir		1,853
Books		150
UN Decade for Women Conference Participants		11,808
ITB: Kafaia — 15th Congress on Dams		2,393
MOP Computer Assessment		9,105
Infrastructure Advisor: Pat Johnson		177,000
ITO: MOP Officials to DC for Tech. Eval. of Bids		10,000
SARSA		995,000
Data Processing Analyst (Bacon)		53,602
Data Entry: National Village Inventory		8,000
Rural Community Development Study		11,397
Infrastructure Advisor: Pat Johnson		95,500
Development Conference		45,000
— Copying Machine		
— One Secretary		
5-Year Development Plan		24,000
English Language Training		2,350
Three MOP Secretaries		100,000
MOP Computer		280,000
National Housing Strategy (PADCO)		596,000
Private Sector Advisor		300,000
		<hr/>
SUBTOTAL		2,739,255
 <u>CENTRAL/FUNDS</u>		
Grant Computer (Central Funding)		7,000
Grant Activity		20,000
		<hr/>
SUBTOTAL		27,000
 <u>DAT</u>		
18 Participants		430,888
		<hr/>
TOTAL		<u>3,197,143</u>

These investments under TSFS seem to complement the bilateral projects, and to provide the basis for the GOJ to carry out studies and to fund consultancies that allow more informed policy review, dialogue and change. The Coopers, Lybrand study of the industrial sector carried out in 1985 as part of the design of the Industrial Development Project is a good example. Even before the PP for the ultimate project was completed, a review of study results encouraged the GOJ to explore and make certain policy changes in the area of partial forgiveness of income taxes for those firms that exported over a certain amount of their production.

3. Linkage

One of the issues raised by the GOJ and USAID officials interviewed by the team has to do with what we are calling the bridging or linkage functions of TSFS-funded activities. Essentially, the question was phrased in terms of the relative priority of using TSFS funds to finish off institution building activities that had begun using TSFS funds as seed money, been continued under bilateral funding, but were now in need of some final funding for the refinement of management systems, monitoring, data analysis and the like. This type of utilization is contrasted with the alternative use of TSFS funds as seed money to catalyze new activities that will ultimately be funded by other donors, the GOJ itself, or in part, by AID*.

USAID officials, in discussing this trade-off, make an interesting point on the basis of actual events. NRA, for example, has recently requested technical assistance for a U.S. seismologist to assist in data analysis and evaluation now that the seismic center infrastructure is in place and data are coming in. In their view, USAID's unwillingness to fund this final "software" aspect of the seismic center activity is short-sighted and anti-institutional. Similarly, they note that USAID also refused to provide funding under TSFS for data interpretation under the aerial mapping activity once the over-flying had been completed.

The response of the USAID's Project Development Office chief, who has been in Jordan over most of the life of TSFS projects III and IV, is that it is important to look at what has really happened even without such final TA. In the case of the aerial mapping, U.S. private sector companies have used the raw data themselves in order to determine whether or not mineral exploration is worthwhile. This has led to exploration agreements between the GOJ and Hunt Oil and Amoco for oil, and may lead to further mineral exploration even without the capacity for data interpretation being funded in the NRA by the USAID or another donor.

* To some extent, the question represents concerns expressed by the more traditional counterpart agencies, those that have benefitted from high and continuous levels of bilateral USAID funding, that they are being left behind in favor of new and less experienced institutions who will be helped to compete successfully for decreasing amounts of TSFS and other AID funding. When expressed by officials of these agencies, these concerns are linked to a reasoned exposition of AID's institutional development policy orientation.

In the instance of the seismology expert, the end-use question is a bit more blurred. USGS is presently providing the data interpretation services that NRA would like to institutionalize in Jordan. This was part of the underlying MOU with the USGS that was negotiated by NRA. The USAID was not involved by either side in the negotiation of this agreement, but is, as its staff see it, still expected by the NRA to fund the whole three-stage MOU, clearly an unrealistic objective given reduced funding levels and re-orientations of the USAID program.

4. Need for Guidelines

These examples lend credence to the idea that it may be time for senior Mission management to meet formally with their counterparts in the MOP, as well as the directors of key executing agencies that have received considerable USAID funding in the past, to discuss the reasons for changes in orientation, and to assess the possibilities of leveraging other-donor funds for these institution-building and strengthening activities, or else of accessing other USG funding sources. This will not solve the problem of disappointed expectations on the part of agencies such as the NRA and the Jordan Valley Authority (JVA) that have been in a large measure created with USG funding, but it may at least clarify the message the USAID is sending, and help these agencies—and indeed the MOP—more fully to understand on what it is based.

As demand for TSFS funding begins to exceed supply and while funds for AID sectoral projects also decline, increasingly hard choices will have to be made on both sides. Based on a number of interviews carried out by the evaluation team, the content and applicability of guidelines and criteria for making these choices should be clarified and refined with the appropriate GOJ counterparts, put in writing, and then applied more stringently.

It should be noted that opinions of both USAID and GOJ officials vary as to whether or not guidelines should be promulgated and disseminated formally within the GOJ, including to executing agencies that are the initiators of the majority of proposals under TSFS. Some of those in the MOP with whom this was discussed were concerned that such a "streamlining" measure might be counter-productive, in fact limiting the number and variety of potentially viable proposals and, more importantly, "limiting flexibility". Others thought it was an excellent recommendation.

Most agreed that some update on the orientations of the program would be useful, at least within the MOP itself. These officials stressed MOP's role as a facilitating ministry rather than as one having the authority to cause or prevent actions on the part of the executing agencies. They stressed the importance of personal relations as a basis for this kind of facilitation. The argument given was, in part, that if the MOP rejected too many requests from executing agencies, when it came time for it to receive cooperation from these agencies on other matters, that cooperation would not be forthcoming. Yet, these same officials stressed the importance of making tough decisions when something proposed by an executing agency really didn't make economic or substantive sense. An example given was the role of the MOP in trying to discourage the Ministry of Public Works from continuing to present modified requests for continuation of TA for remote sensing, an area

that the USAID has been reluctant to continue funding for a number of reasons. Here, the emphasis seems to be on the importance to the MOP of attaining consensus—in other words, for the MOP to be able to convince the executing agency in question to modify or withdraw its request, or else to forward the request to the USAID and thus shift the decision to them.

An example of an attempt on the part of the USAID to shift its policy under TSFS, to complement other related policy shifts, is to move increasingly away from funding long-term U.S. TA, and toward joint-venturing or funding Jordanian private sector technical expertise where it is available. While this shift seemed clear to the Mission staff involved, when we discussed it with the key officials in the MOP who manage the TSFS projects, it seemed to come as a surprise. Another example concerns the Mission's emphasis on private sector initiatives. There seems still to be some confusion within the MOP as to what is appropriate for funding under TSFS with relation to building capacity within the GOJ to deal effectively with the private sector.

Both of these areas could perhaps usefully be clarified through periodic discussions between Mission management and key officials in the MOP as well as in executing ministries, if not necessarily spelled out in written guidelines.

Officials interviewed at the implementation level in the recipient executing ministries seemed about evenly divided on the utility of having written guidelines or formats for proposals. Those in favor thought that this would save time, and increase the flexibility of TSFS in terms of its turn-around time, which they perceive as having become longer rather than shorter over the years.

Those against guidelines or formats were those who had had the most experience with the TSFS mechanism, who had the closest relations with their technical counterparts in the USAID, and who feared that making guidelines clear for everyone would increase competition from "new-comer" agencies for increasingly scarce USAID funding. To the extent that the Mission wishes to encourage new entrants into this competition, guidelines might, indeed, have a leavening effect. But if the team's understanding of how the system actually works is correct, a key effort in marketing on the part of the Mission's technical staff in desired new areas will also be required if such proposals are to be generated and directed toward TSFS. Otherwise, they are likely to be directed toward other donors, or simply toward the USAID or American assistance as an undifferentiated whole.

B. Relevance of TSFS Activities

Here, we are primarily concerned with the relevance of TSFS projects III and IV in terms of the broader Mission and USG policy agenda as it interfaces with the policy concerns of the GOJ. A subsidiary indicator of relevance is the extent to which the percentages of TSFS-funded activities—both in terms of numbers and funding levels—allocated across sector and programmatic categories, correspond to the Mission's stated priorities and its action planning.

1. Aggregate Data

As has been discussed under Chapter II above, the data collected during the evaluation from Mission sources show some interesting breakdowns when aggregated by sectoral and programmatic categories. When the information on pipeline is added, it may be seen that there are significant differences in how fast funds are moving from one sectoral or functional category to another. As we see in Table II, for example, under projects III, IV and V, a fairly significant percentage—31.2%—of funding from January 1985 through December 1986 has gone to the Ministry of Plan to facilitate activities over which it has jurisdiction. The total dollar amount is \$2,739,255, based on earmarks through December 1986. If one adds funds from other sources, including the umbrella participant training project, the grand total is \$3,197,143. It should be noted that of the TSFS amount, \$ 856,850 represents earmarks under TSFS V, of which several activities are each earmarked for more than \$250,000.

For those funds actually earmarked and/or committed under projects III and IV, of 14 activities only three are over \$100,000, but of those, one is nearly \$1,000,000, and another more than \$500,000. The larger-ticket items tend to be for studies—including technical assistance costs—that will yield national-level information, as for example on housing strategy, regional planning, or the Five Year Plan itself.

2. Sector Allocations

If we turn to the sectoral breakdown, presented in Appendix 6, agriculture, health and population, and environment are receiving roughly the same percentage of project funds under IV—around 7.5%— while under III, environment, agriculture, transportation and water and wastewater management received the highest percentages of support—15%, 27%, 16% and 13% respectively—while health, housing and urban development, energy and WID—as well as general Mission program support received the lowest respective percentages. Housing and urban development, private/mixed sector support, and energy, on the other hand, are receiving 11%, 25% and 22% respectively under TSFS IV. Other categories and sectors—transportation, evaluation, general mission support— receive relatively smaller percentages of the funds under IV, while under III, they received similarly low proportions of funding with the exception of transportation. Under TSFS III, private and mixed sector support received only about 7%, while development administration received a fairly hefty 13% as compared to only about 6% under TSFS IV.

3. Relation to Priorities

These proportions can be interpreted in a number of ways. It seems that on the whole, they are appropriate given the Mission's current priorities as expressed in program documentation, and relevant given its attempts to initiate new departures in certain areas—e.g., population— while maintaining a foothold in others, such as water and wastewater management. General mission support seems surprisingly low, given the set-aside for Mission-uses under both projects. The proposed utilization of the \$500,000 allocation for GOJ-programmed funds under TSFS V, for computer purchase and a dam feasibility study, seems policy-neutral.

If these allocations by sector and program category are examined in terms of targets of opportunity, given other USAID funding, then it may be seen that the Mission has made good use of opportunities for buy-ins under centrally-funded projects. This has been true for health and population, where use of centrally-funded initiatives is a purposive means toward low-level pressure for policy reform. In agriculture, now that the Mission is moving away from irrigation toward rainfed highland agriculture while at the same time attempting to strengthen agricultural research and extension systems for the country as a whole, increasing use of S&T centrally-funded subsectoral projects is likely under sectoral project funding. To some degree, agriculture is likely to continue to tap into these kinds of projects under TSFS as well.

4. Informality/Flexibility

One additional benefit that might be expected from the TSFS mechanism has to do with the informality promoted by the mechanism in relationships between the USAID and the MOP. Here, the ease of communication is stressed by both partners, and described as one of the key beneficial features of the project. Yet, a number of activities proposed for funding under TSFS or with other USAID funding that at least complement activities that will be cleared by MOP for funding by other donors, seem somewhat duplicative. An example is the request by the MOP of the IBRD that it update its water sector study of Jordan. This was done, apparently, in the absence of knowledge that the USAID is about to carry out a water sector assessment along potentially similar lines.

Ideally, this sort of awareness should be a by-product of the informality and continuity represented by the TSFS mechanism. The team hypothesizes that one reason why this may not have been the case in this instance is that MOP-level attention is in fact more on TSFS-funded activities than on the more "regular" items in the portfolio which take longer to design, and some of which may be funded by Washington, especially in the assessment and evaluation area.

C. Need for Revised Project Design

The team believes that a revised project design, which more closely reflects the realities within which the TSFS mechanism is used in Jordan, would greatly improve the communication process and understanding between USAID and the ANE Bureau, put the TSFS approval process in a more logical and programmatic context (using logic which is at least retraceable after the fact), and provide a better basis for activity management including periodic evaluation. The principal elements suggested are:

1. Goal (higher level objective)

As already explained, the TSFS Project does not have a goal - it is the GOJ and USG which have goals. Given the nature of this umbrella project, the goal statement does not have any operational significance and is only of marginal use in justifying the level of funding which is presumably established by other means. Accordingly, the modestly stated goal included in the TSFS V Project Paper will suffice, i.e.:

"To strengthen the Government of Jordan's ability to implement its proposed development program."

2. Restatement of Purpose

The inadequacy of the purpose statements included in Project Papers has been discussed under "Findings". They have either been so generic as to defy understanding of what is really being proposed or confuse purpose with the means of accomplishing it, and make infeasible any subsequent attempt at meaningful evaluation at this level, i.e., of effectiveness and/or success. Equally important, they are mundane and don't portray the actual virtues of the project well.

We believe the USAID has a much more convincing story to tell and that restructuring the TSFS purpose statement (along with new emphasis on results achieved and their development or policy effect) will help do this. The following statement, which is extracted from previous documentation and current Mission policy, is suggested:

To create opportunities for policy dialogue on important issues with the GOJ, maximize the use of limited AID funds through selective leverage, and seek cost-effective linkages with planned and on-going development projects in areas of current priority concern to the GOJ and/or the USG.

3. Project Approach

In future PP amendments, the project approach to a) produce desired results, and b) achieve the project purpose, can be described in a separate statement. This is where changes in priority areas, problems, and means of implementation can be explained. In other words, while the project purpose and logic would remain constant, the nature and type of outputs, or their mixture, would change over time as new CDSS objectives are created and new problem areas are selected for attention.

4. Outputs

Outputs are the result of activities, tasks or work, made possible by the provision of necessary inputs (manpower, materials and time). They are not an illustrative list of proposed activities, functional objectives, or selected areas. It is recognized that in this type of umbrella mechanism it is not possible (or even a useful exercise) to attempt to define specific outputs ahead of time. However, a categorization of the type of outputs which are commonly produced under TSFS would be useful, particularly if combined with specific examples of outputs actually produced under previous tranches. An illustrative categorization is suggested:

- pilot-scale production data developed
- experimental trial data collected
- process test results analyzed
- feasibility/investment study delivered to GOJ
- project design completed
- identification and analysis of problem (sector/subsector)
- problem solution/options/recommendations
- increase in institutional capabilities
- new knowledge/technology transferred

- policy dialogue held
- evaluation results/recommendations
- US/GOJ relationship strengthened

5. Indicators

In AID's logframe parlance, indicators at the project purpose level (they are almost meaningless at the goal level for this instrument) are called end-of-project-status (EOPS) indicators. This is because the term "project" is normally used to describe a one-time, non-repetitive set of tasks. When this is not the case, i.e., when the term "project" is applied to a heterogeneous set of continuing activities for accounting purposes or administrative convenience as under an "umbrella" project, problems present themselves and are compounded if an "open-ended" purpose statement is used.

Given the acceptance of the purpose statement suggested above and the fact that the TSFS instrument may continue to be used for the indefinite future, something other than EOPS indicators will be required and, in this case, they will be developed after the fact, e.g., examples recorded which demonstrate that opportunities for policy dialogue did occur and judgements made as to whether such a dialogue was significant or marginal. Evidence of how leverage was applied in selected areas will be collected along with examples of cost-effective bridging or linkage with other bilateral or multilateral projects, including "piggy-backing" on centrally- or regionally-funded projects. The use of such indicators at the effectiveness or success (purpose) level depends upon, first, AID/W understanding the support of such measures and, second, a project information system that will provide such data on a regular and cumulative basis.

The problem of devising indicators at the output level is not difficult. It means only specifying the output(s) in terms of its desired type, magnitude and quality and measuring it upon completion (or as progress is reported). However, it cannot be done at the "project" approval stage—only at the "activity" approval stage. The means of verification will usually be through completion reports, observation and/or evaluation.

D. Opportunities for Management Improvement

1. Programming and Approval Process

a. Ministry of Planning

The Ministry is obviously pleased with the flexibility and extra funding opportunity represented in the several TSFS tranches. It is also hoping to play a more active role in generating demand which is responsive to the priorities established for use of the TSFS. The need for specific guidelines in the allocation of the TSFS resources, however, is viewed with mixed emotions. On the one hand, such guidelines would aid MOP officials in sidetracking frivolous or ineligible proposals before they become embedded in concrete. On the other hand, they could limit their flexibility. Nevertheless, we believe the Mission should explore this possibility further. These guidelines should be prepared based on the current priorities and goals created in the TSFS V Project Paper,

applied to all new approvals regardless of what previous tranche the money will come from, and revised as necessary by the results of this evaluation. They should be jointly reviewed annually and revised as necessary after every new PP/tranche and/or an external evaluation.

b. Joint Programming

While there appears to be excellent day-to-day communication and support between the MOP and USAID on the working level, regularly and formally scheduled meetings (at least annually) between the Secretary General and the Mission Director might be useful, inter alia, to study summary allocation data, review results, re-validate the continuing relevance of programming guidelines and goals, and reascertain the optimum relationship of TSFS activities to other bilateral and multilateral projects. This would seem to be particularly useful when a new tranche is becoming available or a sizeable amount of prior-years funding becomes available for re-earmarking.

The team also believes that more effort should be made to secure a GOJ "cash" contribution when appropriate, particularly in the case of technical advisors with general duties where repeated GOJ requests for extensions most often take place. This contribution, a measure of a Government agency's real need, might increase with each extension.

c. USAID

DATA INPUTS

As discussed under "findings", the approval process is largely ad hoc although in recent months attempts to systematize and rationalize it have been made. There is still room for improvement, including more effective use of modern computer technology and professional staff to establish a data base management system (DBMS) designed especially for this important and innovative mechanism.

The design of a data collection, monitoring and evaluation system, one which is appropriate for the unique characteristics of the TSFS project and the conditions existing in Jordan, begins at the approval stage, with the receipt of a formal request from the MOP (or its equivalent when Mission-uses funds are in view). Upon receipt, identification data should be entered into the TSFS data base by the TSFS Project Officer (M&E systems manager), whereupon the request is sent to the appropriate USAID technical or sponsoring office for review and necessary staff work. A time-limit for response, appropriate to the size and complexity of the proposed activity, should be stipulated by the PO.

APPROVAL

As part of its preparatory work, the technical or sponsoring office, in collaboration or consultation with the PO, will fill out Part I of the

TSFS Data Sheet, (see Appendix No. 7). Upon receipt by the PO, if the request is for \$10,000 or less, he/she (as is now the case) may approve without further action, except for RLA and Controller clearance. The data included on the sheet will then be input into the data base. If higher level approval is required, the data will be entered at the time of such approval.

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Both the MOP and USAID cherish the "flexibility" afforded them through use of the TSFS instrument. This term can mean different things when applied to the approval as against the implementation process. Flexibility does not mean that accountability, oversight or concern with quality, relevance and significance can be ignored or slighted. The team is not inferring that this is the case. In fact, there have been recent USAID-attempts (under TSFS V) to make programming criteria more explicit and in tune with the times. Here, we are concerned with how an activity is managed after it is approved.

We do not wish to lay a "heavy-hand" on TSFS management requirements by making them unduly onerous, non-cost-effective or applicable across the board—given the heterogeneity of TSFS activities. Nonetheless, the management of a multi-year and million-dollar "activity" obviously requires more attention than developing an itinerary for invitational travel, to use the two extremes. What we believe will be useful is, first, to develop some criteria to be used as "guidance" as to when minimum oversight is appropriate and acceptable and, second, to review the management requirements for each activity (or category of activities) as part of the approval process and in collaboration with the GOJ.

The minimum or standard management system (MMS), i.e., the standard to be used for TSFS activities unless otherwise noted, should comprise the following elements:

- (1) Completion of basic data sheets (Parts I - III).
- (2) Concise but succinct statement of the expected output/result and who will use it for what purpose.
- (3) A brief completion and assessment report prepared by the recipient GOJ organization or USAID which, separate from financial reports, indicates that the output was or was not produced and used as planned (see Appendix No. 8 for suggested format and content.)

While the criteria and thresholds are a matter of judgment for the Mission Director, we think any activity costing less than \$10,000 should automatically use a MMS. Establishing quantitative thresholds, i.e., total cost and duration, for choosing a more sophisticated activity or mini-project management system, is not sufficient unto itself. For example, purchase of a computer for \$275,000 without any other support may require only an MMS. On the other hand, a \$495,000 activity of 12 months duration requiring substantial institution-building may require extensive USAID participation. In Appendix No. 9, the

team suggests criteria for determining TSFS management requirements on a case-by-case basis as part of the approval process.

The Review Process

Under the present system, the PO acts as secretariat for the Review Committee which is composed of the Mission Director, Deputy Director and all office heads for any request in excess of \$10,000. We suspect that in many cases, this level and amount of Mission talent is not required, provided that adequate programming guidelines have been promulgated and the PO has sufficient expertise and stature to apply them. Therefore, the team would suggest that some intermediary review measures be used for projects between \$10,000 and \$100,000 (or higher), e.g., approval by the Head of the Project Development Office with clearance by the Controller, and RLA (or Contracts Officer). In any event, the use of minutes to record formally all actions should be continued but with the results entered into the data base. It is further suggested that a separate TSFS Review Committee be established, with appropriate membership, in recognition of the unique management requirements and importance of the TSFS "project" vis-a-vis bilateral projects.

2. Implementation Process

a. Government of Jordan

As part of the approval process suggested above, the recipient GOJ ministry or department should be made aware of the type of management which the MOP and USAID believe necessary for the particular activity, including the requirements for USAID involvement, reports, on-site reviews, periodic work plans, if more than the Minimum Management System (MMS) is decided upon. The team believes the MOP should be encouraged and supported in taking an active role in monitoring and review when the size and importance of an activity warrant it.

b. USAID

COMMITMENT

When notified by the Controller that TSFS funds for an earmarked activity have been committed, Part II of the TSFS Data Sheet should be completed by the PO and entered into the data base. Corrections should be input as and if any subsequent changes in the means of implementation take place.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

The Project Officer, using the monthly TSFS status reports produced by the DBMS, will review the special management requirements for on-going activities, particularly in terms of scheduling and conducting on-site reviews, TSFS reviews, and RLC studies (see evaluation below). He/she will also review reports received from Contractors and Activity Officers to see if problems are surfacing which require senior management attention.

COMPLETION REPORT

A completion and assessment report should be required for each activity to: a) record the actual delivery and use of the product(s) and/or service(s) financed under TSFS; b) provide an opportunity to assess the quality, utility and significance of the output(s) produced; and c) determine what, if any, follow-up action is needed on the part of either the GOJ, USAID or both (see Appendix No. 8). We are uncertain as to whether this report, which includes an assessment, should be completed by the GOJ counterpart, the USAID activity officer, or both. In any event, it is important that the assessment be realistic and subject to verification during the periodic external purpose-level evaluations. The TSFS PO will review them for consistency and, from time to time, the Mission Evaluation Officer should review the process.

Upon receipt of the Completion Report, the PO will enter the data into the TSFS data base which will complete the non-financial record of the activity unless a terminal evaluation has also been scheduled. This is not expected to occur often under TSFS. Copies of the report will be distributed to the MOP, and the Controller, and, in case of those activities of \$10,000 or over, to the ANE Bureau.

3. Evaluation and Feedback Process

ON-GOING/TERMINAL EVALUATION

Monitoring is generally concerned with the delivery of inputs and work accomplished or milestone events. Reviews are usually concerned with problems concerning these factors and, in the case of TSFS, with deobligations and reallocations. Evaluation focusses, or should, on the production of outputs, the achievement of project purpose and the critical assumptions regarding the project environment. This is generally called an assessment of effectiveness or success. In other but more limited instances, because of the time, cost and difficulty involved, evaluation may also focus on the developmental impact of the achievement of the project purpose, i.e., a verification of the original development hypothesis (causal relationship) used in project justification.

Given the heterogeneous nature of TSFS activities, no single form of evaluation can be prescribed. The type, scope and timing of evaluation, or its equivalent, must therefore be decided on a case-by-case basis as part of the approval process (refer to Part I, Section C.3 of Data Sheet). Essentially, three options are available, i.e. to: 1) require only a brief completion and self-assessment report as provided under the minimum TSFS management system requirements; 2) for USAID staff to carry out what the ANE Bureau calls a Rapid Low Cost (RLC) exercise; 3) carry out a RLC exercise using an outside contractor. In the case of centrally or regional funded buy-ins, evaluation may already be a built-in to the activity. Additional options, where warranted, could include an RLC exercise conducted by the MOP, or a Jordanian consultant representing it, or a joint GOJ/USAID exercise. On the basis of the inputs into the data base at activity approval, an annual TSFS evaluation plan or schedule, by type and date, can easily be produced, monitored and continually updated.

Criteria to help decide, on a consistent and defensible basis, what type of evaluation is appropriate, are suggested as follows:

- For activities under \$10,000, completion and self-assessment report only.
- For activities between \$10,000 and \$249,999, and/or with a duration of over three months, "mid-term informal review" by the Activity Officer, with results recorded in a memorandum for the record copied to the TSFS project office. Reference to higher management levels to be made only on a reporting-by-exception basis.
- For activities exceeding \$250,000 or 12 months in duration, unless excepted in the approval process, a RLC study at completion and reviewed by the TSFS-RC.
- For activities exceeding \$500,000 and 18 months in duration, a RLC exercise performed in mid-term and/or as an input to decision making concerning the activity and reviewed by the SRC.
- The same as above when an extension of an activity is requested which, cumulatively, will exceed \$250,000 and/or 12 months in duration.
- The same as above when significant problems exist regarding design, implementation, or host government commitment in which additional data and analyses is required for decision making.

In any event, the purpose or scope of work for informal reviews and RLC's, whether on-going or terminal, should focus on the production of outputs/results, as compared with the intention at activity approval. An assessment should be made of their type, quality and magnitude and whether they are, were, or will be used by the targeted client for the intended purpose. In the case of on-going activities, especially when an extension may be requested, the continuing relevance and significance of the activity in terms of current GOJ and USAID policies and goals-including the extent of GOJ commitment and support-will also be reviewed. Copies of all review memoranda and RLC reports should be placed in the central TSFS file.

As described above under "Monitoring and Review", the TSFS Project Officer, through a monthly updating of the schedule for reviews and RLC exercises, will check that the information thereby produced reaches the appropriate decision level for follow-up, as required.

EVALUATION OF SUCCESS

While the above system description is intended to satisfy normal activity management requirements, there is an obvious need for a more comprehensive and objective exercise which periodically satisfies both the GOJ, Mission management and AID/W that the "purpose" of the TSFS project is being achieved in a reasonable cost-effective manner within the policy and objective parameters existing during the period of review. This would be an evaluation of "effectiveness" or "success". Such an exercise, which is more costly and time-consuming than those described above, should probably take place every three years, preferably before a new

tranche is approved. This evaluation would encompass, inter alia, an analysis of the actual outputs produced through a sample of TSFS activities and a review of their use by recipients (e.g., a pre-feasibility study led to a "go" or "no-go" decision by the GOJ). The new data collection, monitoring and evaluation system recommended will now readily provide this information and only "verification" will be required. This will in turn, provide the basis for assessing the causal relationships between the outputs produced and the elements included in the revised project purpose statement. The analysis would include various combinations of the data included in the TSFS data bank to reach conclusions regarding responsiveness to priorities, functional use, size-of activities, etc.

The Evaluation Team should be requested to develop examples which demonstrate that, e.g., the opportunity for a policy dialogue did indeed occur and make a judgment, supported by some evidence, that the dialogue was significant or otherwise. Evidence of how leverage was obtained and applied in selected areas should also be presented along with examples of cost-effective bridging or linkages with other bilateral and multilateral projects and "piggy-backing" on centrally or regionally funded projects. This, in effect, becomes an exercise in verification of the pre-established indicators of success, substituted for EOPS indicators because of the continuing nature of the TSFS mechanism.

The results of such comprehensive evaluation should be of use to the GOJ and USAID in reviewing effectiveness and considering any changes in priority areas, objectives and functional use. It will provide the Mission with much of data and justification needed to prepare a amendment for a new tranche. It will also give the ANE Bureau the information it needs to ascertain that TSFS is being used in a programmatic and well-managed manner which is responsive to current CDSS goals.

JOINT EVALUATION

As a matter of policy and principle, the team believes that the GOJ should be encouraged and supported to participate more fully at all levels of evaluation and, certainly, in the effectiveness evaluation discussed just above. This support could include, for example, training of selected GOJ officials in evaluation and use of consultants and experts from the Jordanian private and academic sectors. At the minimum, GOJ review and comment on all RLC and evaluation reports should be requested.

4. Management Reporting

If the Data Base Management System (DBMS) is properly designed (using a data base III program) and the inputs are made as suggested, on-line data will be available for the day-to-day use of the TSFS Project Officer (System Manager). Used in conjunction with the fiscal reporting system now being revised by the Controller as a corollary step to this exercise, comprehensive status data will be available from the data base on demand. It will permit the display (and printout) of status and descriptive data of each individual activity, or groups related by sector, size or whatever variable is useful at the time. The question remains as to who will use this information, for what purpose, and with what frequency?

TECHNICAL OFFICER/ACTIVITY OFFICER

The USAID Activity Officer will provide the initial inputs into the data system and, after approval, can use the data base to assist in scheduling and monitoring key events, e.g., review of HC contract scopes of work, on-site review, RLC evaluation, etc., recording new data and updating as necessary through the PP. In short, if terminals could be made available in convenient locations, the activity officers could have on-line access to the data bank reducing reliance on cumbersome or out-of-date files. In any event, they should receive monthly status reports on the TSFS from the Project Officer. (Note: While on-line access should be available to any legitimate user, the responsibility for data input should be given exclusively to the PO (TSFS System Manager) to maintain quality control and system integrity).

PROJECT OFFICER

The principal day-to-day end-user of the DBMS will be the TSFS System Manager, who will now have at her/his fingertips any combination of data on TSFS allocations and activity management events which can be produced on demand. It is suggested that a monthly status printout be distributed throughout the Mission and to the MOP. Special reports, e.g., semi-annual status reports for ANE status of contract execution, updated evaluation schedules, will also be readily producible, on-screen or by printout.

USAID SENIOR MANAGEMENT

Either through the Senior Review Committee or any other device desired by the Mission Director, there should be a quarterly or at least semi-annual formal review of the TSFS Project. In addition to reviewing project status in terms of earmarks, commitments and completions, the PO should present a summary of those activities encountering delays or implementation problems. In the case of jointly programmed funds, a representative of the MOP should be invited to participate. The results of informal reviews and RLC evaluations should also be discussed, including required decisions and follow-up. Because of the unique nature of the TSFS project and its increasing size and importance within the total USAID/Amman program, this review should be separate from bilateral project reviews and tailored to meet the management requirements unique for TSFS.

ANE BUREAU

The monthly project implementation status reports prepared by the Mission for its internal use can also form the basis for improved Project Implementation Reports submitted to AID/Washington every six months. These reports could contain substantially more information on the "results" of various TSFS subactivities than is now the case. The Evaluation Team suggests changing the format and content of PIR reports, and sending in other key data apart from PIRs.

The PIRs should be modified as follows:

- (1) Project Status: This section should not only comment on rate of earmarking, but it should also describe (by percentage breakdown) types of activities funded to date, and sectoral/priority areas.

This data can be found by aggregating the data base in the "initial input" data, Part I, sheet contained in Appendix No. 7. For major activities over \$250,000 which are completed, a brief discussion of the status of the activity would be useful.

- (2) Expected Outputs: These should be reported along the lines of the data asked for in the project completion data sheet, Part III. Special attention should be given to activities planned or in progress budgeted for over \$250,000, describing the specific outputs expected and specifying those outputs which have linkage to other USAID or other donor activities. In the case of activities grouped under a sectoral emphasis (e.g., the energy package), reporting should focus on implementation of the "package" of activities rather than each subactivity itself.
- (3) Major actions expected over next six months: This section should discuss actions expected on major "project elements" over the next six months whose cost exceeds \$250,000.

In addition to the PIR modification suggested above, USAID/Jordan should consider submitting one copy of completion and assessment reports for all activities over \$10,000 to AID/W for its project files. AID/W should also receive RLC evaluation reports, as they are completed, for project files in ANE/PD, including a statement of how Mission and/or the GOJ are dealing with the recommendations in the RLC.

Finally, the Mission may wish to consider sending to AID/W, along with the PIRs, its newly-developed sectoral spreadsheet which aggregates activities by sector and provides the financial data on each one. This spreadsheet is actually a restructuring of the current Controller's Report, but will be more easily followed because of its sectoral grouping of activities.

5. Management Capacity

GOJ

While many of the ministries and agencies of the GOJ have considerable institutional capability and experience in dealing with the USAID, as priorities change and new institutions are to be reached, the need for explicit guidelines will increase. This role would seem to fall to the recently established Ministry of Planning. Insofar as USAID matters are concerned, the MOP has apparently relied heavily on expatriate assistance, a very competent and experienced ex-USAID American employee who may soon be leaving. Whether this useful person stays or leaves, the team believes USAID should be encouraging the MOP to build-up its own capacity, using talent available in Jordan, to continue to strengthen its role in programming, monitoring and evaluation in general as well as for USAID and TSFS matters. TSFS or special fund funding for salary support, local contracting, or some similar device might be used to begin and/or sustain the process.

USAID

If most of the suggestions included in this evaluation report are acceptable to USAID and AID/W, the role of the TSFS Project Officer needs to be re-examined. We believe, that with the DBMS suggested and the imminent hiring of an FSN for TSFS, the Project Officer (or TSFS systems manager) can be freed to take a more active and substantive role in programming and reprogramming, conducting or arranging informal reviews, making on-site inspections, arranging for and/or conducting RLC evaluations and, where necessary, acting as an activity officer. A suggested job description to define this expanded role is provided in Appendix No. 10.

This raises two more questions: first, if considerable responsibility for managing the TSFS is to be delegated to the Systems Manager, as we believe it should, the experience and grade of the officer so designated should be commensurate with such responsibility and the authority required to meet it. Second, since the Project Officer is not a project officer in the traditional sense but, one whose functions are primarily in the areas of applying program criteria and priorities (and reprogramming unexpanded balances), negotiating with USAID technical offices and the MOP, and in monitoring and evaluation, it would seem that her/his principal contacts would be with the PDO, Controller and the Evaluation Officer, or with the Mission Director or his Deputy. If the TSFS function is to remain in the PDO, the systems manager should report directly to the Office Head. We suggest that these factors also be taken into consideration when deciding on the management improvement recommendations included herein.

E. Achievements and Outputs

As we indicated in presenting the evaluation findings, a significant feature of this evaluation has been the team's attempt to help the Mission and the MOP increase management emphasis on outputs, shifting attention somewhat away from its traditional emphasis on inputs.

The teams' attempt to elicit useful information on outputs from Mission staff through the activity questionnaires was unsuccessful. Our own conclusions on key dimensions of project outputs are presented below.

1. Policy Dialogue/Policy Reform

Some allusions have already been made to those activities that seem strikingly to have contributed to new or continuing policy dialogue domains, or to instigation of concrete policy changes on the part of the GOJ. These activities are not necessarily "large-ticket" items. The Coopers, Lybrand industrial study discussed above, for example, which was intended as preparation of a PP design, was earmarked at \$167,840, of which \$140,000 was expended.

A series of relatively low-cost invitational travel opportunities for Ministry of Health staff, in addition to a series of activities in support of nurses training, have helped to move policy along toward increased attention to birth spacing, although an overt population policy statement is still not forthcoming from the GOJ. Of these activities, the least-cost item was less

than \$2,000, and the highest cost item was the series of commitments for nurses training, totaling some \$395,000, substantially less than the usual minimum for a bilateral sectoral or subsectoral project.

There are several strategy assessments that have been funded under projects III and IV which have also had some effect on policy formulation and change. The regional planning exercise discussed above in the section on buy-ins included a strategy element, and supported what may initially have been a somewhat hesitant approach on the part of the MOP to regional and locally-based planning. While this was an investment of nearly \$1 million, it may have a significant variety of policy impacts over time if the base-level planning exercise is replicated over in the next Plan period.

A more definite Mission attempt to assist the GOJ in formulating an initial sector policy was represented by the package of studies and technical assistance for development of a policy for the new Ministry of Energy. In 1985, a series of discussions with the Ministry led to the development of a list of studies and other policy-related activities requested by the Ministry under TSFS funding. Given the total amount of funding represented by this list, the decision was taken by the then Mission Director and Energy Officer to select key initial activities that together could constitute the basis for a first phase of energy policy development.

Of these, Mission staff indicate that the load management study, (\$265,000), the energy planning and pricing study (\$345,000), and an update to the energy input-output model developed by Blitzer in the early 1980's (\$40,000) to be carried out shortly, are all quite useful. In addition, the package includes three further earmarks, one for \$50,000 for an energy conservation advisor, \$203,000 for a study for a unified system of accounts, and \$297,000 for consulting services and commodities for the Energy and Electricity Information and Advising Center (EEIAC). The total package, therefore, represents earmarks under III and IV of \$1,200,000. Clearly, this is a considerable allocation of funds under the TSFS projects, whose policy dialogue and development implications cannot yet be fully assessed.

Technical assistance provided to the Jordan Valley Authority through a buy-in to an S&T centrally-funded project will make recommendations for short-term TA and training that, in turn, will have an effect on the pricing, scheduling and delivery of irrigation water in the Valley. The pricing aspect is clearly crucial, and will also be addressed in the upcoming Water Sector Assessment which will be funded under TSFS IV for \$60,000.

This work on irrigation water pricing will complement the results of the water tariff study being funded under a bilateral project with WAJ, as well as an update of the IBRD Water Sector Study which has been requested by the MOP. Together, the results of these activities should assist the GOJ in taking the difficult policy steps of raising prices of irrigation and potable water to consumers, so as to move somewhat closer to substantial cost recovery.

A variety of studies in support of project design in agriculture, leading to the new Highland Agriculture project, have also had an impact on Ministry of Agriculture thinking about relative resource allocation to rainfed and irrigated agriculture, leading to a new and increasing emphasis on applied research and extension relevant to rainfed agricultural production. This is apparently a key shift both in the policy of the GOJ and the orientation of

the USAID to the agriculture sector. An assessment of assistance to the Jordan Valley in agriculture and related sectoral projects (roads, schools, etc.) will probably result in additional policy recommendations in support of changes in agricultural production and marketing policy. Changes in the latter area will, in turn, be supported by the proposed Agricultural Marketing Project.

One of the least-cost, and highest impact efforts related to policy reform and subsequent implementation appears to have been the funding of locally-available CITIBANK staff to teach a foreign exchange dealing simulation game graduating seniors at Jordan's Yarmouk University. The first time CITIBANK taught it at a loss for \$8,000. Subsequent versions of the eight-week course have been paid for under TSFS at \$10,000 each. Here, it is not possible to make a direct causal statement about the effect of the activity on policy change. Rather, it may be fairly stated that at about the same time the course was first given, the Central Bank deregulated foreign exchange. The Jordanian banks had no experience in this area, and graduates have found themselves attractive in the marketplace. In the near future, an additional iteration of the course will be funded from TSFS, but this time for Jordanian bank staff. The course is given in Arabic and English and CITIBANK is said to be the best in the business by the Project Officer for this activity, who is a former banker. The Secretary General of the MOP is said to have found this one of the most effective activities ever funded under TSFS.

2. Catalytic, Cutting-Edge Studies and Designs.

Several of the activities which have received incremental funding under TSFS projects III and IV in the technology transfer area have been at the then-cutting edge of the technology in question. Examples are the initial remote sensing aerial mapping and seismology activities with the NRA, backed up by USGS MOUs.

The CITIBANK foreign exchange "game" course could also be included here, as can the several computer system and training feasibility studies that have been carried out, including those for JIM, for the MOP, and for WAJ and NRA. Although, especially now that the CIP has been approved, commodity procurement per se is discouraged under TSFS, there have been several of these feasibility and systems design studies with which the recipients have indicated considerable satisfaction, and which have also led to procurement of U.S.-made computer hard and software.

It is possible that some of the results of technical assistance and studies funded under the "energy package" under TSFS will lead to catalytic designs for projects, and/or innovations in energy and energy-saving technology.

Funding for the Aqaba Basin-Wide Flood Study, under TSFS, will probably lead to design of a number of projects or sub-projects for design and construction of civil improvements, including check dams and drainage structures.

3. Leverage of Other-Donor, GOJ and Private Funds.

In an era of declining AID and GOJ resources, this "multiplier effect" of TSFS project funding is particularly germane. If the next tranche of TSFS V is

approved, the total in the TSFS pipeline is likely to equal or even surpass the rest of the Mission's OYB for projects. Thus, it will become even more significant as a lever for other AID funds, through buy-ins of the types described above, for other-donor funds, and for private and GOJ funds. While it is to be hoped that TSFS funding will remain additional rather than substitutional, the amount of leverage achieved will continue to be at least as important as it is now.

Several examples of leverage were provided in interviews with senior Project Development Office staff, as follows (some of which may be from TSFS V):

- The Asraq-Iraq road: TSFS funded the feasibility study and did the road engineering follow-on and packaging to meet IBRD standards. This has led to IBRD funding of the road improvement project.
- Funding to the Potash Company of \$100,000 for evaporation pans and the refinery led to a U.S. corporation receiving the contract for further analysis and modeling, and a \$14 million IBRD loan.
- With help from a technical advisor who bridged a period after a bilateral project was finished, and who was funded under TSFS III, the Jordan Valley Farmers' Association was able to put together a funding package for a fertilizer batching plant which successfully obtained funding from the Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Industrial Development Bank and the Phosphate Mining Corporation.
- The Desert Areas Survey, funded under TSFS, has led to public and private sector funding for a number of initiatives, including funding from the GOJ and the Arab Fund.

4. Other Multiplier Effects and Linkages.

The list of multiplier effects and linkages might well be longer. However, the Mission in the past six months or so has made some hard decisions about cutting off, or declining TSFS funding for, a number of science and technology activities totalling approximately \$1,500,000 in requests which might have been funded under III, IV and/or V. As has been mentioned in the Findings Chapter, increasingly, through the Review Committee mechanism, the Mission is introducing greater coherence into its management of the TSFS projects, and establishing criteria for exclusion as well as inclusion of activities.

As these decisions are acted upon and conveyed to the GOJ through the Ministry of Planning, whether in formal guidelines or through iterative discussions, it is likely that the linkage role will increase, as will the leverage factor. Although in the short term, it would seem that TSFS funding will increase somewhat dramatically, it also appears that demand will increase at least as quickly as supply, if not more quickly. Thus, we would anticipate that if the same questions about linkage and leverage are asked a year from now, the activity managers and senior management will be able to respond more positively and completely to the questions we asked this year.

F. Overall Effectiveness and Significance

Overall, the Team has concluded that application of the TSFS project mechanism, as well as the majority of specific activities funded under TSFS projects III and IV, has been successful in terms of the success indicators suggested in Chapter III.C.5 above. Specifically, the mechanism has been used to facilitate program and project identification, design, implementation and monitoring activities within the USAID--and involving the USAID and executing agencies of the GOJ--in effective and largely efficient ways. It also has been increasingly used to fund activities undertaken by the GOJ that have played either a catalytic, bridging, institutional development or "cutting edge" role in technology development, technology transfer, institutional strengthening, planning, or in support of policy dialogue and policy reform.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Programming

1. USAID Senior Management and the MOP should design a mechanism for "joint" approval and/or rejection of proposals for TSFS funding. (The present system, under which MOP has to "request" approval from the USAID, does not conform to the spirit of "joint programming" which is a very positive objective of the TSFS mechanism).
2. TSFS funds should be jointly-programmed in terms of guidelines mutually developed, and periodically updated, by the USAID and GOJ. However, such an indicative programming effort should not preclude funding unique targets of opportunity that may emerge from other GOJ or other donor efforts.
3. Based on the joint guidelines developed, the MOP should prepare specific guidelines for developing TSFS proposals and circulate them to GOJ executing agencies in order to rationalize access to these funds and save management time currently devoted to review and improvement of poorly conceived or presented proposals.
4. USAID/Amman should continue to use TSFS funds to "buy in" to ANE regional and central bureau-funded projects where these are appropriate in developmental terms.
5. In selecting activities for funding, those which will yield a multiplier effect, either through leveraging, private, GOJ or other-donor funding, generating employment, increasing productivity or supporting policy dialogue and policy reform should be given particular consideration.
6. USAID/Amman should work with the MOP to develop IQC-like mechanisms for procuring locally-available Jordanian expertise. This would help promote the shift advocated by USAID toward increased GOJ utilization of locally available talent.
7. There should be regularly scheduled (at least annual) formal meetings between the Secretary General of MOP and the USAID Director to review summary allocation and performance data and revalidate the continuing relevance of existing programming guidelines.

B. Project Design

8. The project purpose should be restructured to more accurately express its real intent within the programmatic and geopolitical context of the Jordan program, something along the following lines:

To create opportunities for policy dialogue on important issues with the GOJ, maximize the use of limited AID funds through selective leverage, and seek cost-effective linkages with planned and ongoing development projects in areas of current priority concern to the GOJ and/or the USG.

9. Significant changes in the CDSS objectives, priority problems and GOJ needs should be reflected in the "project approach" included in each new PP amendment but the TSFS purpose and its success indicators should remain constant.
10. Clear and specific outputs (i.e., intended results) should be established at the time of TSFS "activity" approval and serve as the framework for subsequent monitoring, reporting, review and evaluation.
11. A project data base system should be designed to provide the type and cumulation of data necessary to verify reasonable success at the TSFS purpose level at stipulated intervals.

C. Management Improvement

Programming and Approval Process

12. Current guidelines should apply to all new "earmarkings", regardless of under what tranche, (e.g., TSFS III) the money was originally obligated.
13. A data base management system (DBMS) for data collection, monitoring and evaluation should be designed to provide and record relevant data needed for approval, implementation and completion (suggested TSFS basic data input sheets provided in Appendix No. 7). The TSFS Project Manager should be considered the "Systems Manager" for this M&E system.
14. Criteria should be developed (suggested criteria provided in Appendix No. 9) as to when minimum oversight is appropriate and acceptable or when more detailed management is required for a specific TSFS-funded activity (or category of activities).
15. The minimum management system (MMS) should comprise the following elements:
 - o completed basic data sheets (I-III);
 - o concise and succinct statement of expected output(s), who will use them, and for what purpose;
 - o brief completion and assessment report on actual output production and use.
16. Any activity budgeted at less than \$10,000 should automatically use the MMS unless otherwise specifically noted. All other activities should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, using the criteria suggested in Appendix No. 9, during the approval process with the decision on the appropriate mix of management requirements entered into the data base at approval.
17. Use of a high-level Project Review Committee to review all requests over \$10,000 under the improvements already instituted or recommended herein may be reduced by allowing the Head of the PDO or other designated senior officer to approve or disapprove requests up to \$250,000 with the clearance of the RLA, or Contracts Officer if one is assigned to USAID, and the Controller.

Implementation Process

18. The MOP should be encouraged to take a more active role in the monitoring and review of individual TSFS activities when size and importance warrant it.
19. The Project Officer, using the monthly TSFS status reports produced by the DBMS, should monitor the application of any special management requirements, providing assistance and support when and as necessary and reporting to higher levels when problems are anticipated which require attention.
20. Consideration should be given, and a decision taken, as to whether the completion and assessment report provided herein should be done solely in-house or in cooperation with the MOP and/or recipient GOJ organization.

Evaluation and Feedback

21. The type, scope and timing of an evaluation, or its equivalent, should be decided on a case-by-case basis as part of the approval process.
22. The criteria provided (see Appendix No. 9) should be used to help decide, on an objective, pre-determined, and consistent basis, what type of an evaluation exercise is necessary. The MMS should only require a completion and assessment report.
23. In any type of final report, review, study or evaluation, the focus should be on results and how they were used.
24. The results and assessments should be filed in the TSFS Project Office and included into the data base. The Project Officer should also monitor follow-up on significant recommendations.
25. Approximately every three years, there should be an external evaluation of project effectiveness with GOJ participation. The GOJ, and particularly the MOP, should be encouraged to participate more fully in all levels of evaluation. USAID support could include training of MOP and Ministry officials in evaluation and financing use of consultants from the Jordanian private and academic sectors.

Management Reporting

26. The TSFS DBMS should be used to provide the appropriate type and frequency of data needed at various management levels, i.e., the systems manager, technical or activity office, USAID senior management, the MOP, and the ANE Bureau. In some cases, this will include on-line access to the data base.

277 Selected information from the DBMS can be used to improve the "substance" in the semi-annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) sent to ANE, particularly in relation to sectoral/priority areas, activity results (outputs), and major actions expected over the next six months.

Financial Management and Contracting Actions*

28. Less reliance on AID/W for contracting and procurement may increase efficiency and effectiveness and save time and money.
29. Further improvements in financial reporting can be made, inter alia by: a) assigning a date for establishment of project elements; b) recording "actual" earmark and commitment dates; and c) introducing a "PACD" for each activity above a minimum amount.
30. Closer monitoring should be instituted of earmarkings, commitments and expenditures, e.g., establish time-specific targets and "sunset" policies, shifting of all de-earmarked and decommitted funds to the current TSFS project, etc., to increase project efficiency and effective use of total obligations.

Management Capacity

31. TSFS funding should be used to strengthen management systems within the MOP, including those that will be applied to the management of TSFS itself.
32. A Contracts Officer should be posted to USAID/Amman as soon as possible with maximum delegation of authority.
33. In the context of the system changes recommended, the role, responsibilities, authorities and commensurate required experience of the TSFS System Manager (Project Officer) and her/his organizational location and supervisory level should be reviewed by the Mission Director and an appropriate job description developed (see Appendix No. 10 for a draft to get the process started).
34. Where Host Government management capacity and absorptive capacity warrant it, the mechanism illustrated by USAID/Amman's TSFS projects should be replicated.

* See Appendix No. 11 for detailed descriptions prepared by F. Young, ANE/PD.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Team Planning Meeting, Washington, D.C.:

At the request of USAID/Amman, ANE/DP/E arranged for a two-day Team Planning Meeting (TPM) to take place at RONCO Consulting Corporation's Washington, D.C. offices, with the services of an ANE direct hire officer provided to facilitate the sessions. Briefings were given by a representative of ANE/DP/E, by the Jordan Desk Officer, and the PD Project Officer who was also to be traveling to Jordan at the same time as the evaluation team.

During these two days (which were supposed to have been additional to the work days allocated for field work in Jordan, but at first had been subtracted from the total number of those workdays), aside from briefings by AID/W staff, the two-person RONCO team, together with the facilitator and the ANE/DP/E representative, went through the scope of work for the evaluation, developed a provisional workplan, identified key issues for resolution in the field, discussed the evaluation process, developed a preliminary table of contents for the report, and made contingency plans in case the scope of work had to be amended in the field due to disagreements and/or misunderstandings between the Mission and the Bureau about the purposes and outputs of the evaluation. A third day was spent interviewing key officials in AID/W who had served in Jordan and had close connections with management of the project during the period being evaluated, and with the DAA of the ANE Bureau, who had originally called for the evaluation.

Fieldwork, Amman, Jordan:

Upon arrival in the field, the first days were spent by the team clarifying the scope of work, interviewing the Project Officer, the Mission's Evaluation Officer, and reviewing documentation. At the end of three days an amendment to the team's scope of work was negotiated with the Mission, and ratified by the PD Project Officer, so as more closely to reconcile the agendas of the Bureau and of the Mission, and to provide the team with more realistic output requirements given these agendas, the actual data available about the project and actual team composition.

Part of the renegotiated scope of work, which was key to the resulting methodology, was the development by the team of a data base on the project and its numerous activities (sometimes referred to, especially by AID/W, as "sub-projects"). A check-off questionnaire for Activity Officers was developed by the team, and distributed to the appropriate technical or PDO officers. This involved considerable reviewing of available data, primarily contained in the Controller's quarterly reports and pipeline analyses, which were the only codified tables available on the projects. The process of reviewing and "scrubbing" the numbers in these reports so as to determine what the data base consisted of and what the questionnaire should include so as to facilitate improved project management once the evaluation was completed, has led to a number of specific recommendations on monitoring and reporting.

After an initial sampling of activity and project files, and a review of the five assessments/evaluation of "large-ticket" activities that had been conducted by the Mission at the request of AID/W, the team agreed on a sample of organizations (recipients) where interviews would be held. This selection followed discussions with Mission technical and PDO officers who had been involved with the management of the two projects, and with a project-funded Multisector Advisor at the Ministry of Plan—the key counterpart GOJ agency. The team selected five GOJ agencies that had been recipients of significant levels of funding under TSFS III and IV, as well as receiving considerable funding under more "normally" designed and implemented bilateral projects. Two parastatal organizations that had received funding were also included.

Interviews were held with representatives of these organizations, with U.S. technical assistance advisors, with the Minister of Finance, who had formerly been head of the MOP's predecessor agency, and with all the technical offices in the Mission, as well as senior Mission management, and most members of the PDO staff, and the Program Office. These interviews followed a semi-structured interview schedule, stressing inputs, outputs, the management process, and evaluation, as well as policy relevance of individual activities and of the mechanism as a whole. An attempt was made to cross-check reactions between and among those interviewed on the same dimensions, and in some instances, as with MOP staff, to reinterview key officials so as to be sure to have grasped their points of view.

The Controller and his staff served throughout as a very important resource, as did the former manager of the TSFS projects, a member of the Program Office FSN staff. Overall, and despite the fact that the general feeling was that this was an AID/W-initiated evaluation activity, both U.S. and FSN employees of the Mission were very cooperative, which was particularly salient given that they were asked to complete a questionnaire for each TSFS III and IV-funded activity for which they had respectively had monitoring responsibility.

In the end, 66 questionnaires were received, completed in varying degrees, and the data input and analyzed with the help of the Mission's computer specialist and a member of the clerical staff. A d-Base III program was used for this purpose, after it was decided that Lotus 1-2-3 would not be adequate for the manipulations the team hoped to carry out. The results were reviewed and cross-checked with the revised and improved Controller's reports, with the central files on the project in the PDO, and with the Controller's files containing commitment and expenditure documentation. Unfortunately, there was not enough time available to run data correlations or prepare various combinations for analysis in Jordan. Part of the intent of the team was to leave behind in the Mission a data base management system that could be revised, updated, and used in the future for activity management, reporting and monitoring purposes.

Midway through the interviewing process, a revised table of contents was developed and reviewed with the Evaluation Officer, the PDO chief, and the Project Officer. The two team members and the AID/W PD Officer, who was serving as a resource person to the team, divided the analysis and writing tasks, and while waiting for the data base inputting and analysis results to be available, continued interviewing, document review, and began writing general sections of the report.

Before departure from Amman, the team presented a briefing on the evaluation conclusions and recommendations to Mission staff, and completed the ES three-page summary of the evaluation and its findings. The revised scope of work allowed complete draft and final report preparation in Washington, so as to maximize time in Amman for data gathering and analysis. During the later interviews with GOJ agencies, preliminary conclusions and recommendations had been discussed. A final informal briefing was held with the main counterpart officials in the MOP before the team left Jordan.

Report Preparation and AID/W Briefing in Washington, D.C.:

On return to Washington, D.C., the two RONCO team members briefed ANE Bureau officials on the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, and finished the draft and final reports, incorporating feedback from Mission and AID/W, as well as GOJ sources. Unfortunately, the ANE/PD Project Officer was still on TDY in North Africa, and so was not available to participate in the briefings.

UNCLASSIFIED

2

ARTICLE III - STATEMENT OF WORK
-----A. SUBSTANTIVE AND PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES

--1. FOR THOSE ACTIVITIES UNDER TSFS III AND IV WHICH HAVE BEEN COMPLETED, TO WHAT EXTENT DO THEIR OUTCOMES OR OUTPUTS CORRESPOND TO THE PROJECT PURPOSE STATEMENTS, GOJ PLAN OBJECTIVES, USAID CDSS AND ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES THAT APPLIED WHEN ACTIVITY FUNDING WAS COMMITTED.

--2. FOR ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH FUNDS HAVE CURRENTLY BEEN COMMITTED, BUT WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN COMPLETED, TO WHAT EXTENT DO PROGRAM AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES SERVE AS SELECTION CRITERIA FOR TSFS III AND IV.

--3. FOR COMPLETED ACTIVITIES, WHAT HAS BEEN THE MULTIPLIER EFFECT OF THE ACTIVITY IN TERMS OF GENERATING POLICY CHANGE; GOJ INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT; SUBSEQUENT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF BILATERAL OR MULTI-LATERAL PROJECTS; LEVERAGING OTHER-DONOR AND GOJ FUNDS; GENERATING CONTRACTS FOR U.S. FIRMS AND INSTITUTIONS.

--4. FOR NEWLY COMMITTED ACTIVITIES, WHAT ARE THE LINKAGES AND THE MULTIPLIER EFFECTS LIKELY TO BE, AND WILL THEY DIFFER FROM THOSE CHARACTERISTIC OF COMPLETED ACTIVITIES GIVEN NEW ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND DECLINING AID FUNDING LEVELS FOR JORDAN?

BASED ON THE ANALYSIS AND ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS, THE TEAM SHOULD DRAW CONCLUSIONS ON THE PROJECT'S SUCCESS IN MEETING STATED OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSES AS WELL AS IN HELPING TO REORIENT OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSES GIVEN A CHANGING PROGRAM AND PROJECT ENVIRONMENT. THIS MAY INVOLVE SUGGESTIONS FOR REVISION OF PURPOSE STATEMENTS IF APPROPRIATE.

--5. BASELINE DATA: THE MAJOR ACTIVITY TO BE UNDERTAKEN DURING THE EVALUATION WILL BE TO SURVEY AND ANALYZE THE BODY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES (APPROXIMATELY 120) TO IDENTIFY PATTERNS OF ACTIVITY SELECTION, ETC. THAT CAN SERVE AS BASELINE DATA UPON WHICH THE TEAM WILL EXAMINE THE PROJECTS.

USAID WILL PROVIDE LISTS OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES, LEVEL OF FUNDING, RATE OF DISBURSEMENT, ETC.. THE EVALUATION TEAM WILL ORGANIZE THIS DATA TO IDENTIFY PATTERNS IN ACTIVITY SELECTION AND EFFECTIVENESS. POSSIBLE APPROACHES MAY INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, ESTABLISHING "FUNCTIONAL" AND DOLLAR CATEGORIES, LISTING MINISTRIES BY NUMBER/VALUE OF ACTIVITIES, AND SETTING STANDARDS TO ASSESS WHETHER ACTIVITIES WERE "SUCCESSFUL" OR "UNSUCCESSFUL". FOR EXAMPLE, AN ASSESSMENT OF TRAVEL (DEFINITELY A "FUNCTIONAL" CATEGORY) SHOULD PROBABLY TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE APPLICABILITY OF THAT TRAINING TO THE INDIVIDUAL'S JOB, BUT COULD BE CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL MERELY BECAUSE IT TOOK PLACE.

IN ASSEMBLING THE DATA BASE, THE TEAM WILL ORGANIZE INFORMATION ALSO ON IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING AND REPORTING, AND ON OUTPUTS OF ACTIVITIES. ACTIVITIES MAY BE GROUPED INTO A VARIETY OF CATEGORIES, AND KEY PROJECTS IN EACH CATEGORY EXAMINED MORE CLOSELY WITH THE USAID PROJECT STAFF, THE MOP APPROVING STAFF, AND THE MINISTRY OR AGENCY IMPLEMENTING STAFF, INCLUDING CONTRACTORS, WHERE APPROPRIATE.

THE TEAM WILL LEAVE BEHIND SORTED DATA ON EACH ACTIVITY FOR WHICH FUNDS HAVE BEEN COMMITTED UNDER PROJECTS III AND IV. THIS DATA BASE CAN LATER BE COMPUTERIZED BY THE MISSION TO CARRY OUT VARIOUS KINDS OF SORTING AND MANIPULATIONS IF IT FEELS THAT THE QUALITY OF THE DATA WARRANTS IT. THE MISSION CAN ALSO ADD TO THE DATA BASE IF THIS APPEARS TO BE A USEFUL WAY OF ENHANCING PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

AS PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DATA BASE, THE EVALUATION TEAM WILL IDENTIFY TO THE EXTENT THAT IS REASONABLE THE PROCESS AND CRITERIA USED FOR SELECTION IN BOTH THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND USAID. THE EVALUATION SHOULD IDENTIFY, IF POSSIBLE, THE BODY OF PROPOSALS FROM WHICH ACTIVITIES ARE SELECTED. ALTHOUGH MUCH OF THE SELECTION PROCESS IS INFORMAL, ITS EXISTENCE BEARS DOCUMENTATION. FORMAL SYSTEMS WILL BE DESCRIBED.

BASED ON ANALYSIS OF THE DATABASE, WHERE HAVE THE MAIN AREAS OF EMPHASIS BEEN IN DOLLAR TERMS - FEASIBILITY STUDIES, TA, TRAINING, ITOS, PROCUREMENT, AND HOW DO THESE RACK UP FOR JOINTLY-PROGRAMMED FUNDS VERSUS "MISSION USE" FUNDS?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

--6. WHAT CONCLUSIONS ABOUT APPROPRIATENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF ALLOCATIONS ARE GENERATED BY THE ANALYSIS?

B. MANAGEMENT/PROCEDURAL ISSUES

- -----

--1. WHAT IS THE SYSTEM NOW IN PLACE, AND HOW DOES IT WORK? HOW DOES IT DIFFER FROM THAT IN PLACE UNDER III AND FIRST PART OF IV? THIS SHOULD BE ANSWERED IN TERMS OF:

---A. PROJECT OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES.

---B. INFORMATION - FLOW WITHIN THE USAID/RECORD KEEPING.

---C. DECISION - MAKING PROCESS FOR:

----1. JOINTLY PROGRAMMED FUNDS AND PROJECT DESIGN.

----2. MISSION - USE FUNDS AND PROJECT DESIGN.

---D. INTERNAL REQUEST ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION PROCESS AND MONITORING AND REPORTING.

----1. IN USAID

----2. IN GOJ ((--NOTE--))

----3. RESULTS COMBINED - CORRECTIVE ACTION.

---E. RE-ALIGNMENT OF PRIORITIES AS FUNDS TO BE EARMARKED BECOME LESS.

((--NOTE--)) THERE, TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, THE TEAM WILL REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR REQUESTS FOR FUNDS SUBMITTED TO THE MOP, THE REVIEW PROCESS WITHIN THE MOP, INCLUDING OUTSIDE CONSULTATION, IF ANY; FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT; RECORD-KEEPING IF ANY IN PROJECT-RELATED TERMS; METHOD FOR PRIORITIZING REQUESTS; METHODS AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRACKING ACTIVITIES AND FOR EVALUATING PERFORMANCE/EFFECTIVENESS. THERE, AS WITH THE USAID PART OF THE ANALYSIS, THEY SHOULD ATTEMPT TO FIND OUT WHAT HAPPENS TO REQUESTS TURNED DOWN UNDER TSFS, WHY SOME COME TO TSFS RATHER THAN TO OTHER GOJ FUNDING SOURCES (E.G. FASTER TURNAROUND, LOW-PRIORITY; DISIRE TO SHIFT DECISION BURDEN TO EXTERNAL DONOR, ETC.) IF THEY ARE ABLE TO ADDRESS THESE QUESTIONS AND ISSUES IN THE TIME AVAILABLE, THEN THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO DRAW BROAD CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT OF THE TSFS PROJECT ON THE MOP.

UNCLASSIFIED

--2. WHAT GAPS ARE REVEALED BY THE REVIEW OF DATA AND CONDUCT OF INTERVIEWS TO ANSWER QUESTION 1?

--3. WHAT SUGGESTIONS CAN BE MADE TO IMPROVE THESE PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES? MONITORING, REPORTING EVALUATION.

--4. WHAT ARE THE HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE SUGGESTIONS?

--5. ARE THERE COMMON/GENERAL PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THE DESIGN OR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SAMPLE ACTIVITIES AND/OR IN THE FIVE SEPARATELY EVALUATED ACTIVITIES? IF THERE ARE IN FACT SUCH COMMON PROBLEMS, THE EVALUATION SHOULD MAKE SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE ACTIVITIES AND PROBLEMS, AND RECOMMEND PROCEDURES THAT COULD BE INCORPORATED IN FUTURE TSFS-LIKE ACTIVITIES TO PREVENT SUCH PROBLEMS FROM RECURRING.

--6. HAS MANAGEMENT OF MORE THAN 120 SEPARATE ACTIVITIES UNDER TSFS III AND IV POSED A MANAGEMENT BURDEN FOR THE MISSION OR AID/W? IF SO, WHAT CAN BE DONE TO LIMIT THE PROBLEM? TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, THE EVALUATION SHALL QUANTIFY THE APPROXIMATE MISSION AND AID/W STAFF TIME SPENT ON PROJECT ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT (E.G., NUMBER OF STAFF REQUIRING WHAT PERCENT OF THEIR TIME OVER HOW MANY PERSON-MONTHS?).

C.--1. COMPLEMENTARITY BETWEEN TSFS-FUNDED ACTIVITIES, USAID AND GOJ OBJECTIVES, AND OTHER-DONOR ACTIVITIES AND RESOURCES.

--2. THE TEAM WILL EXAMINE TSFS AS A FACILITATING MECHANISM FOR PROJECT IDENTIFICATION, DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES IN THE MISSION ON THE "MISSION-USES" SIDE AS WELL AS THE "JOINTLY-PROGRAMMED" SIDE, TO SEE IF A TSFS OUTPUT IS LEVERAGING MORE WITH LESS FUNDING AS RESOURCES DECLINE ON THE AID SIDE.

--3. THE TEAM WILL ASSESS TSFS AS A FACILITATING MECHANISM FOR THE GOJ TO UNDERTAKE UNUSUAL, SHORT-TERM, CATALYTIC ACTIVITIES AND ACTIVITIES WITH SOME POLITICAL RISK (E.G. POPULATION, MCH), ESPECIALLY IN A RESOURCE - SCARCE ENVIRONMENT.

--4. ASSESS THE IMPACT OF TSFS OVERALL ON GOJ ABILITY TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT PRIORITY ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF ITS 5 YEAR PLANS AND PRESSING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC NEEDS. DOES TSFS HELP THE GOJ TO MAKE MID-COURSES CORRECTIONS WHEN ITS ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT CHANGES (E.G. ECONOMIC DOWN TURN, INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT, POLICY SHIFT TOWARD RAINFED AG DEVELOPMENT, REDUCTION IN IMPORTS, SHIFT IN FX AVAILABILITIES?).

--5. THE TEAM, IN INTERVIEWING KEY ACTORS ABOUT THE PROCESS, WILL ASK THEM TO HYPOTHESIZE WHAT WOULD BE DIFFERENT WITHOUT TSFS IN THE PORTFOLIO: FOR USAID STAFF, FOR MOP/GOJ, FOR AID/W WORK LOAD, FOR DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND POLITICAL REALITIES OF CONTEMPORARY JORDAN. SHOULD MAKE CLEAR WHY/HOW TSFS V AND POSSIBLY VI WOULD STILL REMAIN NECESSARY TO UNDER-WRITE POLICY DIALOGUE AND PUBLIC VS PRIVATE SECTOR REALLOCATIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND RESOURCES.

D. THIS SHOULD THEN LEAD TO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR:

--1. CONTENT - SUBSTANTIVE/PROGRAMMATIC ORIENTATION OF REMAINING ACTIVITIES TO BE FUNDED UNDER IV AND V.

--2. ALTERATIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND SPECIFIC PROCEDURES IN USAID AND GOJ TO MAXIMIZE FLEXIBILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF TSFS MECHANISM.

--3. IMPROVEMENTS IN TRACKING, MONITORING AND IN-COURSE EVALUATION OF ACTIVITIES OVERALL AND BY TYPE.

--4. IMPROVEMENTS IN CONTENT OF REPORTING TO AID/W.

--5. REPLICABILITY OF THE MECHANISM FOR OTHER PROGRAMS BY TYPE OF COUNTRY SETTING AND IN TERMS OF FACILITATING "BUY-INS" TO VARIOUS CENTRALLY-FUNDED OR REGIONALLY-FUNDED ACTIVITIES.

--6. POSSIBLE USE OF MECHANISM IN OTHER-COUNTRY SITUATIONS OF DECLINING USAID FUNDING TO LEVERAGE OTHER-DONOR AND HOST-COUNTRY FUNDS, I.E. TO ADD UTILITY THROUGH MINIMAL DOLLAR SUPPORT TO ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE OF PL480 AND CIP-GENERATED LOCAL CURRENCIES,

AND ENCOURAGE U.S. CONTRACTING OF PROJECTS FUNDED BY OTHER DONORS. UTILITY IN SUPPORT OF DIFFICULT POLICY REFORM INITIATIVES, SINCE SUPPORT CAN BE EASILY PROVIDED SPEEDILY AT KEY JUNCTURES IN THE REFORM PROCESS.

F. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES:

PHASE 1 - THE EVALUATION TEAM WILL SPEND THREE DAYS IN WASHINGTON, D.C. FOR A TEAM PLANNING MEETING (TPM) PRIOR TO DEPARTURE FOR AMMAN, JORDAN TO REVIEW DOCUMENTATION RELEVANT TO THE EVALUATION (E.G., PROJECT PAPERS, THE FY 88 CDSS, THE MOST RECENT BUREAU PD AND S GUIDANCE, THE JORDAN FY 87 ACTION PLAN, THE EVALUATIONS OF THE FIVE SPECIFIC TSFS ACTIVITIES AND THE AID/W OFFICERS. THE TEAM WILL DRAFT A TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR MISSION APPROVAL UPON ARRIVAL IN JORDAN.

PHASE 2 - THE TEAM WILL THEN TRAVEL TO JORDAN AND SPEND APPROXIMATELY THREE WEEKS CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION DISCUSSED IN PHASES 2, 3 AND 4. DURING THIS TIME, THE TEAM WILL COMPLETE THE DOCUMENTATION REVIEW RELATING TO THE TSFS PROJECTS INCLUDING PROJECT FILES RELATED TO THE TSFS ACTIVITIES. THE TEAM WILL ALSO INTERVIEW CURRENT USAID TSFS PROJECT AND ACTIVITIES MANAGERS AS WELL AS OTHER APPROPRIATE USAID AND GOJ STAFF WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED WITH THE MANAGEMENT OF TSFS ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING OFFICIALS OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (MOP) AND OTHER APPROPRIATE GOJ IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES.

PHASE 3 - THE TEAM WILL DEVELOP THE PROJECT DATA BASE DISCUSSED IN A 5 ABOVE, AND MORE INTENSIVELY REVIEW A SMALL SAMPLE OF ACTIVITIES SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF DURATION, FUNDING LEVEL, SECTOR, AND FUNCTIONAL/PROGRAMMATIC CATEGORY (I.E. FEASIBILITY STUDY, MINI-PROJECT, TA, TRAVEL).

PHASE 4 - WILL CONSIST OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF FUNDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, BASED ON DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERVIEWS, AND PREPARATION OF AN OUTLINE OF THE DRAFT REPORT, WITH A MORE COMPLETE VERSION OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. IN THIS PHASE, THE TEAM WILL ALSO COMPLETE PART II OF THE EVALUATION SUMMARY, AND GIVE A BRIEFING ON THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TO MISSION STAFF.

G. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM:

THE TEAM SHALL CONSIST OF TWO U.S. CONTRACTORS, MANAGEMENT EXPERTS FAMILIAR WITH AID ADMINISTRATIVE, MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND ACCOUNTING METHODS. THE MISSION WILL MAKE RELEVANT STAFF RESOURCES AVAILABLE, BUT NOT AS TEAM MEMBERS. THERE WILL BE NO GOJ REPRESENTATION ON THE TEAM.

ARTICLE IV - REPORTS

--A. FORMAT OF THE REPORT: THE CONTRACTORS WILL PREPARE A WRITTEN REPORT IN CONFORMANCE WITH ANE BUREAU EVALUATION GUIDANCE. ANE/DP/E WILL PROVIDE THE TEAM WITH THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTATION. THE REPORT INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

- 1. A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY (PART II)
- 2. BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA SHEET/SIGN. EVENTS
- 3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (NOT TO EXCEED THREE PAGES)
- 4. BODY OF THE REPORT (NOT TO EXCEED 40 PAGES) - INCLUDES A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNTRY CONTEXT IN WHICH THE PROJECT WAS DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED. THE ANALYSIS WILL YIELD FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WILL ASSIST USAID/JORDAN IN IMPROVING MANAGEMENT, REDUCING ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS AND ASSESSING DEVELOPMENTAL IMPACT OF PROJECT.
- 5. APPENDICES. THESE SHOULD INCLUDE AT A MINIMUM:
 - A. EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK;
 - B. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK;
 - C. DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODOLOGY USED IN THE EVALUATION;
 - D. FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX; AND
 - E. BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED.

--B. SUBMISSION OF REPORT: THE EVALUATION TEAM SHALL PREPARE A DRAFT REPORT OUTLINE FOR REVIEW BY USAID PRIOR TO DEPARTURE FROM JORDAN. THE EVALUATION TEAM SHALL BE PREPARED TO PROVIDE AN ORAL PRESENTATION OF ITS FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO USAID/JORDAN AND TO PREPARE PART II OF THE ES OUTLINE PRIOR TO THEIR

DEPARTURE FROM JORDAN. FIVE COPIES OF THE DRAFT REPORT SHALL BE PROVIDED TO ANE/PD. THE TEAM WILL ALSO SPEND UP TO ONE DAY IN WASHINGTON, D.C. TO DEBRIEF RELEVANT AID/W OFFICIALS UPON COMPLETION OF THE FIELD WORK.

ON THE BASIS OF THESE DISCUSSIONS, BRIEFINGS AND THE COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM AID, THE EVALUATION TEAM SHALL PREPARE A FINAL REPORT NO LATER THAN 30 DAYS AFTER DEPARTURE FROM JORDAN. SEVEN COPIES OF THE FINAL REPORT SHALL BE SENT TO USAID/JORDAN AND FIVE COPIES WILL BE SENT TO ANE/PD FOR DISTRIBUTION WITHIN AID/W.

ARTICLE VII - LEVEL OF EFFORT

POSITION	- - - - -	-BURDENED DAILY -	-PERSON DAYS-	-TOTAL
- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -

SENIOR RURAL DEVEL- -	DOLS 507.78	- - - -	30	- - -	15,233
MENT SPECIALIST					

SENIOR RURAL DEVEL- -	DOLS 509.55	- - - -	30	- - -	15,287
MENT SPECIALIST					

TOTAL ESTIMATED LEVEL OF EFFORT	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	-30,520
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---------

SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT MANAGER (SEE BLOCK 5 ON THE COVER PAGE), THE CONTRACTOR IS AUTHORIZED TO ADJUST THE NUMBER OF DAYS ACTUALLY EMPLOYED IN PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK BY EACH POSITION SPECIFIED IN THIS ORDER. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ATTACH A COPY OF THE PROJECT MANAGER'S APPROVAL TO THE FINAL VOUCHER SUBMITTED FOR PAYMENT.

IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ENSURE THAT PROJECT MANAGER APPROVED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE WORK DAYS ORDERED FOR EACH POSITION DO NOT RESULT IN COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT WHICH EXCEED THE TOTAL AMOUNT OBLIGATED FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL SUCH ADJUSTMENTS AUTHORIZE THE CONTRACTOR TO BE PAID ANY SUM IN EXCESS OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT OBLIGATED IN THIS ORDER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK.

ARTICLE VIII - TOTAL OBLIGATED AMOUNT AND BUDGET

FUNDS SHOULD BE ADDED UNDER A AND B TO REFLECT THE
ADDITIONAL WORK DAYS ORDERED AND THE MULTIPLIER.

5. MISSION APPRECIATES AID/W COOPERATION IN THIS
SIGNIFICANT EVALUATION EFFORT PLEASE ADVISE WHEN REVISED
PIO/T SENT TO M/SER/OP.
(DRAFTER:FYOUNG; APPRO:DMASTERS)
BOEKER##

UNCLASSIFIED
 AID 01/26/87
 PDO:DCMASTERS
 PDO:FYOUNG:AM
 1.PDO:AVILLEMMAIN, 2.PRM:WMCKINNEY
 AID-2 AMB DCM

DM

FY

AMEMBASSY AMMAN
 SECSTATE WASHDC, IMMEDIATE

AV

AIDAC

WM

FOR: A. DAMERELL, ANE/PD/E; ANE/MENA BEN HAWLEY;
 ANE/PD NATHANIELSZ FROM YOUNG

E.O. 12356:N/A

SUBJECT: TSFS III AND IV EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK AND
 RELATED IQC WORK ORDER WITH RONCO

REF: AMMAN 09659; TPM IN WASHINGTON, JAN 6-7, 1987

1. USAID/AMMAN REQUESTS ANE/PD/E TO AMEND SOW AND BUDGET IN PIO/T NO. 273-0266-60024 AND FORWARD COMPLETED AMENDMENT TO M/SER/OP FOR ACTION TO AMEND SOW AND BUDGET IN RONCO IQC WORK ORDER NO. PDC-1096-I-00-4164-00, W.O.4. AMENDED BUDGET FOR THE SUBJECT WORK ORDER REFLECTS INCREASE IN LEVEL OF EFFORT BY EIGHT TOTAL WORK DAYS. NO INCREASE IN PIO/T FUNDING REQUIRED.

2. GIVEN ABSENCE PD BACKSTOP YOUNG, REQUEST ANE/PD/E, USE THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN TO AMEND ATTACHMENTS 1 AND 2 TO THE PIO/T, ISSUE AMENDED PIO/T, AND FORWARD TO M/SER/OP.

3. NEW SOW HAS BEEN AGREED UPON FOLLOWING EXTENSIVE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN TEAM RESOURCE PERSONS VILLEMMAIN AND YOUNG, AND MISSION PERSONNEL. TEXT FOLLOWS:

APPENDIX NO. 3

PROJECTS/STUDIES UNDER TSFS INITIATED BY MOP

1. Aqaba Flood Study
2. MOP Computer
3. Azraq-Iraqi Road Design - too late - rejected by MPW
4. Advisor to JICECO - not approved
5. Chemical/Petrochemical Industry Study - not approved
6. Prefeasibility Study of Desert Areas
7. Technical Assistance for National Housing Strategy
8. Technical Assistance to Ministry of Education for Review of School Design
9. IESC
10. Rural Community Development Study
11. Wholesale Fruit and Vegetable Marketing
12. Remote Sensing Center Design Study

APPENDIX NO. 4

THE TSFS SYSTEM - PROJECTS III AND IV

The TSFS Project Management System - A Before and After Description

Change in Concept:

According to the project paper for TSFS III, for the first time the TSFS mechanism was viewed as useful in directing activities toward the future program development goals contained in the CDSS for 1984.

Process Steps

Approval

- While "formally" the process begins with a request from the GOJ's National Planning Council (NPC), in fact it begins with discussions between Ministry and USAID management and/or technical people.
- If agreement was reached that a proposed "activity" was appropriate for TSFS funding (presumably the USAID technical office had checked this out beforehand with the project officer), the requesting GOJ organization developed a scope-of-work, usually in collaboration and with the assistance of the USAID-designed sub-project officer (SPO).
- A request was then formally submitted to the NPC by the GOJ organization for its review to assure that the limited funds available under the TSFS grant(s) were applied to activities considered to be of high priority under the GOJ's development plan.
- If the request was approved by the NPC, it issued its own request to USAID accompanied by a justification and proposed scope of work*.
- The incoming request was routed directly to the designated SPO (who was usually involved in the first step above) who staffed out the request (e.g., checked the proposed scope, budget, etc.), and prepared an "action memorandum" for approval by the Mission Director (MD).
- If no objections were raised in the clearance process, the memo was sent directly to the MD for sign-off. If, however, some objection was raised which could not be easily resolved, the proposal was referred to Project Review Committee, chaired by the Project Officer with representatives from the concerned technical office, Controller, RLO, and the SPO and PD. If resolved, the action memorandum was then sent to the MD. If still unresolved, it was presented to the Senior Review Committee (SRC), a device used for all AID projects. The SRC was chaired by the Program Officer and consisted of office heads. The MD usually also participated, but not as chairman. If resolved, the action memorandum was then signed off.

* Even for activities programmed under "Mission-Use", informal agreement from the NPC was sought by USAID.

- In the case of jointly-programmed activities, the Project Implementation Letter (PIL) was included as part of the package sent to the MD and he signed off on it simultaneously. It is at this point that funds for the activity were earmarked.
- Formal procedures for use of Mission-reserved funds were established. USAID project officers identified the requirement for goods or services which was reviewed by the SRC and then authorized by the MD by sign-off on an action memorandum.
- Prior to issuance of any PIL, the NPC was required, when appropriate, to submit for USAID's review and approval: a request for financing of the particular activity including the objective and description of such activity; an implementation plan and budget estimate showing the contribution of the GOJ; and a designation of the implementing Jordanian agency. These procedures were addressed in the Grant Agreement and PIL No. 1 (Note-these are "standard" project agreement provisions).

Implementation

- The next step depended upon whether the activity was to be implemented directly by AID or the GOJ. When appropriate, the host country contracting procedures, as set forth in AID Handbook 11, were applied. Otherwise, USAID employed direct contracts, work order under IQCs, purchase orders, personnel service agreements, and participating agency service agreements.
- Requirement for reporting, clearances, entitlements, etc, were set out in the PIO/T and/or contract or its equivalent.
- While the exact process varied according to circumstances, contractors and consultants were briefed on arrival by the SPO and contact was maintained by the SPO/technical office.
- The Project Officer in 1985 introduced a "feedback" system requiring semi-annual progress reports for monitoring purposes.
- On-going TSFS activities were subject to review by the PRC, usually in connection with a request for extension/additional funding.
- Evaluations of selected activities (or sub-project) were scheduled and carried out by either contracted or USAID personal
- Debriefings were held, as appropriate, on activity completion.

The TSFS System as it Presently Operates on the AID Side for Jointly-Programmed, AID-Use and GOJ-Use Funds:

Origin of Requests. Ideas for TSFS funding can come via letter to AID officially, through the MOP, unofficially from other institutions (GOJ executing agencies, PVOs, etc.), or may be broached verbally during meetings or at social gatherings. The Mission Director has recently been approaching potential new clients, e.g., the Ministry of Transportation, which have not been aware of the TSFS mechanism before, in an attempt to stimulate and diversify demand under TSFS V and the remainder of TSFS IV.

Alternatively, within AID, an idea may have developed for funding on the basis of an assessment of work or activities needed to round out accomplishments funded under a bilateral project, redesign considerations, or new policy dialogue supporting initiatives. Those for which joint funding will be transmitted by formal letter through the Ministry of Plan, whether originating in the MOP itself or from some technical entity in the GOJ, or from a non-governmental entity. This letter should transmit a budget estimate as well as a purpose statement. The idea may have been discussed in advance informally with the USAID, which may mean that there is a constituency for it in advance of formal transmission. Even so, there will be a formal review, once the request has been transmitted in writing through the MOP.

Letters of request (via the MOP or direct from other institutions), are received by the USAID and distributed by C&R to the appropriate technical office. These requests are then forwarded with recommendations for approval or disapproval to the TSFS Project Officer (PO). Letters not channeled through the MOP will be considered ineligible unless the proposals they contain are considered as appropriate candidates for Mission-Uses funding.

2. USAID Processing of Requests for Jointly-Programmed Funds.

- a. Once a request is formally transmitted to the USAID (e.g., by the MOP), the Mission must either approve or disapprove the request. For requests of \$10,000 or less, the TSFS Project Officer can approve or disapprove the request with clearance from the Controller and the RLA. In some instances, where there is no appropriate technical officer in the Mission to provide a technical input to the decision, or where there is little technical relevance to the proposal (e.g., local procurement of books, secretarial support for a conference), the PO will make the determination of appropriateness for funding without technical consultation.
- b. If the budget accompanying the request is for over \$10,000, it will be placed by the TSFS PO on the agenda of the TSFS Review Committee, which currently meets approximately once a month. Relevant documentation, if there is any, will be attached to the agenda, which is primarily a listing of requests in summary form.

3. When the Review Committee meets, the request will be considered in terms of a set of operational criteria generated from the PP objectives, as well as in terms of past assistance to the entity in question, the CDSS and Action Plan objectives, and current policy dialogue concerns (see II E. 1. above). The Mission has been reorienting its assistance planning away from heavy infrastructure, for example. Thus, requests for additional TA to JVA, NRA, or WAJ must be considered in terms of the overall availability of TSFS funds, the purpose of such TA, its role in catalyzing new activities by these agencies, and the availability of other donor or GOJ funding sources for the TA in question, as well as the possibility that Jordanian expertise is available either within the government or in the private sector.

That is, even if—viewed a-historically—such a TA request seems sensible and would constitute a good bridging activity to move the requesting agency to the last steps in an institutional development process, the Mission must now ask itself whether this final phase is something that most appropriately allocates increasingly scarce USAID resources, given the resources already allocated to this agency, subsector,

or sector. Additionally, new sectoral or policy priorities must be taken into account given the multi-use nature of the TSFS mechanism.

4. The TSFS Review Committee acts on each agenda item, either approving the activity (often with modifications), disapproving the activity, or recommending further staff work. Discussions and decisions are recorded in the minutes of the meeting. Based on these minutes, the Controller's Office will record approved activities as Project Elements. As a Project Element, funds for the activity are not yet earmarked, but there is a notation that an amount of funds "x" is likely to be required for the activity.
5. Once the Review Committee makes a decision, the appropriate technical officer is responsible for follow-through with the requesting institution. If the activity is approved for jointly-programmed funding, the technical officer must be sure a formal request was indeed received by the MOP. (There are instances where the Review Committee will disapprove a request for Mission-Use funding, but will approve it for Jointly-Programmed funding. This means that the requesting entity will have to channel its request through the MOP "after the fact". Once the formal request through the MOP is received, if it is essentially the same as the version discussed at the Review Committee, it does not have to be reviewed by the Committee a second time, and can go to the next step in the process.

Once the request is approved and the MOP request letter is in hand, the technical officer will draft a Project Implementation Letter (PIL) to earmark and/or commit the funds. This letter requires the clearance of the TSFS PI, RLA and the Controller, with copies to the Program Office.

At this point, the Controller's Office will earmark funds for the activity on the basis of an estimated budget included in the PIL or in another type of AID earmarking document, such as a PIO/T, PIO/C or, occasionally, a PIO/P. After this has been done, and the PIL has been sent to the GOJ, then either or both sides must generate the commitment documents required for funds to be committed, and for implementation to begin. Here, there are several options.

- a. If the GOJ is going to let a Host Country Contract (HCC), then it is likely that a draft contract will be drawn up by the Mission (with help from the RLA) and transmitted to the GOJ contracting agency, and to the potential contractor if this is already known, for review. When terms are agreed upon, and after AID has reviewed the revised terms and conditions of the HCC, the contractor and the GOJ will sign.
- b. If procurement of commodities is in question, and the procurement will be done locally, as was the case for the MOP computers under TSFS V, for example, then a PIL earmarking the funds is sent, and the GOJ will have to demonstrate that it will be conforming to AID procurement regulations, for example by providing AID with a purchase order, pro forma or other form of documentation. Where the GOJ agency has a long history of cooperation with AID, this step is sometimes omitted, and the PIL establishes a global earmark and gives a list of specified commodities that may be procured under the appropriate USG regulations, which in turn are cited in the first PIL under the project, and may be reiterated in the specific PIL for a procurement. Funds are committed when disbursement is made.

Commitment documents are held by the agency concerned or copies are transmitted to the USAID along with the reimbursement request. Where the requesting agency is new to the process, after the draft procurement documentation has been reviewed, a second PIL will be issued committing the funds.

- c. If an AID direct contract is to be negotiated, a PIO/T will be prepared by the appropriate technical officer or the PO in the PDO. If it is to be an institutional contract, or if the amount of a non-institutional contract is more than \$100,000, AID/W will be asked to negotiate and let the contract, since the current Mission Directors' delegation of authority for contracting is \$100,000 or less. Often, even contracts for less than \$100,000 have come to AID/W for negotiation, as there is no contracts officer presently in the Mission. AID/W informants note that frequently, the Mission has also cabled in the funding cite and language for the scope of work for a PIO/T, instead of cutting the PIO/T in the field and forwarding it to AID/W. This means, from the Mission point of view, that ANE/PD can rewrite the scope of work and revise the budget accordingly. From the AID/W point of view, it means more work, and more clearances. From the point of view of speed of implementation, it means delays.

AID/W management of contracts under TSFS presents problems for financial management within the Mission, since it is often very difficult to obtain up-to-date information from AID/W on contract actions and accrual status of funds being expended under such contracts. The same difficulty obtains when AID/W is asked to procure commodities.

Occasionally, as with Westinghouse Electric Corporation, an AID direct contract, although institutional, was negotiated, and subsequently amended in Jordan, since the firm was already present in the country, the local representatives had permission to negotiate, and there was an ad hoc delegation to the Mission Director that covered the amount of the contract and the subsequent amendment. This was the exception, however and pertains to actions under TSFS II and IV.

A PIO/T will also be prepared if an IQC work order is to be issued, or an 8(a) contract used. Again, AID/W will execute the PIO/T, on the basis of a Mission cable, and negotiate the work order with the IQC firm, or the contract with the SBA. In some instances, the Mission may specify the firm desired. In others, the PD backstop officer will search out the appropriate IQC or 8(a) firm and seek Mission concurrence. The contractor will usually voucher AID/W. Preferably, vouchers should come to the Mission, to allow better financial management at the USAID level.

- d. In some cases, a PASA arrangement will be negotiated for the services of an individual from another USG agency, such as the USGS. Here, AID/W will arrange PASA execution on the basis of a PIO/T prepared by the Mission, but executed in Washington. Usually, there will be an underlying Memorandum of Understanding with between the GOJ and USG entities in the domain in question that provides a framework for negotiation of the individual PASA agreement. The agreement, in turn, is the only document in which the USAID is able to specify which portion of the agreed activities it wishes to fund, and to have an influence on the specifics of the scope of work.

- e. Personal Services Contracts (PSCs) for the services of individuals are also an option for TA under TSFS. In these instances, the Mission will usually draft and negotiate the contract with an individual, and monitoring and vouchering will be done at the Mission level.
 - f. If procurement of commodities is required, the Mission may request AID/W to procure the commodities directly, by transmitting a PIO/C, or may ask that a PSA be used, either under a procurement IQC, or under a purchase order. Sometimes, the Mission will issue a direct L/Com to speed up procurement. Delays and problems with information flow have been reported with AID/W direct procurement for activities under TSFS projects III and IV. Therefore, there is a preference for limiting commodity procurement under TSFS requiring formal IFBs.
 - g. For a specific product, the Mission may issue a purchase order (P.O.) up to the \$100,000 delegation of authority.
 - h. For invitational travel, an ITO (Invitational Travel Order) may be issued, either to bring someone from the US to Jordan, or to send someone from Jordan overseas. Under TSFS, invitational travel has been the mechanism used to supplement short-term training in the US, or conference attendance overseas, where the majority of the funds came from the blanket participant training project (DAT), or from bilateral projects. This is the exception rather than the rule. ITOs have been issued in other cases where an expert was available under other funding in a nearby country, and could be brought for little additional cost to Jordan to carry out a specific trouble-shooting or evaluation task.
6. Reporting. During implementation, little reporting from the GOJ is required. Where funds have been provided for technical assistance, however, the contract usually includes a requirement for monthly, quarterly or semi-annual reporting, and for an end of contract report prepared by the contractor.

Where feasibility studies have been carried out under HCCs, AID receives a copy of the study and its findings, perhaps along with the sponsoring GOJ entity's evaluation of the findings and recommendations, as well as a of the quality of the services and of the report. In general, however, there are no formal reporting requirements for the GOJ on HCCs. Vouchers are sent to the Controller which allows pipeline analysis and thus as sense of whether things are proceeding on time. Problems may or may not be raised on a person to person basis by the GOJ sponsoring agency or the technical assistance expert during the course of the contract. In one instance, someone whose contract had been extended four times is said only to have described problems encountered during his work with the GOJ counterpart entity during his final exit interview with the USAID technical officer.

For AID direct contracts, the usual reporting requirements are included. Frequency of reporting and quality will depend on the relationship of the contractor to the nature of the job, the traditions of the GOJ entity regarding supervision of TA, and the level of interest of the concerned AID officer. Reporting requirements included in AID/W negotiated contracts are likely to follow the usual boilerplate which may or may not be of particular utility to the Mission or the GOJ recipient agency.

Reporting to AID/W takes the form of inclusion of the TSFS projects in quarterly implementation reports and in the reporting process for semi-annual project implementation reviews, following AID/W guidance. Quarterly reports for internal utilization by the USAID have more information, but the format is "input-oriented" and does not reflect TSFS accomplishments and purposes particularly well. A more appropriate format would use the operational criteria/activity matrix that has recently been developed by the PO and the Review Committee as the basis for a format for describing outputs and accomplishments (see below).

Completion reporting seems to be largely lacking both from the AID side and from the GOJ. There is a reporting system in place for all projects in the MOP, but it is not clear that it is routinely applied to TSFS-funded activities. Activity completion reports are not currently required within the Mission either, so that it is often difficult for the TSFS PO and the Controller to tell whether or not the activity has been completed, whether there are additional funds remaining that should be decommitted, or whether additional funds may be required to meet the full costs of the activity. This is particularly difficult, as has been noted above, for activities that are contracted in AID/W, and for AID/W-managed commodity procurement.

Rejected Requests

For formal requests representing a funding level of under \$10,000, the TSFS Project Officer has the authority—with RLA and CONT clearance—reject what appears an inappropriate request. Where such a request has come through the technical officer in the Mission, it will already have been reviewed technically before it reaches the PO. In some instances, where it has come directly to the TSFS PO, through the "front office" from the GOJ, the PO may not necessarily consult a technical officer before rejecting the request.

For requests over \$10,000, the technical officer will present and defend for his or her request for TSFS funding. Allocation under Mission-Uses versus Jointly-Programmed funding categories will be debated at this time. The track record of that officer and office and its host country counterpart agencies is likely to be taken into account informally in the approval process. These are the kinds of informally determined criteria that are endemic in the sort of decision-making process characteristic of A.I.D. world-wide, and are difficult to record or quantify. In the case of TSFS in USAID/Amman, some sense of how much funding has already gone to this subsector or sector under the project will also enter into the calculus leading to a decision on approval, although formal cumulation by project by sector or functional category has not been done routinely up to this point in time.

A request for under \$10,000, if rejected, only enters the data system and records of the project in the central files, in which the request letter and the rejection letter are kept. At the CONT level of recording, the request will not have been listed as a project element since it will never have reached the TSFS Review Committee for decision. Were it desirable to note such activities, a list could be prepared quarterly or on a semi-annual basis, so that an analysis could be made of the sectoral, substantive and programmatic or functional categories in which most disapproved requests fall. This reporting feature would have to be done by the Project Development Office rather than the Controller, as these are non-funded activities and therefore do not show up in Controller's accounts which then provide the data for the pipeline analysis.

Such a listing or analysis might additionally be useful in quarterly and/or semi-annual reviews to help the GOJ as well as the Mission and AID/W to understand the nature and application of selection criteria, and better to assess the screening process which is evolving under the project. This, in turn, might lead to increased efficiency in screening proposals for requests within the GOJ before they reach the MOP, as well as within the MOP before formally reaching the USAID.

Mission-Use Funds

The procedures and steps here are similar to those outlined above for Jointly-Programmed funds, except that the PIL is not used, while the usual AID internal earmarking documents are. Technical offices compete for these funds, which are used for the typical PD and S functions in support of project design. Some Mission-Use funds are used for general program support purposes (see Table I).

GOJ-Use Funds

Under TSFS V, it was decided to reserve \$500,000 or approximately 9% of the initial obligation for unilateral programming by the MOP. This would then provide flexibility to the MOP of the type that had always been available to the USAID under the Mission-Uses reservation. Initially, the MOP appeared to be reluctant to program these funds unilaterally. It is only in the past few weeks that they have finally been earmarked for the purchase of the MOP VAX computer system in support of project monitoring, and for the feasibility study of the Said Dam. The USAID TSFS PO indicates that in both instances, these funds have been handled exactly as though they had been Jointly-Programmed funds, thus allowing the MOP to avoid the appearance of acting unilaterally.

ANALYSIS OF TSFS EVALUATIONS
(TSFS III and IV)

Findings:

1. Exercises labeled "evaluations" were carried out on five TSFS-funded activities, viz:
 - Jordan Seismological Observatory - March 1985
 - CRS Income Generation Project for Rural Women in Jordan - November 1985
 - Technical Assistance to Municipality of Amman - July 1985
 - Technical Assistance to MOP for Regional Planning - March 1986
 - Technical Assistance to Ministry of Public Works - 1986

2. These exercises required an average of one week - or less. Two were performed by outside contractors/consultants and three by USAID technical staff, either U.S. or Jordanian. The total funding, from TSFS III and IV, for these projects was:

JSO	\$ 697,980 (plus \$65,500 in local costs)*
CRS	\$ 200,000
MA	\$ 800,000
MOP/RP	\$1,095,000
MPW	\$ 606,858*

3. The type of evaluations were variously described as "interim" or "ad hoc" although in one case (SARSA), it appeared to be terminal.

4. The scope of the exercise varied but usually involved assessment of: progress; accomplishments; outputs; continuing validity of design and project relevance; and comparison with original scope of work. One important factor in common was the intent to use evaluation results for decision-making, i.e. to extend, redesign, terminate and/or add additional financing.

5. Statements (where they could be found) on activity design (i.e., logframe elements) were not very useful for evaluation purposes. Purpose, outputs, and activities were often unclear or mixed, which can be particularly burdensome if the activity function is institution-building versus direct support. With one or two exceptions, outputs or expected results were not very specific and baseline data was missing, making objective assessment difficult.

6. Progress was usually described (in the evaluation reports) in terms of input deliveries and activities. Progress in producing predetermined outputs was sometimes lacking.

7. The "assessments" were all favorable except for one performed by a contractor. The TSFS/PO was unaware that achievement of this activity's "institution-building" purpose was in jeopardy.

* Evaluation conducted by USAID staff.

8. In three cases, continuation of the activity was recommended. In one case there was no recommendation and in the case referred to just above, the recommendation, in effect, was to redesign and find a counterpart organization or terminate.
9. Four of the five activities can be considered "successful", Particularly if the project function was primarily direct-support rather than institution-building. One project is in trouble.
10. The quality of the evaluations varied. In two cases, both involving USAID staff, the exercises were routine and more in the nature of workplan reviews. The exercises carried out by consultants were most justifiably labeled as evaluations and were of good quality given the circumstances. One exercise did not meet the requirements of its terms of reference, particularly in the comparison of planned versus actual outputs produced.
11. Under TSFS III, one activity of \$500,000 (FAA), has not yet been evaluated. Under TSFS IV, there are three projects of \$500,000 or over which have not yet been evaluated or scheduled for evaluation, i.e., Load Research and Management Study, National Housing Strategy, and Arabic Literary Series (CTW).

Conclusions:

12. Criteria need to be developed to determine when result-oriented formative and/or terminal evaluation is cost-effective under TSFS.
13. Guidelines should be developed for self-evaluation by MOP/Ministries and/or by the activity manager in the USAID.
14. Duties of the TSFS Project Officer should be expanded to include oversight of the project monitoring and evaluation process and the conduct of these exercises.
15. There is a need for a simple, output-oriented completion report to be prepared by the activity manager.
16. More involvement of the GOJ is needed.

SECTORAL BREAKDOWN TABLES

MOBID	PROJECT INPUTS	PILO	I (FEB:FT)	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	EARNINGS AMOUNT	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. *	SLS PROJECT OFFICER
										UNEAF. *	
ENVIRONMENT											
20001	JORDAN SEISMIC SYSTEM-FX COSTS		3	559,310.00	559,310.00	559,310.00	448,866.27	50,000.00	498,866.27	60,443.73	VILLEMARIN
	-LOCAL COSTS		3A	65,500.00	65,500.00	65,500.00	64,532.07	867.93	65,500.00	0.00	VILLEMARIN
20002	PIO/T-GORDON ANDREASON CONT.		3E	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00	0.00	75,000.00	0.00	
20020	ENVIRONMENTAL REMOTE SENSING		17	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	0.00	12,000.00	0.00	
20021	CONTRACT-R. ICHERT		29A	10,612.00	10,612.00	10,612.00	10,612.00	0.00	10,612.00	0.00	
2062N	VAX TRAINING MAT. FOR NRA		31	13,000.00	13,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13,000.00	VILLEMARIN
2072N	SEISMIC TRNG FOR NRA		36	17,000.00	17,000.00	11,200.00	2,524.92	8,555.08	11,200.00	5,800.00	VILLEMARIN
2033N	ITD-S.ANDREASON			2,692.28	2,692.28	2,692.28	2,692.28	0.00	2,692.28	0.00	
2020N	ITD-MORGAN			200.00	200.00	200.00	0.00	200.00	200.00	0.00	VILLEMARIN
2022N	TDY-BOSEWELL			1,592.50	1,592.50	1,592.50	1,592.50	0.00	1,592.50	0.00	
TOTAL-ENVIRONMENT			15.14	756,706.78	756,906.78	738,106.75	617,930.04	59,733.01	677,663.05	79,243.73	
AGRICULTURE & RURAL DEVELOPMENT											
20003	RURAL DEVELOPMENT II		9	945,000.00	945,000.00	945,000.00	931,375.50	13,624.50	945,000.00	0.00	MCYINNEY
20006	HIGHLAND AG. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT		10	115,473.38	115,473.38	115,473.38	115,473.38	0.00	115,473.38	0.00	CUMMINGS
20007	M'SALE FRUIT & VEG. MARKETS		11	23,721.54	23,721.54	23,721.54	23,721.54	0.00	23,721.54	0.00	
20008	HIGHLAND AG. DEV. PROJ.-PRI. SEC. STUDY		12	35,083.49	35,083.49	35,083.49	27,749.12	7,334.37	35,083.49	0.00	CUMMINGS
2019N	SUPPLY ADVISOR		15	19,950.00	19,950.00	19,950.00	19,950.00	0.00	19,950.00	0.00	
2028N	EXT. CONT.-BOONETILLEYE		20	68,109.93	68,109.93	68,109.93	68,109.93	0.00	68,109.93	0.00	
2027N	RESEARCH-CEREAL VARIETIES (ICARDA)		19/17A	45,000.00	45,000.00	45,000.00	44,615.71	0.00	44,615.71	384.29	CUMMINGS
2036N	CONT.-CHILD & FURTIK		23	7,957.75	7,957.75	7,957.45	7,957.45	0.00	7,957.45	(25.70)	QUSHAIR
2054N	CONSULTATION-TAKA IZUMI		25	4,500.00	4,500.00	4,500.00	4,500.00	0.00	4,500.00	0.00	
2032N	RAINFED AGR. INFO. NETWORK			861.90	861.90	861.90	861.90	0.00	861.90	0.00	
2047N	HADP-ENG. ANNEX-ENG. PLANS			1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	
2052N	CONT. EXT.-FURTIK			61,839.00	61,839.00	61,839.00	47,158.31	14,680.69	61,839.00	0.00	RISHOI
2060N	HIGHLAND AG PROJ. PP PREP.-PER-DIEM			1,200.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	0.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	0.00	CUMMINGS
2038N	RURAL COM. DEV. STUDY (CLARK UNIVERSITY)		24	11,396.92	11,396.92	11,396.92	11,396.92	0.00	11,396.92	0.00	
2024N	REPROD. COSTS-BOYD POST REPORT			274.62	274.62	274.62	274.62	0.00	274.62	0.00	
TOTAL-AGRICULTURE & RURAL DEVELOPMENT			26.83	1,341,368.53	1,341,368.53	1,241,394.27	1,204,170.78	36,839.56	1,341,609.94	358.59 ***	
HEALTH & POPULATION											
2055N	SCHISTOSOMIASIS MANUAL		26	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	0.00	12,500.00	12,500.00	2,500.00	HALADAY
2053N	I.T.D.-M.FAROUQ/R. BSOUK (ORT CONF.)		27	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,929.22	0.00	3,929.22	1,070.78	HALADAY
2006N	ITD-UNDERSEC. OF MOH TO USA			1,374.67	1,374.67	1,374.67	1,374.67	0.00	1,374.67	0.00	
2026N	SYS. ANALYST / PROG. (PASAI)-BUCEM		18	50,500.00	50,500.00	50,500.00	33,884.57	0.00	33,884.57	16,615.43	HALADAY
2008N	ITD-POP. CONF. -GEHEVA			2,857.07	2,857.07	2,857.07	2,857.07	0.00	2,857.07	0.00	
TOTAL-HEALTH & POPULATION			1.49	74,731.74	74,731.74	74,731.74	42,045.53	12,500.00	54,545.53	20,186.21	

ISFS III(0253)

MOB#	PROJECT INPUTS	PIL#	Z (PER:PT)	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	ERRORA AMOUNT	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCON.+ UNEIP.+ UNEAR. BALANCE	SUB PROJECT OFFICER
WATER AND WASTE-WATER RESOURCES DEVELOP											
2001N	GREATER AMMAN STAGE II(JMM)	2		154,303.67	154,303.67	154,303.67	154,303.67	0.00	154,303.67	0.00	#
2005N	SANITARY ENGINEER-AWSA	6		175,465.00	175,465.00	175,465.00	174,042.88	0.00	174,042.88	1,402.12	SALAH
2001O	N.JORDAN GROUND WATER RES. PROJ.	14		256,125.00	256,125.00			0.00		79,257.99	SWEISS
2001CA	PASA EXTENSION					92,531.65	92,531.65	0.00	92,531.65		#
2001OC	PER-DIEM(IN-COUNTRY)					13,360.52	13,360.52	0.00	13,360.52		#
2001OD	GROUNDWATER ADVISOR(T.OTOVA)					140,000.00	73,174.84	6,860.00	79,974.84		SWEISS
2035N	CDNT.-M.PIRNIE	22		59,854.92	59,854.92	59,854.92	59,854.92	0.00	59,854.92	0.00	#
2061N	I.T.O. (OTOVA)	29		1,500.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	1,085.79	0.00	1,085.79	414.21	SWEISS
2025N	WATER RES. PUBLICATION			154.35	154.35	154.35	154.35	0.00	154.35	0.00	#
TOTAL-WATER & WASTE-WATER RES. DEV.			12.95	647,402.94	647,402.94	637,170.11	568,528.62	6,860.00	575,328.52	72,074.32	
TRANSPORTATION											
2007A	CONSULTANTS-MUNICIPALTY OF AMMAN	7		800,000.00	800,000.00					14,326.82	SWEIS
2007NA	PRE CONTRACT EXPENSES					10,080.68	10,080.68	0.00	10,080.68		#
2007NB	CONTRACT-CARSTEN D.LEIKVOLD					132,516.00	126,766.40	0.00	126,766.40		SWEISS
2007NC	CONTRACT-MOHAMMED SOOMRO					178,215.00	178,215.00	0.00	178,215.00		SWEISS
2007ND	CONTRACT-BHAGWAN DASS					45,415.99	45,415.99	0.00	45,415.99		#
2007NE	CONTRACT-CENEL EGEMEN					181,697.75	178,520.26	0.00	178,520.26		#
2007NF	CONTRACT-WILBUR SMITH & ASS.					50,048.69	50,048.69	0.00	50,048.69		#
2007NG	CONTRACT(H/C)-G.O.ABDO					8,000.00	7,959.93	0.00	7,959.93		#
2007NH	CONTRACT-BARRY BAKER					125,909.00	118,311.23	2,500.00	120,311.23		SWEISS
2007MI	CONTRACT-FRANCIS KANE					67,955.00	63,531.10	4,023.90	67,855.00		SWEISS
2070N	56TH ANNUAL TRAFFIC ENG. SEMINAR	33		3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	SWEISS
TOTAL-TRANSPORTATION			16.06	803,000.00	803,000.00	800,938.11	778,949.28	9,823.90	788,573.18	14,326.82	
WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT											
20004	ROLE OF WOMEN IN H'LAND AG.			2,750.00	2,750.00	2,750.00	2,750.00	0.00	2,750.00	0.00	#
2049N	ITC-UN DEC. OF WOMEN			11,807.50	11,807.50	11,807.50	11,807.50	0.00	11,807.50	0.00	#
TOTAL-WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT			0.29	14,557.50	14,557.50	14,557.50	14,557.50	0.00	14,557.50	0.00	

TSFS III (2258)

MOD#	PROJECT INPUTS	PIL#	I (PEB:PT)	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	EARMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCL. +	SUB
										UNCL. + UNE:R. BALANCE	PROJECT OFFICER
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT											
2039M	RESEARCH TRI. INST.-S.SHRADER			49,049.50	49,049.50	49,049.50	49,049.50	0.00	49,049.50	0.00	*
2069M	2ND INT. SHELTER CONF. VIENNA AUSTRIA	32		5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	4,341.87	0.00	4,341.87	653.13	B. RILEY
2046M	HIS PP PREP.			15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00	0.00	*
2051M	REPRODUCTION-J.H.A.DEV. PROJ.			212.36	212.36	212.36	212.36	0.00	212.36	0.00	*
TOTAL-HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			1.39	69,261.96	69,261.96	69,261.96	68,603.73	0.00	68,603.73	653.13	
DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION											
2002M	FINANCIAL ADVISOR-AWSA(IEF SMITH)	4		115,902.96	115,902.96	115,902.96	115,902.96	0.00	115,902.96	0.00	*
2003M	FAA TECHNICAL ASS. TO JCAA	5		500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	0.00	500,000.00	0.00	*
2021M	EDP ANALYST CONT.-S.BACON	16		3,800.98	3,800.98	3,800.98	3,800.98	0.00	3,800.98	0.00	*
20014	CONT.-GUNCAM(COMPUTER SPECIALIST)			5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	*
2030M	MRA & WAJ COMP. SYSTEMS-L.NORTH			1,166.47	1,166.47	1,166.47	1,166.47	0.00	1,166.47	0.00	*
2031M	PO-PUBS. (MPC)			150.00	150.00	150.00	0.00	150.00	150.00	0.00	ISHAQ
2034M	COMP. SPECIALIST-L. NORTH			1,662.50	1,662.50	1,662.50	1,662.50	0.00	1,662.50	0.00	*
2037M	DATA ENTRY/PRG.-M.O.P.	21		7,959.76	7,959.76	7,959.76	7,959.76	0.00	7,959.76	0.00	*
2023M	TDY-PAT JOHNSON			8,137.28	8,137.28	8,137.28	8,137.28	0.00	8,137.28	0.00	*
20009	INS.-DR.MALALLAH (REF.2018M)			300.00	300.00	300.00	0.00	300.00	300.00	0.00	MASR
TOTAL-DEVELOPMENT ADMIN.			12.88	644,079.95	644,079.95	644,079.95	643,629.95	450.00	644,079.95	0.00	
PRIVATE/MIXED SECTOR SUPPORT											
2009M	INTERNAT. EXEC. SERVICE CORP(IQC)	8		102,000.00	102,000.00	102,000.00	52,000.00	20,000.00	102,000.00	0.00	RISHDI
2015M	CONTRACT-GREAT SALT LAKE/POTASH CO.	13		97,500.00	97,500.00	97,500.00	97,500.00	0.00	97,500.00	0.00	*
2017M	C.R.S. (REF.#004M)			160,000.00	160,000.00	160,000.00	160,000.00	0.00	160,000.00	0.00	*
2050M	CHILDREN'S TV W/S			3,636.31	3,636.31	3,636.31	3,636.31	0.00	3,636.31	0.00	*
TOTAL-PRIVATE AND MIXED SECTOR SUPPORT			7.26	363,136.31	363,136.31	363,136.31	343,136.31	20,000.00	363,136.31	0.00	
ENERGY											
2071M	HIGH VOLTAGE INSULATORS EXPERTS ASSIST	35		90,000.00	90,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90,000.00	SALAH
TOTAL-ENGINEERING SUPPORT			1.80	90,000.00	90,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90,000.00	

29

TSFS 111(0258)

MOB#	PROJECT INPUTS	PILO	Z (PEB:PT)	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	EAEMAFK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCON. + UNETP. + UNEAR. BALANCE	SUB PROJECT OFFICER
EVALUATIONS / ASSESSMENTS											
20015	EVALUATION-JMM			57,387.00	57,387.00	57,387.00	50,364.32	0.00	50,364.32	7,022.68	RISHGI
2040M	TRANSLATION SERVICES-UDA ASSESS.			793.06	793.06	793.06	793.06	0.00	793.06	0.00	*
	TOTAL-EVALUATIONS/ASSESS.		1.16	58,180.06	58,180.06	58,180.06	51,157.38	0.00	51,157.38	7,022.68	
GENERAL MISSION PROGRAM SUPPORT											
20011	PIO/P 20011-JUDEN			3,391.00	3,391.00	3,391.00	3,391.00	0.00	3,391.00	0.00	*
20016	PIO/T20016-CIP (MOLFBANG)			9,720.00	9,720.00	9,720.00	9,720.00	0.00	9,720.00	0.00	*
20017	PIO/T-CIP-TRADE/COM.SPECIALIST			17,826.00	17,826.00	17,826.00	17,826.00	0.00	17,826.00	0.00	*
20019	ECON. ANALYSIS-T.A/JABER			15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00	0.00	*
2011M	ITO-HIRZALLAH			3,325.71	3,325.71	3,325.71	3,325.71	0.00	3,325.71	0.00	*
2012M	ITO-DR. A. VUTURO			7,484.73	7,484.73	7,484.73	7,484.73	0.00	7,484.73	0.00	*
2013M	ADVERTISEMENT			159.60	159.60	159.60	159.60	0.00	159.60	0.00	*
2016M	PD-PRISCILLA BASSON			655.73	655.73	655.73	655.73	0.00	655.73	0.00	*
2018M	ITO-SHARAI BEH/MALLALAH			6,842.08	6,842.08	6,842.08	6,842.08	0.00	6,842.08	0.00	*
2029M	ITO-SAIF NAZIR			1,853.34	1,853.34	1,853.34	1,853.34	0.00	1,853.34	0.00	*
2041M	OFFICE SPACE-UDA			1,500.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	0.00	MCKINNEY
2042M	ITO-GENEVA & USA-M.SAUDI			5,597.02	5,597.02	5,597.02	5,597.02	0.00	5,597.02	0.00	*
2043M	STUDIES-DRS.MRYIAN/KHADRA&AROURI/IBRAHIM			7,940.44	7,940.44	7,940.44	7,940.44	0.00	7,940.44	0.00	*
2045M	PIO/T-DR.E.MALIK			10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00	MASTERS
2048M	ITO-B.KIFAYA			2,392.67	2,392.67	2,392.67	2,392.67	0.00	2,392.67	0.00	*
2056M	ITO-DR.S.KHATTARI			3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	2,646.60	0.00	2,646.60	353.40	CUMMINGS
2057M	ITO-F.SHARAI BEH			2,834.96	2,834.96	2,834.96	2,834.96	0.00	2,834.96	0.00	*
2059M	ITO-A. SHRAIDEN/F.SUBHI			2,627.45	2,627.45	2,627.45	2,627.45	0.00	2,627.45	0.00	*
	TOTAL-GENERAL MISSION PROG.SUPPORT		2.04	102,150.73	102,150.73	102,150.73	90,297.33	11,500.00	101,797.33	353.40	
	UNPROGRAMMED		0.70	35,223.60						35,223.60	
	PROJECT TOTAL		100.00	5,000,000.00	4,077,957.04	3,958,949.91	3,660,895.54	147,822.57	3,908,718.11	304,462.53	

E M D

19

(SFS IV-0260)

MOD	P.E.	PROJ. ELEM./EARMARK/COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	FIL	I (PER:PET)	PROJECT ELEMENT		COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNECM. + UNEAF. + UNEEP. BALANCE		
					BUDGET	ENFAMY AMOUNT							
ENVIRONMENT													
40051		JORDAN SEISMIC SYSTEM (PASA-USGS)	12		178,670.00	178,670.00	178,670.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	178,670.00	VILLEMATIN	
4014N		ACTION MEMO-LOCAL COSTS-USGS PERS.	12		28,560.00	28,560.00	28,560.00	9,447.74	5,000.00	14,047.74	14,512.66	VILLEMATIN	
40053		CONTRACT EXT.-G.ANDREASON			75,300.00	75,300.00	75,300.00	67,456.26	2,000.00	69,456.26	5,843.74	VILLEMATIN	
5009N		CONTRACT-RALPH EICHER	18		121,263.00	121,263.00	121,263.00	58,601.98	17,000.00	71,601.98	49,661.02	VILLEMATIN	
5010N		ARABA BASIN WIDE FLOOD STUDY	21		248,000.00	248,000.00	248,000.00	0.00	124,000.00	124,000.00	124,000.00	ABDULLAH	
TOTAL-ENVIRONMENT				8.56	611,793.00	611,793.00	611,793.00	175,105.58	144,000.00	279,105.58	332,687.42		
AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT													
40069		CONTRACT-DEV. & MGT. POTENTIALS	11		275,000.00	275,000.00	275,000.00	185,896.00	89,102.00	275,000.00	0.00	CUMMINGS	
5007N		CONTRACT EXT.-B.GONETILLEFE	20		65,500.00	65,500.00	65,500.00	52,696.80	5,000.00	57,696.80	8,503.17	QUASHAIR	
4018N		AGRICULTURE ASSESSMENT RONGG CONS. CORP. CONTRACT-SUBHI BASEN PO PASA			54,731.64	54,731.64	54,731.64	0.00	0.00	54,731.64	54,731.64	CUMMINGS	
					20,931.64	20,931.64	20,931.64	0.00	0.00	20,931.64	20,931.64	23,071.00	
					3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	
					800.00	800.00	800.00	0.00	0.00	800.00	800.00	0.00	
					5,929.00	5,929.00	5,929.00	0.00	5,929.00	5,929.00	5,929.00	0.00	
4012B		CONTRACT-LEM LAURENT			26,683.00	26,683.00	26,683.00	26,314.58	0.00	26,314.58	368.12	CUMMINGS	
4024N		CONTRACT EXTENSION-W. FURTICK (PASA)			118,405.00	118,405.00	118,405.00	8,791.44	95,747.56	194,529.96	12,856.00	CUMMINGS	
4036N		AGRICULTURE CONF. (ITO)	19		4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	1,542.96	2,357.02	4,000.00	0.00	QUASHAIR	
5017N		FURTICK (CONT. EXT.)			8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	0.00	CUMMINGS (NO COM.)	
4039N		JACK KELLER-TRAVEL COSTS	24		10,000.00	10,000.00	7,410.00	2,764.98	3,625.02	7,410.00	2,590.00	QUASHAIR	
TOTAL-AGRICULTURE & RURAL DEVELOPMENT				7.98	563,419.64	563,419.64	527,892.64	307,850.75	210,750.60	514,521.35	48,758.29		
HEALTH & POPULATION													
40019		NURSING INSTRUCTION (WESTINGHOUSE)	3/7A		96,737.00	96,737.00	96,737.00	92,004.00	4,733.00	96,737.00	0.00	HALADAY	
4002N		NURSING (LOCAL COSTS) LECTURE FEES EDUCATIONAL EQUIP. (SHELF PROC.)	7,7A, 1E,		51,208.78	51,208.78	51,208.78	48,938.57	0.00	48,938.57	51,208.78		
					2,270.21	2,270.21	2,270.21	2,270.21	0.00	2,270.21	0.00		
40090		NURSING INSTRUCTION	13		247,087.00	247,087.00	247,087.00	0.00	0.00	247,087.00	247,087.00	HALADAY	
40080-1		CONTRACT-ALICE BAHIA			80,503.00	80,503.00	80,503.00	0.00	0.00	80,503.00	80,503.00		
40080-2		CONTRACT- WESTINGHOUSE OVERSEAS CORP			165,477.00	165,477.00	165,477.00	155,300.12	11,176.88	166,477.00	166,477.00		
50602		DEV. ASSOC. INC. (HEALTH PROJ DEV.)	17/17A		33,750.00	33,750.00	33,750.00	30,717.11	0.00	30,717.11	3,032.89	HALADAY	
50607		UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORP. HLTH. PROJ.	17/17A		15,750.00	15,750.00	15,750.00	12,660.73	0.00	12,660.73	3,089.27	HALADAY	
50611		PP TEAM FOR TRAINING URSULA XABOLNY			57,900.00	57,900.00	43,672.00	33,996.18	9,683.82	43,672.00	14,228.00	HALADAY	
TOTAL- HEALTH & POPULATION				7.07	502,432.78	502,432.78	487,748.78	450,762.80	25,543.70	487,975.00	20,456.28		

df

TSFS IV (02a0)

MOD	P.E.	PROJ. ELEM./EARMARK/COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	PIL	Z (PEP:PET)	PROJECT ELEMENT BUDGET	EARMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. +
											UNEXP. +
WATER AND WASTE-WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT											
40126		BASELINE SURVEY-JMM			68,500.00	68,500.00	50,929.24	50,929.24	17,570.76	68,500.00	0.00 SWEISS
		TOTAL-WATER & WASTEWATER DEV.	0.96		68,500.00	68,500.00	50,929.24	50,929.24	17,570.76	68,500.00	0.00
TRANSPORTATION											
4029N 50009		MUNICIPALTY OF AMMAN (SODIRO CONTRACT) 25 AMMAN DEFE SEA ROAD-ECON. CONS.			16,200.00 84,200.00	16,200.00 84,200.00	16,200.00 76,268.00	16,200.00 70,371.62	0.00 5,826.18	16,200.00 76,268.00	0.00 + 6,032.00 ABDULLAH
		TOTAL-TRANSPORTATION	1.41		100,500.00	100,500.00	94,468.00	86,551.62	5,965.18	94,468.00	6,032.00
WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT											
4041N 4045N		ADVISORY SERVICE TO WOMENS DEPT. PROTOTYPE LOOP	28		94,000.00 43.00	94,000.00 43.00	94,000.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	16,000.00 0.00	16,000.00 0.00	78,000.00 MCKINNEY 43.00 ABDULLAH
		TOTAL-WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT	1.32		94,043.00	94,043.00	94,000.00	0.00	16,000.00	16,000.00	78,043.00
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT											
5006N 5008N		NATIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY (PADCO) HIG FROS. IMP.-JORDAN HOUSING BANK	19 22		595,867.00 250,000.00	595,867.00 0.00	595,867.00 0.00	182,459.01 0.00	90,000.00 0.00	272,459.01 0.00	323,407.99 B.RILEY 250,000.00 B.RILEY
		TOTAL-HOUSING & URBAN DEV.	11.23		845,867.00	595,867.00	595,867.00	182,459.01	90,000.00	272,459.01	573,407.99
DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION											
4006N 40003 5004N 4039N 5015N 4014b 50006		INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISOR-MOP (PAT J) PUBLIC SECTOR TRNG. NEEDS ASSESSMENT WATER AUTHORITY-ADMINISTRATIVE MANG SYSTEM (3) DEAN SALPINI P.O. # 6153 (COMPUTER STUDIES MOP) TAX STUDY (SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY)	4 5/5A 16 22 15		177,000.00 96,569.00 134,946.67 15,056.34 3,500.00 9,104.57 23,000.00	177,000.00 96,569.00 134,946.67 15,056.34 3,500.00 9,104.57 23,000.00	177,000.00 96,569.00 134,946.67 15,056.34 3,500.00 9,104.57 23,000.00	168,339.64 28,803.56 134,946.67 15,056.34 0.00 1,751.81 19,677.30	8,600.36 0.00 0.00 0.00 3,500.00 7,352.76 2,322.90	177,000.00 28,803.56 134,946.67 15,056.34 3,500.00 9,104.57 27,000.00	1,001 VILLEMAIN 57,765.44 VILLEMAIN 0.00 + 0.00 + 0.00 DONOVAN 0.00 VILLEMAIN 0.00 MASTERS
		TOTAL-DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION	6.42		459,176.58	459,176.58	459,176.58	358,575.12	22,775.02	391,411.14	67,765.44

MOD #	P.E. #	PROJ. ELEM. / EARMARK / COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	PIL #	%	(PER:FET)	PROJECT	EARMARK	COMMITMENT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCON.	UNEXP.	UNEAR.	BALANCE
						ELEMENT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT				BUDGET	AMOUNT		
PRIVATE/MIXED SECTOR SUPPORT															
40005		INDUSTRIAL DEV. PROJECT(C&L)	9			167,840.00	167,840.00	167,840.00	160,302.90	0.00	140,002.50	27,337.10			ROUSSEAU
40096		ARABIC LITERARY SERIES (CTM)	15			1,500,000.00	1,500,000.00	1,500,000.00	0.00	1,500,000.00	1,500,000.00	0.00			RISHDI
5005N		CTM-ACCOUNTANT				20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	17,752.39	1,500.00	17,252.39	742.61			RISHDI
4004N		CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES				40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	0.00			
6012N		CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES				54,000.00	54,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	54,000.00			ISHAQ
4023N		PRIVATIZATION CONFERENCE				5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	3,927.69	1,072.31	5,000.00	0.00			RISHDI
4025N		ORAL REHYDRATION THERAPY CONF. (CRS)				654.75	654.75	654.75	654.75	0.00	654.75	0.00			RALEIGH
4032N		UNIVERSITY OF YARMOUK-SAME	27			8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00	0.00			
TOTAL-PRIVATE/MIXED SECTOR SUPPORT						25.11	1,775,494.75	1,775,494.75	1,741,094.75	210,328.77	1,592,572.31	1,710,911.04	90,563.71		
ENERGY															
4001N		TECH ASSISTANCE MFW	2/2B			129,520.61	129,520.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	129,520.61			
4001N-1		AMERICAN OVERSEAS BODY CO., INC						6,524.04	6,524.04	0.00	6,524.04	(6,524.04)			
4001N-2		CONTRACT- BELEUM CATER						120,356.57	120,356.57	0.00	120,356.57	(120,356.57)			
5001N		TECH. ASSISTANCE MFW	2/2B			477,336.39	477,336.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	477,336.39			SWISS
5001N-1		AMERICAN OVERSEAS BODY CO., INC						1,475.36	180.39	0.00	150.39	(16.39)			
5001N-2		CONTRACT-BELEUM CATER						475,861.03	378,128.65	25,000.00	402,128.65	(402,128.65)			
4011N		RSS ENERGY STUDY	13			68,000.00	68,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	68,000.00			
		ENERGY CONSV. STUDY						47,000.00	47,000.00	0.00	47,000.00	(47,000.00)			
		SOLAR WATER HEATER STUDY						21,000.00	21,000.00	0.00	21,000.00	(21,000.00)			
4047N		ACCOUNT SYSTEM FOR J.E.U.				160,000.00	160,000.00	160,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	160,000.00			SALAH
		ENERGY PACKAGE				743,000.00	743,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	743,000.00			SALAH
5002N		ENERGY CONSERVATION ADVISOR	6			200,000.00	200,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	200,000.00			
5003N		LOAD RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT STUDY	6			250,000.00	250,000.00	250,000.00	187,670.98	66,729.02	250,000.00	(250,000.00)			
5003N-1		UNIFORM SYSTEM A/C FOR J E U(MRI)	6D			42,000.00	42,000.00	42,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
5003N-1		LOAD RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT STUDY	6			77,466.00	77,466.00	77,466.00	51,659.34	25,999.99	76,659.34	(76,659.34)			
TOTAL-ENERGY						22.07	1,577,357.00	1,465,323.00	1,265,213.00	811,158.37	116,329.02	727,488.39	650,339.61		
EVALUATIONS / ASSESSMENT:															
4031N		IMPACT EVALUATION(DAJANI)				5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	7,519.50	1,480.50	9,000.00	0.00			MCKINNEY
50007		PRIVATE SERVICE SECTOR ASS.				89,068.86	89,068.86	89,068.86	89,068.86	89,068.86	89,068.86	0.00			ROUSSEAU
TOTAL-EVALUATIONS/ASSESSMENTS						0.07	94,068.86	94,068.86	94,068.86	7,519.50	90,549.36	98,068.86	0.00		

TSES IV0260

NOG	P.E. PROJ. ELEM./EARMARK/COMMITMENT	FIL	3 (FEB:FET)	PROJECT ELEMENT BUDGET	EARMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNEXP. UNERR. UNERR. BALANCE
GENERAL MISSION PROGRAM SUPPORT										
4009N	TOURISM DEVELOPMENT STUDY ADVERTISING CONTRACT	8		146,729.50	146,729.50	5,437.50	5,437.50	0.00	5,437.50	146,729.50 VILLEMARIN (5,437.50)
4008B	TRAVEL-PID/P-MS ISMAT SACR OMAK			667.90	667.90	141,290.00	120,096.00	21,194.00	141,290.00	(141,290.00)
40149	ENGINEERING DESIGN - SCHOOLS	27		30,000.00	30,000.00	667.90	667.90	0.00	667.90	0.00
40111	COM INF. PROG(SPIEGELFELD CONT.)			2,979.79	2,979.79	24,769.00	0.00	24,769.00	24,769.00	5,291.00 ABDULLAH
4026N	ADVERTISEMENTS-CIP PROGRAM			3,500.00	3,500.00	2,979.79	2,979.79	0.00	2,979.79	0.00 VILLEMARIN
4042N	PE66 RADIOS & SPARES FOR CONTRACTOR			42,961.34	42,961.34	1,812.36	1,812.36	1,867.64	3,500.00	0.00 DONDVAN
5011N	RADIOS FOR COT FE 66 @SPARES			19,976.66	19,976.66	42,961.34	0.00	42,961.34	42,961.34	0.00 VILLEMARIN
						19,976.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	19,976.66 VILLEMARIN
TOTAL-GENERAL MISSION PROG.SUPPORT			3.70	275,977.19	275,977.19	200,684.19	136,993.55	96,551.98	220,640.53	5,321.66
UNPROGRAMMED			2.75	196,876.20						196,876.20
TOTAL PROJECT			6.45	472,853.39	472,853.39	200,684.19	136,993.55	96,551.98	220,640.53	5,321.66

END

60

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES III (025B)

MOD#	PROJECT INFUS	PIL#	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. + UNEXP. + UNEAR. BALANCE	SUB PROJECT OFFICER
PROJECT USES												
2001M	GREATER AMMAN STAGE II JMM CONTRACT (IQC)	2	154,303.67		154,303.67		154,303.67	154,303.67	0.00	154,303.67	0.00	*
20001	JORDAN SEISMIC SYSTEM PID/T-20001 (PASA-IJD-258-P-2198-00-USGS)	3	559,310.00		559,310.00		559,310.00	448,866.27	50,000.00	498,866.27	60,443.73	VILLENAIN
2004M	JORDAN SEISMIC SYSTEMS LOCAL COST (EXT. PID/T 20001)	3A	65,500.00		65,500.00		65,500.00	64,632.07	867.93	65,500.00	0.00	VILLENAIN
20002	PID/T-GORDON ANDREASON CONT.	3E	75,000.00		75,000.00		75,000.00	75,000.00	0.00	75,000.00	0.00	*
2002M	FINANCIAL ADVISOR-AWSA E.F.SMITH-EXTENSION OF CONTRACT	4	115,902.96		115,902.96		115,902.96	115,902.96	0.00	115,902.96	0.00	*
2003M	FAA TECHNICAL ASS. TO JCAA	5	500,000.00		500,000.00		500,000.00	500,000.00	0.00	500,000.00	0.00	*
2005M	SANITARY ENGINEER-AWSA	6	175,465.00		175,465.00		175,465.00	174,062.88	0.00	174,062.88	1,402.12	SALAH
2007M	CONSULTANTS-MUNICIPALITY OF AMMAN	7	800,000.00		800,000.00						14,326.62	SWEIS
2007MA	PRE CONTRACT EXPENSES						10,080.68	10,080.68	0.00	10,080.68		*
2007MB	CONTRACT-CARSTEN D.LEIFVOLD						132,616.00	126,766.40	0.00	126,766.40		SWEIS
2007MC	CONTRACT-MOHAMMED EDOMRO						178,215.00	178,215.00	0.00	178,215.00		SWEIS
2007MD	CONTRACT-BHAGWAN DASS						45,415.99	45,415.99	0.00	45,415.99		*
2007ME	CONTRACT-CEMEL EGEMEN						181,697.75	178,520.26	0.00	178,520.26		*
2007MF	CONTRACT-WILBUR SMITH & ASS.						50,048.69	50,048.69	0.00	50,048.69		*
2007MG	CONTRACT (H/C)-G.D.ABDO						8,000.00	7,959.93	0.00	7,959.93		*
2007MH	CONTRACT-BARRY BAKER						123,909.00	118,311.23	2,500.00	120,811.23		SWEIS
2007MI	CONTRACT-FRANCIS KAME						67,855.00	63,531.10	4,323.90	67,855.00		SWEIS
2009M	INTERNAT. EXEC. SERVICE CORP (IQC)	8	102,000.00	12/31/85	102,000.00	01/13/85	102,000.00	82,000.00	20,000.00	102,000.00	0.00	RISHDI
20003	RURAL DEVELOPMENT II LONG TERM CONSULTANTS SARSA CONTRACT	9	945,000.00		945,000.00		945,000.00	931,375.50	13,624.50	945,000.00	0.00	MCKINNEY
20006	HIGHLAND AG. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SEVEN CONSULTANTS	10	115,473.38		115,473.38		115,473.38	115,473.38	0.00	115,473.38	0.00	CUMMINGS
20007	W'SALE FRUIT & VEG. MARKETS	11	23,721.54		23,721.54		23,721.54	23,721.54	0.00	23,721.54	0.00	*
20008	HIGHLAND AG. DEV. PROJ. PRIVATE SECTOR STUDY	12	35,083.49		35,083.49		35,083.49	27,749.12	7,334.37	35,083.49	0.00	CUMMINGS
2015M	CONTRACT-GREAT SALT LAKE/POTASH CO.	13	97,500.00	01/13/85	97,500.00	01/13/85	97,500.00	97,500.00	0.00	97,500.00	0.00	*
20010	N. JORDAN GROUND WATER RES. PROJ.	14	256,125.00		256,125.00						70,257.99	SWEISS
20010A	PASA EXTENSION						92,531.65	92,531.65	0.00	92,531.65		*
20010C	FEF-DIEM (IN-COUNTRY)						17,111.69	17,111.69	0.00	17,111.69		*

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES III (0258)

NOB#	PROJECT INPUTS	PIL#	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. + UNEXP. + UNEAR. BALANCE	SUB PROJECT OFFICER
20011	PID/P 20011-JUDEH		3,391.00		3,391.00		3,391.00	3,391.00	0.00	3,391.00	0.00	*
2019N	SUPPLY ADVISOR EXT. CONTRACT-BOONETILLEKE	15	19,950.00	12/31/84	19,950.00	12/31/84	19,950.00	19,950.00	0.00	19,950.00	0.00	*
2021N	EDP ANALYST CONT.-S.BACON	16	3,800.98	12/31/84	3,800.98	12/31/84	3,800.98	3,800.98	0.00	3,800.98	0.00	*
20020	ENVIRONMENTAL REMOTE SENSING PID/P 20020 (IQC)	17	12,000.00	10/14/85	12,000.00	01/13/86	12,000.00	12,000.00	0.00	12,000.00	0.00	*
2026N	SYS. ANALYST/PROG. (PASA)-BUCEN	18	50,500.00	12/31/84	50,500.00	05/14/85	50,500.00	33,884.57	0.00	33,884.57	16,615.43	HALADAY
2027N	RESEARCH-CEREAL VARIETIES (ICARDA)	19/19A	45,000.00	12/31/84	45,000.00	01/12/85	45,000.00	44,615.71	0.00	44,615.71	384.29	CUMMINGS
2028N	EXT. CONT.-GOSNETILLEKE	20	68,109.93	04/25/85	68,109.93	04/25/85	68,109.93	68,109.93	0.00	68,109.93	0.00	*
2037N	DATA ENTRY/PROG.-M.O.P.	21	7,959.76	03/11/85	7,959.76	10/14/85	7,959.76	7,959.76	0.00	7,959.76	0.00	HARDY
2035N	CONT.-M.PIRNIE	22	59,854.92	03/21/85	59,854.92	03/21/85	59,854.92	59,854.92	0.00	59,854.92	0.00	*
2036N	CONT.-CHILD & FURTICK	23	7,957.75	03/21/85	7,957.75	03/21/85	7,983.45	7,983.45	0.00	7,983.45	(25.70)	DUSHAIR
2038N	RURAL COM. DEV. STUDY (CLARK UNIVERSITY)	24	11,396.92	03/23/85	11,396.92	03/23/85	11,396.92	11,396.92	0.00	11,396.92	0.00	*
2054N	CONSULTATION-TAKA IZUMI	25	4,500.00	07/24/85	4,500.00	07/24/85	4,500.00	4,500.00	0.00	4,500.00	0.00	*
2055N	SCHISTOSOMIASIS MANUAL	26	15,000.00	10/24/85	15,000.00		15,000.00	0.00	12,500.00	12,500.00	2,500.00	HALADAY
2053N	I.T.O.-M.FARUQ/R.BSOUL (ORT CONF.)	27	5,000.00	10/29/85	5,000.00	10/29/85	5,000.00	3,929.22	0.00	3,929.22	1,070.78	HALADAY
20021	PID/TB 278-258-3-20021 CONTRACT- RALPH EICHER	28A	10,612.00	12/12/85	10,612.00	12/12/85	10,612.00	10,612.00	0.00	10,612.00	0.00	*
2061N	I.T.O. (OTOVA)	29	1,500.00	01/07/86	1,500.00	01/07/86	1,500.00	1,085.79	0.00	1,085.79	414.21	SWEISS
2062N	VAT TRAINING MAT. FOR NRA	31	13,000.00	08/10/86	13,000.00						13,000.00	VILLEMAIN
2069N	2ND INT. SHELTER CONF. VIENNA AUSTRIA	32	5,000.00	09/07/86	5,000.00	09/07/86	5,000.00	4,341.87	0.00	4,341.87	658.13	B.RILEY
2070N	56TH ANNUAL TRAFIC ENG. SEMINAR	33	3,000.00	09/07/86	3,000.00	09/07/86	3,000.00	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	SWEISS
2071N	HIGH VOLTAGE INSULATORS EXPERTS ASSIST	35	90,000.00	10/9/86	90,000.00		0.00				90,000.00	SALAH
2072N	SEISMIC TRNS FOR NRA UNPROGRAMMED	36	17,000.00 25,081.70	11/9/86	17,000.00	11/12/86	11,200.00	2,534.92	8,665.08	11,200.00	5,800.00 25,081.70	VILLEMAIN
PROJECT USE TOTAL			4,500,000.00		4,474,918.30		4,353,749.28	4,068,454.72	129,615.78	4,198,070.50	301,929.50	

49

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES III (0258)

NO	PROJECT INPUTS	PILD	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. + UNEXP. + UNEAR. BALANCE	SUB PROJECT OFFICER
MISSION USES												
2004	ROLE OF WOMEN IN H'LAND AG.	*	2,750.00	04/15/84	2,750.00	04/15/84	2,750.00	2,750.00	0.00	2,750.00	0.00	*
2005	INS.-DR. MALALLAH (REF. 2018N)		300.00	12/31/84	300.00	12/31/84	300.00	0.00	300.00	300.00	0.00	NASR
2004	CONT.-DUNCAN (COMPUTER SPECIALIST)	*	5,000.00	01/16/85	5,000.00	01/16/85	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	*
2005	EVALUATION-JMM		57,387.00	01/23/85	57,387.00	03/07/85	57,387.00	50,364.32	0.00	50,364.32	7,022.68	RISHDI
2006	PID/T2001b-CIF (WOLFGANG)	*	9,720.00	07/16/85	9,720.00	07/16/85	9,720.00	9,720.00	0.00	9,720.00	0.00	*
2007	PID/T-CIF-TRADE/COM. SPECIALIST	*	17,826.00	10/21/85	17,826.00	10/21/85	17,826.00	17,826.00	0.00	17,826.00	0.00	*
2009	ECON. ANALYSIS-T.A/JASER	*	15,000.00	08/12/85	15,000.00	10/21/85	15,000.00	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00	0.00	*
2006	ITO-UNDERSEC. OF HIGH TO USA	*	1,374.67	05/24/83	1,374.67	05/24/83	1,374.67	1,374.67	0.00	1,374.67	0.00	*
2006	ITO-POP. CONF. -GENEVA	*	2,857.07	10/15/83	2,857.07	10/15/83	2,857.07	2,857.07	0.00	2,857.07	0.00	*
2001	ITO-HIRZALLAH	*	3,325.71	12/31/84	3,325.71	12/31/84	3,325.71	3,325.71	0.00	3,325.71	0.00	*
2002	ITO-DR. A. VUTURO	*	7,484.73	12/31/84	7,484.73	12/31/84	7,484.73	7,484.73	0.00	7,484.73	0.00	*
2003	ADVERTISEMENT	*	159.60	12/31/84	159.60	12/31/84	159.60	159.60	0.00	159.60	0.00	*

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES III (0258)

NO.	PROJECT INPUTS	FILE	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM.+ UNEXP.+ UNEARN. BALANCE	SUB PROJECT OFFICER
2016N	PG-PRISCILLA BASSON	*	655.73	08/01/84	655.73	08/01/84	655.73	655.73	0.00	655.73	0.00	*
2017N	C.R.S. (REF. 4004N)	*	160,000.00	12/31/84	160,000.00	12/31/84	160,000.00	160,000.00	0.00	160,000.00	0.00	*
2018N	ITG-GHARIBEH/MALLA...	*	6,842.08	12/31/84	6,842.08	12/31/84	6,842.08	6,842.08	0.00	6,842.08	0.00	*
2020N	ITD-MORGAN	*	200.00	12/31/84	200.00	12/31/84	200.00	0.00	200.00	200.00	0.00	VILLEMAIN
2022N	TEY-ROSEWELL	*	1,592.50	12/31/84	1,592.50	12/31/84	1,592.50	1,592.50	0.00	1,592.50	0.00	*
2023N	TEY-PAT JOHNSON	*	8,137.28	12/31/84	8,137.28	12/31/84	8,137.28	8,137.28	0.00	8,137.28	0.00	*
2024N	REPRD. COSTS-BOYE TEST REPORT	*	274.62	10/25/84	274.62	10/25/84	274.62	274.62	0.00	274.62	0.00	*
2025N	WATER RES. PUBLICATION	*	154.35	12/31/84	154.35	12/31/84	154.35	154.35	0.00	154.35	0.00	*
2029N	ITD-SAIF NAZIR	*	1,853.34	01/23/85	1,853.34	01/23/85	1,853.34	1,853.34	0.00	1,853.34	0.00	*
2030N	NRA & WAJ COMP. SYSTEMS-L.NORTH	*	1,166.47	02/01/85	1,166.47	02/01/85	1,166.47	1,166.47	0.00	1,166.47	0.00	*
2031N	PG-PUES. (NPC)	*	150.00	02/12/85	150.00	02/12/85	150.00	0.00	150.00	150.00	0.00	ISHAQ
2032N	RAINFED AGR. INFO. REPORT	*	861.90	02/19/85	861.90	02/19/85	861.90	861.90	0.00	861.90	0.00	*
2033N	ITG-G.ANDREASON	*	2,692.28	02/20/85	2,692.28	02/20/85	2,692.28	2,692.28	0.00	2,692.28	0.00	*
2034N	COMP. SPECIALIST-L. NORTH	*	1,662.50	02/24/85	1,662.50	02/24/85	1,662.50	1,662.50	0.00	1,662.50	0.00	*
2039N	RESEARCH TR1. INST.-E.SHRAGER	*	49,049.50	04/28/85	49,049.50	04/28/85	49,049.50	49,049.50	0.00	49,049.50	0.00	*
2040N	TRANSLATION SERVICES-UDA ASSESS.	*	793.06	05/01/85	793.06	05/01/85	793.06	793.06	0.00	793.06	0.00	*
2041N	OFFICE SPACE-UDA	*	1,500.00	05/01/85	1,500.00	05/01/85	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	0.00	MCKINNEY
2042N	ITD-GENEVA & USA-M.E.-DUBI	*	5,597.02	05/01/85	5,597.02	05/01/85	5,597.02	5,597.02	0.00	5,597.02	0.00	*
2043N	STUDIES-DRS.MPYAN -SERABAROURI/IBRAHIM	*	7,940.44	05/09/85	7,940.44	05/09/85	7,940.44	7,940.44	0.00	7,940.44	0.00	*
2045N	PID/T-DR.E.MALIK	*	10,000.00	06/06/85	10,000.00	10/19/85	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00	MASTERS

103

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES III (0258)

MOON	PROJECT INPUTS	PILO	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCKUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM.+ UNEEXP.+ UNEAR. BALANCE	SUB PROJECT OFFICER
2046N	HIG PP PREP.		15,000.00	06/09/85	15,000.00	10/19/85	15,000.00	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00	0.00	*
2047N	HADF-ENG. ANNEX-ENG. PLANS	*	1,000.00	06/09/85	1,000.00	06/09/85	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	*
2048N	ITO-B.FIFAYA	*	2,392.67	06/14/85	2,392.67	06/14/85	2,392.67	2,392.67	0.00	2,392.67	0.00	*
2049N	ITO-UN EEC. OF WOMEN	*	11,807.50	06/04/85	11,807.50	06/04/85	11,807.50	11,807.50	0.00	11,807.50	0.00	*
2050N	CHILDRENS' TV W/S	*	3,636.31	06/17/85	3,636.31	08/06/85	3,636.31	3,636.31	0.00	3,636.31	0.00	*
2051N	REPRODUCTION-J.H.A.DEV. PROJ.	*	212.36	07/16/85	212.36	07/16/85	212.36	212.36	0.00	212.36	0.00	*
2052N	CONT. EXT.-FURTICV		61,839.00	08/12/85	61,839.00	09/30/85	61,839.00	47,158.31	14,680.69	61,839.00	0.00	RISHOI
2056N	ITO-DR.S.KHATTARI		3,000.00	08/06/85	3,000.00	08/06/85	3,000.00	2,646.60	0.00	2,646.60	353.40	CUMMINGS
2057N	ITO-F.GHARAISEH	*	2,834.96	08/12/85	2,834.96	08/14/85	2,834.96	2,834.96	0.00	2,834.96	0.00	*
2059N	ITO-A. SHFAIDEH/F.SUSHI	*	2,627.45	10/29/85	2,627.45	11/29/85	2,627.45	2,627.45	0.00	2,627.45	0.00	*
2060N	HIGHLAND AG PROJ.PP PREP.-PER-DIEM		1,200.00	08/21/85	1,200.00	08/21/85	1,200.00	0.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	0.00	CUMMINGS
	UNPROGRAMMED		10,141.90								10,141.90	
	SUB TOTAL-MISSION USES		500,906.00		489,858.10		489,858.10	454,451.33	28,030.69	482,482.02	17,517.98	
	PROJECT TOTAL		5,000,000.00		4,964,776.40		4,843,607.38	4,522,906.05	157,646.47	4,680,552.52	319,447.48	

E N D

TECHNICAL SERVICES & FEASIBILITY STUDIES IV (02&0)

MOD #	P.E. #	PROJ. ELEM./EARMARK/COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	PIL #	PROJECT ELEMENT BUDGET	EARMARK DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACTUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM.+ UNEXP.+ UNEAR. BALANCE
JOINTLY PROGRAMMED (FY 84 FUNDS)												
4001M		TECH ASSISTANCE MPW	2/2B *	129,520.61		129,520.61						129,520.61 *
4001M-1		AMERICAN OVERSEAS BOOK CO., INC					02/19/85	8,524.04	8,524.04	0.00	8,524.04	(8,524.04)
4001M-2		CONTRACT-DELEUN CATHER INTL.LTD. (ADV FOR MPW. CONT. # 27B-0260-002-HCC) (L/COM # 27B-0260-001)					02/19/85	120,996.57	120,996.57	0.00	120,996.57	(120,996.57)
40010		NURSING INSTRUCTION CONTRACT-WESTINGHOUSE ELEC.CORP. (PID/T # 40010)	3/3A *	96,737.00		96,737.00	02/11/85	96,737.00	92,004.00	4,733.00	96,737.00	96,737.00 HALADAY (96,737.00)
4006M		INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISOR-MDP PAT JOHNSON (CONTRACT #27B-0260-001-HCC-001)	4	177,000.00		177,000.00					0.00	177,000.00 VILLEMMAIN (177,000.00)
40003		PUBLIC SECTOR TRNG. NEEDS ASSESSMENT 5/5A CLAFF & MAINE (PID/T # 27B-0260-3-40003)		96,569.00		96,569.00						96,569.00 VILLEMMAIN (28,803.56)
4002M		PIL # 7 LECTURE FEES (HEALTH MGT & SERVICES PROJ) 16A	7,7A,16, *	51,208.78		51,208.78						51,208.78 * (48,938.57)
		EDUCATIONAL EQUIP. (SHELF PROC.)						2,270.21	2,270.21	0.00	2,270.21	(2,270.21) *
4009M		TOURISM DEVELOPMENT STUDY ADVERTISING CONTRACT	8	146,729.50		146,729.50		5,437.50	5,437.50	0.00	5,437.50	146,729.50 VILLEMMAIN (141,290.00)
40005		INDUSTRIAL DEV. PROJECT (PID/T # 27B-0260-2-40005) COOPERS AND LYBRAND	9	167,840.00		167,840.00	03/01/85	167,840.00	140,002.90	0.00	140,002.90	167,840.00 ROUSSEAU (140,002.90)
4011M		RSS ENERGY STUDY ENERGY CONS. STUDY SOLAR WATER HEATER STUDY	10 *	68,000.00	04/09/85	68,000.00	03/31/85	47,000.00	47,000.00	0.00	47,000.00	68,000.00 * (47,000.00) *
40069		CONTRACT-DEV. & MGT. POTENTIALS DESERT AREAS (PRE FEAS.STUDY) (PID/T # 27B-0260-3-40069)	11	275,000.00	07/24/85	275,000.00	03/31/85	21,000.00	21,000.00	0.00	21,000.00	(21,000.00) *
40051		JORDAN SEISMIC SYSTEM (PID/T #27B-0258-2-20001) (FASA-110-0258-F-1C-2198-04)	12	138,670.00	06/05/85	138,670.00	03/17/86	138,670.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4014M		ACTION MEMO-LOCAL COSTS-USGS PERS.	12	28,560.00	02/02/85	28,560.00	02/02/85	28,560.00	9,047.34	5,000.00	14,047.34	14,512.66 VILLEMMAIN
40053		CONTRACT EXT.-G.ANDERSON (PID/T # 20002)		75,300.00		75,300.00	06/05/85	75,300.00	67,456.26	1,000.00	69,456.26	75,300.00 VILLEMMAIN (69,456.26)

TECHNICAL SERVICES & FEASIBILITY STUDIES IV (0260)

MOD #	P.E. #	PROJ. ELEM. / EARMARK / COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	PIL #	PROJECT ELEMENT BUDGET	EARMARK DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. + UNEXP. + UNEAR. BALANCE
40080		NURSING INSTRUCTION	13	247,087.00	08/12/85	247,087.00						247,087.00 KALADAY
40080-1		CONTRACT-ALICE BAHIA (278-0260-5-00-4001-00)					08/12/85	80,610.00	80,503.88	0.00	80,503.88	(80,503.88)
40080-2		CONTRACT- WESTINGHOUSE OVERSEAS CORP					08/12/85	166,477.00	155,300.12	11,176.88	166,477.00	(166,477.00)
40088		TRAVEL-PID/P-MS ISMAT BACR OMAR		667.90	08/21/85	667.90	06/12/85	667.90	667.90	0.00	667.90	0.00 *
40096		ARABIC LITERAR. SERIES (CTM) CONTRACT	15	1,500,000.00	09/10/85	1,500,000.00	10/23/85	1,500,000.00	0.00	1,500,000.00	1,500,000.00	RISHDI (1,500,000.00)
4032N		UNIVERSITY OF YARMOUK-GAME	23	8,000.00	04/17/86	8,000.00	09/09/86	8,000.00	8,000.00		8,000.00	0.00 *
4030N		JACK KELLER-TRAVEL COSTS	24	10,000.00	08/05/86	10,000.00	11/18/86	7,410.00	3,784.98	3,625.02	7,410.00	QUSHAIR
4029N		MUNICIPALITY OF AMMAN:SOOMRO CONTRACT	125	16,200.00	04/09/86	16,200.00	04/09/86	16,200.00	16,200.00	0.00	16,200.00	0.00 *
40140		ENGINEERING DESIGN - SCHOOLS PID/T # 40140	27	30,000.00	04/16/86	30,000.00	07/01/86	24,709.00	0.00	24,709.00	24,709.00	5,291.00 ABDULLAH 0.00
4041N		ADVISORY SERVICE TO WOMEN DEPT.	28	94,000.00	07/17/86	94,000.00	07/17/86	94,000.00	0.00	16,000.00	16,000.00	78,000.00 MCKINNEY
4043N		ACCOUNT SYSTEM FOR J.E.U.		160,000.00	09/25/86	160,000.00	09/25/86	160,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	160,000.00 ABDULLAH
		UNPROGRAMMED		82,910.21								82,910.21
		TOTAL PROJECT USES (FY '84 FUNDS)		3,600,000.00		3,517,089.79		3,509,206.79	1,330,331.47	1,686,140.26	3,016,471.73	580,939.27

8

TECHNICAL SERVICES & FEASIBILITY STUDIES IV (0260)

NOB	P.E.	PROJ. ELEM./EARMARK/COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	FIL	PROJECT ELEMENT BUDGET	EARMARK DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. +
												UNEIP. +
PROJECT USES (FY85 FUNDS)												UNEAR. BALANCE
5001N		TECH. ASSISTANCE MPW	28	477,336.39		477,336.39						477,336.39 SWEISS
5001N-1		AMERICAN OVERSEAS BOOK CO., INC					02/19/85	1,475.96	180.39	0.00	180.39	(180.39)
5001N-2		CONTRACT-DELEUM CATHER INTL.LTD. (AD- FOR MPW. CONT. # 278-0260-002-MCC) (L/COM # 278-0260-001)					02/19/85	475,860.43	378,128.05	25,000.00	403,128.05	(403,128.05)
5002N		ENERGY PACKAGE		743,000.00								743,000.00 SALAHI
5002N-1		ENERGY CONSERVATION ADVISOR	=		12/19/84	200,000.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00 SALAHI
5003N		LOAD RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT STUDY	=		12/19/84	250,000.00	01/07/86	250,000.00	183,670.98	66,329.02	250,000.00	(250,000.00) SALAHI
5002N-3		UNIFORM SYSTEM A/C FOR J E U			09/25/86	43,000.00	12/22/86	42,890.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00 SALAHI
5003N-1		LOAD RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT STUDY				77,466.00	07/08/86	77,466.00	51,659.34	25,000.00	76,659.34	(76,659.34) SALAHI
5004N		WATER AUTHORITY-ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY UPGRADE (SEMINAR- CONT. & PROC., ILI)	16	134,946.67	09/10/85	134,946.67						
							09/09/85	134,946.67	134,946.67	0.00	134,946.67	(134,946.67)
50002		PID/T # 276-0260-3-50002 IQC # PDC-1406-1-00-4064-00 DEV. ASSOC. INC.	17/17A	33,750.00	10/31/85	33,750.00						33,750.00
							11/20/85	33,750.00	30,717.11	0.00	30,717.11	(30,717.11) HALADAY
50003		PID/T # 276-0260-3-50003 IQC # PDC-1406-1-00-4063-00 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORP.	17/17A	15,750.00	10/31/85	15,750.00						15,750.00 HALADAY
							11/25/85	15,294.00	12,660.73	0.00	12,660.73	(12,660.73)
5006N		NATIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY CONTRACT H/C-PACCO INC.	19	595,867.00	12/18/85	595,867.00						595,867.00 B.RILEY
							01/20/86	595,867.00	182,459.01	90,000.00	272,459.01	(272,459.01)
5007N		CONTRACT EXT.-D.GOONETILLEKE	20	66,600.00	01/15/86	66,600.00	01/15/86	66,600.00	52,696.83	5,000.00	57,696.83	8,903.17 F.QUSHAIR
5008N		HIG PROG. IMP.-JORDAN HOUSING BANK	22	250,000.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	250,000.00 B.RILEY
5009N		CONTRACT-RALPH EICHER	18	121,263.00	05/18/86	121,263.00	05/15/86	121,263.00	58,601.98	13,000.00	71,601.98	49,661.02 VILLENAIN
5010N		AGABA BASIN WIDE FLOOD STUDY	21	248,000.00	07/17/86	248,000.00	11/05/86	248,000.00	0.00	124,000.00	124,000.00	124,000.00 ABDULLAH
5011N												
		UNPROGRAMMED		13,486.94								13,486.94
TOTAL PROJECT USES (FY 85 FUNDS)				2,700,000.00		2,263,979.06		2,063,413.06	1,085,721.09	348,329.02	1,434,050.11	1,265,949.89

21

TECHNICAL SERVICES & FEASIBILITY STUDIES IV (0260)

MOD #	P.E. #	PROJ. ELEM. #	REMARK/COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	FIL #	PROJECT ELEMENT BUDGET	REMARK DATE	REMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. + UNEXP. + UNEAR. BALANCE
U S A I D L E E S (FY84 FUNDS)													
4004N			CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES (WOMEN INCOME GENERATION)		40,000.00		40,000.00		40,000.00	40,000.00	0.00	40,000.00	0.00 *
40111			COM IMP. PROE CONTRACT-WOLFFENS SPIEGELFELD (PID/T 40111)		2,079.79	11/19/85	2,079.79	11/19/85	2,079.79	2,079.79	0.00	2,079.79	2,079.79 VILLEMAM (2,079.79)
4018N			AGRICULTURE ASSESSMENT IQC # PDC-14--1-00-4087-00 RDNCO CONS. CORP. PID/T # 278--220-3-50001 CONTRACT-SUB-1 WASEM PG RASA		54,731.64	11/8/85	20,931.64	11/08/85	20,931.64	20,931.64	0.00	20,931.64	54,731.64 CUMMINGS (20,931.64)
						10/31/85	3,000.00	11/31/85	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00	3,000.00	(3,000.00) *
						10/31/85	800.00	10/31/85	800.00	800.00	0.00	800.00	(800.00)
							6,929.00		6,929.00	0.00	6,929.00	6,929.00	(6,929.00)
40126			BASELINE SURVEY-JMM		68,500.00	04/14/86	68,500.00	05/18/86	50,929.24	50,929.24	17,570.76	68,500.00	0.00 SWEISS
40128			CONTRACT-KEN LAURENT		26,683.00	02/20/86	26,683.00	02/20/86	26,683.00	26,314.88	0.00	26,314.88	368.12 CUMMINGS
4023N			PRIVATIZATION CONFERENCE (DRS KALAJI & TARAMNEH)		5,000.00	02/05/86	5,000.00	02/05/86	5,000.00	3,927.69	1,072.31	5,000.00	0.00 RISHDI
4024N			CONTRACT EXTENSION-W. FURTICK (USDA PASA)		118,405.00	03/10/86	118,405.00	08/05/86	104,539.00	8,791.44	95,747.56	104,539.00	13,866.00 CUMMINGS
4025N			ORAL REHYDRATION THERAPY CONF. (KARADSHI-CRE)		654.75	03/17/86	654.75		654.75	654.75	0.00	654.75	0.00 HALADAY
4026N			ADVERTISEMENT-CIP PROGRAM		3,500.00	03/16/86	3,500.00	03/16/86	3,500.00	1,812.36	1,687.64	3,500.00	0.00 DONOVAN
40146			P.O. # 6153 (COMPUTER STUDIES MOP)	15	9,104.57	05/21/86	9,104.57	05/21/86	9,104.57	1,751.81	7,352.76	9,104.57	0.00 VILLEMAM
4031N			IMPACT EVALUATION (DAJANI)		9,000.00	04/15/86	9,000.00	04/15/86	9,000.00	7,519.50	1,480.50	9,000.00	0.00 SALAH
4036N			AGRICULTURE CONF. (ITD)	19	4,000.00	05/20/86	4,000.00	05/20/86	4,000.00	1,642.98	2,357.02	4,000.00	0.00 VILLEMAM
4039N			WANG SYSTEM	22	15,056.34	07/01/86	15,056.34	07/01/86	15,056.34	15,056.34	0.00	15,056.34	*
4040N			PROTOTYPE LOG		43.00	07/07/86	43.00					0.00	43.00 ABDULLAH
4042N			PE66 BATTERIES & SPARES FOR CONTRACTOR		42,961.34	07/17/86	42,961.34	07/17/86	42,961.34		42,961.34	42,961.34	VILLEMAM
			UNPROGRAMMED		280.57								280.57
TOTAL MISSIO L E E S (84 FUNDS)					400,000.00		374,649.43		345,168.67	185,212.42	177,158.89	362,371.31	37,628.69

92

TECHNICAL SERVICES & FEASIBILITY STUDIES IV (0260)

MOD #	P.E. #	PROJ. ELEM. / EARMARK / COMMITMENT DESCRIPTION	PIL #	PROJECT ELEMENT BUDGET	EARMARK DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	COMMITMENT DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM. + UNEXP. + UNEAR. BALANCE
U S A I D U S E S (FY85 FUNDS)												
005M		ACTION MEMO 11/85 (ACCT. JCTV) CONTRACT H/C-D. KARADSHEH		20,000.00	11/12/85	20,000.00	05/12/86 11/12/85	20,000.00	17,753.39	1,500.00	19,253.39	746.61 RISHOI
009B		TAX STUDY (SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY)		23,000.00	06/17/86	23,000.00	06/17/86	23,000.00	19,677.10	3,322.90	23,000.00	0.00 MASTERS
0009		AMMAN DEAD SEA ROAD-ECON. CONDS.		84,300.00	06/18/86	84,300.00	07/21/86	78,268.00	72,301.82	5,966.18	78,268.00	6,032.00 ABDULLAH
0007		CONTRACT PDC-0091-1-00-3172-00		89,068.86	07/01/86	89,068.86	07/01/86	89,068.86		89,068.86	89,068.86	0.00 ROUSSEAU
0011		PP TEAM FOR TRAINING URSULA MADOLNY		57,900.00	09/10/86	57,900.00	09/14/86	43,672.00	33,988.18	9,683.82	43,672.00	14,228.00 HALADAY
011M		RAGIDS FOR COT FE 66 SPARES		10,038.66	07/17/86	10,038.66	07/17/86	10,038.66			0.00	10,038.66 VILLEMAIN
013M		FURTICK		8,000.00		8,000.00		8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	0.00 CUMMINGS
015M		DEAN SALPINI		3,500.00	11/17/86	3,500.00	11/17/86	3,500.00	0.00	3,500.00	3,500.00	0.00 DONOVAN
		UNPROGRAMMED		4,192.48								4,192.48
TOTAL MISSION USES (85 FUNDS)				300,000.00		295,807.52		275,547.52	143,720.49	121,041.76	264,762.25	35,237.75
U S A I D U S E S (86 FUNDS)												
012M		CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES		54,000.00		54,000.00						54,000.00 ISHAQ
		UNPROGRAMMED		96,000.00								96,000.00
TOTAL MISSION USES (86 FUNDS)				150,000.00		54,000.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	150,000.00
TOTAL PROJECT				7,150,000.00		6,507,524.80		6,193,336.04	2,744,985.47	2,332,669.93	5,077,655.40	2,069,754.60

E N D

27

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES (0266)

MOD#	PROJECT INPUTS	PIL#	PRDJ. ELEM. BUDGET	DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	UNCOM.+ UNEEXP.+ UNEAR. BALANCE
JOINTLY PROGRAMMED											
6006	CHILDREN TV WORKSHOP NY	3	400,000.00	11/17/86	400,000.00	11/17/86	400,000.00				
60041	JORDAN VALLEY IMPACT ASSEMT	10	240,000.00	11/24/86							
6006N	CHEMICAL & PETROCHEM FLOOR TECH	2	250,000.00	10/09/86	250,000.00						
6007N	IESC PROG 25B	6	100,000.00	11/05/86	100,000.00						
6008N	5 YEAR PLAN TRANSLATION	9	24,000.00	12/03/86	24,000.00	12/03/86	24,000.00	20,764.72	0.00	20,764.72	
6010N	MEALYBUS BIOLOGICAL CONTROL	8	93,300.00	12/09/86	93,000.00						
6011N	JORDAN ENERGY PACKAGE	5	297,000.00	12/09/86	297,000.00						
6013N	JORDAN SEISMIC GORDON ANDREASEN	13	32,721.00	12/15/86	32,721.00	12/15/86	32,721.00	13,238.68	6,600.00	19,838.68	
6014N	PAT JOHNSON INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISDR	4	95,500.00	12/15/86	95,500.00	12/15/86	95,500.00				
6015N	ENGLISH TRNG MOP STAFF	11	2,350.00	12/15/86	2,350.00	12/15/86	2,350.00	0.00	2,350.00	2,350.00	
6016N	JORDAN DEV CONFERENCE FOLLOW UP	7	45,000.00	12/15/86	45,000.00						
	SIDE WADI DAMS FEASIBILITY STUDY		300,000.00								
	REMOTE SENSING CENTER		641,000.00								
	TOURISM PHASE III		300,000.00								
	F A A		250,000.00								
	AQABA EXCAVATION (ACOR)		60,000.00								
	SEISMIC PASA		85,000.00								
	POTASH		1,500,000.00								
	PUBLIC TRANSPORT COMPANY PRIVATIZATION		200,000.00								
	POLICY DIALOGUE STUDIES		250,000.00								
	UNPROGRAMMED		448,679.00								448,679.00
TOTAL-JOINTLY PROGRAMMED			5,714,550.00		1,339,571.00		554,571.00	34,003.40	8,950.00	42,953.40	448,679.00

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES V (0266)

UNCOM. +
UNEIP. +
UNEAR.
BALANCE

MOD#	PROJECT INPUTS	PILO	PROJ. ELEM. BUDGET	DATE	EARMARK AMOUNT	DATE	COMMITMENT AMOUNT	DISBURSEMENTS	ACCRUALS	EXPENDITURES	
USAID PROGRAMMED											
6001N	LINDA FINAM				30,000.00		30,000.00	6,594.21	1,200.00	7,794.21	
6002N	WIJDAN KAYALI				40,000.00		40,000.00	8,553.78	1,500.00	10,053.78	
6003N	MARIE MAJJAR				29,000.00		29,000.00	6,255.65	1,100.00	7,355.65	
6004N	JOHN PERSHING				14,768.00		14,768.00	11,344.83	3,423.17	14,768.00	
6005N	JV 278 B6 036 FURTICK				15,988.97		15,988.97	5,482.35	10,506.62	15,988.97	
60024	TWO EVALUATION EXPERT				56,000.00					0.00	
6009N	ADV. IM ECONOMIST				6,200.00		6,200.00	0.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	
	UNPROGRAMMED		476,610.00								
	TOTAL- USAID PROGRAMMED		470,610.00		191,956.97		135,956.97	38,230.82	18,929.79	57,160.61	0.00
GOJ PROGRAMMED											
	UNPROGRAMMED		537,840.00								
	TOTAL- GOJ PROGRAMMED		537,840.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	PROJECT TOTAL		6,723,000.00		1,531,527.97		690,527.97	72,234.22	27,879.79	100,114.01	6,622,885.99

E N D

5

I. IDENTIFICATION

STATUS		SOURCE		CONFIGURATION	
IN-PROCESS	3	JOINTLY PREPARED	37	SINGLE COMPONENT/ACT.	44
ON-GOING	10	USAID PROGRAMMED	19	MULTIPLE COMPONENT/ACT.	7
COMPLETED/TERMINATED	46				

AMOUNT BARRAKED	NUMBER OF RECORDS	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF RECORDS	SECTOR/PRIORITY AREAS	NUMBER OF RECORDS	PRIOR TSFS FUNDING?	NUMBER OF RECORDS
> 0 - < 10,000	16	PRE FEASIBILITY STUDY	NO RECORDS	PRIVATE ENTERPRISE	4	YES > 1,000	9
> 10,000 - < 50,000	11	FEASIBILITY STUDY	3	AGRICULTURE	9	YES > 1,000 < 5,000	1
> 50,000 - < 100,000	10	PRE INVESTMENT STUDY	NO RECORDS	WATER AND WASTEWATER	7	YES > 0 < 5,000	6
> 100,000 - < 250,000	13	TECHNICAL STUDY	3	HUMAN RESOURCES	11	YES > 5,000 < 10,000	1
> 250,000	11	TECHNICAL ADVISORY SERVICES	31	HEALTH AND POPULATION	10	YES > 10,000 < 50,000	1
> 500,000	5	MANAGEMENT STUDY	NO RECORDS	URBAN DEVELOPMENT & HOUSING	1	YES > 50,000 < 100,000	2
> 1,000,000	1	PRE IMPLEMENTATION	NO RECORDS	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	11	YES > 100,000 < 250,000	4
		DESIGN	4	ENERGY	4	YES > 250,000	NO RECORDS
		EVALUATION	3	TRANSPORTATION	1	NO	46
		TENDER PREPARATION	1	WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT	1	YES	14
		SECTOR/SUBSECTOR ASSESSMENT	4	PVOs	NO RECORDS		
		ENVIRONMENTAL/SOCIAL ASSESSMENT	NO RECORDS	ENVIRONMENT	NO RECORDS		
		INVITATIONAL TRAVEL	8	OTHER	3		
		COMMODITIES	2	CANNOT DETERMINE	NO RECORDS		
		OTHER	3				
		CANNOT DETERMINE	NO RECORDS				

APPROVED/PENDING TSPS FUNDING?	NUMBER OF RECORDS	LINKAGE TO OTHER PROJECT	NUMBER OF RECORDS	PROGRAMMING MATTERS	NUMBER OF RECORDS	ACTIVITY GOALS	NUMBER OF RECORDS
YES > 0 < 5,000	9	PREPARATORY TO BILATERAL PROJECT	9	A1	9	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	25
YES > 5,000 < 10,000	7	PREPARATORY TO MULTILATERAL PROJECT	1	A2	21	POLICY REFORM	1
YES > 10,000 < 50,000	6	PREPARATORY TO OTHER DONOR PROJECT	NO RECORDS	A3	NO RECORDS	INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	13
YES > 50,000 < 100,000	6	SUPPLEMENTAL TO BILATERAL PROJECT	3	A4	3	PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT	1
YES > 100,000 < 250,000	4	SUPPLEMENTAL TO MULTILATERAL PROJECT	NO RECORDS	A5	1	ADDRESS PROGRAM EVAL CONCERNS	NO RECORDS
YES	13	SUPPLEMENTAL TO OTHER DONOR PROJECT	1	A6	4	FUND EVAL, ASSESSMENT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OR AUDIT ACTIVITIES	NO RECORDS
NO	19	FOLLOW-UP TO BILATERAL PROJECT	NO RECORDS	A7	2	FUND CDSS-RELATED STUDIES & SECTOR ASSESSMENTS	1
		FOLLOW-UP TO MULTI-LATERAL PROJECT	NO RECORDS	A8	7	FACILITATE STUDIES IN SUPPORT OF POLICY DIALOGUE	NO RECORDS
		FOLLOW-UP TO OTHER DONOR PROJECT	2	A9	6	ANALYZE INSTITUTIONAL OR TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS	4
		OTHER	4	A10	NO RECORDS	PROVIDE FOR/FACILITATE PROJECT DESIGN, FEASIBILITY STUDIES, OPERATIONS RESEARCH, PILOT TESTING OF HYPOTHESES, FINALIZATION OF PROJECT DESIGN	6
		NO LINKAGE	25	A11	NO RECORDS	ALLOW FOR PRE-IMPLEMENTATION OR BUDGETING ACTIVITIES	1
				A12	NO RECORDS		
				A13	1		

III.C.	NUMBER OF RECORDS	III.D.	NUMBER OF RECORDS	III.E.	NUMBER OF RECORDS	METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION	NUMBER OF RECORDS
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	26	USAID TECHNICAL OFFICE	31	TECHNICAL MINISTRY	28	USAID	30
JORDANIAN PRIVATE SECTOR ORGAN.	6	U.S. AMBASSADOR	1	MOP	11	AID/W	9
URBAN/RURAL ORGAN.	12	USAID MISSION DIRECTOR	NO RECORDS	INDEPENDENT AUTHORITY	5	SELECTED INSTRUMENT	
URBAN POPULATION	NO RECORDS	PDO	4	POLITICAL SOURCE	NO RECORDS	INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACT	NO RECORDS
JORDANIAN ECONOMY	9	AID/W	1	PRIVATE SECTOR	1	PSC	4
U.S. PRIVATE SECTOR	NO RECORDS	OTHER USC	4	OTHER	5	IQC/8a	9
		CANNOT DETERMINE	10			FASA	4
						MISSION "BUY-IN"	1
						PURCHASE ORDER	3
						ITD	4

METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION NUMBER OF RECORDS

MOP/MPC	19
MINISTRY OF:	17
SELECTED INSTRUMENT	
HC-CONTRACT	11
HC-PSC	5
OTHER	12

COMMODITIES	NUMBER OF RECORDS	ACTIVITY/SUBPROJECT DESIGN	YES	NO	N.A.	C.D.
DIRECT AID	NO RECORDS					
AID PROCUREMENT	2	CLEAR STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	37	9	1	2
PROC. SERVICES AG'T CONTRACT	1	OUTPUTS (RESULTS) SPECIFIED	35	7	3	3
PURCHASE ORDER	2	CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS IDENTIFIED	22	5	7	6
GOJ		WORKPLAN AND SCHEDULE	34	8	1	3
HC PROCUREMENT	3	ADEQUATE JOB DESCRIP.	34	8	2	4
HC PURCHASE ORDER	1	ADEQUATE INPUT SPECIFIC.	33	5	2	8

MANAGEMENT	YES	NO	MONITORING & REVIEW	YES	NO	EVALUATION	NUMBER OF RECORDS	ACTIVITY EXTENDED	NUMBER (
REPORTING CONTRACTOR			USAID			HOP	2	NO	25
INTERIM	15	6	ON-GOING	27	5				
FINAL	16	8	COMPLETION	28	5	MINISTRY	1	YES	12
REPORTING CONSULTANT			GOJ			USAID	2		
INTERIM	11	7	ON-GOING	22	8				
FINAL	21	7	COMPLETION	19	8	OUTSIDE PARTY	4		
USAID			SRC/PRC						
INTERIM	4	20	ON-GOING	2	14				
FINAL	2	23	COMPLETION	2	14				
NOP/MINISTRY			NOP/WRC						
INTERIM	1	25	ON-GOING	3	15				
FINAL	2	24	COMPLETION	5	14				

99

DATE FUNDS EARMARKED

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
ARDO			1	4		
AGRI						
EEE			1	3	6	
ENG	1	1	1	1	2	
HPN			3	6	2	
PLO		1	1	2		
PDO		1	4	7	1	
PRM			2			
TRAG					1	

AMOUNT OF FUNDS EARMARKED, BY USAID OFFICE

	<2,000	>2,000	>5,000	>10,000	>50,000	>100,000	>250,000
ARDO		2	1	4	1	1	1
AGRI		1					
EEE	3	1	1	1	1	3	1
ENG	1				2	2	1
HPN		1	2	3	3	1	1
PEU		1				2	1
PDO	1	1		3	3	4	4
PRM							3
TRAG	1						1

FUNDS EARMARKED, BY YEAR AND AMOUNT

	<2,000	>2,000	>5,000	>10,000	>50,000	>100,000	>250,000
1982							
1983						1	
1984	2	1	1	1	1	2	4
1985	2	1	4	6	4	2	4
1986	2			2	3	4	1
1987							

SIGNIFICANCE

	HIGH	AVERAGE	MARGINAL	C.D.
ARDO	9	1	0	0
AGRI	0	0	0	0
EEE	6	3	1	3
ENG	2	0	0	0
HPN	5	1	0	0
PEO	1	2	1	0
PDO	6	5	2	0
PRM	0	1	0	0
TRAG	0	0	0	0

EFFECTIVENESS

	HIGH	AVERAGE	MARGINAL	C.D.	N/A
ARDO	3	3		4	.
AGRI					
EEE	4	4		1	
ENG	2				
HPN	2	4		2	
PEO	1	1	1		
PDO	7	1	1		4
PRM		1			
TRAG					

PRELIMINARY DESIGN OF
BASIC DATA INPUT SHEETS
FOR TSFS DATABASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

EXPLANATIONPurpose:

The attached sheets have been designed (subject to further refinement and testing) to provide the necessary inputs into an appropriate TSFS data collection, monitoring and evaluation system, i.e., a data base Management System (DBMS). It is based on the guidance provided by the ANE Bureau^{1/}, recent USAID management improvements, and suggestions provided by the TSFS External Evaluation Team. It will be used to assist in the approval process, in the determination of appropriate accountability requirements, and for monitoring and reporting. The TSFS Project Officer, with advice from the Mission Program and Evaluation Officers, will act as the M&E system manager.

INSTRUCTIONS

Part I (initial input) will be filled out by the appropriate USAID technical office, with assistance as required from the TSFS Project Office, and included in the approval documentation package. (Note: A two section Part I form, one portion of which could be completed by the MOP and the second completed by USAID, can also be considered.) When approved, the data will be entered into the TSFS data base by the Project Officer.

Part II (implementation) will be completed and entered by the Project Officer when notified by the Controller that funds have been committed.

Part III will be completed by the USAID sponsoring or technical office and entered into the data base by the Project Officer who is also responsible for appropriate distribution of the forms and maintenance of a central file.

^{1/} See "Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans for Asia and Near East Bureau Projects", dated August 1985.

DATA SHEET - PART I (Initial Input)

A. Identification^{2/}

1. Activity Title and No. _____

2. Activity Officer and Office: _____

3. GOJ Counterpart Officer and Agency: _____

4. Jointly programmed MOP programmed USAID programmed

B. Programming

1. Type of Activity (Check one or more):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prefeasibility study | <input type="checkbox"/> Tender assistance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Feasibility study | <input type="checkbox"/> Sector/Subsector Assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-investment study | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/social assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Technical study | <input type="checkbox"/> Invitational travel |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advisory Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Commodity procurement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Management Study | <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Implementation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-implementation | <input type="checkbox"/> Pilot/demonstration |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Design | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____ |

2. Sector/Priority areas (Check one or more):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Private Enterprise | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water and Wastewater | <input type="checkbox"/> Women in Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Human resources | <input type="checkbox"/> PVO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health and Population | <input type="checkbox"/> Environment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Dev. and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Sectoral |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Science and Technology | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |

3. Relevance to GOJ Development Goals (1986-1990) (Check one or more)

- Increased output, particularly in agriculture and industry, through management efficiency, reduced cost of production, effective use of R&D and upgrading of management practices.

^{2/} To be entered into data base by TSFS System Manager immediately upon receipt of request from MOP. Balance of data to be provided by assigned activity officer, with PO assistance as/if required.

_____ Improved marketing and distribution networks to encourage production for the domestic and export markets.

_____ Strengthened local consultancy capabilities in various branches of engineering, business administration, and project formulation and appraisal, through on-the-job training and other programs designed to transfer technology.

_____ Exploitation of the tourist potential especially through tourism promotion, marketing and logistic support.

_____ Revision of the policy, legal and regulatory framework to encourage local and foreign investment and competition in Jordan.

_____ Improving the effectiveness and efficiency of fiscal and monetary policy so as to ensure that the private sector achieves the targets set forth in the plan for the investment, output, employment and balance of payments.

_____ Other (Specify) _____

4. Relevance to TSFS Purpose (Check one or more)

_____ Create opportunities for policy dialogue (briefly describe issue, e.g., family planning) _____

_____ Maximize the use of limited AID funds through selected leverage

_____ Seek cost-effective linkages with planned and on-going development projects in areas of current concern to GOJ and USG.

5. Relevance to USAID Functional objectives (check one or more)^{3/}:

_____ Improve Jordan's knowledge of its physical and natural environment.

_____ Refine the policy and infrastructure environment to broaden private sector participation in the economy (including studies of potential opportunities for privatization).

^{3/} This section of the checklist should be revised when the objectives are changed. All other data categories, however, will remain constant.

___ Upgrade management capabilities to improve the quantity and effective delivery of government goods and services.

___ Policy analysis and dialogue

___ development of projects (including feasibility studies, design and pilot activities) and evaluation.

6. Linkage (bridging action)

Prior TSFS funding?

Prior bilateral funding?

___ No ___ Yes

___ No ___ Yes

If yes from:

If yes:

TSFS _____, Amount \$ _____

Project No. and Title _____

(check one only)

___ preparatory to bilateral proj..	___ follow-up to bilateral proj..
___ preparatory to multilateral proj..	___ follow-up to multilateral proj..
___ preparatory to other donor proj..	___ follow-up to other donor proj..
___ supplemental to bilateral proj..	___ other (specify) _____
___ supplemental to multilateral proj..	_____
___ supplemental to other donor proj..	___ no linkage

7. Primary Purpose of Activity (check one only):

___ institution-building	___ direct support
___ training	___ technology transfer
___ policy reform	___ commodity support
___ mission support	___ other (specify) _____
___ experimental	_____
___ pilot/demonstration	_____

8. Direct Beneficiaries (check one or more)

___ Government Agency _____
(Insert Name)

___ Private Sector Organization _____
(Insert Name)

___ Urban population	___ U.S. private sector
___ Rural population	___ USAID
___ Jordanian economy	___ Other (specify) _____

C. Management Options

1. Criteria for Choice

- Eligible for automatic minimum management system (MMS) requirements^{4/}. Is yes, no further action necessary.
- Decision required as to appropriate management requirements. If this is required, check applicable criteria as follows:
- (1) Budget (or cumulative addition) is \$250,000 or higher
- (2) Total duration (with extensions) exceeds 12 months
- (3) Activity has high complexity factor, i.e.:
- (a) advanced technology (high tech)
 - (b) multiple functions/purpose
 - (c) multiple outputs
 - (d) multiple recipients
 - (e) multiple implementing agents
- (4) High level of USAID support/participation required in:
- (a) design (including success indicators)
 - (b) execution
 - (c) implementation
 - (d) review and evaluation
- (5) High level of political importance and/or sensitivity
- (6) Adequate management system already built-into activity (e.g., through mission buy-in to centrally or regionally funded project)
- (7) High level of maturity and management capability in recipient organization
- (8) Availability of qualified activity officer in appropriate technical office

^{4/} The minimum or standard management system requirements include: (a) statement of output expected, who will use it and for what purpose, (b) preparation of basic data sheets and (c) completion and assessment report.

2. Special Requirements

Based upon an analysis using the above criteria, in addition to the minimum management requirements, the following is necessary for this activity (check one or more):

- (1) Close USAID involvement in design and preparation of execution documentations
- (2) Assistance in appraisal and selection of contractors/consultants
- (3) Participation in contract negotiation and execution
- (4) Participation in specification of output(s), preparation of workplan and review of revisions
- (5) Briefing of contractor staff
- (6) Review of quarterly reports
- (7) Conduct ad hoc on-site reviews
- (8) Attend TSFS Review Committee sessions for quarterly review of progress and problems.
- (9) Coordination with other bilateral or multilateral projects
- (10) Active monitoring by activity officer and TSFS-PO
- (11) Planning, scheduling and/or participation in evaluation
- (12) Debriefing of activity staff
- (13) Other (specify) _____

3. Evaluation

(1) Type (check as appropriate):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completion report only | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress review by TSFS-RC |
| <input type="checkbox"/> RLC study | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____
_____ |

(2) Preferred agent (check one only)

USAID GOJ
 USAID/Contractor GOJ Contractor
 Joint

(3) Schedule

Date _____ Estimated Duration _____

D. Expected Results

1. Statement of Output(s):

2. Intended User and Purpose:

E. Approval of Activity, Including Management Requirements*

Up to \$9,999

approved disapproved

Technical Office Head _____
TSFS System Manager _____
Date _____

\$10,000 to \$249,999

approved disapproved

Technical Office Head _____
TSFS System Manager _____
Head, Project Development Office _____

* Clearance will also be obtained from the controller, Regional Legal Officer and/or the Contracts Officer regarding non-programmatic questions within each area of concern.

\$250,000 and above

_____ approved

_____ disapproved

Technical Office Head _____

TSFS Systems Manager _____

Deputy Mission Director _____

If disapproved, letter of explanation sent to Ministry of Planning
on _____

Reason for non-approval:

_____ does not meet programming
criteria

_____ Exceeds normal TSFS
limits

_____ No funds available

_____ Other, explain: _____

F. Approval Data

Date request received from MOP or
USAID office for Mission use _____

Date approved by USAID _____

PIL or MU number _____

Amount earmarked:

U.S. _____ \$ _____
GOJ _____ in kind _____ cash JD _____

If GOJ cash contribution to be provided, check source:

_____ regular budget _____ special account

DATA SHEET PART - II (implementation)^{5/}

A. Identification

1. Activity Title and No. _____

^{5/} To be completed and entered into data base by TSFS System Manager at
time of fund commitment.

2. Activity Officer and Office: _____
3. GOJ Counterpart Officer and Agency: _____

4. _____ Jointly programmed _____ MOP programmed _____ USAID programmed
-

B. Implementation

1. Technical Assistance (check one only)

- | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| (a) <u>AID</u> | | (b) <u>GOJ</u> | |
| _____ | USAID execution | _____ | MOP |
| _____ | AID/W execution | _____ | Ministry of _____ |
| | | | (insert name) |

If USAID, _____ within MD authority or
_____ delegation requested

Type of instrument

- _____ institutional contract
 _____ PSC
 _____ IQC/8a
 _____ PASA
 _____ buy-in
 _____ purchase order
 _____ ITO
 _____ Date PIO signed _____

Type of instrument

- _____ HC-contract
 _____ HC-PSA
 _____ other (specify) _____

 _____ Date of USAID clearance _____

2. Commodities (check one only):

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| _____ AID/W procurement | _____ HC procurement |
| _____ Proc. Services Agent.
Contract | _____ HC purchase order |
| | _____ Purchase order |

3. Commitment

Total Amount \$ _____
 Date: _____

DATA SHEET - PART III (Completion)^{6/}

A. Identification

1. Activity Title and No. _____

2. Activity Officer and Office: _____

3. GOJ Counterpart and Agency Officer: _____

_____ Jointly programmed
_____ USAID programmed

_____ MOP programmed

B. Type of Output (check one or more)

_____ pilot scale data
_____ process demonstrated
_____ experimental data
_____ feasibility/investment
projections
_____ increased institutional
capabilities
_____ US/HKJ relationships
strengthened

_____ new knowledge/technology
_____ problem identified & analyzed
_____ problem solved/recommendation
project design
_____ policy dialogue
_____ technical advice
_____ other (specify) _____

C. Assessment

1. Type of Assessment (check one or more)

_____ TSFS-RC review how many? _____

_____ SRC review how many? _____

_____ on-site inspection how many? _____

^{6/} To be completed and entered into data base by TSFS System Manager at time of fund commitment.

_____ evaluation (RLC)

conducted by:

- _____ USAID staff
- _____ U.S. contractor/consultant
- _____ MOP staff
- _____ GOJ Contractor
- _____ Ministry staff

_____ Date conducted: _____

2. Ratings

	<u>Excel.</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Cannot Determine</u>
(a) adequacy of design	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) delivery of input(s)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) quality of input(s)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) quality of output(s)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) utilization of output(s)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) desired effect achieved	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. Name and Title of Rating Officer: _____

4. Date of Assessment: _____

5. Follow-up (check one or more)

- _____ report/recommendations discussed with Ministry/department
- _____ report/recommendations discussed with MOP
- _____ report/recommendations discussed with SRC
- _____ report/recommendations discussed with PRC
- _____ report/recommendations sent to AID/W for comment
- _____ use of output could not be determined at completion of activity operations. If checked, insert best estimate of when determination can be made _____.
- _____ extension/new phase in process
- _____ coordinated results with other USAID project/activities
- _____ coordinated results with other bilateral or multilateral project activities.
- _____ other action taken (specify) _____

TSFS ACTIVITY COMPLETION AND ASSESSMENT REPORT*

Activity Title: _____

Activity Number: _____

Date Approved: _____ Date Operationally Completed: _____

Total Amount committed \$ _____ JD _____

GOJ Responsible Agency _____

USAID Activity Officer _____

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to (a) record the actual delivery and use of the product(s) and/or service(s) financed under TSFS; (b) provide an opportunity to assess the quality, utility and significance of the output(s) produced; and (c) determine what, if any, follow-up action is needed by either the GOJ or USAID.

PLANNED OUTPUT(S)/EXPECTATIONS:

Repeat the statement of output(s) included in the basic data sheet (Part I) prepared during the activity approval process.

ACTUAL RESULTS ACHIEVED:

Briefly and concisely describe the actual result(s) achieved (e.g., a summary of the highlights of a prefeasibility study, the major elements of a project design, production and economic data from a pilot plant), including whether it met expectations in terms of content, magnitude and quality.

* It is preferable, but not required, that this report be prepared jointly by the USAID office concerned and the counterpart GOJ agency.

USE OF RESULTS:

Explain briefly whether the result(s) were used for its/their intended purpose and by whom (e.g., the results of a feasibility study were used by the JIM to design a computer training program and purchase necessary hardware and software). Note and explain if additional time is required before such a determination can be made.

ASSESSMENT:

To the best of your knowledge, assess the following activity elements:

		<u>Excel.</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Can't Determine</u>
(1)	Adequacy of design	—	—	—	—	—	—
(2)	Delivery of input(s)	—	—	—	—	—	—
(3)	Quality of input(s)	—	—	—	—	—	—
(4)	Quality of output(s)	—	—	—	—	—	—
(5)	Utilization of output(s)	—	—	—	—	—	—
(6)	Causing desired effect	—	—	—	—	—	—

Title and Signature of Preparer(s)

DISTRIBUTION:

Keep one copy in office file and forward three copies to TSFS Project Officer who will retain one in central TSFS file and forward one copy each to MOP and AID/W for activities of \$10,000 or over. The Project Officer will enter the data into the TSFS data base (Part III).

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING
TSFS ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

These criteria, which are a checklist for factors to be considered jointly in the approval process, are meant to aid, not substitute for, the decision making process. They need to be applied with common sense and, if necessary, referred to the appropriate management level in the GOJ and USAID for resolution.

Minimum Management System Requirements

Unless otherwise indicated in the approval process, all TSFS funded activities will be subject to the following standard management requirements:

- (1) The formal request from the MOP will include a draft statement of the output(s) or result(s) expected from the activity, who will use it and for what purpose.
- (2) USAID will prepare basic data sheets at the times of approval and commitment and enter the data into the TSFS information system.
- (3) At the completion of activity operations, the recipient of TSFS assistance will fill out a brief completion report which includes an assessment of the quality and usefulness of the output. (This is separate from any financial reporting but can be used by the Controller for expenditure control/scrubbing).

Management Requirements for Major Activities

At the minimum, the management requirements outlined above will apply to so-called major activities or mini-projects. Additional requirements will be added, on a case-by-case basis as part of the approval process and may include:

- High level of USAID assistance to be required in drafting a contract, scope-of-work, job descriptions, request for tenders, developing a travel itinerary, etc.
- High level of USAID assistance to be required in the appraisal and selection of contractors/consultants.
- High level of USAID assistance to be required in contract negotiations and execution.
- Level of USAID assistance to be required in specification of output(s) and approval of work plan, including revisions.
- Detailed USAID briefing of contractor staff required on arrival.
- Quarterly reports required for TSFS-RC.
- Coordination required with bilateral or multilateral projects.
- On-site review(s) by USAID technical staff.

- Frequent participation in TSFS-RC sessions.
- Active participation of TSFS PO required in all phase
- Evaluation (internal or external).
- Debriefing.

Suggested Criteria

\$10,000 Rule

Unless otherwise required by the MOP or SRC, all activities estimated to cost less than \$10,000 for the life-of-the-activity are automatically eligible to use only the minimum. i.e. standard management system requirements. All other activities will specify the specific management requirements as a part of the approval process when completing the initial basic data input sheet, Part I Responsibility for making this determination will rest with the Project Officer and the Technical Office Activity Officer. All such decisions, for activities exceeding \$ 250,000 in total cost and/or 12 months in duration, however. must be reviewed by the TSFS-RC and the SRC before final approval.

Factors To Be Considered

While none of the factors listed below should be an absolute determinant of the extent of activity-management required. they will assist in making such a determination on a rationale and consistent basis. They include:

- Total cost is estimated to be \$250,000 or more (Note: when an extension of less than \$250,000 brings the new or accumulative total to over \$250,000, a new determination will be required).
- Total duration exceeds 12 months (Note: when an extension results in the expected accumulative duration exceeding 12 months, a new determination will be required).
- Activity has high complexity factor, viz, it involves:
 - (1) Advanced technology (high tech)
 - (2) Multiple functions (e.g., direct support and institution-building)
 - (3) Multiple outputs
 - (4) Several recipients (requiring coordination)
 - (5) More than one implementing agent.
- Level of USAID support/participation is high in:
 - (1) Design
 - (2) Execution
 - (3) Implementation
 - (4) Review and evaluation.

- Technical office willing/able to assume activity management responsibility v. assumption by TSFS Project Officer.
- High level of political importance and/or sensitivity.
- Adequate management system already built into activity (e.g., thru mission buy-in to centrally or regionally funded project).
- Maturity and management capability of host country counterpart institution/agency.
- Need to predetermine objectively verifiable indicators of success and means of verification.

**JOB DESCRIPTION
FOR
TSFS SYSTEMS MANAGER***

BASIC FUNCTION: Serves as System Manager (the equivalent of Project Officer) for the Technical Services and Feasibility Studies (TSFS) projects.

MAJOR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: The incumbent will be responsible for the management of the TSFS system as a whole, through the three principal stages of 1) programming and approval; 2) implementation; and 3) completion and assessment of TSFS-funded activities. Specific responsibilities and duties include:

DBMS

1. Design and maintain a Data Base Management System (DBMS) which will provide appropriate information for programming, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation.
2. Control all inputs (Parts I-III of Basic Data Sheets) for timeliness, quality and completeness.
3. Prepare regularly scheduled and special reports required for USAID and ANE management needs.
4. Control documentation process for each principal stage.

Programming and Approval

5. Draft Project Papers for new TSFS obligations.
6. Draft and revise periodically, programming guidelines including priority goals and problem areas, for joint and mission programming of TSFS funds.
7. Schedule and provide secretariat and follow-up services to MOP/USAID for periodic meetings for approval/revision of programming guidelines and indicative planning allocations and for the USAID TSFS Project committee.
8. Review requests for adherence to programming guidelines and approve/disapprove up to \$9,999. For requests exceeding this amount refer, with appropriate recommendation and documentation, either to the Head of PDO (up to \$249,999) or to the TSFS-Project Committee (in \$250,000 or over).

* Incumbent most likely will serve in a similar capacity for Private Enterprise Technical Resource Assistance (PETRA) projects.

9. Prepare recommendation for appropriate management system for each activity request and review adequacy of output(s) statement(s).
10. Record approval data and notify MOP accordingly (Basic Data Sheet - Part I).
11. Identify activities requiring de-earmarking and decommitment and advise Controller.
12. Prepare monthly status reports of earmarkings by sectors, goals, type of activities, and other useful programmatic data.

Implementation

13. Draft PILs, action memoranda, cables, and other obligating documents. Serve as central clearing house for all PIOs, RFPs, etc.
14. In close coordination with Regional Legal Advisor (or Contracts Officer), assist recipients with contracting for services including contract execution. Assists in the resolution of contract problems.
15. Record implementation data at times of commitment and contract executives (Basic Data Sheets - Part II).
16. Prepare and update schedules for activity on-sets inspections, reviews and/or evaluations, the latter in collaboration with the Mission Evaluation Officer.
17. Monitor the status/progress of activities and report problems and proposed solutions to the Head of PDO or the TSFS-PC, as appropriate. Prepare quarterly status report on implementation.
18. Assist in the development of evaluation scopes of work and review subsequent reports. Arrange for joint exercises with GOJ when appropriate and participants on a selected basis. Prepare and update list of potential evaluations consultants, both U.S. and Jordanian.
19. Assist other USAID Officer Heads and TSFS activity officers in execution of their management responsibilities involving technical services.

Completion

20. Monitor recipient of completion and assessment reports and enter information into data base (Basic Data Sheets - Part III).
21. Monitor follow-up actions required.
22. Prepare semi-annual report on production and use of outputs.

Other

23. Act as activity officer for assigned activities (Note: this should be minimized).
24. Conduct briefings on purpose, current approach, and administration of TSFS projects.

POSITION ELEMENTS:

Supervision Received: The incumbent will be under the direct supervision of the Head of the Project Development Office and will receive general guidance from the Deputy Mission Director.

Available Guidelines: USAID handbooks and related policies and regulations; Project Papers and Project Documentations for TSFS projects.

Exercise of Judgement: Must be able to make considerable judgements concerning the applicability, management and developmental effects of TSFS activities as the systems manager of an increasingly important programming tool for the GOJ and USAID.

Authority to Make Commitments: May approve requests up to \$9,999 in accordance with current policies and priorities with clearance from Controller and RLO (or Contracts Officer).

Nature, Level and Purpose of Contacts: The incumbent will work closely with senior and middle management levels in the MOP and requesting/executing GOJ agencies in all stages of project activity. She/he will also work closely with subgrantees, contractors, consultants, PASAs and the technical and activity officers within USAID/Amman. These contacts will run the gamut from guidelines and indicative planning, through data collection to recording activity results and their use.

Supervision Exercised: TSFS Program Assistant (FSN) and Secretary.

REQUIRED MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS:

Education: At least a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or University with majors in business or public administration, economics, international affairs or related field.

Abilities, Skills and Experience: Experience and skill in several of the following areas is necessary: project management; program budgeting; data management; programming, evaluation, and contracting; ability to negotiate and write also highly important.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND CONTRACTING ACTIONS

The following recommendations have been discussed with Mission staff as ways to improve financial management of the overall TSFS program.

1. Less reliance on AID/W in contracting and procurement may increase efficiency, effectiveness and save time and money.

By its very nature, TSFS is a relatively high "unit cost" activity. The larger number of short-term actions, often executed in short timeframes, forces heavy reliance on IQCs and PASAs where overheads are substantial. We do not see an easy way to avoid this pattern in the short-run except on the margin, through better advance planning in some instances to permit competition, use of buy-ins through centrally-funded projects where they can substitute for IQCs, and in some instances, increased use of resident expatriate and Jordanian talent, paying travel and per diem at the Mission to avoid inclusion of those amounts in overhead. The Mission is already taking some actions in this direction, but we accept that the savings involved may not be decisive.

The more decisive factor affecting management and cost is delays resulting from heavy reliance on AID/W for procurement actions. For example, out of 79 activities in TSFS III, 29 required AID/W contracting assistance. Similarly, under TSFS IV, out of 40 activities, 19 required AID/W contracting assistance. (In FY 1987, 12 of 15 TSFS V contract actions will request AID/W execute the contract documents).

The Mission could cut down on contracting delays in the short-term by executing all PIO/Ts in the field, and sending them to AID/W via pouch for contract action. It is estimated this action alone could save at least four weeks processing time. Over the longer run, establishing a contract officer position in the Mission will permit both execution of PIO/Ts and contracts in the field, leaving to AID/W only those rare contracting actions where waiver actions are necessary. (Even in the latter case, AID/W may issue the waiver but contract action could remain in the field). AID/W contracting action could then be reserved for those IQC and central project buy-in actions where field contracting is impractical. More field-based contracting will also permit USAID to become the vouchering office for contractor billing and allow the Controller to better manage and monitor project resources.

Over the long-term, an option for lowering the cost of TA provided under TSFS is to increase use of local consultants. The preferred way to do this is to provide the money for the GOJ to contract locally for specialized services. However, requirements for competitive procurement under the GOJ contracting system often means it takes considerable time to secure the services needed. AID's flexibility through buy-ins, 8A, and IQC mechanisms means that AID can bring higher-priced U.S. technical assistance services to bear on a problem much more quickly.

USAID should explore with the GOJ the possibility of setting up a local network of IQC contractors financed initially from TSFS, but which could also draw resources from other Mission projects (E.G., PETRA). The Mission could explore setting up the local IQC network under GOJ auspices, using GOJ competition procurement regulations to govern both prequalification and selection of IQC contractors; or USAID could try to establish the network itself. demonstrate its use for TSFS activities and negotiate with the GOJ assumptions of the IQC contracts on terms similar to the USAID IQC arrangements. The fact that TSFS is likely to be a long-term "fixture" in the Missions portfolio makes the investment of time in establishing a local IQC network worth considering.

2. Improvements on Multi-Purpose Controller's Report

It was difficult for the team to reconcile some of the dates and figures in the Controller's quarterly report. The report is frequently used by Mission staff as a management tool to track implementation progress, with sometimes frustrating results. The Controller has recognized these defects, and in the process of reviewing each subactivity under TSFS III-IV with the team, discovered data inaccuracies which he immediately undertook to correct.

Unfortunately, even with the corrections, the Controller's Report cannot provide a wholly adequate management tool for tracking specific subactivities. However, it can be improved by:

- a. Assigning a date to establishment of project elements. Project elements should be deemed established when agreed to by the projects Review Committee.
- b. Recording earmark dates as the actual date of execution of PILs or PIO/Ts, rather than as the date of receipt of executed documents.
- c. Similarly, commitment dates should reflect date of contract or other procurement document execution, rather than receipt of such documents.
- d. Introduction of a "PACD" for activities as one of the column headings for activities above a minimum amount.

In addition, the very useful tables produced by the Controller (Appendix No.6) aggregating activities of TSFS III and IV under sectoral headings should be further developed for use as a management tracking device, adding where appropriate the necessary dates suggested above.

3. Suggestions for "Scrubbing the Numbers" and Monitoring Completion

Most of the suggestions which follow have already been discussed above, and some are being acted upon concomitant with this evaluation. They are:

- a. Establish a "sunset" policy for subactivities over a certain amount, say \$ 10,000. This can be done for activities by the Review Committee deciding to treat establishing project budget elements over the above amount as a significant financial action, assigning a date to that act, and establishing in principle how long the element will be available for earmarking before reprogramming is considered.

- b. Similarly, for activities over a minimum amount, establish a PACD date by which time contract services are expected to be delivered.
- c. The RC should apply the "sunset" policy retroactively to a review of TSFS III and IV, to permit the Controller to maximize results of de-earmark and decommitment actions in the shortest possible time.
- d. In the process of de-earmarking and decommitting funds from TSFS III and IV, the Controller should close-out TSFS III as soon as possible.
 - (1) Shifting all unprogrammed amounts to TSFS IV and V (as appropriate) through deob/reob;
 - (2) Shifting all contract amounts for activities expected to extend beyond 6/30/87 to TSFS IV; and
 - (3) Shifting all de-earmarked and decommitted amounts to TSFS IV and V (as appropriate) through either deob/reob, or by using upward adjustment authority.
- e. The Mission should consider consolidating all TSFS resources into a single project, TSFS V, as soon as practical. This would involve initiating no new contract actions under TSFS IV (except amendments to complete work already underway), and transferring currently unearmarked and uncommitted funds to TSFS V.
- f. ANE/PD should undertake to assist the Mission in determining the decommitment amounts for completed contracts under TSFS III and IV.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AID/W/IRM - Assessment of Computer Systems Requirements for the Jordanian Ministry of Planning (USAID/Amman), Pemberton Computer Consultants, 1986.

Coopers and Lybrand, May 1985, Jordan Industrial and Export Development (Draft).

Dajani, J.S., An Impact Evaluation of the Jordan Valley Development Effort, (1973-1986), A Proposed Scope of Work, April 1986.

Dajani, J.S., Interim Evaluation of State I of the Jordan Valley Development Plan: A Proposed Scope of Work, January 1980.

USAID/Amman, TSFS III Project Paper, April 1982.

USAID/Amman, TSFS IV Project Paper, June 1984

USAID/Amman, TSFS V Project Paper, June 1986

USAID/Amman, FY 85 CDSS, January 1983.

USAID/Amman, FY 86 CDSS January 1984.

USAID/Amman FY 88 CDSS, May 1986.

USAID/Amman, FY 86 Action Plan, March 1985.

USAID/Amman, FY 1987 Action Plan.

USAID/Amman, PETRA Project Paper.

USAID/Amman, Quarterly Report, September 30, 1986.

AID/W, ANE Bureau Procedural Guidelines for Evaluation, February 1985.

AID/W, Draft Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans for ANE Bureau Projects, May 1985.

AID/W, PIS Guidance.

AID/W. ANE Action Plan Guidance Cable FY 88-89.

AID/W, Mission Order - Evaluation Summary.

PD&S Guidance Cable - Management of FY 87 PD&S Funds.

**MATRIX OF TSFS EVALUATION
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Explanation:

While the TSFS Evaluation Report was organized around the logic that findings led to conclusions which, in turn, lead to recommendations, it was not always feasible or useful to make sharp distinctions, particularly between findings and conclusions. Furthermore, there are a number of conclusions which take the form of observations, judgements or assessments. While such conclusions are an important part of the evaluation results and relate to subjects specified in the Evaluation Team's statement of work, they do not necessarily lead to actionable recommendations. Finally, the recommendations as presented in Chapter IV represent a summary of the many detailed suggestions (particularly concerning management and process improvements) which are included in Chapter III on conclusions and in several of the appendices. Therefore, the findings and conclusions selected for display in this matrix are only those directly related to recommended actions and are grouped under appropriate categories. Unfortunately, this results in an unbalanced presentation of findings and conclusions which focusses on those involving desirable improvements.

FINDINGS

Programming

There was a substantial shift in sectoral emphasis between TSFS III and IV but it was not possible to verify whether this reflected a determined programmed effort or an *ad hoc* process reacting to targets of opportunity.

A large proportion of the activities financed involved technical advisory services.

It was not uncommon for a TSFS activity to have received prior and/or subsequent TSFS funding, a phenomenon which can reduce the flexibility and responsiveness of TSFS as a programming mechanism.

There was a lack of programming and management data generated and recorded and an absence of jointly agreed-upon operational guidance, with over-reliance on informal, day-to-day contacts.

There is no basis to conclude that the management effort required is excessive vis-a-vis and alternative methods.

Mission has made good use of regional and centrally-funded "buy-ins".

CONCLUSIONS

There is a need for more formal and frequent joint meetings at the senior management level to discuss reasons for changes in project orientation, to assess possibilities of leveraging other donor funds, to study summary allocation data, review major results, etc.

The context and applicability of guidelines and criteria for making increasingly hard choices should be clarified and refined, reduced to writing, and applied more stringently. This is also necessary if new areas and new agencies are to be reached in TSFS and subsequent tranches.

In terms of USAID/Amman management time and the GOJ's consistent desire for quick turn-around time, the "buy-in" mechanism is probably the most efficient.

As a technique for both reducing the number of requests for general technical advisors (the blue-eyes syndrome) and objectively defining the need, a cash contribution should be required from the GOJ agency which increases with each request for extension.

Closer coordination between MOP TSFS requests and MOP requests for funding by other donors (or in other AID projects) is needed to avoid duplication.

The programming process, as the first stage in the total TSFS management process, needs to be more result-oriented and tied into a redefined project purpose.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Numbers 1-12, 25, and 31.

126

FINDINGS

Despite the problems involved in trying to retrace the programming logic, the TSFS mechanism was used to facilitate program and project identification, design, implementation and monitoring activities within AID in meaningful and largely efficient and timely ways. The overall effectiveness of such assistance to the GOJ is not objectively verifiable with the data readily available.

Project Design

Problems arise when attempting to force a project design concept, i.e., the logframe, on non-project activities as in this case with the TSFS mechanism employing an "umbrella" concept to package heterogeneous activities.

This is reflected in: a) attempting to explain a project "goal", b) using a purpose statement which is unmeasurable in any objective fashion, c) developing assumptions only for the goal level, d) failing to describe outputs because they cannot be determined at the time of project approval, and e) ANE suggestions regarding the programming and evaluation of TSFS activities based on a misconception of the project logic.

Recent attempts have been made to patch up some of these deficiencies, e.g., the description of functional objectives which appear in the TSFS V Project Paper.

Management Improvement

The process for the receipt and processing of TSFS requests from the GOJ requires some tightening up.

CONCLUSIONS

In an era of declining AID and GOJ resources, the "multiplier effect" of TSFS is particularly germane as it becomes a larger part of the Mission's OYB and it becomes more significant as a lever for other AID funds, through buy-ins, other donor funds and for private and GOJ funds.

A revised project design, which more closely reflects the realities within which the TSFS mechanism is currently used in Jordan, would greatly improve the communication process and understanding between USAID/Amman and AID/W, put the TSFS approval process in a more logical and programmatic context (using logic which is at least verifiable after the fact), and provide a better basis for activity management, including periodic external evaluations.

Such a design should also recognize the peculiar needs under an umbrella arrangement in determining specific outputs, critical assumptions, and success indicators.

USAID, in the management of TSFS V, is attempting to tie approvals closer to specific USG and GOJ goals and priorities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Numbers 8-11 and 25.

Numbers 13-27.

FINDINGS

Although the Project Officer has recently been authorized to approve requests up to \$10,000, there seems to be an excessive involvement of senior USAID staff in the approval process which could be reduced through better programming guidance additional delegation and less participatory management.

There has been almost a sole reliance on Controller reports which constitute the only body of codified information about activity implementation, just as Review Committee minutes and PILs constitute the only record of the approval process.

The role of the TSFS Project Officer has only recently been recognized as essentially that of systems manager and not a project officer in the traditional sense. Up to this point, the incumbent PO has functioned mostly in a secretariat, facilitative and administrative role with uncertain responsibilities and authorities, i.e., in a very informal manner.

The data collected and the problems presented for higher level review related almost exclusively to the status of "earmarkings", "commitments" and delivery of inputs.

An attempt in 1985 to establish a TSFS feedback system with a semi-annual output-related status report went into disuse shortly after its installation.

CONCLUSIONS

Notwithstanding these efforts, there is still a need for more effective use of computer technology in establishing and operating a data base management system (DBMS) especially designed for the unique characteristics of the TSFS instrument.

There is a need to develop guidance as to the minimum oversight appropriate for each activity as part of the approval process.

The use of a Review Committee consisting of all Office Heads to meet on items budgeted for less than \$250,000 may require a level and quantity of USAID/Amman talent that will no longer be necessary if adequate programming guidelines have been promulgated and the PO has sufficient expertise and stature to apply them.

The MOP should be encouraged and supported to take an active role and joint role in the monitoring, review and evaluation of TSFS activities when size and importance warrants it.

Output(s), i.e., the expected result(s) to be produced from the resources made available through the TSFS, and their actual use by the intended direct beneficiaries (impact), needs to be emphasized more in all stages, i.e., approval, implementation and completion.

RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

The semi-annual reports to AID/W have been primarily related to contract status with little attention to substance and an absence of information on results and their use for developmental or policy purposes.

In the past two years, increasing attention has been given to the evaluation of larger-scale activities. The quality of the five evaluations of "mini-projects" has varied but there is an observable tendency to concentrate on inputs and administrative problems rather than substance and outputs. Follow-up has not been recorded and some eligible activities have not yet been scheduled for evaluation.

There has been little or no effective MOP participation in joint progress reviews or evaluations, except as part of the re-allocation process.

Financial Management and Contracting

The recent rapid programming process appears to reflect aggressive implementation action to define priorities and secure GOJ agreement.

There has been a heavy reliance on IQCs and PASAs.

A major factor affecting management and cost is delays resulting from heavy reliance on AID/W for procurement actions.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the heterogeneous nature of TSFS activities, no single form of evaluation can be prescribed and the type, scope and timing of an evaluation, or its equivalent, must be decided on a case-by-case basis, normally as part of the approval and/or implementation process. This can range from a simple completion and self-assessment report to a rapid low cost (RLC) or in-depth evaluation.

There is need for a periodic, comprehensive and external evaluation of effectiveness at the TSFS purpose level with a focus on results, their utilization, significance and relevance to programming goals and priorities.

Management reporting, both internal, to the GOJ and AID/W can be considerably improved through accumulation and analysis of data produced through a DBMS.

There should be less reliance on AID/W for contracting and procurement through more use of buy-ins and increased use of resident expatriate and Jordanian talent.

Similarly, contracting delays can be reduced by issuing all P/O/Ts in Amman and, over the longer run, establishing a contract office position in USAID.

There may be merit in setting up a local network of IQCs financed initially from TSFS.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Numbers 28-30 (and Appendix No. 11)

124

FINDINGS

A cursory review of actions suggests delays in converting "earmarkings" and "commitments" and in decommitting unexpended balances.

Management Capacity

The MOP has relied heavily on expatriate assistance on USAID matters in general, and TSFS in particular.

The TSFS/PO is uncertain about her role and urgently needs some support assistance (a FSN is under recruitment).

CONCLUSIONS

The Controller's quality reporting can be improved by a number of actions, e.g., providing a sectoral breakout and use of more descriptive activity titles, recording earmark dates, etc.

More rigorous "scrubbing" of accounts and application of a "sunset" policy can maximize results for decommitments.

Better fiscal management can be exercised by shifting all de-earmarked and decommitted amounts to TSFS IV and V, or better still, consolidating all past and future TSFS resources into a single project.

The MOP should be encouraged to build-up its own capacity, using Jordanian talent, to strengthen its role in programming, monitoring and evaluation in general as well as for USAID and TSFS matters.

The role and qualifications of the TSFS Project Officer should be re-examined in the context of a systems manager with a more active and substantive role in the entire TSFS management process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Numbers 31-34.