



EUROPEAN UNION
DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION
TO THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN

Date: 11 November 2007
Note no.: MN/1598

Note for the attention of Ms. Androulla Kaminara,
Director, AIDCO/ E

Subject: Developing a EuropeAid Strategy to meet the EU aid effectiveness targets
on Technical Cooperation and Project Implementation Units

Reference: Your note AIDCO/E/AK D(2007) 22075

Further to your request to participate in a survey on TC and PIUs, please find in annex
the filled out questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Patrick Renault
Head of Delegation

Annex: Questionnaire for the 46 delegations members of the Aid Effectiveness Network



Brussels, 25 October 2007

“Developing a EuropeAid strategy to meet the EU aid effectiveness targets on Technical Cooperation and Project Implementation Units”

Questionnaire for the 46 delegations members of the Aid Effectiveness Network

Background and purpose

In July 2007, EuropeAid launched the preparation of a new strategy to improve the quality of its Technical Cooperation and of the implementation arrangements of its projects. The approach and work plan are described in the Terms of References¹. Learning from the Delegation's experiences is essential to the success of this initiative and this survey is the major component of the preparation of our strategy.

The objectives of the survey include :

- To serve at Delegation level as a starting point for : i) stocktaking on current practices ; ii) structuring an internal discussion on how to improve quality and meet EU targets
- To provide us with your contributions into the development of our strategy on TC and PIUs.
- To promote exchange of practices among members of the network (see below features of the "D- Group facility")

Answering this survey is a first step towards enhancing the quality of TC provision and project implementation arrangements. Your views will be key to addressing the potential "areas of change" that we have pre-identified for the development of the forthcoming strategy (see areas shown in red in the matrix attached in annexe 1).

The questionnaire has been reviewed by the EuropeAid Working Group on TC – PIU and at delegation level. It has been estimated that two/three hours of work may be needed to fill it in. In line with the objective of using the survey as a first step towards better practices, we strongly suggest to prepare the reply through team work/internal meetings. The Head of Operations – as members of the network - may coordinate the preparation of the final reply.

For regional delegations, questionnaires should be filled up by country. The questionnaire can be filled up in French or in English.

The **DEADLINE** for reply is the **16 November 2007**. A feed-back document, summarising the essence of your replies, will be transmitted to the Network in early December.

Filled up questionnaires should be sent to the functional box : “AIDCO E5 Survey on TC-PIU”.

The D-Group Facility, organisation and contact

To foster intra-network communication among the Delegations members of the Aid Effectiveness Network, the survey will be managed through a "**Discussion - Group facility**" (**D-Group**). Each member of the Group will automatically receive by e-mail the replies to the survey sent by the other delegations. All filled up questionnaires will be accessible on the D-Group site..

The Head of Operations members of the AE network are automatically registered as members of the D-Group. We recommend that any person in delegation interested on these topics become member of the Group addressing a demand to the functional box : "**AIDCO E5 Survey on TC-PIU**". The D-Groups Facility site contains selected documentation on TC and PIU issues under the menu "resources" and will be utilized again to support communication in the coming phases of the preparation of the strategy

For additional information, please do not hesitate to contact either Virginia Manzitti or Felice Zaccheo at Unit E5, in charge of the preparation of the strategy.

¹ Key documents are posted on the AIDCO intranet, see the menu “Revisiting Technical Cooperation and PIUs” : http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/europeaid/activities/adm/technical_cooperation/index_en.htm and on the D_Groups site

PARIS and EU targets in the area of TC and PIU Definitions

Box 1 a) : The aid effectiveness targets on TC and PIUs

The Paris Declaration has 12 indicators of which 2 are designed to monitor the use of TC and PIUs. The EU has agreed on two more ambitious complementary indicators on these two issues:

Indicators on TC :

Paris Declaration - Indicator 4: ***"50% of TC flows are implemented through coordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies"***.

EU's target : ***"to provide all capacity building assistance through coordinated programmes with an increasing use of multi-donor arrangements"***.

Indicators on PIUs :

Paris Declaration - Indicator 6: ***"to reduce by two-thirds the stock of parallel implementation PIUs"***.

EU target : ***"to avoid the establishment of new PIUs"*** .

Box 1 b) : Working definitions² of TC and TA

There are many definitions for the terms 'technical cooperation' and 'technical assistance'. For the purposes of this exercise, we have adopted the definitions used by the OECD-DAC for the monitoring of the Paris declaration:

Technical cooperation (TC) is the provision of know-how in the form of personnel, training, and research and associated costs. It comprises activities that augment the level of knowledge, skills, technical know-how or productive aptitudes of people in developing countries, AND services such as consultancies, technical support or the provision of know-how that contribute to the execution of a capital project.

TC thus includes a range of activities, including long and short-term TA*, training, research, twinning, peer-support etc.

*In this questionnaire The term Technical assistance (TA) is used to refer only to the personnel involved in these activities

Structure of the questionnaire

Part I: Mapping of long term technical assistance

Part II: Exploring current practices and options for the future

- A. Completing the picture: Technical cooperation in the EC's assistance portfolio
- B. TA design in project/programme formulation
- C. Tendering and procurement of TA
- D. Implementation of TA
- E. Evaluation of TC/TA
- F. Questions on PIUs
- G. Role played by the partner government
- H. Donor coordination on TC/TA and PIUs

I. Looking forward and collecting your ideas on the future strategy

² For a definition of PIUs please see section F of this questionnaire.

Country: JORDAN

Part I: Mapping of long term technical assistance

The table below is intended to provide a basic mapping of main long-term TA currently posted in major programmes in your country. Please use it to screen long term TA in the "top 5 programmes" ³ currently under implementation (including GBS, SPSP, projects). Refer to Box 2 on page 4. There are more detailed questions on some of the aspects listed here in Part II of the questionnaire.

Table 1: Long term technical assistance

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
1. Short Project/ Programme title	Institutional Support –Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority /S-ASEZA CRIS no. 3357	Presentation and preservation of Cultural Heritage in Jordan CRIS no. 3496 programme	Institutional Capacity building for the Ministry of Environment (part of SAAP II)	Support to Regulatory Reform and Privatisation	
2. Financing modality	Grant	Grant	FWC + TA under SAAP II	Programme support – 20 MEuro	
3. Description of the TAs component	TA for Laboratories establishment and procurement, as well as establishing a tourism division	Project coordinator	Institutional capacity building and legislative approximation towards EU standards	5 big TA contracts (TRC, EPC, CAA, ERC, Cross sector)	
4. Are the TAs part of or linked to a PIU?	Yes	Same	Part of the PIU of SAAP	Yes, it is the fifth TA contract	
5. Type of role(s) played by TAs	Technical advisors and trainers, plus developing technical reports	Coordination and implementation follow up including financial management for the local accounts, plus preparing needed tender documents and follow up	Technical advisors and trainers, plus developing technical reports as well as updating or developing special regulations	Assist local institutions	
6. Centralised or decentralised management	Decentralised management	Decentralised	Decentralised	Decentralised but with centralised payment	
7. Level of partner government involvement	High	Low	High	100%	
8. Who do TAs report to in practice?	Programme coordinator/PIU	Government partner	Government partner	Local Institutions	
9. TA quality	Adequate (DEL & PI)	Adequate (DEL)	Adequate (DEL & PI)	Very good	

³ It's up to the delegation to select the programmes where the TA component is particularly significant and relevant for this survey (innovative approach, good and bad practices, importance of the financial envelope, etc)

10. TA Effectiveness	effective at strengthening government capacity in terms of reform practices	Moderately effective	Effective	Very Good	
Comments	TA brought in most needed technical capabilities	TA brought in needed technical support , yet faced many obstacles due to lack of coordination and harmonisation among involved government agencies	TA helped the Ministry reach their reform targets		

Box 2: How to fill up Table 1

1. Short Project/ Programme title	Please indicate which project/programme the TA position is linked to (e.g. health project, NAO support, education programme). If possible , please also indicate the accounting number to help us extract information from the CRIS and ROM systems for further reference.
2. Financing modality	Please indicate which financing modality is being used : General Budget Support (GBS), Sector Budget Support (SBS), Pooled Funding (PF), Project (P)
3. Description of the TAs component	Please briefly describe how the TA is structured, indicate how many long term TA positions there are, and where possible, how many of the positions are filled by international, local or regional TAs.
4. Are the TAs part of or linked to a PIU?	Please indicate whether the long-term TA is part of a PIU, or closely linked to it (is the TA's main function to support / work with a PIU?). For definitions see section F of the questionnaire. Please answer Yes or No.
5 Type of role(s) played by the TAs	<p>Please indicate the main role(s) played by the long-term TAs selecting up to three out of the following options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project/programme financial implementation ('Controlling funds') - please indicate if the TA performs the role of Imprest Accounting Officer 2. Programme/project technical implementation (including monitoring): please indicate if the TA performs the role of Imprest Administrator 3. Gap-filling in partner government institutions 4. Advisory work to partner government (mentoring, coaching, facilitating, etc) 5. Supporting internal reforms and domestic change processes 6. Training 7. Support to delegation 8. Project/programme identification and formulation 9. Other? (please specify)
6 Centralised or decentralised management	<p>Please indicate whether the TA component is managed centrally or by decentralised management. If the latter, please also specify the form of decentralised management used : Please answer by using the following letters:</p> <p>(A) decentralised management with ex ante controls (B) decentralised management with ex post controls, (C) direct decentralised management (D) public indirect decentralised management (E) private indirect decentralised management</p>
7 Level of partner government involvement	Please indicate how you would grade the level of involvement and leadership by the partner government in the design, selection and management of the long term TAs. Please answer: " low ", " medium ", or " high ".
8 Who do the TAs report to in practice?	Please indicate who, in practice, the TAs report to on any major issues concerning their assignment. Please answer by using the following abbreviations: the Partner Government (PG) / the Delegation (Del)?
9 TA quality	Please indicate whether the overall quality of the different TAs is considered to be: " adequate " or " inadequate ". Please add to this judgement whether these opinions originate from the partner institution (PI) and/ or the Delegation (Del).
10 TA Effectiveness	Please give us your estimate of whether this TA is seen as overall " effective ", " moderately effective " or " ineffective ". Please add to this judgement whether you mean "effective at strengthening government capacity, in line with the aid effectiveness principles", or "effective as regards project/ programme implementation and management"?
11 Comments	Please provide us any other relevant comments on this TA, for instance on what you see as its main strengths and weaknesses .

Part II: Exploring current practices and options for the future

This section aims at collecting your views and experience with TC, TA and PIUs. Experiences will vary from one case to the other depending on sector/area, therefore answer by referring to major trends. Add references to other cases/experiences particularly relevant. Please report on "real life" practices.

A. Completing the picture: Technical cooperation in the EC's assistance portfolio

1. What do you think is on average the proportion of technical cooperation in each EC project/ programmes in the country you work in? Please give a rough estimate.
 - a. **Up to 20%**
 - b. Up to 50%
 - c. Above 50%
 - d. Please comment if necessary
2. How would you judge the current overall supply of TA in your country, including long-term and short-term TA?
 - a. Oversupplied
 - b. Correctly supplied
 - c. **Undersupplied, one can realise that TA are instrumental to achieve objectives.**
 - d. **Please comment if necessary: The issue is quality rather than quantity**
3. In the last three years have you had any significant experience of Twinning/peer support?
 - a. **Yes**
 - b. No
 - c. Please score the quality/effectiveness by H (high) / M (medium) / L (low) and provide basic information
4. In the last three years, have you had any significant experience with other forms of TC (see box 1 for definitions?)
 - a. **Yes**
 - b. No
 - c. Please score the quality/effectiveness by H (high) / M (medium) / L (low) and provide basic information where relevant

B. TA design in project/programme formulation

5. Who in reality "wants" technical assistance?
 - a. **Partner government**
 - b. **Delegation**
 - c. HQ
 - d. Recommendation from the QSG process
 - e. Recommendations from evaluations/monitoring
 - f. Others – please specify: **line ministries, the Government generally prefers budget support**
6. During identification and formulation of projects/programmes, is the role which TA may play in supporting development of local capacity ⁴ in the partner institution part of the discussion?
 - a. **Yes**
 - b. No
 - c. Please comment if necessary : **we try to combine more and more TA and budget support in different aspects.**
7. During identification and formulation of projects/programmes, are the costs of technical assistance transparent enough for the Partner Government to explore an alternative use of resources (including other forms of technical cooperation)?

⁴ There are many different definitions of capacity. The Aid Delivery Methods Concept Paper *Institutional Assessment and Capacity Development – Why? what and how?* (September 2005) defines it as follows (p.5): "Capacity is the ability to perform tasks and produce outputs, to define and solve problems, and make informed choices."

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Please comment if necessary

8. Who, in practice, drafts the terms of reference of TAs?

- a. Delegation
- b. Government
- c. Joint effort
- d. Other consultants
- e. Please comment if necessary

9. Does the QSG stimulate discussion on TA provision during programme preparation?

- a. Yes
- b. No, but it is starting to be more involved.
- c. Please comment if necessary

10. Where do you see room for improvement in the design of TA interventions? Is there a need for more guidance, working tools or other support?

Quality: The structure of a TA/BS programme is very complex. There is a need for further discussion and training opportunities to discuss the guidelines, and share experience with other countries.

As indicating we started tackling the QSG so if this continues it will help the design, making sure to involve the local partner in the preparation of the TA.

C. Tendering and procurement of TA

11. Of the procedures stipulated in the Financial Regulations and the PRAG, which procedures do you use most for procuring technical assistance?

**Frame work contracts in quantity.
Open tender in value.**

12. Please describe your experience of working with Framework Contracts:

- a. To what extent do framework contracts allow you to get good quality TAs?

Moderate extent

- b. What are the TAs used for in practice?

- i. **Mainly working directly with the Partner Government**
- ii. Mainly supporting the work of the Delegations

- c. What are your opinions on the cost effectiveness of Framework Contracts?

- a. **Positive**
- b. **Negative**
- c. Other/ comment

13. What is your experience of using the international restricted tender procedure?

- a. **Satisfactory**
- b. Unsatisfactory
- c. Other/comment

14. Do you have any experience of using national (partner government) procurement procedures for procuring TA?

- a. Yes
- b. **No**

c. If yes, please tell us more

15. Are you aware of any other donors using country procedures to contract and manage TA? If yes, could you indicate who?

a. Yes

b. No

c. If yes, please tell us more

16. Please give us your views on the use of local/regional TAs:

a. If possible, could you provide a rough estimate of the proportion of local/regional TAs actually used (despite the fact that EC procedures no longer make any distinction between these categories...)?

In numbers, about 1/3 is local, and depends on which experts are proposed by the Framework contracts companies

b. Do you have any views on the pros and cons of using local/regional consultants in your country?

Pro: Would encourage increased inter-Arab cooperation and as well as having more Arab experts within the lists of Framework contracts companies

We would like to have a team that combines both fields of expertise.

Neg: Practical difficulties of cooperation between different entities might hamper potential increase,

17. Do you see room for improvement concerning current practices on tendering and procuring TA?

a. Yes

b. No

c. If yes, please tell us where and how!

D: Implementation of TA

18. Which of the roles played by TAs are seen by the delegations as most useful? Please tick the most relevant answers and indicate whether Partner Government (PG) view diverge significantly in the "comments" column

Table 2: Which TA roles are most appreciated?

	Most useful	Useful	Not useful	Neither	Comments
1. Project/programme financial implementation ('Controlling funds')		X			
2. Project/programme technical implementation	X				
3. Gap-filling in partner government institutions		X			
4. Advisory work to partner government		X			
5. Supporting internal reforms and domestic change processes				X	Comes rather from within the organisation
6. Training	X				
7. Support to delegation		X			
8. Other? (please specify)					

19. Do the terms of reference of TAs adequately reflect the requirements of the position by the time they start their assignments? If not, are they amended in practice?

Yes, and are amended if needed.

20. Following Question 8 in Table 1, if relevant, please comment on the reporting and accountability relations of TAs: Who, in practice, do they feel accountable to?

To the Delegation or it can depend on the relation they build with the PI.

21. How is TA performance monitored in practice and by whom? Does monitoring lead to changes in the assignment? Please tick the relevant answer below and provide further comments if you wish.

Table 3: Who monitors TA?

	Yes / No	Comments
The partner government	X	
The partner government and the Delegation	X	
The Delegation	X	
ROM missions	X	
Not at all		

E. Evaluation

22. What are the lessons learned, for TC/TA, from the evaluations of projects and programmes? Do you see a need to evaluate TC/TA components separately?

When TA is properly planned and situated, the chances for a better project or programme are better. TA can also serve as a driving force for programmes with a reform element that includes changing attitudes and mentality. We do not see a need to have a separate evaluation for such TA except in the rare cases where it proves that such TA was unsatisfactory.

F. Questions on PIUs⁵

Box 4: Current OECD - DAC definition of PIUs

For the purpose of this exercise, we use DAC definitions on PIU as follows. A **project implementation unit (PIU)** is a **dedicated management unit designed to support the implementation and administration of projects or programmes**. PIUs can be 'parallel' or 'integrated', as defined below:

Parallel PIU:

A PIU is parallel when it is created **outside existing country institutional structures**. PIUs are said to be parallel when they meet at least three of the four criteria set out below:

- **Q1:** Is the PIU accountable to the external funding agencies or donor rather than to the country implementing agencies (ministries, departments, agencies etc)? (YES/NO)
- **Q2:** Are the terms of reference for externally appointed staff determined by the donor (rather than by the country implementing agencies)? (YES/NO)
- **Q3:** Is most of the professional staff appointed by the donor rather than the country implementing agencies? (YES/NO)
- **Q4:** Is the salary structure of staff higher than those of civil service personnel. (YES/NO)

Integrated PIU:

➤ If there are **fewer than 3 'yes' answers**, then the PIU qualifies as integrated.

NB: In practice, the format and features of PIU will vary according to the country context. In some cases, PIUs are fully national structures with TAs supporting them. In others, TAs are integrated within the PIU. Please apply DAC definitions to your country context and indicate if there are major divergences

23. Could you give a rough estimate of the proportion of projects which use PIUs in the country you work in?

10 - 25 %

⁵ These questions address PIUs linked to programmes supporting classical public sector functions

24. Please fill in the table below for at least the "5 top programmes"⁶ implemented through a PIU in your country (including support units to NAO for EDF) and answer the questions referring to the above definitions

Table 5: Mapping the main PIUs

PIU linked to project/ programme name	Q1: PIU accountable to?	Q2: TOR of external staff drafted by?	Q3: Most professional PIU staff appointed by?	Q4: Is the salary structure higher than that of the civil service?	Position and role of TA*
IS-ASEZA	No	Yes	No	Yes	
SRRP	Partner	Delegation	Partner	Yes	Advisory/implementation

* Please indicate whether the TA is formally integrated in the PIU (YES / NO). If YES: please specify, what the main roles of the TA are (refer to the roles described in section 5, Box 2)

Yes. Main roles include administrative and financial management of the programme, as well as foreseeing setting up and implementing the annual work plans including TA and procurement as well.

25. What, in your opinion, should be done to increase domestic ownership and quality of project implementation set ups and to meet the EU aid effectiveness target ("avoid the establishment of any new PIUs")?

Build capacity.

Lessons learnt from the existing PIU are extremely important, and we recommend that programmes with fairly big funds should have a PIU, building on the existing experienced local staff. To make best use of the local staff working within the PIU team, it is advisable to continuously build their capacities and knowledge.

26. Please comment on the Paris target n. 6 of reducing the stock of existing PIUs by 2/3^{ths} by 2010:

a. Given your current portfolio, do you expect that this target can be met?

b. What should be done and by whom (Delegation, HQ, PG, TA, etc....) to facilitate this process?

Delegation and Government to build the capabilities of special local teams to continue to follow up new programmes when they start in order to have more domestic ownership.

c. Are there any national or donor initiatives to reach this target?

No

27. For EDF countries: In your view, is there a prospect of phasing out "parallel PIUs" supporting NAOs offices by 2010?

28. Do you have any other comments on PIUs?

G. Role played by the partner government

29. Is there any national policy or strategic guidance on TC/TA⁷, or an effort to coordinate TC/TA interventions by the partner government, in the country you work in? Please give details.

⁶ It's up to the delegation to select these programme, as the most significant for this survey (including in terms of diversity of practices and arrangements).

⁷ For instance on what type of TA will be sought for what purposes.

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Please comment if necessary: **under the form of Donor coordination**

30. Further to the information you gave in Table 1 – question 7, do you have any additional comments on the level of overall partner government involvement/ownership on technical assistance and on how to promote it:

	Comments on PG involvement
TA Design	Good
TA Procurement	Good
TA Management	Needs further capacity building

H. Donor coordination on TC/TA and PIUs

31. Please comment on donor coordination in the country you work in:

- a. Is there any process in place to increase coordination focusing on TC and PIU issues in line with the Paris Declaration and the EU aid effectiveness targets?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. If yes, what has been the outcome of these processes so far?
- d. Please comment if necessary: **Process is in place at through coordination groups with MS and through donor/lender coordination groups**

- b. Are there any pool funds for technical cooperation? Are you participating in them?

- a. Yes
- b. No, no pool funds
- c. Please comment

32. Please comment on the EU target of coordinating "100% of capacity building assistance" by 2010:

- a. Given your current portfolio, do you expect that this target can be met?

NO

- b. What should be done and by whom (Delegation, HQ, PG, other donors TA, etc....) to facilitate this process/ to work more through joint approaches?

Government should call for capacity building.

- c. Are there any national or donor initiatives to reach this target?

NO

I. Looking forward and collecting your ideas on the future strategy

33. Please analyse in the table below future needs of TC by sector/area of work.

Table 6: Future needs for Long-term TAs in your country

Main sector/ working areas ⁸	Need of future TAs (H, M, L),	Role of TAs*	Other forms of TC**	Comments

* Please use types specified in Question 5, Box 2.

⁸ Including BS – SWAP and new sectors/areas of intervention (migration, climate change),

** Other forms of TC: Please use "types" specified in Box 1.

How would you judge the overall trend for future needs of TA against current practices?

- a) steady
- b) decreasing
- c) increasing

34. Are you aware of any TA financed through the national budget? Would budget support be an option to support fully nationally owned TA integrated in the partner government's budget?

YES, but question if utilised.

35. Your views on how best to support capacity development process led by partner governments ? what are the pro and cons of TA in this respect?

An independent TA would be in a better position to oversee needs, as well as overcome obstacles that may be faced during implementation.

36. What in your view, are the major issues/areas of change that the future strategy on technical cooperation and PIUs should deal with? Please indicate the 3 most important from the list below and tell us why !!!

- a. **Develop a clear policy and REFERENCE material**
- b. **Support/promote coordination with member states/other donors, ENSURES COMPREHENSIVE AND INTEGRATED SUPPORT APPROACHES**
- c. **Support country/ sector dialogue with Partner Government: UNDERSTAND NEEDS AND WORK AS PARTNERS**
- d. Rules/ financial regulations
- e. Review contracting procedures developed by EuropeAid (Practical Guide, Programme Estimate, etc)
- f. Consider issues related to management and capacity/expertise in delegation
- g. Update methodology and develop ad hoc tools (PCM/SWAP, QSG systems/ROM, TOR..)
- h. Training/ workshops/ seminars
- i. Information/ communication
- j. Other (please specify)

37. Are there any major good or bad stories you would like to tell us, including suggestions for cases we should look at more deeply (if yes, please provide references and background documentation)?

The IS-ASEZA programme.

Additional comments? Please use this space for any insights or thoughts you wish to share

Annexe 1 to the questionnaire

Proposed areas for change and for actions

This matrix shows in the column a preliminary list of axes of the future strategy/workplan. Delegations views are particularly important in the sections shown in red.

Areas of change/actions	Design and formulation	TA/TC procurement	Implementation Monitoring	Delegation
Content and format of EC policy and guidance on TC and PIU				
How to foster coordination with member states and other donors				
How to foster Country/sector dialogue with Partner Government				
Focus on Financial Management EC Rules (Focus on the FR)				
Review of the Financial and Contracting procedures developed by EuropeAid (PRAG, Programme Estimates Guide, etc...)				
Review of methodology, guidance, QSG systems (checklists, etc...), monitoring and ROM				
Training				
Information/communication				
Management issues and capacity/expertise at delegation level (including incentives, workload and tasks)				
Any other areas resulting from this survey				