

**« FICHE CONTRADICTOIRE »**

**Evaluation of the European Commission's support to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Response of Commission services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
<p><b><i>1. Move up a gear with joint policy development in Jordan</i></b></p> <p>As far as relevant, any EC activity in Jordan should be explicitly embedded in a policy development process. This should be made fully transparent to the Government and Member States, and subject to policy dialogue and EU-level coordination. The targeted policy reforms might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• either not yet on the Government's agenda, in which case the EC would coordinate with Member States in order to work with NGOs and networks of experts in order to build some capacity in the civil society and to raise awareness in the public arenas;</li> <li>• or not yet tested but already on the Government's agenda, in which case the EC would coordinate with Member States in order to develop pilots and capacity-building projects;</li> <li>• or else fully tested and ready to be endorsed by the Government, in which case the EC would continue to promote sector budget support, or even an exit strategy.</li> </ul>	<p align="center"><i>(Partial) Agreement</i></p> <p>The COM agrees that it is important to adapt the choice of the working methods (awareness raising, institution building, sector support...) to the degree of ownership of the targeted reform. The choice of reform priorities is based on Jordan's reform agenda and the choice of working method/approach is done jointly with the GoJ.</p> <p>In the CSP 2007-2010, suggestions of priorities are made in that spirit. Budget/sector support is suggested for reforms that are well integrated in the GoJ's agenda (public finance management, trade facilitation..) while institution building will be favoured for areas where it is acknowledged by the GoJ that reforms are needed but without a clear idea of how to proceed (modernisation of the services sector).</p> <p>However, we would like to underline that in our view, we should not always try to use the three approaches successively but sometimes to play with the complementarity of these approaches.</p> <p>On the issue of civil society, which is a very sensitive one, a regular dialogue takes already place with the GoJ in the context of the sub-committee on "human rights and</p>	

Recommendations	Response of Commission services	Follow-up (one year later)
	<p>democracy” (with involvement of MS). Debates between the delegation, MS and CSOs have been organised to discuss the best way to promote role of CSOs. In terms of cooperation, we try to work both at institutional and civil society level. However, the principle of sector budget support can be controversial (can be perceived as if we “buy” the reforms, as the cost of political reform is usually not as high as sectoral reforms..).</p>	
<p><b>2. Focus coordination with Member States on joint policy development</b></p> <p>The sharing of roles between EU players should be considered from a new perspective, as opposed to the old fashioned donor matrix approach, in which the EC is a player among others.</p> <p>In the recommended new perspective, several EU players would flexibly complement one another in a given policy domain, according to their generic strengths and weaknesses, the strengths of the EC being credible policy dialogue and sector budget support.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agreement</b></p> <p>We agree that EC should keep a leadership regarding coordination of a constructive policy dialogue in the framework of the ENP. We will also continue to build on EC comparative advantages on aid delivery methods (sector support, but also support to civil society). It is interesting to note that EC and MS strengths can be combined in case of twinning operations (procedure and definition of priorities led by EC, experts provided by MS).</p> <p>Coordination is ensured by (i) frequent coordination meetings EC/MS organised by the Delegation, (ii) broader coordination with other donors in the “donors lenders group”. An objective is also that GoJ takes the lead of donors’ coordination.</p>	
<p><b>3. Manage the transfer of knowledge to Governmental institutions better</b></p> <p>There is no state of the art solution which could be recommended for handling this problem, which was observed even in the case of EJADA although</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Agreement</b></p> <p>The Com agrees that moving from one aid method to another method supposed to give more ownership should be done carefully.</p>	“

Recommendations	Response of Commission services	Follow-up (one year later)
<p>a lot of attention was paid to sustainability. An innovative approach has therefore to be invented and tested, either in Jordan if a new sector budget support programme is being designed within the next months, or in another similar country. Such innovative approaches should implement the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The switch to sector budget support should involve transitional measures aimed at maintaining the accumulated knowledge readily available to the Government until the new institutional framework is fully stabilised. Since the evaluation team assumes that the accumulated knowledge percolates through individuals, such transitional measures should secure the sustained availability of managers, trainers, advisers, and/or experts involved in the previous projects/programmes. During a period of typically two years, financial and institutional resources should be secured in order to allow these people to be hired (full or part time) by the new institutions, or to participate in periodic workshops or training seminars;</li> <li>• The sector budget support programme should include a target expressed approximately as: “until the institutional setting is fully stabilised, those responsible for the implementation of the sector budget support programme in Governmental institutions should maintain a close working relationship with those having the institutional memory of</li> </ul>	<p>We believe risks are limited in the future as our approach is less to set-up large TA assistance projects where experts work <i>outside</i> public institutions, but rather to reinforce existing public institutions &amp; departments. This will ensure that “institutional memory” is maintained.</p>	

Recommendations	Response of Commission services	Follow-up (one year later)
<p>the previous project/programme". This target should be operationalised through sharply designed indicators, (e.g. training sessions, workshops, twinning arrangements ...) subject to monitoring and policy dialogue, and associated with financial incentives.</p>		
<p><b>4. Refine the EC's approach to mainstreaming cross-cutting issues</b></p> <p>The EC's approach should move from systematic mainstreaming to a more strategic mainstreaming, i.e. in areas where substantial impacts could be achieved.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>(Partial)Agreement</i></b></p> <p>In the EC Delegation in Jordan there are 3 focal points on good governance, gender and environment responsible for the mainstreaming of EC cross-cutting issues during all phases of the project cycle. This function is carried out in line with the guidelines contained in the EC handbooks for mainstreaming good governance, gender and environment. It should be considered that the EC handbooks on 'Good Governance' and 'Environmental Integration' were elaborated by HQs and made available to Delegations by the end of 2006/beginning of 2007. This implies that at this stage it is premature to assess the impact of these tools in relation to the mainstreaming of EC cross-cutting issues. An impact assessment could be conducted in the medium-long term (e.g. 5 years from the adoption of these EC manuals). The strategic mainstreaming should become part of the EC guidelines as regards the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all EC interventions.</p> <p><u>Environment:</u> in close cooperation with Environment Help Desk in Brussels, a special training course on mainstreaming environment in development cooperation was organised in May 2006 with attendees from EU Delegations in the region as well as partner government</p>	

Recommendations	Response of Commission services	Follow-up (one year later)
	<p>institutions from Jordan. The environment mainstreaming handbook has been shared with participants and the Ministry of Environment. This action reached a broad audience and contributed to a better sensitisation of EC partners towards Environmental mainstreaming. Environment mainstreaming is also carried out during the project identification and implementations phases in accordance to the guidelines provided by Brussels.</p> <p><u>Gender:</u> a new Focal person has been appointed in September 2007. A special regional programme on gender will start in 2008 and will have a broader and more strategic approach in tackling gender inequalities. The work on mainstreaming gender into the projects and the strategies will continue in cooperation with AIDCO colleagues. A special network of Gender Focal Persons from the Delegations has met in Brussels in November 2007 during a 3-day workshop which focused among others on the strategies for gender mainstreaming.</p> <p><u>Good Governance:</u> A focal point on good governance was appointed in 2006. Mainstreaming of good governance issues is ensured during all phases of the project cycle and notably during the identification and formulation phases by providing technical comments to the identification fiches, action fiches and related implementing documents. The Handbook on 'Promoting Good Governance in EC Development and Co-operation' has proven to be a relevant tool for this purpose.</p>	
<p>5. <i>Clarify implicit assumptions and proceed to early tests</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>(Partial) Disagreement</i></p> <p>The problem is not necessarily that the two mentioned</p>	

Recommendations	Response of Commission services	Follow-up (one year later)
<p>In order to speed up the learning process in the most strategic areas, the EC should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on two far-reaching strategic objectives which are not clearly understood at present, i.e. export-based growth and mutual understanding, and for each of these objectives:</li> <li>• Write a short draft paper explaining how its current cooperation with Jordan is supposed to achieve these objectives;</li> <li>• Discuss this paper with Member State missions, relevant officials in the Government and Jordanian experts, possibly in a seminar, with a view to check the credibility of the assumptions;</li> <li>• Discuss this paper in the relevant arenas at sub-regional level;</li> <li>• Finalise the paper and post it on the Delegation website;</li> <li>• Select a few projects / programmes which have the best potential for testing these assumptions within the next months or years;</li> <li>• Identify the main chains of cause-and-effect assumptions which explain how the selected interventions are meant to achieve the far-reaching strategic objectives;</li> <li>• Evaluate the impacts of the selected interventions with a view to testing the assumptions.</li> </ul>	<p>objectives are not clearly understood. They are probably amongst the most challenging ones and good responses not easy to find.</p> <p><u>Trade:</u></p> <p>In general, the whole reflection on how to promote trade has evolved (from tariff barriers to beyond-the-border reforms) during the period covered by this evaluation. Trade is a key issue in the EC-Jordan dialogue, which already contributed to better identify specific problems.</p> <p>However, although the EC has developed tools to help JOR to understand better market requirements, to provide support to SMEs (including on export promotion), there is certainly a need for a comprehensive analysis of the causes of limited exports to the EU market (lack of networking, competitiveness...). On this basis, a better orientation of projects could be done. However, the strategy to develop exports to the EU should not only focus on financial cooperation but also take into account impact of trade negotiations.</p> <p>On <u>mutual understanding</u>, the answers that the EC can provide with its limited resources cannot necessarily be at the level of the challenges. In addition, a general recommendation of the Development Consensus is to limit the number of priorities. In that context, we feel that tools could rather be developed at regional level (Anna Lindh foundation, etc) as the objective is more generally to promote sharing of values between the EU and a large number of partners in the southern Mediterranean. It is interesting to note that new areas of cooperation have been</p>	

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Response of Commission services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>developed as from 2007 to stimulate people to people contacts (e.g. new scholarship system).</p> <p>Therefore, regarding these two objectives, we suggest to (i) assess what has already been done since the end of period covered by the evaluation, in terms of new tools and approaches, (ii) to decide what are the most appropriate means to reach further results, taking into account means other than financial assistance..</p>	