

DATA QUALITY REVIEW REPORT

VOLUME II: FILLED DQR TOOLS

DOCUMENT SUBMITTED TO:
MCA-JORDAN

By:
IDEA INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE

Final Draft Report (Version 2)
April 11th, 20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. REPORTING AND SYSTEM ASSESSMENT PROTOCOLS.....	1
1.1. MCA-JORDAN (CENTRAL LEVEL).....	1
1.2. WATER NETWORK PROJECT	5
1.3. WASTE WATER NETWORK PROJECT	9
1.4. AS-SAMRA EXPANSION PROJECT	15
2. INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS	21
2.1. COMPACT-LEVEL INDICATORS	21
2.2. WATER NETWORK PROJECT	29
2.3. WASTE WATER NETWORK PROJECT	41
2.4. AS-SAMRA EXPANSION PROJECT	59
3. DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRIDS	67
3.1. COMPACT-LEVEL INDICATORS	68
3.2. WATER NETWORK PROJECT	74
3.3. WASTE WATER NETWORK	80
3.4. AS-SAMRA EXPANSION PROJECT	86

1. REPORTING AND SYSTEM ASSESSMENT PROTOCOLS

1.1. MCA-JORDAN (CENTRAL LEVEL)

Reporting and System Assessment Protocol - MCA-Jordan			
MCA-J M&E Unit/Organization:		MCA M&E Unit	
Date of Review:		10th December	
Reporting Period Verified:		Quarter 5 to Quarter 8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting Performance			
Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Intermediate Aggregation Sites. How many reports should there have been from all Aggregation Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?			
1	How many reports should there have been from PIUs? [A]	36	M&E Unit expects quarterly : 1 report from WAJ-Zarqa, 1 report from JVA, 3 monthly reports from As-Samra PMU, 1 quarterly report from PMC (starting Q5), 1 report per quarter from WAJ-Amman (MWI Finance directorate) but now agreed reporting will be annually (1 per year counted here).
2	How many reports are there? [B]	33	All reports available except from WAJ-Amman for year 1, 4 reports were expected but only one received. This is due to the frequency of reporting which was not adapted to the availability of data. Now reporting yearly.
3	Calculate % <u>Available Reports</u> [B/A]	92%	See explanations above
4	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	31	WAJ-Zarqa on time but at the beginning needed reminders. As-Samra reports all on time. PMC 11 out of the 12 reports on time (some difficulties on Q5 (first report). Fiscal agent (WAJ-Amman) report not on time. JVA Q1 to Q4 needed to call but now reports on time without reminder. WAJ-Amman (Fiscal agent), report received with many follow-up.
5	Calculate % <u>On time Reports</u> [C/A]	86%	
6	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	32	WAJ-Zarqa, one quarter with missing 1 or 2 indicators missing because of problems with the WAJ MIS (X7). As-Samra reports complete. PMC reports always complete. Fiscal agent report complete.
7	Calculate % <u>Complete Reports</u> [D/A]	89%	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There is a documented organizational structure/chart that clearly identifies positions that have data management responsibilities at the M&E Unit.	Partly	There is an MCA organizational chart (provided) but it does not clearly identify . Roles and responsibilities of M&E staff are identified in the M&E plan, however, they do not correspond to positions specified in the organizational chart. Job descriptions were provided for M&E Director, Deputy Director and M&E Officer. The mandate of the M&E Unit is described briefly in the Compact Agreement.
2	All staff positions dedicated to M&E and data management systems are filled.	Partly	2 out of 3 positions are filled. The position of M&E Director is vacant at the moment.
3	Current human resources at the M&E Unit are sufficient in quantity to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	There is need for 3 staffs at the M&E Unit to ensure good quality M&E. For Director for overall supervision and validation; 1 staff dedicated to monitoring (ITT) and 1 staff dedicated to Evaluation (e.g. impact evaluation). Nothing has been decided yet (does not seem to be a priority of CEO)
	List the additional human resources needed to ensure good quality M&E		Need for a 1,5 person for monitoring (support, field visits, ITT, training and sensitization); Need for 1,5 person for evaluation (supervision, review quality of data, analysis)
4	Current human resources at the M&E Unit have necessary skills (knowledge, ability and attitude) to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	The M&E Deputy Director joined the Evaluator Institute for 2 courses (impact evaluation methodology) and a training was organized by Social Impact on Impact evaluation for all MCA and IEs.
	List the skills needed to ensure good quality M&E		Need for skills in: Internal data quality review, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, report writing skills, M&E reporting, building indicators, quality control, evaluation.
5	A senior staff member (e.g., the Program Manager) is responsible for reviewing the aggregated numbers prior to the submission/release of reports from the M&E Unit.	Yes - completely	ITT is approved by Dep. Director before submission to MCC. Deputy CEO and Project Directors are also involved in validation.
6	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness, timeliness and confidentiality) received from PIUs.	Yes - completely	The M&E officer is in charge of reviewing the quality of data received. He checks for inconsistencies in numbers and trends.
7	There is a training plan which includes staff involved in M&E and data-collection and reporting at all levels in the reporting process.	No - not at all	There is no training plan. One of the objective of this DQR is to make recommendations in terms of capacity-building at all levels.
8	The training plan is being implemented in a timely manner.	N/A	
9	All relevant staff have received training in M&E and on the data management processes and tools.	Partly	Only one 3 days training on Impact Evaluation was organized and offered by Social Impact in June 2013. Training included themes such as M&E, ITT and Impact Evaluation. All MCA-Jordan staff and key M&E focal points participated.

II- Reporting Guidelines			
10	The M&E Unit has documented the definition of the indicator(s).	Yes - completely	The M&E plan and the Narrative indicator sheets available for MCA-Compact and each project. The M&E plan is available. However, the Narrative indicator sheets were not disseminated to the implementing entities yet. M&E unit is waiting to update the M&E plan first.
11	The M&E Unit has shared the definition of the indicator(s) with all relevant levels of the reporting system (e.g., regions, districts, service points).	Partly	Unfortunately, the narrative indicator sheets were not shared with stakeholders. Definitions were discussed during meetings with stakeholders.
12	The M&E plan shows a description of the services (activities) that are related to each indicator measured by the Program.	Yes - completely	In the logical model and also in the Indicator tracking tables presented in the M&E plan.
13	There is a written policy that states for how long source documents and reporting forms need to be retained.	No - not at all	No clear guidelines stating how long source documents should be stored by stakeholders.
14	The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines to all PIUs on reporting requirements and deadlines.	Partly	Some reference to reporting requirements in the IE agreement, but not clearly stated (reporting requirements and deadlines are not specified). The M&E plan does not clarify this either.
The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines per indicator to PIUs on ...			
15	... what they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	Indicated in the M&E plan (Indicators Tracking Tables: Indicator Names + Definitions, Baseline and Targets). They have also been discussed and agreed with the implementing entities.
16	... how (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Partly	Formats have been agreed with the implementing entities. Basically, the M&E unit is using the format originally used by the IE. However, no specific written guidelines.
17	... to whom the reports should be submitted.	Partly	The M&E focal points know whom they need to submit the report to. However, there are no specific written guidelines.
18	... when the reports are due.	Partly	This has been agreed with the various entities. However, no written guidelines.
III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
19	The M&E Unit has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by all reporting levels.	No - not at all	No standard reporting format use at all levels. Reporting format varies across entities and was identified based on discussions with IEs.
20	If multiple organizations (PIUs) are implementing activities under the Program/project, they all use the same reporting forms and report according to the same reporting timelines.	Partly	They are not using the same format. Reporting timelines are between the 25th and 30th of previous month, however the period reported varies across entities. The specific reporting period is thus specified in the ITT (reference date).
21	...The standard forms/tools are <u>consistently</u> used by PIUs.	Yes - completely	The entities usually use the agreed format consistently.
22	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Unit on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Partly	M&E unit is regularly in contact with the entities. Since the format is the one already used by the entity, it is not really needed.
23	All source documents and reporting forms relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	Information used for M&E was available at M&E unit when requested.
IV- Data Management Processes			
26	The M&E Unit has clearly documented data aggregation, analysis and/or manipulation steps performed at each level of the reporting system.	Yes - completely	The Narrative indicator sheets present the calculation formulas for each indicator (when necessary). Important information on changes to the ITT are indicated in the form of notes. Since Excel sheets (ITT) is protected, there is a need to justify all changes.
27	Feedback is systematically provided to PIUs on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Partly	Feedback is usually provided by email or through phone calls. Sometimes visits are necessary to discuss issues.
28	(If applicable) There are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	N/A	No computerized system at M&E Unit. However, some control in the ITT excel sheets.
29	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Partly	There is no back-up procedure. However, M&E Director uses his own system. He keeps files of all emails and all documents for each quarter and per source. Back-up is done on laptop and flash disk. No regular back-up on the server (may once).
30	...If yes, the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	Partly	After completion of ITT report.
31	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with PIUs on data quality issues.	No - not at all	Procedure is not written. Follow-up done by email, visits or calls.
32	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from PIUs, the M&E Unit has documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	Yes - completely	Usually if changes needed in the ITT, this is documented.
33	The M&E Unit can demonstrate that regular supervisory site visits have taken place and that data quality has been reviewed.	Partly	Sites visits and supervisory work is being done regularly. However, internal data quality reviews have not been possible given the various sources and lack of time). Data quality is discussed with the entities (i.e., how good they feel about the data).
V- Use of M&E results			
33	Are M&E results used to inform planning of Compact activities? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	M&E is perceived mostly as an MCC request. For the moment, ITT does not provide additional information to the progress reports submitted by PMC and contractors.
34	Are M&E results used to inform budgeting within the Compact? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	see above. However, disbursements by MCC are linked to achievement of targets for some of the indicators (mostly progress indicators).
35	Are M&E results used at MCA-T level to assess performance during implementation? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	See above. There used to be bi-weekly meetings in which each section's head would present challenges and results. But this has stopped in May 2013 due to unavailability of people.
36	Are M&E results used for supporting evidence-based decision-making? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	See above
37	Are M&E results used for informing advocacy efforts? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	Some information on progress of projects is used by the communication specialist, but it mostly comes from the project directors, not from M&E unit.
38	How could use of M&E results be improved at MCA-T level?		M&E is mainly seen as an MCC request. There is a need to raise awareness at management level on the usefulness of M&E. There is a need to clarify communication channels within MCA. Some suggestions would be the preparation of fact sheets, progress reports, annual summary of achievements.

Reporting and System Assessment Protocol - Intermediate Level (PIU/IE)			
IE/Organization:		Water Authority of Jordan (central level) Finance Department	
Date of Review:		19th December 2013	
Reporting Period Verified:		Q5 to Q8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting performance			
<i>Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Service delivery sites within the Region. How many reports should there have been from all Service Delivery Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?</i>			
1	How many reports should there have been from all service delivery sites? [A]	4	
2	How many reports are there? [B]	1	
3	Calculate % Available Reports [B/A]	25%	Only one report available, but contained information for Q6 and Q7 (Q2 and Q3 for 2013).
4	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	0	
5	Calculate % On time Reports [C/A]	0%	None of the reports were on time
6	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	0	
7	Calculate % Complete Reports [D/A]	0%	The report did not contain the calculated indicator (outstanding debt). Only Operating cost coverage.
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness) received from sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites).	Partly	It does not seem there is validation of data received by finance department or WAJ-Zarqa. Only calculations are made en sent to M&E Unit
2	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing aggregated numbers prior to submission to the next level (e.g., to the central M&E Unit).	N/A	No aggregation necessary.
3	Current human resources at the M&E Unit are sufficient in quantity to ensure good quality M&E	Yes - completely	Reporting is only annual. Does not require an important workload.
	List the additional human resources needed to ensure good quality M&E		
4	Current human resources at the M&E Unit have necessary skills (knowledge, ability and attitude) to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	There is need for additional skills.
5	List the skills needed to ensure good quality M&E		Data management, data verification and reporting skills.
6	All relevant staff have received training on the data management processes and tools.	No - not at all	
II- Indicator Definitions and Reporting Guidelines			
The M&E Department at IE level has provided written guidelines to each sub-reporting level on ...			
7	... <i>what</i> they are supposed to report on.	Partly	Definition does not seem to be clear to them.
8	... <i>how</i> (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Yes - completely	Reporting format used is their own.
9	... <i>to whom</i> the reports should be submitted.	Yes - completely	To Raed.
10	... <i>when</i> the reports are due.	No - not at all	They get the data only when Raed asks for it.

III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
11	Are you aware of the indicators in the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT)?	No - not at all	
12	Do you understand the indicators you need to report on in the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT)?	Partly	
13	The M&E Department at PIU level has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by <u>all reporting levels</u>	Partly	
14	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Department at PIU level to sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites) on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	N/A	
15The standard forms/tools are <u>consistently</u> used by Service Delivery Sites and other sub-reporting levels.	N/A	
16	All <i>source documents</i> and <i>reporting forms</i> relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	No - not at all	Source documents were not provided, even after many requests.
IV- Data Management Processes			
17	Feedback is systematically provided to all service delivery sites on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	No - not at all	
18	If applicable, there are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	No - not at all	
19	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Partly	No written back-up procedure. However, back-up is done on 3 computers.
20	... <u>If yes</u> , the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	Partly	
21	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with service delivery sites on data quality issues.	No - not at all	
22	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from service delivery sites, the Intermediate Aggregation Levels (e.g., regions, PIU) have documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	No - not at all	
V- Use of M&E results			
33	Are M&E results used to inform planning of Project activities? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	
34	Are M&E results used to inform budgeting of the project? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	
35	Are M&E results used to assess performance during implementation of the project? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	
36	Are M&E results used for supporting evidence-based decision-making? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	
37	Are M&E results used for informing advocacy efforts? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	
38	How could use of M&E results be improved at Project level?		

1.2. WATER NETWORK PROJECT

Reporting System Assessment Protocol - MCA-Jordan			
MCA-T M&E Unit/Organization:		Water Network Project Directorate	
Date of Review:		December, 2013	
Reporting Period Verified:		NA-Contracts are recently awarded.	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting Performance			
<i>Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Intermediate Aggregation Sites. How many reports should there have been from all Aggregation Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?</i>			
1	How many reports should there have been from PIUs? [A]	NA	Water Project Directorate shall be receiving monthly progress reports from the PMC reflecting the progress of each of the awarded contracts separately.
2	How many reports are there? [B]		
3	Calculate % Available Reports [B/A]	-	
4	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]		No reports has yet been received as the contracts are recently awarded.
5	Calculate % On time Reports [C/A]	-	
6	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]		Reports templates are not available. However, the indicators defined are directly related to the project activities and must be accurately reported for progress follow up and financial instalments.
7	Calculate % Complete Reports [D/A]	-	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There is a documented organizational structure/chart that clearly identifies positions that have data management responsibilities at the M&E Unit.	Yes - completely	
2	All staff positions dedicated to M&E and data management systems are filled.	Yes - completely	The Water Project Director are also considering the introduction of a Project Engineer/Supervisor position to be in charge for the on-site supervision of contractors activities.
3	Current human resources at the M&E Unit are sufficient in quantity to ensure good quality M&E	Yes - completely	
	List the additional human resources needed to ensure good quality M&E		
4	Current human resources at the M&E Unit have necessary skills (knowledge, ability and attitude) to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	Directorate staff are highly qualified, still, once reporting scheme and templates are developed by the PMC and approved by the Directorate, training on the use of these templates and data verification and validation techniques should be provided.
	List the skills needed to ensure good quality M&E		Data verification and validation techniques.
5	A senior staff member (e.g., the Program Manager) is responsible for reviewing the aggregated numbers prior to the submission/release of reports from the M&E Unit.	Yes - completely	Water Project Director
6	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness, timeliness and confidentiality) received from PIUs.	Yes - completely	Deputy Water Project Director
7	There is a training plan which includes staff involved in M&E and data-collection and reporting at all levels in the reporting process.	No - not at all	No training plan is available.
8	The training plan is being implemented in a timely manner.	No - not at all	
9	All relevant staff have received training in M&E and on the data management processes and tools.	Partly	

II- Reporting Guidelines			
10	The M&E Unit has documented the definition of the indicator(s).	Yes - completely	
11	The M&E Unit has shared the definition of the indicator(s) with all relevant levels of the reporting system (e.g., regions, districts, service points).	Yes - completely	
12	The M&E plan shows a description of the services (activities) that are related to each indicator measured by the Program.	Yes - completely	
13	There is a written policy that states for how long source documents and reporting forms need to be retained.	No - not at all	No documented records retention policy is available. However, the system adopted by the PMC allows for records and reports retention throughout the project duration for contractual purposes.
14	The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines to all PIUs on reporting requirements and deadlines.	Yes - completely	reporting requirements are defined for all agreed indicators.
The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines per indicator to PIUs on ...			
15	... what they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	
16	... how (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	No - not at all	Reporting templates/formats are not yet developed.
17	... to whom the reports should be submitted.	Yes - completely	
18	... when the reports are due.	Yes - completely	
III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
19	The M&E Unit has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by all reporting levels.	No - not at all	Reporting templates are not yet developed.
20	If multiple organizations (PIUs) are implementing activities under the Program/project, they all use the same reporting forms and report according to the same reporting timelines.	No - not at all	The PMC shall define reporting scheme for the contractors and shall take into consideration time required by contractors to send their reports for verification by PMC prior to sending to MCA-J.
21	...The standard forms/tools are <u>consistently</u> used by PIUs.	No - not at all	No reports are yet developed.
22	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Unit on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Partly	Indicators definitions are well-established. However, reporting templates are not yet developed.
23	All source documents and reporting forms relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	No - not at all	No reports are yet developed.
IV- Data Management Processes			
26	The M&E Unit has clearly documented data aggregation, analysis and/or manipulation steps performed at each level of the reporting system.	Partly	Data review and analysis responsibilities are well defined, still, no documented procedures for data management are in place.
27	Feedback is systematically provided to PIUs on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	N/A	No reports are developed so far.
28	(If applicable) There are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	N/A	No quality control measures are developed for data entry and/or post entry verification.
29	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Yes - completely	Data will be maintained and backed-up at several levels (contractors, PMC, and Water Project Directorate).
30	...If yes, the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	N/A	Data and records are not yet generated.
31	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with PIUs on data quality issues.	No - not at all	No written procedure is developed.
32	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from PIUs, the M&E Unit has documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	N/A	No data is available yet.
33	The M&E Unit can demonstrate that regular supervisory site visits have taken place and that data quality has been reviewed.	Partly	MCA-J are planning to assign a site engineer/supervisor for the direct supervision of the project(s) progress including on site data quality verification.
V- Use of M&E results			
33	Are M&E results used to inform planning of Compact activities? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	No reports are yet developed. Progress in some contracts (e.g. Primary and Secondary network rehabilitation/restructuring) will affect other indicators (e.g. NRW level)
34	Are M&E results used to inform budgeting within the Compact? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	No progress is yet achieved. However, each of the contract has a budget that is being monitored against progress.
35	Are M&E results used at MCA-J level to assess performance during implementation? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	Progress is controlled against financial installments of contract values.
36	Are M&E results used for supporting evidence-based decision-making? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Yes - completely	Results will be used to monitor project progress and taking decisions on mitigation measures to be taken to re-adjust progress.
37	Are M&E results used for informing advocacy efforts? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	N/A	
38	How could use of M&E results be improved at MCA-J level?		

Reporting and System Assessment Sheet - Intermediate Aggregation Site			
Organization:		Jordan Water Authority – Zarqa	
Date of Review:			
Reporting Period Verified:		Quarter 5 to Quarter 8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting performance			
<i>Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Service delivery sites within the Region. How many reports should there have been from all Service Delivery Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?</i>			
5	How many reports should there have been from all service delivery sites? [A]	4	WAJ-Zarqa are issuing NRW reports on quarterly basis. Data used for NRW calculation are obtained from the Customer Services system (X7) for water billing quantities and from Operations for water production, imports, and exports quantities. It is agreed that NRW calculations are time consuming and a One-Quarter lag in reporting is accepted (i.e. Q8 NRW percentage is actually for Q7).
6	How many reports are there? [B]	4	All reports are available for the review period as agreed between WAJ-Zarqa and MCA-J.
7	Calculate % Available Reports [B/A]	100%	See explanation above.
8	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	4	All reports are received as agreed with one quarter lag. Data is usually provided for the Quarter after 4-6 weeks of quarter end and is reported for the next quarter.
9	Calculate % On time Reports [C/A]	100%	See explanation above.
10	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	4	Reports sent to MCA-J are all complete and sent formally and duly signed and authorized by WAJ-Zarqa.
11	Calculate % Complete Reports [D/A]	100%	See explanation above.
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness) received from sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites).	Partly	The NRW Directorate and support staff are taking the initiative of reviewing the data collected from the system through checking some suspected customers consumption extracted from X7. However, no official mandate is available.
2	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing aggregated numbers prior to submission to the next level (e.g., to the central M&E Unit).	Partly	The NRW Directorate and support staff are taking the initiative of reviewing the data collected from the system through checking some suspected customers consumption extracted from X7. However, no official mandate is available.
3	Current human resources are sufficient to ensure good quality M&E at PIU level.	Partly	Data quality control is delivered upon availability of the staff but no staff is officially designated for this control.
4	All relevant staff have received training on the data management processes and tools.	No - not at all	No official data management training was provided.

II- Indicator Definitions and Reporting Guidelines			
The M&E Department at PIU level has provided written guidelines to each sub-reporting level on ...			
5	..., what they are supposed to report on.	Partly	No written guidelines were provided on data collection, review, processing, reviewing, authorizing, and reporting. However, reporting formats have been discussed and agreed. However, no written guidelines.
6	... how (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Partly	See explanation above.
7	... to whom the reports should be submitted.	Partly	See explanation above.
8	... when the reports are due.	Partly	See explanation above.
III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
9	The M&E Department at PIU level has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by all reporting levels	Yes - completely	WAJ-Zarqa adopted the outline developed by IWA for NRW calculation. The same table is used for reporting NRW results.
10	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Department at PIU level to sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites) on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	N/A	only reports extracted from the system are provided by sub-reporting levels. No specific data processing or special reporting formats are requested.
11The standard forms/tools are consistently used by Service Delivery Sites and other sub-reporting levels.	Yes - completely	Same forms of reports are always being used.
12	All source documents and reporting forms relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	All detailed results can be provided from the system upon request.
IV- Data Management Processes			
13	Feedback is systematically provided to all service delivery sites on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Partly	In case of serious data quality issues (like significant drop or increase in water production) only.
14	If applicable, there are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	No - not at all	only in case of apparent mistakes, data is being re-checked.
15	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	No - not at all	Data is being instantly transferred to WAJ-Central servers. Only local back-up is delivered as an initiative from IT staff. No emergency/contingency plans in case of connection failure with WAJ-Central.
16	...If yes, the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).		
17	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with service delivery sites on data quality issues.	No - not at all	No written procedures are available.
18	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from service delivery sites, the Intermediate Aggregation Levels (e.g., regions, PIU) have documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	No - not at all	No official documentation for resolved discrepancies is available. They are dealt with directly between the NRW-Directorate, IT Department, and the concerned department(s)

1.3. WASTE WATER NETWORK PROJECT

Reporting System Assessment Protocol - MCA-Jordan			
MCA-T M&E Unit/Organization:		Waste Water Network Project Directorate	
Date of Review:		17 December, 2014	
Reporting Period Verified:		Quarter 5 to Quarter 8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting Performance			
Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Intermediate Aggregation Sites. How many reports should there have been from all Aggregation Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?			
1	How many reports should there have been from PIUs? [A]	4	There are three contracts under this project: C1 (East Zarqa), C2 (West Zarqa) and C3 (Ruseifa). PMC reports monthly, quarterly and annually through DCEO which then forwards reports to the Project Director. However, only the quarterly report is included here. WAJ-Zarqa used to report to Project Director (by phone) and information was then forwarded to M&E Unit. Since the last 3 months, WAJ-Zarqa directly sends information to M&E Unit (more efficient). This is not included here, just PMC reports.
2	How many reports are there? [B]	4	All reports are available
3	Calculate % Available Reports [B/A]	100%	
4	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	4	All reports are submitted on time
5	Calculate % On time Reports [C/A]	100%	
6	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	4	All reports are complete
7	Calculate % Complete Reports [D/A]	100%	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There is a documented organizational structure/chart that clearly identifies positions that have data management responsibilities.	Partly	Some job descriptions are not available. Though when announcements are made for the position this job description is clearly formulated
2	All staff positions dedicated to M&E and data management systems are filled.	Yes - completely	M&E activities are not really time consuming as the information provided to the M&E Unit is readily available in the PMC reports. WAJ-Zarqa now sends information directly to M&E Unit.
3	Current human resources at the M&E Unit are sufficient in quantity to ensure good quality M&E	Yes - completely	The Project Director used to be the only staff for the project. However, a junior Eng. Was recruited in November. There is still need for a Mid-Experienced Eng. To ensure proper supervision of the project.
	List the additional human resources needed to ensure good quality M&E		
4	Current human resources at the M&E Unit have necessary skills (knowledge, ability and attitude) to ensure good quality M&E	Yes - completely	See above
	List the skills needed to ensure good quality M&E		Training on project management tools, especially in the use of Primavera P6.
5	A senior staff member (e.g., the Program Manager) is responsible for reviewing the aggregated numbers prior to the submission/release of reports from the M&E Unit.	Yes - completely	The Project Director reviews and provide feedback on all reports submitted by the PMC.
6	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness, timeliness and confidentiality) received from PIUs.	Yes - completely	The Project Director reviews and provide feedback on all reports submitted by the PMC. Site visits are made every week.
7	There is a training plan which includes staff involved in M&E and data-collection and reporting at all levels in the reporting process.	N/A	
8	The training plan is being implemented in a timely manner.	N/A	
9	All relevant staff have received training in M&E and on the data management processes and tools.	Yes - completely	The Project Dir. Was in the Social Impact Training. However, the new Junior Engineer was not there since he's new.

II- Reporting Guidelines			
10	The M&E Unit has documented the definition of the indicator(s).	Partly	Sometimes the Project Director asks what the M&E wants. Not always clear.
11	The M&E Unit has shared the definition of the indicator(s) with all relevant levels of the reporting system (e.g., regions, districts, service points).	Partly	Not clear for contractors and PMC as reporting on M&E is not included in their contracts and there are no written guidelines.
12	The M&E plan shows a description of the services (activities) that are related to each indicator measured by the Program.	Yes - completely	
13	There is a written policy that states for how long source documents and reporting forms need to be retained.	Yes - completely	As long as Project information goes, it is included in the PMC and Contractor's contracts.
14	The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines to all PIUs on reporting requirements and deadlines.	Partly	No written guidelines as to when reports are to be submitted. Project Director receives a reminder from M&E Unit a week before the submission deadline.
The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines per indicator to PIUs on ...			
15	... what they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	Progress report format was agreed with PMC.
16	... how (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Yes - completely	Progress report format was agreed with PMC.
17	... to whom the reports should be submitted.	Yes - completely	Yes, stated in PMC contract.
18	... when the reports are due.	Partly	Not stated clearly for submission to M&E Unit. However, submission dates for PMC reports are clear and stated in their contract.
III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
19	The M&E Unit has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by <u>all reporting levels</u> .	Yes - completely	Progress report format was agreed with PMC.
20	If multiple organizations (PIUs) are implementing activities under the Program/project, they all use the same reporting forms and report according to the same reporting timelines.	N/A	
21The standard forms/tools are <u>consistently</u> used by PIUs.	Yes - completely	
22	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Unit on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Yes - completely	Progress report format was agreed with PMC.
23	All source documents and reporting forms relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	Yes, the PMC stores all information on their website (in addition to hard copies).
IV- Data Management Processes			
26	The M&E Unit has clearly documented data aggregation, analysis and/or manipulation steps performed at each level of the reporting system.	N/A	
27	Feedback is systematically provided to PIUs on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Yes - completely	
28	(If applicable) There are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	N/A	
29	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Partly	No written procedures at MCA-Level
30	...If yes, the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	Yes - completely	The Project Director does a regular back-up of his files. Emails are stored on the MCA server, but this was to be checked with the IT specialist. However, it was not possible to meet him during the mission.
31	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with PIUs on data quality issues.	Partly	It is understood by all but not written.
32	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from PIUs, the M&E Unit has documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	Yes - completely	Issues with data in the reports from PMC are discussed during meetings.
33	The M&E Unit can demonstrate that regular supervisory site visits have taken place and that data quality has been reviewed.	Yes - completely	The Director goes to site twice a week.
V- Use of M&E results			
33	Are M&E results used to inform planning of Compact activities? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	Use of M&E results(ITT) is very limited, since the information is already available in the PMC reports. Main results (outcome and impacts) will show up mostly at the end of the Compact or even only after. Only limited involvement in the planning and budgeting of activities (determined by WAJ and MCC at the time). Some results might be helpful in defining the solution for blockages (cleaning instead of replacement). In addition, in many cases, he is the one providing the data to M&E Unit, so no new information.
34	Are M&E results used to inform budgeting within the Compact? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	Might be useful to budget for the connection of other sites (outsourcing options. E.g., P2)
35	Are M&E results used at MCA-T level to assess performance during implementation? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Yes - completely	progress of contractor work and preparing next tenders
36	Are M&E results used for supporting evidence-based decision-making? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	Data are too premature to be useful for decision-making. Some stakeholders do not like long detailed reports.
37	Are M&E results used for informing advocacy efforts? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	We have been told that many people asked to be connected to the network after hearing about its activities
38	How could use of M&E results be improved at MCA-T level?		Partial handing over might show an impact on some indicators. By better presentation of the huge data collected and the work done

Reporting and System Assessment Protocol - Intermediate Level (PIU/IE)			
IE/Organization:		WAJ – Zarqa Directorate	
Date of Review:			
Reporting Period Verified:			
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting performance			
<i>Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Service delivery sites within the Region. How many reports should there have been from all Service Delivery Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?</i>			
1	How many reports should there have been from all service delivery sites? [A]	4	delays at the beginning. In the last three quarters on time
2	How many reports are there? [B]	4	
3	Calculate % <u>Available Reports</u> [B/A]	100%	
4	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	4	
5	Calculate % <u>On time Reports</u> [C/A]	100%	with need to reminder
6	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	4	as per the form
7	Calculate % <u>Complete Reports</u> [D/A]	100%	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness) received from sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites).	No - not at all	Wastewater division at WAJ-Zarqa lacks many personal. Mangement system is also deficit
2	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing aggregated numbers prior to submission to the next level (e.g., to the central M&E Unit).	Partly	due to lack of technical professionals and software problems. They do themselves the double check where they detect the confusing billing numbers. They are fully aware of the problem and need technical support with x7
3	Current human resources at the M&E Unit are sufficient in quantity to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	For some indicators like sewer outflow incidents, the staff are not enough to report. No further information is also included excpet the number
	List the additional human resources needed to ensure good quality M&E	Data review specialist	labour, data mangement specialist
4	Current human resources at the M&E Unit have necessary skills (knowledge, ability and attitude) to ensure good quality M&E	Yes - completely	They have the knowledge and could identify the gaps of the data collection system, the technical problems. WAJ zaraqa needs personal and technical support
5	List the skills needed to ensure good quality M&E	Compact anlysis. Reporting and presentation	data review, reporting monitoring
6	All relevant staff have received training on the data management processes and tools.	No - not at all	They need training in evaluation of the data, reporting and
II- Indicator Definitions and Reporting Guidelines			
The M&E Department at IE level has provided written guidelines to each sub-reporting level on ...			
7	... <i>what</i> they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	
8	... <i>how</i> (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Yes - completely	They use the format agreed with MCA M&E unit
9	... <i>to whom</i> the reports should be submitted.	Yes - completely	M&E
10	... <i>when</i> the reports are due.	Yes - completely	Monthly

III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
11	Are you aware of the indicators in the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT)?	No - not at all	Waj Zarqa send the requested information and do not have with ITT and direct connection
12	Do you understand the indicators you need to report on in the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT)?	N/A	WAJ z are not informed about the ITT
13	The M&E Department at PIU level has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by <u>all reporting levels</u>	Yes - completely	No written guidelines
14	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Department at PIU level to sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites) on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Yes - completely	no written procedures
15The standard forms/tools are <u>consistently</u> used by Service Delivery Sites and other sub-reporting levels.	Yes - completely	agreed on the format
16	All <i>source documents</i> and <i>reporting forms</i> relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	not within waj-z
IV- Data Management Processes			
17	Feedback is systematically provided to all service delivery sites on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Yes - completely	no feedback from m&e unit to waj-z only in case of late reports or missing data
18	If applicable, there are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	Yes - completely	Quality control is done WAJ amman
19	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Yes - completely	yes
20	... <u>If yes</u> , the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	Yes - completely	weekly
21	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with service delivery sites on data quality issues.	Yes - completely	no written guidelines. But according to their experience they communicate to clear things up. However, no written minutes or protocols is done
22	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from service delivery sites, the Intermediate Aggregation Levels (e.g., regions, PIU) have documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	Yes - completely	again no written guidelines
V- Use of M&E results			
33	Are M&E results used to inform planning of Project activities? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Yes - completely	Progress in work and capacity needs
34	Are M&E results used to inform budgeting of the project? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Yes - completely	They are informed of the contingency component with the budgeting to recommend new activities or new personals
35	Are M&E results used to asses performance during implementation of the project? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	They got the reports from PMC or WAJ do no assessment
36	Are M&E results used for supporting evidence-based decision-making? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	the form of their presentation like ITT is not very attractive to stakeholders. Long and lacks attraction
37	Are M&E results used for informing advocacy efforts? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Yes - completely	it shows the project progress and achievements
38	How could use of M&E results be improved at Project level?		

Reporting and System Assessment Sheet - Intermediate Aggregation Site			
Organization:		PMC	
Date of Review:		17 December 2013	
Reporting Period Verified:		Q5 to Q8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting performance			
Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Service delivery sites within the Region. How many reports should there have been from all Service Delivery Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?			
5	How many reports should there have been from all service delivery sites? [A]	4	considered for this excersis as q5-q8
6	How many reports are there? [B]	4	
7	Calculate % <u>Available</u> Reports [B/A]	100%	
8	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	4	told by M&E unit at MCA J
9	Calculate % <u>On time</u> Reports [C/A]	100%	
10	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	4	assured by M&E unit
11	Calculate % <u>Complete</u> Reports [D/A]	100%	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness) received from sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites).	Yes - completely	project directorate and PMC do revision for the data. Health and gender specialist are also involved in the revision process
2	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing aggregated numbers prior to submission to the next level (e.g., to the central M&E Unit).	Yes - completely	Reports go through different channels before approval. Project directorate, MCA mangement level through discussion and then MCA when uploaded. In the field green test procedure is done where 3 sign the daily report (residence eng, inspector and ...)
3	Current human resources are sufficient to ensure good quality M&E at PIU level.	Partly	In the field further skills would be needed like reporting. More personal are also needed to follow up the increasing number of contracts.
4	All relevant staff have received training on the data management processes and tools.	Partly	Some would need more mangement and DQR training . Eng. Ababneh expressed the need for a mid experienced assistance
II- Indicator Definitions and Reporting Guidelines			
The M&E Department at PIU level has provided written guidelines to each sub-reporting level on ...			
5	... <i>what</i> they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	most indicators are defiened. However, some need more clarification like number of sewere out flow. Or need to be improved in terms of reporting.
6	... <i>how</i> (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Yes - completely	M&E unit send a home made format for WAJ and JVA
7	... <i>to whom</i> the reports should be submitted.	Yes - completely	not written guideline
8	... <i>when</i> the reports are due.	Partly	They do remind sometimes WAJ Zarqa of the reports timeline

III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
9	The M&E Department at PIU level has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by all reporting levels	Yes - completely	daily reports from contractors. Complaints, payments, PMC reporting and daily reports
10	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Department at PIU level to sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites) on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Yes - completely	no written guidelines for the reporting at WAJ-Z who do what and when
11The standard forms/tools are consistently used by Service Delivery Sites and other sub-reporting levels.	Yes - completely	as agreed upon
12	All source documents and reporting forms relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	
IV- Data Management Processes			
13	Feedback is systematically provided to all service delivery sites on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Yes - completely	mainly on completeness.
14	If applicable, there are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	Yes - completely	by project directors and before by program administrator
15	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Yes - completely	
16	<u>...If yes, the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).</u>	Yes - completely	weekly
17	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with service delivery sites on data quality issues.	Yes - completely	no written procedures. However, when incomplete data or missing data appears they make a note or communicate through emails or meet in person. As clarified by M&E and project directors
18	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from service delivery sites, the Intermediate Aggregation Levels (e.g., regions, PIU) have documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	Partly	They do meetings in discrepancy cases, use telephone call or personal talks

1.4. AS-SAMRA EXPANSION PROJECT

Reporting System Assessment Protocol - MCA-Jordan			
MCA-T M&E Unit/Organization:		As-Samra Project Directorate	
Date of Review:		December 17 2013	
Reporting Period Verified:		Q5 to Q8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting Performance			
Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Intermediate Aggregation Sites. How many reports should there have been from all Aggregation Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?			
1	How many reports should there have been from PIUs? [A]	4	
2	How many reports are there? [B]	4	
3	Calculate % <u>Available Reports</u> [B/A]	100%	
4	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	4	
5	Calculate % <u>On time Reports</u> [C/A]	100%	
6	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	4	
7	Calculate % <u>Complete Reports</u> [D/A]	100%	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There is a documented organizational structure/chart that clearly identifies positions that have data management responsibilities at the M&E Unit.	Yes - completely	yes the organizational chart identifies positions
2	All staff positions dedicated to M&E and data management systems are filled.	Partly	not all. An assistant to the director is still under preparation for announcement
3	Current human resources at the M&E Unit are sufficient in quantity to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	
	List the additional human resources needed to ensure good quality M&E		
4	Current human resources at the M&E Unit have necessary skills (knowledge, ability and attitude) to ensure good quality M&E	Yes - completely	
	List the skills needed to ensure good quality M&E		
5	A senior staff member (e.g., the Program Manager) is responsible for reviewing the aggregated numbers prior to the submission/release of reports from the M&E Unit.	Yes - completely	
6	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness, timeliness and confidentiality) received from PIUs.	Yes - completely	
7	There is a training plan which includes staff involved in M&E and data-collection and reporting at all levels in the reporting process.	N/A	
8	The training plan is being implemented in a timely manner.	N/A	
9	All relevant staff have received training in M&E and on the data management processes and tools.	Yes - completely	training on the compact evaluation

II- Reporting Guidelines			
10	The M&E Unit has documented the definition of the indicator(s).	Partly	The expansion indicator is still to be defined. Modification for the name of the indicator or design of a new one is recommended
11	The M&E Unit has shared the definition of the indicator(s) with all relevant levels of the reporting system (e.g., regions, districts, service points).	Partly	Still there is an agreement that expansion indicator shall be defined
12	The M&E plan shows a description of the services (activities) that are related to each indicator measured by the Program.	Yes - completely	
13	There is a written policy that states for how long source documents and reporting forms need to be retained.	Yes - completely	
14	The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines to all PIUs on reporting requirements and deadlines.	Yes - completely	For progress data yes. Not for data informed by IEs directly to M&E Unit.
The M&E Unit has provided written guidelines per indicator to PIUs on ...			
15	... what they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	Yes for progress of the constructions. No for indicators informed by IEs
16	... how (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Partly	format is available and in use, but no written guidelines
17	... to whom the reports should be submitted.	Partly	No written guidelines although known
18	... when the reports are due.	Partly	No written guidelines although known
III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
19	The M&E Unit has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by all reporting levels.	Yes - completely	all forms are available
20	If multiple organizations (PIUs) are implementing activities under the Program/project, they all use the same reporting forms and report according to the same reporting timelines.	Yes - completely	yes. Contractor is using the format as the authority engineer. IEs use format discussed with M&E Unit.
21The standard forms/tools are <u>consistently</u> used by PIUs.	Yes - completely	
22	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Unit on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Yes - completely	
23	All source documents and reporting forms relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	
IV- Data Management Processes			
26	The M&E Unit has clearly documented data aggregation, analysis and/or manipulation steps performed at each level of the reporting system.	Yes - completely	As regards progress reports from contractor only.
27	Feedback is systematically provided to PIUs on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Yes - completely	only on completeness
28	(If applicable) There are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	Yes - completely	an external German firm is reviewing the data form
29	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Yes - completely	backups are done hard and electronic
30	...If yes, the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	Yes - completely	weekly
31	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with PIUs on data quality issues.	Yes - completely	
32	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from PIUs, the M&E Unit has documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	Yes - completely	
33	The M&E Unit can demonstrate that regular supervisory site visits have taken place and that data quality has been reviewed.	Yes - completely	
V- Use of M&E results			
33	Are M&E results used to inform planning of Compact activities? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Yes - completely	technical progress, employment, gender.
34	Are M&E results used to inform budgeting within the Compact? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Yes - completely	
35	Are M&E results used at MCA-T level to assess performance during implementation? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	reporting is done only on the engineering part. Though some procurement, and gender issues are included.
36	Are M&E results used for supporting evidence-based decision-making? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	reports are discussed on technical basis. If needed recommendations or modifications shall be done before the report is approved and uploaded
37	Are M&E results used for informing advocacy efforts? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	more focus shall be done for the project novelty especially for the sludge line
38	How could use of M&E results be improved at MCA-T level?		

Reporting and System Assessment Protocol - Intermediate Level (PIU/IE)			
IE/Organization:		Ministry of Water and Irrigation - Project Magement Unit	
Date of Review:		December 29 2013	
Reporting Period Verified:		Q5 to Q8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting performance			
<i>Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Service delivery sites within the Region. How many reports should there have been from all Service Delivery Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?</i>			
1	How many reports should there have been from all service delivery sites? [A]	4	Quarterly report on progress sent by SPC on influent, effluent and quality of water.
2	How many reports are there? [B]	4	
3	Calculate % <u>Available Reports</u> [B/A]	100%	
4	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]	4	
5	Calculate % <u>On time Reports</u> [C/A]	100%	
6	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]	4	
7	Calculate % <u>Complete Reports</u> [D/A]	100%	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness) received from sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites).	Yes - completely	The M&E focal point at PMU is responsible for reviewing the quality of the data
2	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing aggregated numbers prior to submission to the next level (e.g., to the central M&E Unit).	Yes - completely	The M&E focal point at PMU is responsible for reviewing the quality of the data
3	Current human resources at the M&E Unit are sufficient in quantity to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	The MWI PMU is managing various projects and would therefore need proper staff to ensure better supervision.
	List the additional human resources needed to ensure good quality M&E		Financial, legal, technical staff and engineers.
4	Current human resources at the M&E Unit have necessary skills (knowledge, ability and attitude) to ensure good quality M&E	Partly	There is need for further training apart from the one already organized by M&E Unit.
5	List the skills needed to ensure good quality M&E		Analysis, interpretation, presentation and reporting of M&E data. Mostly, how to adapt the format to stakeholders. How to share their experience with wider public. How to publish papers.
6	All relevant staff have received training on the data management processes and tools.	Partly	Yes, but further needs. Trainings should be organized outside Amman and Zarqa to ensure attendance.
II- Indicator Definitions and Reporting Guidelines			
The M&E Department at IE level has provided written guidelines to each sub-reporting level on ...			
7	... <i>what</i> they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	Yes
8	... <i>how</i> (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Yes - completely	A specific reporting format is used by SPC
9	... <i>to whom</i> the reports should be submitted.	Yes - completely	Yes, see Document control procedures
10	... <i>when</i> the reports are due.	Yes - completely	Yes in contract with SPC

III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
11	Are you aware of the indicators in the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT)?	Yes - completely	
12	Do you understand the indicators you need to report on in the Indicator Tracking Table (ITT)?	Yes - completely	Though some indicators need to be rephrased like using reclaimed water instead of treated wastewater. The Effluent shall exclude runoff in the indicator reporting. This was discussed with Eng Owies
13	The M&E Department at PIU level has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by <u>all reporting levels</u>	Yes - completely	Yes in contract with SPC
14	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Department at PIU level to sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites) on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Yes - completely	
15The standard forms/tools are <u>consistently</u> used by Service Delivery Sites and other sub-reporting levels.	Yes - completely	
16	All <i>source documents</i> and <i>reporting forms</i> relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	Yes, see document control procedures for As-Samra Waste Water Treatment Plan Expansion BOT project
IV- Data Management Processes			
17	Feedback is systematically provided to all service delivery sites on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Yes - completely	Timeliness and completeness
18	If applicable, there are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	N/A	
19	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	Yes - completely	Yes, in the agreement.
20	... <u>If yes</u> , the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	Yes - completely	Hard and electronic backup are done at WAJ Amman MWI monthly
21	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with service delivery sites on data quality issues.	Yes - completely	See document control procedures.
22	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from service delivery sites, the Intermediate Aggregation Levels (e.g., regions, PIU) have documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	Yes - completely	See document control procedures.
V- Use of M&E results			
33	Are M&E results used to inform planning of Project activities? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	The need to specify the indicators to be used to monitor progress of the project. It would be more useful then for decision-making.
34	Are M&E results used to inform budgeting of the project? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	its only a small item in the ITT
35	Are M&E results used to asses performance during implementation of the project? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	M&E unit get those reports as available data. Did not notice any input from the M&E unit on those report as evaluation
36	Are M&E results used for supporting evidence-based decision-making? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	No - not at all	M&E unit still need to identify the indicators for the expansion of AS Samra treatment plant
37	Are M&E results used for informing advocacy efforts? If yes, please provide examples of use. If no, why?	Partly	The project itself is of great importance though the sludge line is of special dimension for this project that shall be highlighted
38	How could use of M&E results be improved at Project level?		

Reporting and System Assessment Sheet - Intermediate Aggregation Site			
Organization:		Jordan Valley Authority	
Date of Review:			
Reporting Period Verified:		Q5 to Q8	
Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely Partly No - not at all N/A	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response not coded "Yes - Completely". Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)	
Part 1: Reporting performance			
Review availability, completeness, and timeliness of reports from all Service delivery sites within the Region. How many reports should there have been from all Service Delivery Sites? How many are there? Were they received on time? Are they complete?			
5	How many reports should there have been from all service delivery sites? [A]		
6	How many reports are there? [B]		
7	Calculate % Available Reports [B/A]	-	
8	Check the dates on the reports received. How many reports were received on time? (i.e., received by the due date). [C]		
9	Calculate % On time Reports [C/A]	-	
10	How many reports were complete? (i.e., complete means that the report contained all the required indicator data*). [D]		
11	Calculate % Complete Reports [D/A]	-	
Part 2. Systems Assessment			
I - M&E Structure, Functions and Capabilities			
1	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing the quality of data (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness) received from sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites).	Yes - completely	WAJ amman is revising the data. However, number and capacities were not identified.
2	There are designated staff responsible for reviewing aggregated numbers prior to submission to the next level (e.g., to the central M&E Unit).	Yes - completely	yes the reports from sites are reviewed WAJ amman before approved and delivery
3	Current human resources are sufficient to ensure good quality M&E at PIU level.	Yes - completely	JVA has sufficient staff and skills. Their expertise is also identified.
4	All relevant staff have received training on the data management processes and tools.	Yes - completely	Meeting with JVA ensure that the staff got training on data collection, mangement and processing.

II- Indicator Definitions and Reporting Guidelines			
The M&E Department at PIU level has provided written guidelines to each sub-reporting level on ...			
5	... what they are supposed to report on.	Yes - completely	
6	... how (e.g., in what specific format) reports are to be submitted.	Yes - completely	
7	... to whom the reports should be submitted.	Yes - completely	MCA Jordan
8	... when the reports are due.	Yes - completely	Quarterly
III- Data-collection and Reporting Forms / Tools			
9	The M&E Department at PIU level has identified standard reporting forms/tools to be used by all reporting levels	Yes - completely	However, there are some differences in the format sometimes. Mainly, its scanned copies.
10	Clear instructions have been provided by the M&E Department at PIU level to sub-reporting levels (e.g., service delivery sites) on how to complete the data collection and reporting forms/tools.	Yes - completely	Clear instructions are provided.
11The standard forms/tools are consistently used by Service Delivery Sites and other sub-reporting levels.	Yes - completely	Reports mostly have a standard form
12	All source documents and reporting forms relevant for measuring the indicators are available for auditing purposes (including dated print-outs in case of computerized system).	Yes - completely	All reports submitted to MCA M&E Unit for the period were provided. However, source documents were not provided.
IV- Data Management Processes			
13	Feedback is systematically provided to all service delivery sites on the quality of their reporting (i.e., accuracy, completeness and timeliness).	Partly	only on completeness but accuracy and timeliness are followed up.
14	If applicable, there are quality controls in place for when data from paper-based forms are entered into a computer (e.g., double entry, post-data entry verification, etc).	N/A	on data form not data content
15	There is a written back-up procedure for electronic data and information.	N/A	
16	...If yes, the latest date of back-up is appropriate (e.g., back-ups are weekly or monthly).	N/A	
17	There is a written procedure to address late, incomplete, inaccurate and missing reports; including following-up with service delivery sites on data quality issues.	Partly	There is no systematic written procedure, however, JVA uses written letters or mails to discuss certain cases
18	If data discrepancies have been uncovered in reports from service delivery sites, the Intermediate Aggregation Levels (e.g., regions, PIU) have documented how these inconsistencies have been resolved.	Partly	Mostly but not all the time and there is no guideline for this.

2. INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS

2.1. COMPACT-LEVEL INDICATORS

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Network water consumption per capita (residential and non-residential)
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 01
1.2 Responsible Entity	WAJ-Zarqa
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact (Goal/Objective))	Outcome
1.4 Measurement Unit	Liters per capita per day (l./c./d.)
1.5 Data Source	WAJ (billed water consumption) and DOS (population data). ITT department in charge of providing information.
1.6 Definition	For Zarqa Governorate: [Annual billed residential and non-residential (in m3)] / [population of governorate] * 1000 / 365
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	[Annual billed residential and non-residential] / [population of governorate] * 1000 / 365. Check calculation formula since in reality this is calculated quarterly: [billed residential and non-residential consumption for the quarter in cubic meters] / [population of governorate] * 1000 / 365
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	Not applicable
1.9 Data Collection Method	Consumption data is collected both by water collectors using electronic meters and reports from the field for which data is entered manually. Data from electronic meter readers is directly transferred to the X7 system. Batches are run on a daily basis to check data consistency. Sometimes lack of commitment from meter readers more than lack of qualification. They decided
1.10 Reporting Method	Data is sent to MCA quarterly using WAJ-Zarqa's template.
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	None but data could be available for Zarqa and Ruseifa separately. Also, each subarea has a code and information could be disaggregated by sub-area.
1.13 Data Storage Method	X7 system. Backups are done daily.
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	SQL database.
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Data for Q4 corresponds to data for Q3 since data often needs to be amended when errors are found. Corrected data is sent to MCA. Also, might not be correct to divide by total population, should be divided by total number of residential and non-residential customers? In that case however would be consumption per customer
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	65 liters per capita per day (l./c./d.)
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	1. Numbers used for Baseline calculation were for year 2009. Annual billed residential and non-residential: 21272723 cubic meters (WAJ-Z); Estimated Population of Zarqa Governorate: 891000 (DOS). 2. Source of this indicator: WAJ Zarqa (Subscribers Directorate)
2.4 Observations on Baseline	For population data, the last census is 2004 using an estimated growth rate.
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	96 litres per capita by the end of Compact (disaggregated by year - see Narrative) The numbers were taken for year 2009 (source PMU/MWI director).
3.2 Observations on Targets	Formula: [Target for water consumption per capita in rural areas]*[Percentage of rural areas in Zarqa]+[Target for water consumption per capita in urban areas]*[1-Percentage of rural areas in Zarqa]. % increase applied yearly to reach 15% increase by 2015. Check target setting method. Why are we using rural and urban consumption targets if we don't have baseline data

4. Indicator Monitoring		
4.1	Value	
	Q5	60,4
	Q6	56,4
	Q7	63,4
	Q8	78,7 The value of this indicator for this quarter is quite high compared to the previous quarters. Is this the right figure? There is an important jump in total residential consumption from 4998073 in the previous quarter to 6322985 in Q8. This does not seem possible given data from
4.2	Reporting Date	
	Q5	March 2013
	Q6	June 2013
	Q7	September 2013
	Q8	December 2013
5. Recounting of Reported Results		
5.1	Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2	What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3	Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4	What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	All the data submitted by Waj-Zarqa correspond to the data in the ITT input table.
6. Comments		
6.1	Quality of Indicator	Fair
6.2	Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Contemplate using indicator: Network water consumption per customer, since population data might be misleading. In fact, the population variable used to calculate this indicator is beyond the influence of the project and can be affected by external conditions (such as the influx of important number of refugees from Syria). In this case, the performance of the project will
6.3	Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	None, information is available on a timely basis.
6.4	Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	The M&E plan states that this indicator is cumulative, but it cannot be summed up as it is consumption per day. Check population data. Why in Q7, population skips from 931000 to 951

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Billed residential water consumption
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 03
1.2 Responsible Entity	WAI-Zarqa
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome
1.4 Measurement Unit	liters per capita per day (l./c./d.)
1.5 Data Source	WAI-Zarqa
1.6 Definition	Billed residential network water consumption.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	[average percentage of residential customers]*[consumption per capita]
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	Consumption data is collected both by water collectors using electronic meters and reports from the field for which data is entered manually. Data from electronic meter readers is directly transferred to the X7 system. Batches are run on a daily basis to check data consistency. Sometimes lack of commitment from meter readers more than lack of qualification. They decided to implement new guidelines where collectors need to do 20 readings per day and report.
1.10 Reporting Method	Data is sent to MCA quarterly using WAI-Zarqa's template.
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	None but data could be available for Zarqa and Ruseifa separately. Also, each subarea has a code and information could be disaggregated by sub-area.
1.13 Data Storage Method	X7 system. Backups are done daily.
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	SQL database.
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Review definition of the indicator and indicator name as it is misleading. If the information is per capita, the indicator name should state it. The calculation formula stated in the narrative indicator sheet does not seem right. Data for Q4 corresponds to data for Q3 since data often needs to be amended when errors are found. Corrected data is sent to MCA.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	57 liters per capita per day
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	[average percentage of residential customers (WAI-Z)]*[consumption per capita (WAI and DOS)]
2.4 Observations on Baseline	Baseline formula should be revised as data for 2009 is available at WAI-Zarqa. Consumption has actually decreased looking at ITT data. This is probably due to a wrong baseline. There is need to revise the baseline.
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	% increase applied yearly to reach 20.5% increase by 2016
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Q5	55,1 in input table but 50,1 in ITT Compact sheet. (why is it multiplied by 0,91? The same for all quarters)
Q6	
Q7	
Q8	
4.2 Reporting Date	
Q5	
Q6	
Q7	
Q8	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	All the data submitted by Waj-Zarqa correspond to the data in the ITT input table. However, some inconsistencies within the ITT itself (see discussion below).
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Fair
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Contemplate usign indicator: Billed residential consumption per customer, since population data might be misleading.
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	None, information is available on a timely basis, except for population data which is an estimate.
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	The M&E plan states that this indicator is cumulative, but it cannot be summed up as it is consumption per day. Check why it is multiplied by 0,91.

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Operating cost coverage
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 04
1.2 Responsible Entity	WAJ-Amman
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome
1.4 Measurement Unit	Percentage
1.5 Data Source	WAJ-Amman - Fiscal Agent
1.6 Definition	Total quarterly operational revenues divided by total quarterly operating costs.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	$\frac{[\text{Total Quarterly Operational Revenue}]}{[\text{Total Quarterly Operational Cost (including maintenance)}]}$
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	
1.11 Frequency	Used to be quarterly, now Annually (starting Q9)
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Not applicable
1.13 Data Storage Method	
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	This is a common indicator.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	TBD or 81% in 2012?
2.2 Period of Reference	2012?
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	The source for Baseline calculation is WAJ Amman Financial reports and WAJ Zarqa administrative reports. Based on consolidated audited statements (yearly).
2.4 Observations on Baseline	Baseline data should have been available if from administrative data of WAJ
3. Targets	100% by end of Compact
3.1 Target Setting Method	
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	For Q2 value is 75%
Year 2	For Q6 85,4%
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	Q2
Year 2	Q6
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	74,9%
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to M&E Unit)? [B]	85,5%
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	1
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	No discrepancy
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Fair
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	Clarify reporting requirements to WAZ-Amman. Discuss detailed definition of the indicator and clarify in the M&E plan.
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	Baseline data

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Outstanding debt
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 05
1.2 Responsible Entity	WAI-Amman
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome
1.4 Measurement Unit	Percentage
1.5 Data Source	WAI-Amman
1.6 Definition	Account receivable compared with annual sales.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	[Account receivable] / [annual sale]
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly (should be annual)
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Given the characteristics of this indicator, frequency should be annual.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	TBD
2.2 Period of Reference	
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	
2.4 Observations on Baseline	Need to calculate the baseline. The information is available in the information system at WAI-Zarqa (financial indicators)
3. Targets	TBD
3.1 Target Setting Method	
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	
Year 2	Q6 is 2,5%. Information for Q2 should be available also.
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	Q6 is 2,5%. Information for Q2 should be available also.
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Fair. This is a common indicator.
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Need to clarify the definition: Account receivable (Account receivable in the previous year + Sales in the current year - Bills collected during the year) / sales in the current year.
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	This indicator has been informed only in Q6. There is need to clarify reporting requirements to WAI-Amman and check why the information is not available.
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	Make sure all information is available and that WAI-Amman can provide the information. Update the baseline.

2.2. WATER NETWORK PROJECT

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Restructure and rehabilitate primary and secondary pipelines (km)
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 01
1.2 Responsible Entity	Project Management Consultant, PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output
1.4 Measurement Unit	Kilometer, km
1.5 Data Source	Contractors sending their reports to PMC for verification and approval. PMC send progress reports to MCA-J.
1.6 Definition	Restructuring of the water distribution network involves the overall sub-division of the network into Water Supply Areas, Distribution Areas and District Meter Areas. Rehabilitation of primary and secondary pipelines involves renovation or replacement of an existing pipeline
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	Summation of lengths of secondary and primary pipelines that were restructured or rehabilitated.
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	NA
1.9 Data Collection Method	Project(s) progress reports by contractors.
1.10 Reporting Method	Progress reports by PMC.
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly Reports
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Data will be provided based on the contract released for Primary and Secondary pipelines replacement.
1.13 Data Storage Method	PMC Database.
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	GIS data.
1.15 Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	NA
2.2 Period of Reference	NA
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	NA
2.4 Observations on Baseline	NA
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	Based on the estimated length of pipes to be replaced or rehabilitated
3.2 Observations on Targets	The set target in the Narrative Description does not define the length of Primary and Secondary pipelines to be replaced or rehabilitated in each of the targetted areas. The Summation of Primary and Secondary Pipelines replacement target in the ITT for each of the areas does not match the figure in the Narrative Description.

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	Contract has been recently awarded. No data is available yet.
Year 1	
Year 2	
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	NA (data should be provided for each of the targetted areas separately)
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	NA
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	NA
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Indicator is directly related to project performnce and reflects its progress.
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Redefine the length of pipelines to be replaced or rehabilitated in each of the three target areas.
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	None
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	None

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Restructure and rehabilitate tertiary pipelines (km)
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 02
1.2 Responsible Entity	Project Management Consultant, PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output
1.4 Measurement Unit	Kilometer, km
1.5 Data Source	Contractors sending their reports to PMC for verification and approval. PMC send progress reports to MCA-J.
1.6 Definition	Restructuring and rehabilitation of tertiary pipelines by replacement, reinforcement or renovation of existing pipelines.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	Summation of lengths of secondary and primary pipelines that were resstructured or rehabilitated.
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	NA
1.9 Data Collection Method	Project(s) progress reports by contractors.
1.10 Reporting Method	Progress reports by PMC.
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly Reports
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Four contracts are being released for the rehabilitation and restructuring of the tertiary networks.
1.13 Data Storage Method	PMC Database.
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	GIS data.
1.15 Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	NA
2.2 Period of Reference	NA
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	NA
2.4 Observations on Baseline	NA
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	Estimation of the total length of tertiary pipelines to be replaced and rehabilitated in the targetted areas.
3.2 Observations on Targets	The set target does not define the length of the tertiary pipelines to be replaced or rehabilitated in each of the targetted areas. Four contracts are awarded.

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	Four contracts has been recently awarded and no progress has been yet achieved.
Year 1	
Year 2	
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	Mismatching figures of the length of Tertiary pipelines between the Narrative Description and the ITT Figures summary
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Name		Replace customer meters (#)
1. Metadata		
1.1	Indicator Code	Output 03
1.2	Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3	Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output
1.4	Measurement Unit	Number
1.5	Data Source	Contractors sending their reports to PMC for verification and approval. PMC send progress reports to MCA-J.
1.6	Definition	Replacement of defective domestic customer water meter.
1.7	Calculation Method (formula)	Number of replaced customer meters
1.8	Sampling Method (if applicable)	NA
1.9	Data Collection Method	Progress reports by contractors
1.10	Reporting Method	Progress Reports by PMC to MCA-J
1.11	Frequency	Quarterly
1.12	Level of Disaggregation	The ITT demonstrates the number of meters to be replaced in each of the targeted areas.
1.13	Data Storage Method	PMC Database
1.14	Database Format (if applicable)	GIS Database
1.15	Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values		
2.1	Value	NA
2.2	Period of Reference	NA
2.3	Baseline Value Estimation Method	NA
2.4	Observations on Baseline	NA
3. Targets		
3.1	Target Setting Method	Estimation of the number of defective meters in the targeted areas using consumption reports from WAI-Zarga.
3.2	Observations on Targets	more than 53,000 meters to be replaced in the ITT but around 7,500 in the narrative description

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	NA
Year 1	NA
Year 2	NA
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	NA
Year 2	NA
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	NA
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	NA
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	NA
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	NA
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Need to exactly define guide for Defective Meters replacement activity. On what basis are meters judged as defective and will be replaced.
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	None
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	NA
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	NA

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Restructure and construct District Meter Areas (#)
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 04
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output
1.4 Measurement Unit	Number
1.5 Data Source	Contractors sending their reports to PMC for verification and approval. PMC send administrative reports to MCA-J.
1.6 Definition	Restructuring and construction of District Meter Areas, isolating DMA's and constructing DMA's connection points.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	Number of established District meter Areas.
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	NA
1.9 Data Collection Method	Progress reports by contractors
1.10 Reporting Method	Progress Reports by PMC to MCA-J
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	The ITT demonstrates the number of meters to be replaced in each of the targetted areas.
1.13 Data Storage Method	PMC Database
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	GIS Database
1.15 Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	NA
2.2 Period of Reference	NA
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	NA
2.4 Observations on Baseline	NA
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	design of the new isolated districts and location of district meters at isolated districts boundaries and connection points.
3.2 Observations on Targets	Depending on the design of the isolated districts, DMAs are to measure the quantities of water flowing into the area and out of it (if applicable). Still, the target defined in the Narrative sheets is different than that in the ITT.

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	NA
Year 1	NA
Year 2	NA
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	NA
Year 2	NA
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	NA
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	NA
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	NA
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	NA
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Direct operational indicator that depends on the design of the new districts water system.
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	None
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	NA
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	NA

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Install strategic meters on key water transfer pipes
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 05
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output
1.4 Measurement Unit	Number
1.5 Data Source	Contractors sending their reports to PMC for verification and approval. PMC send administrative reports to MCA-J.
1.6 Definition	Install strategic bulk water meters on key water transfer pipes at 32 locations in Zarqa Governorate.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	NA
1.9 Data Collection Method	Progress reports by contractors
1.10 Reporting Method	Progress Reports by PMC to MCA-J
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	The ITT demonstrates the number of strategic water meters to be installed during the different phases of the project. They are all referred to in the Zarqa High DA component.
1.13 Data Storage Method	PMC Database
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	GIS Database
1.15 Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	NA
2.2 Period of Reference	NA
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	NA
2.4 Observations on Baseline	NA
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	Depending on the new design of the water system, strategic water meters are to be installed at key locations to monitor water flow.
3.2 Observations on Targets	Although the definition states that 32 water meters are to be installed, the detailed targets are showing 65 files strategic water meters are to be in place.

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	NA
Year 1	NA
Year 2	NA
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	NA
Year 2	NA
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	NA
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	NA
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	NA
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	NA
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Direct operational indicator that depends on the new design of the water system in the area.
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	None
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	NA
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	NA

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Install SCADA Telemetry monitoring system
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 06
1.2 Responsible Entity	Project Management Consultant, PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output
1.4 Measurement Unit	Kilometer, km
1.5 Data Source	Contractors sending their reports to PMC for verification and approval. PMC send progress reports to MCA-J.
1.6 Definition	Install outstations for SCADA/Telemetry monitoring system at Zarqa Governorate strategic water infrastructure and District Meter Area connection points.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	number of points connected to the SCADA system (DMAs and strategic meters at the main system).
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	NA
1.9 Data Collection Method	Project(s) progress reports by contractors.
1.10 Reporting Method	Progress reports by PMC.
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly Reports
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Connections points are dependent on the new districts to be designed and main water supply system.
1.13 Data Storage Method	PMC Database.
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	SCADA System
1.15 Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	NA
2.2 Period of Reference	NA
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	NA
2.4 Observations on Baseline	NA
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	One SCADA System to monitor water flows into the different areas through the main system. All dependent on the new design of the supply system.
3.2 Observations on Targets	Number of points (meters) to be connected to the system depends on the progress in contracts completion then integrated with the SCADA. Therefore, the SCADA system should be installed prior to completion of the first contract.

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	NA
Year 1	
Year 2	
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	SCADA monitoring points are dependent on the new design of the supply system. Each point shall provide data on the water quantities flowing into the system to the different areas.
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	NA
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	NA
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Indicator is directly related to project performance and reflects its progress.
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	NA
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	None
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	None

2.3. WASTE WATER NETWORK PROJECT

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Incidents of sewage overflow reduced
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 01
1.2 Responsible Entity	WAJ-Zarqa
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome 01
1.4 Measurement Unit	Number
1.5 Data Source	WAJ-Zarqa
1.6 Definition	Annual number of blockages that occurred in sewers network per year (pumping station blockages shall not be included)
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	-
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	-
1.9 Data Collection Method	Complain Book, Calls
1.10 Reporting Method	Email, Phone
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Not disaggregated but recommended to be measured by type and location
1.13 Data Storage Method	M&E store both electronic and hard copy
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	-
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Need to know how they detect the blockages, how data is collected, stored and reported.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	8500
2.2 Period of Reference	Not indicated
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Number of Sewage Blockages (Zarqa and Ruseifa)during months 1,2, 11 and 12+Number of Sewage Blockages (Zarqa and Ruseifa)during months 3,4,..., 10
2.4 Observations on Baseline	How it was calculated? For one year? Which year? Or average last years? Not indicated. Also defention has to be specified for the blockage duration, is it one hour, one day...
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	Number of Sewage Blockages (Zarqa and Ruseifa)during months 1,2, 11 and 12 * (30%)+Number of Sewage Blockages (Zarqa and Ruseifa)during months 3,4,..., 10 * (20%) A reduction in the number of Sewage Blockages by 20% during months: 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 is expeted as a result of the project. A target was also provided from WAJ-Zarqa, but this only accounted for the benefits from cleaning, not rehabilitation.
3.2 Observations on Targets	A reduction in the number of Sewage Blockages by 30% during months: 1,2,11,12 is expeted as a result of the project. A reduction in the number of Sewage Blockages by 20% during months: 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 is expeted as a result of the project. A target was also provided from WAJ-Zarqa, but this only accounted for the benefits from cleaning, not rehabilitation.

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	8500
Year 2	8500
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	Not indicated
Year 2	Not indicated
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	8500
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	8500
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	100%
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	No clear system for blockages complains (note book or dispeared calls) No call system. Lack of storage sytem for type and location
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Shall include type of Blockages with spatial distribution and reason. Name of indicator should be revised as: Number of incidents of sewage overflow reported.
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	call center where complains shall be saved electronic with updates
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	Identify locations within the project area with blockages repition for analysis

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Quantity of wastewater collected from Zarqa Governorate increased
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 02
1.2 Responsible Entity	WAI-Zarqa
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome 02
1.4 Measurement Unit	Million Cubic Meters
1.5 Data Source	MWH,policy note
1.6 Definition	Total volume of wastewater collected through the sewer system and pumped via West Zarqa, East Zarqa and West Russaifa pumping stations.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	Average Flow from ZPS (West Zarqa) + Average Flow from Hashemiyah PS (East Zarqa)
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	none
1.9 Data Collection Method	flowmeters from pumping stations
1.10 Reporting Method	
1.11 Frequency	quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	none
1.13 Data Storage Method	electronic and hard copy by M&E
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	its including assumptions and constrains
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	24
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Average Flow from ZPS (West Zarqa) + Average Flow from Hashemiyah PS (East Zarqa)
2.4 Observations on Baseline	Calculated based on 2009. Population growth in the project area was not expecting the sudden increase of population
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	$[(\text{Served Pop 2015} * \text{Water provided to HH per capita} * \text{WW generation} * \text{Portion of people/houses that will be served for WW /1000 L}) / 365] * 0.9$
3.2 Observations on Targets	Kumar stated that they are using assumption of 85% connection rate within areas served, 4-Aug-2010. A factor of 90% is applied to account for uncertainty about the population served from Amman- provided by Mohammad Ababneh., where part of Amman (Marka) is being collected through zarqa network

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	
Year 2	
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	24
Year 2	24
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	24
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	1
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	wastewater collected from amman part shall be identified
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	good
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Revise indicator name to: Volume of wastewater collected from Zarqa Governorate
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Access to wastewater network increased
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 03
1.2 Responsible Entity	WAI-Zarqa
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome 03
1.4 Measurement Unit	Percentage
1.5 Data Source	WAI-Zarqa
1.6 Definition	Zarqa Governorate wastewater subscribers as a percent of water subscribers; each connection serves three subscribers and all subscribers will connect to the new network.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	$(\text{Wastewater bills in Zarqa} + \text{Wastewater bills in Rusifah}) / (\text{Water bills in Zarqa} + \text{Water bills in Rusifah})$
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	Mail
1.11 Frequency	quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	3
1.13 Data Storage Method	electronic and hard copy
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Name of indicator should be revised. The indicator is stated as the expected outcome rather than the indicator that will be used to measure the achievement of the outcome. Recommended is to use number of people connected to
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	72,1
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	$(\text{Wastewater bills in Zarqa} + \text{Wastewater bills in Rusifah}) / (\text{Water bills in Zarqa} + \text{Water bills in Rusifah})$
2.4 Observations on Baseline	1. Calculation for the Baseline refers to water bill if it includes wastewater discharge rates or not. 2. Numbers of issued bills were in year 2009 at two cities: Zarqa and Rusifah.
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	$(\text{Wastewater bills in Zarqa} + \text{Wastewater bills in Rusifah}) / (\text{Water bills in Zarqa} + \text{Water bills in Rusifah})$
3.2 Observations on Targets	1. Sukneh area is excluded from calculations as it is assumed out of scope. 2. There are two assumptions: one for percentage of connected population to wastewater network and the another for who decide not to connect to wastewater network with 95% factor

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	72
Year 2	72
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	72
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	72
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	1
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	Serious problems with X7 software for billing at WAJ-Zarqa which can lead to misleading billing data
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Shall contain some degree of disaggregation to distinguish between was not connected and does not want to be connected. Revise the name of the indicator as: Percentage of water subscribers with acces to waster water network. Add number of people connected
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	Connections number which is according to number of subscribers might be less than Families connected. Subscribers are also not zoned. Shall be added to the ITT as number not percentage

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Expand network - West Zarqa
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 01
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output 01
1.4 Measurement Unit	KM
1.5 Data Source	PMC
1.6 Definition	Expansion of the network entails the installation of new pipes for the connection of new households to the wastewater network(households were not previously connected to waste water network).
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	MAIL
1.11 Frequency	Monthly/Quarterly/Yearly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	Electronic mail and on the website
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Administrative reports of PMC will be the source for this indicator. Indicator name needs to be revised as it is stated as an action and not an output.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	0
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Set to 0 before work starts.
2.4 Observations on Baseline	
3. Targets	See ITT for targets
3.1 Target Setting Method	Based on work planned
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
4.1	Value	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
4.2	Reporting Date	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
5.1	Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2	What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3	Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4	What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments		
6.1	Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2	Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Review indicator name: KM of new pipes installed for the connection of new households to the wastewater network - West Zarqa
6.3	Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4	Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	Zoning of the KM shall be added

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Expand network - East Zarqa
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 02
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output 02
1.4 Measurement Unit	KM
1.5 Data Source	PMC
1.6 Definition	Expansion of the network entails the installation of new pipes for the connection of new households to the wastewater network(households were not previously connected to waste water network).
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	Mail and website
1.11 Frequency	Monthly/Quarterly and Yearly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Administrative reports of PMC will be the source for this indicator. Indicator name needs to be revised as it is stated as an action and not an output.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	0
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Set to 0 before work starts.
2.4 Observations on Baseline	
3. Targets	See ITT for targets
3.1 Target Setting Method	Based on work planned
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
4.1	Value	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
4.2	Reporting Date	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
5.1	Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2	What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3	Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4	What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments		
6.1	Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2	Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Review indicator name: KM of new pipes installed for the connection of new households to the wastewater network - East Zarqa
6.3	Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4	Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Expand network - Ruseifa
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 03
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output 03
1.4 Measurement Unit	KM
1.5 Data Source	PMC
1.6 Definition	Expansion of the network entails the installation of new pipes for the connection of new households to the wastewater network(households were not previously connected to waste water network). Indicator name needs to be revised as it is stated as an action and not an output.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	mail and website
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Administrative reports of PMC will be the source for this indicator
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	0
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Set to 0 before work starts.
2.4 Observations on Baseline	
3. Targets	See ITT for targets
3.1 Target Setting Method	Based on work planned
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
4.1	Value	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
4.2	Reporting Date	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
5.1	Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2	What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3	Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4	What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments		
6.1	Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2	Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Review indicator name: KM of new pipes installed for the connection of new households to the wastewater network - Ruseifa
6.3	Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4	Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Reinforce and rehabilitate network - West Zarqa
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 04
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output 04
1.4 Measurement Unit	KM
1.5 Data Source	PMC
1.6 Definition	Reinforcement entails upgrades to existing pipelines. Rehabilitation entails replacement of existing pipelines. Indicator name needs to be revised as it is stated as an action and not an output.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	Mail and website
1.11 Frequency	quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Indicator name needs to be revised as it is stated as an action and not an output.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	0
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Set to 0 before work starts.
2.4 Observations on Baseline	
3. Targets	See ITT for targets
3.1 Target Setting Method	Based on work planned
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
4.1	Value	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
4.2	Reporting Date	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
5.1	Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2	What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3	Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4	What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments		
6.1	Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2	Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Review indicator name: KM of existing pipelines reinforced and rehabilitated - West Zarqa
6.3	Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4	Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Reinforce and rehabilitate network - East Zarqa
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 05
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output 05
1.4 Measurement Unit	KM
1.5 Data Source	PMC Administrative Reports.
1.6 Definition	Reinforcement entails upgrades to existing pipelines. Rehabilitation entails replacement of existing pipelines.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	mail website
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	Mail and website
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Indicator name needs to be revised as it is stated as an action and not an output.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	0
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Set to 0 before work starts.
2.4 Observations on Baseline	
3. Targets	See ITT for targets
3.1 Target Setting Method	Based on work planned
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
4.1	Value	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
4.2	Reporting Date	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
5.1	Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2	What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3	Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4	What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments		
6.1	Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2	Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Review indicator name: KM of existing pipelines reinforced and rehabilitated - East Zarqa
6.3	Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4	Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Reinforce and rehabilitate network - Ruseifa
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Output 06
1.2 Responsible Entity	PMC
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Output 06
1.4 Measurement Unit	KM
1.5 Data Source	PMC
1.6 Definition	Reinforcement entails upgrades to existing pipelines. Rehabilitation entails replacement of existing pipelines.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	mail and website
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Administrative reports of PMC will be the source for this indicator. Indicator name needs to be revised as it is stated as an action and not an output.
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	0
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Set to 0 before work starts.
2.4 Observations on Baseline	
3. Targets	See ITT for targets
3.1 Target Setting Method	Based on work planned
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
4.1	Value	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
4.2	Reporting Date	
	Year 1	
	Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	Not applicable only if work has not started yet.	
5.1	Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2	What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3	Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4	What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments		
6.1	Quality of Indicator	Good
6.2	Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	Review indicator name: KM of existing pipelines reinforced and rehabilitated - Ruseifa
6.3	Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4	Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

2.4. AS-SAMRA EXPANSION PROJECT

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Treated wastewater used in agriculture
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 01
1.2 Responsible Entity	JVA
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome 01
1.4 Measurement Unit	Percentage
1.5 Data Source	JVA
1.6 Definition	Treated wastewater used for irrigation in Northern and Middle Jordan Valley as a percent of all water used for irrigation in Northern and Middle Jordan Valley.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	$\frac{([Quantities\ of\ mixed\ water\ sources\ released\ for\ irrigation\ in\ North\ Ghor] + [Quantities\ of\ mixed\ water\ sources\ released\ for\ irrigation\ (in\ Middle/South\ Ghor)])}{(Total\ water\ quantities\ used\ in\ Ghor\ agriculture)}$
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	Mail
1.11 Frequency	Annual
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Fresh water , traeted wastewater used for irrigation in North and Middle Jordan Valley
1.13 Data Storage Method	Mail and hard copy
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	Numbers were taken in year 2009.JVA is the source. No fresh water is used for agriculture in Middle /South Ghor
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	61
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	$\frac{([Quantities\ of\ mixed\ water\ sources\ released\ for\ irrigation\ in\ North\ Ghor] + [Quantities\ of\ mixed\ water\ sources\ released\ for\ irrigation\ (in\ Middle/South\ Ghor)])}{(Total\ water\ quantities\ used\ in\ Ghor\ agriculture)}$
2.4 Observations on Baseline	Numbers were taken in year 2009.JVA is the source. No fresh water is used for agriculture in Middle /South Ghor
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	$\frac{([Quantities\ of\ mixed\ water\ sources\ released\ for\ irrigation\ in\ North\ Ghor] + [Quantities\ of\ mixed\ water\ sources\ released\ for\ irrigation\ (in\ Middle/South\ Ghor)])}{(Total\ water\ quantities\ used\ in\ Ghor\ agriculture)}$
3.2 Observations on Targets	1. Numbers is based on year 2015 forecast.2. POC is various (Eng. Husam Hassan from JVA, and unknown from AS-Samra WWTP. 3. All numbers used in target calculation are unverifiable.4. Treated wastewater includes rainwater runoff mixed with traeted wastewater in kking Talal dam.

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	62,5
Year 2	64
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	To include rainwater runoff. Data reference?
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Quality of As-Samra effluent meets standard
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 02
1.2 Responsible Entity	MWI/JVA
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome 02
1.4 Measurement Unit	In Narrative P3 is 'level' while in the defention its number of days
1.5 Data Source	MWI/JVA
1.6 Definition	Number of days during the past quarter when effluent does not meet the applicable standard set out in the As-Samra Project Agreement.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Disaggregated -BOD< COD...etc. Eng Mashagbeh JVA
1.13 Data Storage Method	Storage System at MWI
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	including assumptions and constrains
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	
2.2 Period of Reference	
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	
2.4 Observations on Baseline	
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	
3.2 Observations on Targets	

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	
Year 2	
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Volume of waste water effluent discharged from the As-Samra plant per year
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 03
1.2 Responsible Entity	MWI/JVA
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome 03
1.4 Measurement Unit	Cubic Meter
1.5 Data Source	MWI/JVA
1.6 Definition	Annual volume of wastewater treated to at least secondary level (measured as annual volume of wastewater effluent discharged from the As-Samra plant, million cubic meters per year).
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	Mail and hard copy
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	
1.13 Data Storage Method	Storage system at MWI
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	65000000
2.2 Period of Reference	2009
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	Not indicated
2.4 Observations on Baseline	1. POC is Eng. Sultan Mashaqbah 2. Actual volume for year 2009 was 65,360,176 cubic meters.
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	[Estimated As-Samra effluence in year 2015]*[Factor for "water not lost"]
3.2 Observations on Targets	[Estimated As-Samra effluence in year 2015]*[Factor for "water not lost"]

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	65 000 000
Year 2	65 000 000
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator Name	Agriculture use of treated wastewater
1. Metadata	
1.1 Indicator Code	Outcome 03
1.2 Responsible Entity	JVA
1.3 Indicator Type (input, activity, output, outcome, impact)	Outcome 03
1.4 Measurement Unit	Hectar
1.5 Data Source	JVA
1.6 Definition	Agriculture land in the Middle and Northern Jordan Valley using treated wastewater for at least part of their irrigation water.
1.7 Calculation Method (formula)	$((\text{Potential treated wastewater irrigation area in North Ghor}) * [\text{Actual percentage of wastewater irrigation area in North Ghor}]) + ((\text{Potential treated wastewater irrigation area in Middle Ghor}) * [\text{Actual percentage of wastewater irrigation area in Middle Ghor}])$
1.8 Sampling Method (if applicable)	
1.9 Data Collection Method	
1.10 Reporting Method	Mail
1.11 Frequency	Quarterly
1.12 Level of Disaggregation	Potential and actual irrigated area in North and Middle Jordan Valley
1.13 Data Storage Method	Storage system at MWI
1.14 Database Format (if applicable)	
1.15 Observations on Metadata	
2. Baseline Values	
2.1 Value	13700
2.2 Period of Reference	Not indicated
2.3 Baseline Value Estimation Method	$((\text{Potential treated wastewater irrigation area in North Ghor}) * [\text{Actual percentage of wastewater irrigation area in North Ghor}]) + ((\text{Potential treated wastewater irrigation area in Middle Ghor}) * [\text{Actual percentage of wastewater irrigation area in Middle Ghor}])$
2.4 Observations on Baseline	POC is Mr. Yousef Hassan
3. Targets	
3.1 Target Setting Method	$((\text{Potential treated wastewater irrigation area in North Ghor}) * [\text{Expected percentage of wastewater irrigation area in North Ghor}]) + ((\text{Potential treated wastewater irrigation area in Middle Ghor}) * [\text{Expected percentage of wastewater irrigation area in Middle Ghor}])$
3.2 Observations on Targets	Including assumptions and constrains

4. Indicator Monitoring	
4.1 Value	
Year 1	14000
Year 2	14400
4.2 Reporting Date	
Year 1	
Year 2	
5. Recounting of Reported Results	
5.1 Re-aggregate the numbers from the reports received from all Service Delivery Sites. What is the re-aggregated number? [A]	
5.2 What aggregated result was contained in the progress report prepared by the grantee (and submitted to AGRA M&E Unit)? [B]	
5.3 Calculate the ratio of recounted to reported numbers. [A/B]	
5.4 What are the reasons for the discrepancy (if any) observed (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, other)?	
6. Comments	
6.1 Quality of Indicator	
6.2 Proposition for Revising Current Indicator	
6.3 Proposition to ensure timely availability of the data	
6.4 Aspects to update in the M&E Plan	

3. DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRIDS

3.1. COMPACT-LEVEL INDICATORS

1. Validity - Do the data adequately represent the desired performance?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			
	Network water consumption per capita (residential and non-residential)	Billed residential water consumption	Operating cost coverage	Outstanding debt
1.1. Relevance				
Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly
1.2. Adequacy				
Do the indicators for particular expected results fully measure them? (completeness)	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are definitions clear enough for all users to have the same understanding?	Partly	Partly	Partly	No - not at all
If applicable, were national definitions used to define impact and outcome indicators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are the indicators sufficient to characterize and/or measure the results?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Does data include sufficient detail for disaggregated analysis if necessary?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
1.3. Data collection tools (non-survey data only)				
Is the data collection instrument well designed (e.g., reporting formats)?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly
Are data collectors well trained? How were they trained?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.4. Non Sampling or Measurement Error (survey data only)				
Is the data collection instrument well designed? I.e., does it enable to inform the indicator?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Was there any quality control in the selection process of the enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were trainers insiders of the program/project?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were enumerators well trained?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were response rates sufficiently large?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Has non-response rate been followed up?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there reasons for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

1.5. Representativeness of Data (survey data only)				
Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sampling frame adequate? (i.e., the list of units in the target population up to date, comprehensive, mutually exclusive (for geographic frames))	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sample of adequate size?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.6. Transcription error				
Are steps being taken to limit transcription errors? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	N/A
1.7. Data processing				
Are the correct formulae being applied?	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly
Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are procedures for dealing with missing data/outliers traceable?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Have procedures for dealing with missing data/outliers been correctly applied?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
1.8. Does the data set reflect data entered at the source? (non-survey data only)				
Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	No - not at all
Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information? (Yes-completely, if no more marginal value remaining to conquer?)	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	No - not at all
Does the recording and reporting system avoid double counting people (e.g., a person receiving the same service twice in a reporting period, a person registered as receiving the same service in two different locations, etc)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	Yes - completely
Does the reporting system enable the identification and recording of a "drop out", a person "lost to follow-up" and a person who died?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	Yes - completely
Average score	2,65	2,59	2,83	2,31
Recommendations on Validity	Its definition needs to be reviewed. This analysis does not include method for estimating population.	Clarify indicator definition as it is per capita consumption. Contemplate possibility of dividing by number of domestic customers instead of by population. See comments for previous indicators that also apply.	Clarify reporting requirements to WAZ-Amman. Discuss detailed definition of the indicator and clarify in the M&E plan.	Need to clarify the definition: Account receivable (Account receivable in the previous year + Sales in the current year - Bills collected during the year) / sales in the current year.

2. Reliability - Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			
	Network water consumption per capita (residential and non-residential)	Billed residential water consumption	Operating cost coverage	Outstanding debt
2.1. Consistency				
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.2. Internal quality control				
Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling (random checks) and quality assessment of data?	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
2.3. Transparency				
Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly
Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
2.4 Technology and Software				
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to collect, analyse and manage data ensure reliability of data?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to report data adapted to the needs of internal users?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly
Is the technology used to report data adequate and accessible for external users.	No - not at all	No - not at all	No - not at all	No - not at all
Average score	2,18	2,18	2,45	2,45
Recommendations on Reliability	Population data used to calculate this indicator based on growth rate estimates. Do not factor for recent immigration from Syria.	Population data used to calculate this indicator based on growth rate estimates. Do not factor for recent immigration from Syria.	Audit statements allow to check reliability of data.	Audit statements allow to check reliability of data.

3. Timeliness - Is data collected frequently and is it current?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			
	Network water consumption per capita (residential and non-residential)	Billed residential water consumption	Operating cost coverage	Outstanding debt
3.1. Frequency				
Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly	Partly
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly	Partly
3.2. Availability				
Is data reported in a given period the most current (up-to-date) practically available?	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	No - not at all
Is data from within the period of interest for management purposes?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly	Partly
Is data reported as soon as possible after collection?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	No - not at all	No - not at all
Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	No - not at all	No - not at all	No - not at all	Partly
3.3. Practicality				
Is the collection of data for the indicator a reasonably viable matter (human and financial resources are adequate)?	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the data collection cost effective (are costs acceptable and justifiable)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are conditions favourable for timely data collection?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly	Partly
Average score	2,56	2,56	2,11	2,00
Recommendations on Timeliness	The only problem here is the availability of up-to-date population data.	The only problem here is the availability of up-to-date population data.	There is a need to clarify reporting requirements and make sure data is available on time.	There is a need to clarify reporting requirements and make sure data is available on time. This indicator was not informed in the ITT for Q2 although the data could be easily available.

4. Precision - Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			
	Network water consumption per capita (residential and non-residential)	Billed residential water consumption	Operating cost coverage	Outstanding debt
4.1. Reproducibility				
Would repeated measurement yield the same results under similar conditions?	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly
4.2. Precision (survey data only)				
Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the margin of error acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average score	2,00	2,00	3,00	2,00
Recommendations on Precision	Need to contemplate using number of customers as denominator or total consumption (not per capita)	Need to contemplate using number of customers as denominator or total consumption (not per capita)		Need to clarify reporting period and formula to make sure repeated measurements give the same results.

5. Integrity - Are data free of manipulation?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			
	Network water consumption per capita (residential and non-residential)	Billed residential water consumption	Operating cost coverage	Outstanding debt
5.1. Integrity				
Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Have data collection, management and analysis processes been reviewed by an independent body?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly
If data is from a secondary source, is the credibility of the data verified?	Partly	Partly	N/A	N/A
If relevant, is personal data maintained according to national or international confidentiality guidelines?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	Yes - completely
Average score	2,60	2,60	2,67	2,75
Recommendations on Accuracy	Can only base evaluation on consumption information. Population data was not reviewed.	Can only base evaluation on consumption information. Population data was not reviewed.	Financial data used to inform this indicator come from annual consolidated audited financial statements.	

3.2. WATER NETWORK PROJECT

1. Validity - Do the data adequately represent the desired performance?

Dimension / Question	Outcome	Output					
	Non-revenue water	Restructure and rehabilitate primary and secondary pipelines (km)	Restructure and rehabilitate tertiary pipelines (km)	Replace customer meters (#)	Restructure and construct District Meter Areas (#)	Install strategic meters on key water transfer pipes	Install SCADA Telemetry monitoring system
1.1. Relevance							
Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
1.2. Adequacy							
Do the indicators for particular expected results fully measure them? (completeness)	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are definitions clear enough for all users to have the same understanding?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
If applicable, were national definitions used to define impact and outcome indicators?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are the indicators sufficient to characterize and/or measure the results?	Yes - completely	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Does data include sufficient detail for disaggregated analysis if necessary?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
1.3. Data collection tools (non-survey data only)							
Is the data collection instrument well designed (e.g., reporting formats)?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are data collectors well trained? How were they trained?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.4. Non Sampling or Measurement Error (survey data only)							
Is the data collection instrument well designed? I.e., does it enable to inform the indicator?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Was there any quality control in the selection process of the enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were trainers insiders of the program/project?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were enumerators well trained?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were response rates sufficiently large?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Has non-response rate been followed up?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there reasons for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

1.5. Representativeness of Data (survey data only)							
Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sampling frame adequate? (i.e., the list of units in the target population up to date, comprehensive, mutually exclusive (for geographic frames))	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sample of adequate size?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.6. Transcription error							
Are steps being taken to limit transcription errors? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.7. Data processing							
Are the correct formulae being applied?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are procedures for dealing with missing data/outside traceable?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have procedures for dealing with missing data/outside been correctly applied?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.8. Does the data set reflect data entered at the source? (non-survey data only)							
Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information? (Yes-completely, if no more marginal value remaining to conquer?)	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Does the recording and reporting system avoids double counting people (e.g., a person receiving the same service twice in a reporting period, a person registered as receiving the same service in two different locations, etc)?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Does the reporting system enable the identification and recording of a "drop out", a person "lost to follow-up" and a person who died?	No - not at all	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average score	2,53	2,67	2,67	2,83	2,67	3,00	3,00
Recommendations on Validity	MCA-J can utilize the detailed NRW data that is available for the targetted areas rather than relying on the overall NRW percentage in the governorate						
	Information related to data processing are based on the simplicity of expected techniques as no data is currently available.						

2. Reliability - Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

	Outcome	Output					
Dimension / Question	Non-revenue water	Restructure and rehabilitate primary and secondary pipelines (km)	Restructure and rehabilitate tertiary pipelines (km)	Replace customer meters (#)	Restructure and construct District Meter Areas (#)	Install strategic meters on key water transfer pipes	Install SCADA Telemetry monitoring system
2.1. Consistency							
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.2. Internal quality control							
Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely
Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling (random checks) and quality assessment of data?	No - not at all	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely
2.3. Transparency							
Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	No - not at all	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	No - not at all	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.4 Technology and Software							
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to collect, analyse and manage data ensure reliability of data?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to report data adapted to the needs of internal users?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes - completely
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to report data adapted to the needs of internal users?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes - completely
Is the technology used to report data adequate and accessible for external users.	No - not at all	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average score	1,86	2,25	2,25	2,25	2,25	2,25	3,00
Recommendations on Reliability							

3. Timeliness - Is data collected frequently and is it current?

Dimension / Question	Outcome	Output					
	Non-revenue water	Restructure and rehabilitate primary and secondary pipelines (km)	Restructure and rehabilitate tertiary pipelines (km)	Replace customer meters (#)	Restructure and construct District Meter Areas (#)	Install strategic meters on key water transfer pipes	Install SCADA Telemetry monitoring system
3.1. Frequency							
Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
3.2. Availability							
Is data reported in a given period the most current (up-to-date) practically available?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is data from within the period of interest for management purposes?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is data reported as soon as possible after collection?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.3. Practicality							
Is the collection of data for the indicator a reasonably viable matter (human and financial resources are adequate)?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the data collection cost effective (are costs acceptable and justifiable)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are conditions favourable for timely data collection?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Average score	2,78	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
Recommendations on Timeliness							

4. Precision - Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

	Outcome	Output					
Dimension / Question	Non-revenue water	Restructure and rehabilitate primary and secondary pipelines (km)	Restructure and rehabilitate tertiary pipelines (km)	Replace customer meters (#)	Restructure and construct District Meter Areas (#)	Install strategic meters on key water transfer pipes	Install SCADA Telemetry monitoring system
4.1. Reproducibility							
Would repeated measurement yield the same results under similar conditions?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
4.2. Precision (survey data only)							
Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	Partly	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the margin of error acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	No - not at all	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	No - not at all	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average score	1,80	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00

5. Integrity - Are data free of manipulation?

	Outcome	Output					
Dimension / Question	Non-revenue water	Restructure and rehabilitate primary and secondary pipelines (km)	Restructure and rehabilitate tertiary pipelines (km)	Replace customer meters (#)	Restructure and construct District Meter Areas (#)	Install strategic meters on key water transfer pipes	Install SCADA Telemetry monitoring system
6.1. Integrity							
Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	No - not at all	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely
Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have data collection, management and analysis processes been reviewed by an independant body?	No - not at all	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If data is from a secondary source, is the credibility of the data verified?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely
If relevant, is personal data maintained according to national or international confidentiality guidelines?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average score	1,75	2,00	2,00	2,00	2,00	2,00	3,00
Recommendations on Accuracy							

3.3. WASTE WATER NETWORK

1. Validity - Do the data adequately represent the desired performance?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			Output	
	Incidents of sewage overflow reduced	Quantity of wastewater collected from Zarqa Governorate increased	Access to wastewater network increased	Expand network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)	Reinforce and rehabilitate network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)
1.1. Relevance					
Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
1.2. Adequacy					
Do the indicators for particular expected results fully measure them? (completeness)	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly
Are definitions clear enough for all users to have the same understanding?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly
If applicable, were national definitions used to define impact and outcome indicators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are the indicators sufficient to characterize and/or measure the results?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly
Does data include sufficient detail for disaggregated analysis if necessary?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
1.3. Data collection tools (non-survey data only)					
Is the data collection instrument well designed (e.g., reporting formats)?	Partly	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are data collectors well trained? How were they trained?	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.4. Non Sampling or Measurement Error (survey data only)					
Is the data collection instrument well designed? I.e., does it enable to inform the indicator?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Was there any quality control in the selection process of the enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were trainers insiders of the program/project?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were enumerators well trained?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were response rates sufficiently large?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Has non-response rate been followed up?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there reasons for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

1.5. Representativeness of Data (survey data only)					
Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sampling frame adequate? (i.e., the list of units in the target population up to date, comprehensive, mutually exclusive (for geographic frames))	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sample of adequate size?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.6. Transcription error					
Are steps being taken to limit transcription errors? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
1.7. Data processing					
Are the correct formulae being applied?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are procedures for dealing with missing data/outliers traceable?	No - not at all	N/A	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Have procedures for dealing with missing data/outliers been correctly applied?	N/A	N/A	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
1.8. Does the data set reflect data entered at the source? (non-survey data only)					
Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information? (Yes-completely, if no more marginal value remaining to conquer?)	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Does the recording and reporting system avoids double counting people (e.g., a person receiving the same service twice in a reporting period, a person registered as receiving the same service in two different locations, etc)?	No - not at all	N/A	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Does the reporting system enable the identification and recording of a "drop out", a person "lost to follow-up" and a person who died?	N/A	N/A	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Average score	2,07	2,62	2,65	3,00	2,77
Recommendations on Validity	Poor data management. No written guidelines for reporting. Lack of personnel.	recommended to exclude ww collected from south amman (marqa)	use of percentage underestimate the project effort.	action not output indicator	action not output indicator

2. Reliability - Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			Output	
	Incidents of sewage overflow reduced	Quantity of wastewater collected from Zarqa Governorate increased	Access to wastewater network increased	Expand network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)	Reinforce and rehabilitate network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)
2.1. Consistency					
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
2.2. Internal quality control					
Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling (random checks) and quality assessment of data?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
2.3. Transparency					
Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
2.4 Technology and Software					
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to collect, analyse and manage data ensure reliability of data?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to report data adapted to the needs of internal users?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the technology used to report data adequate and accessible for external users.	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly
Average score	1,69	2,92	2,77	2,92	2,92
Recommendations on Reliability	data is collected from different sources that are not connected or validated	in case of problems its not stated on the reports.Random checks are not done	using the existing x7 billing gives controversial results	action not output indicator	action not output indicator

3. Timeliness - Is data collected frequently and is it current?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			Output	
	Incidents of sewage overflow reduced	Quantity of wastewater collected from Zarqa Governorate increased	Access to wastewater network increased	Expand network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)	Reinforce and rehabilitate network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)
3.1. Frequency					
Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
3.2. Availability					
Is data reported in a given period the most current (up-to-date) practically available?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is data from within the period of interest for management purposes?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is data reported as soon as possible after collection?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	No - not at all	No - not at all	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
3.3. Practicality					
Is the collection of data for the indicator a reasonably viable matter (human and financial resources are adequate)?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is the data collection cost effective (are costs acceptable and justifiable)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Are conditions favourable for timely data collection?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Average score	2,44	2,78	2,67	3,00	3,00
Recommendations on Timeliness	need a reminder from M&E			As actions its followed up through AE an IE and actions are reported by contractors	As actions its followed up through AE an IE and actions are reported by contractors

4. Precision - Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			Output	
	Incidents of sewage overflow reduced	Quantity of wastewater collected from Zarqa Governorate increased	Access to wastewater network increased	Expand network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)	Reinforce and rehabilitate network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)
4.1. Reproducibility					
Would repeated measurement yield the same results under similar conditions?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
4.2. Precision (survey data only)					
Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the margin of error acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average score	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
Recommendations on Precision	repeated records in different consistent way will not lead to the same numbers		correction factor 95% (narrative)		

5. Integrity - Are data free of manipulation?

Dimension / Question	Outcome			Output	
	Incidents of sewage overflow reduced	Quantity of wastewater collected from Zarqa Governorate increased	Access to wastewater network increased	Expand network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)	Reinforce and rehabilitate network (West Zarqa, East Zarqa and Ruseifa)
5.1. Integrity					
Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	No - not at all	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
Have data collection, management and analysis processes been reviewed by an independant body?	No - not at all	No - not at all	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely
If data is from a secondary source, is the credibility of the data verified?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If relevant, is personal data maintained according to national or international confidentiality guidelines?	N/A	N/A	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Average score	1,00	2,33	2,75	3,00	3,00
Recommendations on Accuracy	there are no written procedures	one source of data collection	billing system is the base and it has some technical problems		

3.4. AS-SAMRA EXPANSION PROJECT

1. Validity - Do the data adequately represent the desired performance?

Dimension / Question	Outcome				Output	
	Treated wastewater used in agriculture	Quality of As-Samra effluent meets standard	Volume of waste water effluent discharged from the As-Samra plant per year	Agriculture use of treated wastewater	Actual "substitution calculation" (TBD)	Expansion of As-Samra Treatment Plant (TBD)
1.1. Relevance						
Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
1.2. Adequacy						
Do the indicators for particular expected results fully measure them? (completeness)	Partly	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Are definitions clear enough for all users to have the same understanding?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
If applicable, were national definitions used to define impact and outcome indicators?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Are the indicators sufficient to characterize and/or measure the results?	Partly	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Does data include sufficient detail for disaggregated analysis if necessary?						
1.3. Data collection tools (non-survey data only)						
Is the data collection instrument well designed (e.g., reporting formats)?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly	N/A	N/A
Are data collectors well trained? How were they trained?	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	N/A	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.4. Non Sampling or Measurement Error (survey data only)						
Is the data collection instrument well designed? I.e., does it enable to inform the indicator?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Was there any quality control in the selection process of the enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were trainers insiders of the program/project?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were enumerators well trained?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were response rates sufficiently large?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Has non-response rate been followed up?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there reasons for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

1.5. Representativeness of Data (survey data only)						
Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sampling frame adequate? (i.e., the list of units in the target population up to date, comprehensive, mutually exclusive (for geographic frames))	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Is the sample of adequate size?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.6. Transcription error						
Are steps being taken to limit transcription errors? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.7. Data processing						
Are the correct formulae being applied?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Are procedures for dealing with missing data/outliers traceable?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have procedures for dealing with missing data/outliers been correctly applied?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.8. Does the data set reflect data entered at the source? (non-survey data only)						
Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information? (Yes-completely, if no more marginal value remaining to conquer?)	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Does the recording and reporting system avoids double counting people (e.g., a person receiving the same service twice in a reporting period, a person registered as receiving the same service in two different locations, etc)?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Does the reporting system enable the identification and recording of a "drop out", a person "lost to follow-up" and a person who died?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	n/a
Average score	2,64	2,92	2,73	2,91	N/A	N/A
Recommendations on Validity	no clear measurment were illustrated at the time of this assessment from JVA	validated by third part RSS	volumes of ww effluent reported does not take into account runoff, springs or fresh water that is mixed	revise the indicator to reclaimed water.	in the phase of operation this indicator can be applied.	not applicable yet.

2. Reliability - Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

Dimension / Question	Outcome				Output	
	Treated wastewater used in agriculture	Quality of As-Samra effluent meets standard	Volume of waste water effluent discharged from the As-Samra plant per year	Agriculture use of treated wastewater	Actual "substitution calculation" (TBD)	Expansion of As-Samra Treatment Plant (TBD)
2.1. Consistency						
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?						
Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?		Yes - completely				
2.2. Internal quality control						
Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling (random checks) and quality assessment of data?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
2.3. Transparency						
Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
2.4 Technology and Software						
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to collect, analyse and manage data ensure reliability of data?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to report data adapted to the needs of internal users?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Does the technology and/or statistical software used to report data adapted to the needs of internal users?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Is the technology used to report data adequate and accessible for external users.	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Average score	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	N/A	N/A
Recommendations on Reliability	JVA have developed their calculation procedures overtime. We did not have access to the detailed reports	RSS do the validation	though in ITT quarterly	this has a margin or error I believe. Difficult to detect		

3. Timeliness - Is data collected frequently and is it current?

Dimension / Question	Outcome				Output	
	Treated wastewater used in agriculture	Quality of As-Samra effluent meets standard	Volume of waste water effluent discharged from the As-Samra plant per year	Agriculture use of treated wastewater	Actual "substitution calculation" (TBD)	Expansion of As-Samra Treatment Plant (TBD)
3.1. Frequency						
Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely		
3.2. Availability						
Is data reported in a given period the most current (up-to-date) practically available?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	n/a	n/a
Is data from within the period of interest for management purposes?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	n/a	n/a
Is data reported as soon as possible after collection?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	n/a	n/a
Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	n/a	n/a
3.3. Practicality						
Is the collection of data for the indicator a reasonably viable matter (human and financial resources are adequate)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	n/a	n/a
Is the data collection cost effective (are costs acceptable and justifiable)?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	n/a	n/a
Are conditions favourable for timely data collection?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	n/a	n/a
Average score	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	N/A	N/A
Recommendations on Timeliness	on time upon agreement	cost is associated with review of third party				

4. Precision - Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

Dimension / Question	Outcome				Output	
	Treated wastewater used in agriculture	Quality of As-Samra effluent meets standard	Volume of waste water effluent discharged from the As-Samra plant per year	Agriculture use of treated wastewater	Actual "substitution calculation" (TBD)	Expansion of As-Samra Treatment Plant (TBD)
4.1. Reproducibility						
Would repeated measurement yield the same results under similar conditions?	Yes - completely	Partly	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
4.2. Precision (survey data only)						
Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?						
Is the margin of error acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)						
Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?						
Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?						
Average score	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	N/A	N/A
Recommendations on Precision	according to JVA assurance	according to JVA interview. Qais Oweis				

5. Integrity - Are data free of manipulation?

Dimension / Question	Outcome				Output	
	Treated wastewater used in agriculture	Quality of As-Samra effluent meets standard	Volume of waste water effluent discharged from the As-Samra plant per year	Agriculture use of treated wastewater	Actual "substitution calculation" (TBD)	Expansion of As-Samra Treatment Plant (TBD)
5.1. Integrity						
Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
Have data collection, management and analysis processes been reviewed by an independant body?	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	Yes - completely	N/A	N/A
If data is from a secondary source, is the credibility of the data verified?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If relevant, is personal data maintained according to national or international confidentiality guidelines?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average score	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	N/A	N/A
Recommendations on Accuracy	no intrusion of manipulation to the data is done according to JVA secretary general					