



Managing for Results— Reform, Perform, Achieve





Managing for Results—Reform, Perform, Achieve

Introduction

Since May 1993, when USAID became one of two reinvention laboratories under the vice president's National Performance Review, we have sought to remake the Agency by

- Improving our strategic focus on fewer, more attainable objectives
- Linking resource allocation more directly to program performance
- Reducing redundancy in management and empowering employees
- Instilling critical values of customer service, teamwork, results orientation, empowerment, and diversity into our corporate culture
- Supporting the new values with reformed operating systems that simplify and streamline our work
- Bolstering new operating systems with modern technology that will improve accountability and better track our program and financial performance

These management reforms have made us more responsive, effective, and efficient in delivering assistance in the 79 countries where we had field presence at the end of 1996.

Promoting new management vision has been far easier than realizing it. When we began the task in 1993, reengineering experts in private sector companies and colleagues in other government departments and agencies illuminated the fault lines that lay ahead.

Beyond changing organizational values and introducing new ways of doing business, we faced resource shortages that drove the pace and content of our reform. From 1993 through 1996, we had to cut almost 9 percent from our operating expenses budget, and almost 28 percent from our program dollar budget (excluding Egypt and Israel). We had to cut staff by almost 28 percent. More than 24 percent of U.S. direct hires were let go in the Agency's first reduction in force since the end of the Vietnam War. At the end of 1996, we were spending only about 8 percent of our budget on operating expenses, down from just over 10 percent in fiscal years 1993–95.

These cuts directed our efforts to restructuring overseas operations. Although our comparative strength lies in our overseas presence, deep funding cuts in 1996, especially in operating expenses, meant we could no longer sustain that advantage as we had in the past. So we concentrated programs on a smaller number of higher priority objectives in fewer countries. To balance budget and mandate, we have had to examine how to tailor our mission with fewer resources.

In the midst of downsizing, we were also embarking on a new phase of management reform at the end of 1996. We began to review what we had learned from the previous three years and act on it. We are starting to tackle some tough management areas—human resources and work force management, information management, and procurement reform—to support our smaller, more focused field Missions.

Progress in Implementing The Core Values

1996 marked a watershed in our corporate culture. We began to see evidence of how the new core values were being implemented. We began to develop responses to some unintended distortions that resulted when some of our management systems could not keep pace with the momentum created by the reengineering effort.

Teamwork and Participation

Assessments of 10 country experimental labs as well as other studies indicate strong support for working in and managing by teams. More than half of our field operating units have informally modified their organizational structures by establishing teams to work on strategic objectives while retaining more conventional office setups. A few have explored formally modifying the traditional Mission office to a team structure.

In addition, Missions are reaching out to Washington operating units to join field-based teams. We developed new ways to collaborate using better communications systems and new operating processes. In Washington we now provide technical and program support to the field and our reviews look for results.

Surveys have suggested that while working in teams is labor-intensive at the front end, it has a payoff over the long term. Effective teamwork shortens the time it takes to develop an activity, improves the speed and quality of decision-making, engages partners, informs those who have a stake in our work, encourages us to empower the foreign service nationals working in our Missions, and helps us adjust to having fewer U.S. direct hires overseas. Most of the evidence so far is anecdotal, but it suggests that teams may be more efficient because they encourage program integration, support customer service, and improve performance reporting.

There are also problems with the team approach. For instance, lack of training and constraints on delegating authority limit the responsibility teams can take on. Teams struggle with determining when and how to include partners and customers. Getting support from senior managers has been difficult. And teams put a demand (or premium) on communication and information sharing, which increases our need for and dependence on information technology. We are now using the Internet to access documents in a fraction of the time required previously, e-mail to sustain “virtual teams,” and groupware programs in pilot Missions to facilitate work flow.

The team approach has also illuminated a need to change position descriptions and incentives to support team-based achievement. Missions demanded that we reassess our management policies. That led to an initiative in 1996 called Reform (**R**eengineering **E**ffort for **O**rganization and **M**anagement). Reform, described in detail below, will develop new guidance in organizational management that will give Missions greater latitude in determining their own structures.

At the same time that we began implementing reengineering reforms, we started a pilot New Partnerships Initiative (NPI) in 15 Missions. This initiative takes an integrated approach to development assistance by increasing the capacity of local people—from civil society, the business community, and institutions of democratic local governance—to work together to solve problems at the community level. It builds on one of the precepts of reengineering—increased involvement in the design and implementation of USAID programs by those who have a stake in them.

NPI emphasizes the formation of local and international coalitions of public and private sector people (both between societies and across diverse sectors in a society). Reports from the pilot Missions, compiled in the two-volume NPI Resource Guide, suggest that the effort invested increased local ownership and mobilized

more local resources. The initiative has increased efficiency, targeted development efforts more effectively, broadened access to benefits, and improved sustainability.

Customer Service

The President's Executive Order No. 12862 of September 1993 required that all federal agencies develop and implement customer service plans to measure customer satisfaction, improve program responsiveness and performance, and report results. We worked from our experience with country experimental labs, using technical support from headquarters. And by 1996, we had integrated customer service planning in every operating unit's strategic plan. We have also incorporated it in the Agency's Automated Directives System, our computerized internal manual of policies, essential procedures, and reference materials.

By the end of 1996, we had conducted customer surveys in almost all field operating units and consulted partners and customers in strategic plan development. We made consid-

erable progress in putting customer service plans in place in Missions, although most Washington operating units still do not have them. We also developed new training modules on customer service delivery and initiated limited staff training. Although we believe customer service has improved the quality of strategic planning and managing for results, we need to develop precise measures to validate those assertions.

Empowerment And Accountability

Empowerment involves locating authority and responsibility where resources are managed. Because information is the currency that supports employee empowerment, training is critical to help employees exercise their new authorities. One way we've promoted empowerment and accountability is by unifying headquarters' approval of Mission strategic plans and objectives with authorization to deliver assistance. We do that through management contracts between Mission directors and regional bureau assistant administrators. By the end of 1996, each field operating unit with an approved strategic plan had a management contract in place.

However, our experience so far indicates critical gaps in providing the environment needed for empowerment and accountability to succeed. For instance, some senior managers are reluctant to delegate authority to new teams, particularly if they haven't received adequate training on how to carry out responsibilities in a new environment. Our management contracts reinforce empowerment with heads of operating units, but we continue to struggle with how to provide training for both staff and senior managers.

In addition, operating expense shortages in 1996 meant program and staffing decisions were centralized, frustrating managers' attempts to promote accountability. We need to find ways to decentralize these decisions to lower levels to make the best use of limited operating expenses.

Results Orientation

Our results orientation means operating units are to manage toward achievement of results. This entails setting clear objectives and targets, collecting adequate information to judge progress, and adjusting strategies and tactics as required. This is an ongoing process in which failure can lead to success if we learn from the experience.

By the end of 1996, nearly all operating units expending development assistance were using a new strategic planning process. Field operating units typically propose strategic objectives that take five to eight years to achieve, reflecting the long-term effort required to realize sustainable economic and social development. Strategic objectives must be developed not only with host-country governments and Agency development partners (such as private voluntary organizations), but also with customer input, because it is important to involve those most affected by the interventions.

The inspector general's first interim report on USAID's implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 concluded that USAID substantially accomplished what it proposed as a pilot agency. It made progress in developing an Agency strategic plan and made significant progress in establishing performance monitoring systems to report results.

However, the report also said the Agency overstated its progress in reporting under GPRA and had not delegated responsibility for overseeing implementation of GPRA and the development of performance measures, as required by the Government Management and Reform Act. The report recommended delegating implementation responsibilities to one office. That would ensure that strategic plan issues relating to attribution, aggregation, data collection and reporting, and limiting goals and indicators to program areas are addressed.

During 1996 we continued to make progress toward creating a corporate learning culture—a stimulating environment where continuous improvement is a way of life. The Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) and the Agency's training division collaborated to present a series of 15 workshops, training some 350 employees and partners in strategic planning, performance measurement, and reengineering. CDIE also continued its annual Summer Seminar series, which looks at performance measurement issues for our goals.

Valuing Diversity

We address diversity as a core value in several ways. First, we carry out the mandates of the equal opportunity law, investigate allegations of discrimination, and respond affirmatively to indications of unfair practices, all of which influence the effectiveness and quality of the work environment.

Second, we value diversity because of our unique mission as a foreign affairs agency that works in different cultures. Effective teamwork and participation reinforce the value we place on diversity by providing an environment in which all employees are encouraged to participate, regardless of background, appearance, or interaction style. We have promoted diversity by using more multidisciplinary teams, encouraging use of expanded teams to include partners and customers, and empowering foreign service nationals to head teams or make major contributions to the work of teams.

Third, we believe diversity is a value that requires constant reinforcement through training. During 1996 we initiated training in team management practices and equal opportunity principles.



Achievements in 1996 In Business Areas

USAID made major progress in most of its core business areas and administrative support systems in 1996. These achievements built on the major reforms instituted since 1993.

Operations

Changes in how we plan, deliver, and monitor assistance have been the most dramatic. By the end of 1996, almost all Agency field operating units had strategic plans supported by management contracts. More than half of our Missions had formed and were operating in strategic objective teams with varying levels of delegated authorities. About 80 percent of all our operating units had performance monitoring systems in place with baseline data established for at least one strategic objective.

The Agency's reengineered and streamlined Program Operations System is in full use, and has resulted in dramatic improvements in efficiency. For example, the time from conceptualization to funding of an activity has been reduced by more than one half, according to USAID and Government

Accounting Office surveys conducted at selected Missions in 1996.

In addition, we have broadened the use of umbrella task ordering contracts and increased the use of fixed-price contracts, cutting the time to procure development services by half for some contract actions. Where eight separate documents were required for project approval, only four are required under the reengineered system. While much of this evidence is anecdotal, Missions are reporting similar results during reviews of the annual Results Reporting and Resource Request (R4).

The Automated Directives System (ADS), accessible either by CD-ROM or through the Agency's internal corporate web, replaces 17 of our 33 handbooks and eliminates an estimated 55 percent of all internal regulations.

Procurement

Procurement and assistance are two of the major ways we translate development objectives into performance. They are also among the most important areas of interaction among contractors, grantees, and USAID. Since 1994 we have been part of the overall federal effort to make procurement more user friendly, while administering resources responsibly. We concentrated on two areas: communication and training, and use of innovative contracting techniques and assistance agreements.

Improving communications with contractors and grantees is an important part of our reform effort. In 1996 we used our World Wide Web site to post contract information on some 75 solicitation documents—about half of all competitive contracts. Most of the queries we received on our Web site that year involved procurement.

Within USAID, however, it was equally important to improve working partnerships between activity or project managers and procurement personnel. In 1996 we developed a performance-based contracting course and scheduled training for 1997 for more than half of our procurement officers, as well as a number of nonprocurement personnel. The courses were designed to give new impetus to the use of performance-based contracting in USAID. Procurement personnel are participating more in program performance evaluations, as a result, which should improve contract administration.

In addition, we established a past-performance database on contractor execution and achievements. That is supported by an automated system that facilitates annual evaluation of contractor performance on all contracts more than \$500,000. Agency personnel began to have access to that information in late 1996.

During 1996, we also began using more contract modalities that focus on results. We developed performance-based contract models, and we awarded an increasing number of firm fixed-price contracts. These types of contracts emphasize outcomes and payment for successful completion of specified activities. In fact, level-of-effort contracts that pay for services according to the number of days worked are now the exception. In addition, we are using more award fees and incentive fees.

Organizational Management And Human Resources Management

1996 was a critical year for staffing and organizational restructuring. Driven by severe budget cuts, we began revamping our overseas presence, reducing U.S. direct hires in Missions by 34.4 percent compared with 1992. Eleven Missions were closed in 1996, and another 12 are beginning the transition to smaller, more focused programs.

The most serious and disruptive event of 1996, though, was the reduction in force (RIF). This, coupled with a government shutdown of almost two months, hurt morale and disrupted progress in reengineering. Budget-driven RIFs affected foreign service, general schedule, and foreign service national employees. They reduced U.S. direct-hire staff by 200—about 8 percent of our total U.S. work force. Foreign service nationals were cut by 484 or 10.2 percent.

In projecting staffing capabilities, we determined, in consultation with the State Department, that we would retain full Missions in 25 to 30 countries, about 40 percent of our current full Mission presence. Programs in smaller posts would remain in 15 to 20 countries. That means we will have a presence in only about 50 countries by the middle of the next decade, down from more than 100 countries in 1992.

Some in the Agency are concerned that such dramatic downsizing has eliminated the technical staff necessary to reach our sustainable development goals and depleted our stock of controllers, procurement officers, executive officers, and other management personnel. We need to look at ways to rebuild personnel and determine where best to deploy them—at headquarters or in the field.

We have changed the employee evaluation and assignments processes. Both have long been core concerns of employees, particularly those in the foreign service. 1996 was the first year we put in place a wholly revamped employee evaluation program. It ties employee work objectives to our operating units strategic objectives and, more broadly, the Agency's goals. It puts the emphasis on results and achievements rather than process, provides for 360 degree input—from co-workers, subordinates, supervisors, and relevant customers—empowers appraisal committees to nominate employees for promotion, and places a heavy value on teamwork.

By the end of 1996, we were evaluating the new program to determine ways to strengthen it. The new assignments process enhances transparency and efficiency. The goal is to reduce the time it takes to assign foreign service officers by an average of 50 percent.

Also in 1996 we completed a business systems design in human resources that developed a strategy for automating the critical functions, including assignments, work force planning, and payroll. The new system will give us an integrated database for those three areas, giving employees anywhere in the world on-line access to their records. We have begun procurement of an off-the-shelf software tailored to USAID's needs.

A major reform effort in 1996 was the launching of Reform, the reengineering effort. The initiative's objective was to review management, organization, and personnel issues that inhibit implementation of the new operations system. It will implement changes that will

- Give Missions increased authority to change their organizational structures to support team organizations
- Allow Missions greater latitude to delegate authorities to foreign service nationals
- Revise foreign service national position classifications to reflect the new way of doing business
- Give Missions greater latitude to install incentive systems that recognize results achievement and effective teamwork

Budget

During the past two years, we have struggled to simplify how we allocate resources. Our budget process has been encumbered by congressional directives, in addition to Clinton administration and Agency initiatives. These have significantly reduced our discretion to match resources with performance.

Since 1995, regional bureaus have used a resource allocation system that generally attempts to relate funding decisions in their budget requests to performance, country need, and foreign policy priorities. However, reflecting the unique development characteristics of each region, the bureaus adopted different approaches. This system provided a more transparent methodology for bureau allocations, but because bureau approaches were not comparable, Agencywide budget decisions did not necessarily match performance, need, and priorities.

By the end of 1996 we decided to issue guidance to our operating bureaus to put in place a common system for allocating resources. Under this system, all bureaus are to apply more consistent weights to factors such as performance, country need, development partnership with the host country, and foreign policy priorities. The goal is to identify priorities and trade-offs between as well as within regions. Our regional and central bureaus will use this approach to develop the 1999 internal budget submission.

Information Resources Management

Critical to making our core values succeed is effective information and communication. We measure effectiveness on one level by the quick dissemination of management, financial, and personnel information to the people who need it. An integrated information system, as envisioned by the New Management System, or NMS, empowers employees by providing ready access to shared information and improves accountability through better record-keeping. On another level, communication promotes management effectiveness and teamwork by sharing experiences and best practices within and outside the Agency.

Over the past year we have improved our ability to communicate—internally, with employees, and externally, with customers. 1996 witnessed the development of a variety of channels for reaching employees and customers. These include USAID Internet and intranet web pages with links to Agency documents, policies, and announcements in Washington and 40 of our largest Missions; *On Track*, a monthly reengineering digest; our Automated Directives System and supplementary references on CD-ROM as well as on the Agency's intranet; a Program and Policy Coordination/Center for Development Information

and Evaluation series on reengineering best practices and participatory practices, and Performance Monitoring and Evaluation *Tips* available electronically through CDIE On-Line; a Reengineering and Reform Reference Guide issued periodically by the Agency's Quality Council; establishment of an electronic bulletin board on reinventing USAID; and an employee-developed and -maintained network called RF-NET that serves as an interactive forum on reengineering and Agency policy. All these are supported by electronic help desks. By the end of 1996 all employees had access to at least one channel of management support for management and policy questions.

Our employees are relying more heavily than ever on information technology to enhance productivity and support teamwork. Nearly all our policy statements, USAID-relevant news clips, and remarks on issues by senior USAID and other foreign affairs executives are accessible through USAID's Web site. Our Web site has links to other international organizations, foreign affairs agencies, and nongovernmental organizations, reducing the time dedicated to research and data gathering. Personnel information can also be easily retrieved.

We are also using information technology to improve our outreach to customers and others with a stake in our programs. By the end of 1996, USAID corporate Web pages on the Internet were reaching an estimated 65 million people worldwide. Organizations and individuals are now able to access procurement policies and business opportunities from nearly anywhere in the world. This initiative has clearly responded to outside demand. Monitoring our Web site, we have found most traffic is on procurement.

USAID partners and hundreds of other development professionals join with staff to discuss issues in customer-focused, participatory development on GP-NET, an electronic conversation group, and the Participation Forum, which has periodic sessions posted on USAID's home page.

For employees to adapt to new information technology requires substantial training. A modest beginning was made in 1996, when we trained 200 professionals in the New Management System. This group formed the faculty for training worldwide. We also provide training electronically, using e-mail and CD-ROM, for example, in our new operating systems, as well as in software packages such as WordPerfect, Windows, Lotus Notes, and various spreadsheet programs.

The most serious information management challenge we faced in 1996 was introducing a fully functioning NMS worldwide. Enthusiasm for this integrated financial and information management system was high. Both hardware and software are standardized, and a standard international transmission system was established as the platform for data transmission. We directed substantial effort and funding toward training.

The system was rolled out on October 1, 1996, in 43 Missions and in Washington. The success of the system could resolve the Agency's long-standing lack of an integrated financial accounting system and provide greater efficiencies in budgeting, reporting results, and managing financial resources. Initially, the system processed \$288 million in contracts and grants, as well as an annual \$1.2 billion cash transfer to Israel. In addition, 14,500 records from financial accounting and contract information management systems were moved to the new system's database.

Soon after the system was introduced, however, unanticipated problems that had not come up in testing emerged. These problems, which include interactivity between the different modules, telecommunications linkage problems, and data reconciliation, are slated to be addressed in 1997-98. Problems are not unusual for the start of a new information system and should not impede

our ultimate objective—a system that meets the requirements of an integrated financial and information management system called for in the Chief Financial Officers Act. We are using an unconventional systems approach, but the ground it is breaking, if successful, will benefit government as a whole. We continue to work with the Office of Management and Budget, the Government Accounting Office, and our own inspector general and private sector systems experts to ensure that success.

Financial Management

We improved several areas of financial management significantly. In accountability, we have increased use of automation, permitting us to streamline cash reconciliation. By increasing our use of electronic systems, we pay 99 percent of our personnel through electronic fund transfers. Moreover, we paid 96 percent of domestic vouchers electronically, one of the highest rates of any government agency. Although we did not meet the Treasury frequency rate standard under the Prompt Payment Act (2 percent or fewer of invoices paid late), we were still within the Treasury standard of .02 percent on the amount of interest incurred in relation to the total dollar value of invoices paid. Moreover, the actual number of invoices paid

late decreased by 5 percent, despite problems created by two lengthy furloughs during the fiscal year.

We made limited progress in correcting internal accounting and administrative controls. Ten weaknesses in those controls were identified in 1995. Chief among them was the lack of a single, integrated financial management system. Those 10 remained in 1996. Owing to concerns about internal controls and financial information in the 1996 consolidated financial statements, our inspector general was unable to determine whether the statements were presented fairly or accurately. We had a delay in implementing our integrated financial management system, part of NMS, which prevented significant progress in correcting these weaknesses. But full implementation of the New Management System will correct most of these weaknesses.

In the area of audit, we made a concerted effort to enhance our working partnership with the Office of the Inspector General. The Office of Management Planning and Innovation in USAID's Management Bureau has developed an audit resolution program that closely tracks

and works to resolve recommendations that have not been acted on in more than six months.

With the inspector general's office, we have developed and promulgated procedures and policies for managing and following up on audits through our Automated Directives System. In addition, the management planning and innovation office and the inspector general's office jointly developed a consolidated audit information system that went into effect in April 1996.

Administrative Services

1996 saw the start of intensive work between USAID and State management bureaus, as well as other foreign affairs agencies, to consolidate overseas and Washington-based administrative functions where practical. The organizations agreed to replace the old system of assigning overseas support costs among foreign affairs agencies with a new, more accountable system called ICASS (International Cooperative Administrative Support Services). The long-term objective of the new system is quality service at our field posts at the lowest cost.

Under the system, service providers will be evaluated and held responsible for meeting customer service and account-

ability standards. ICASS is intended to more closely align the costs of delivering management services with the demand for that service. Through local interagency councils, foreign affairs agencies in the field share responsibility for management of shared services. Agencies will pay their fair share (based on usage) of administrative costs. Costs are determined using a methodology that all agencies agree to. Each agency provides services in areas where it has developed a competence.

The new system is being implemented over three years. In 1996, it was tested at four pilot posts, two of which (Poland and El Salvador) had USAID presence. The system was adjusted after an assessment conducted in April. We distributed ICASS handbooks and the required software to the field by the end of 1996. The system was introduced worldwide in 1997. Once Congress approves a transfer of funding, ICASS will be fully implemented.

The most significant administrative event of 1996–97, though, was planning for the consolidation of our operating units into an office building at Federal Triangle. When completed, USAID will move from 11 sites to 1. This will improve productivity by eliminating the need to transport employees between buildings and by facilitating contacts between bureaus. A major challenge, however, will be to sustain close coordination with the State Department now that we will be housed in a different building. This will require, at minimum, improvements in electronic communications, including e-mail.

Finally, in 1996 we initiated our last business area analysis of property management. USAID acquires and controls property in support of its offices in Washington and overseas. The Agency tracks this property through 15 automated and manual systems. The purpose of this last analysis was to identify system requirements for the purchase of commercial off-the-shelf software to replace the current cumbersome systems and allow better property management and accountability.

Conclusion

The objective of reforming our management systems has been to deliver development resources more responsively, effectively, and efficiently. As our global mission has become more complex and we respond increasingly to transnational problems, countries in transition, and manmade and physical emergencies, our management systems have been challenged. Changes in the international environment and cuts in staffing demand management change. A traditional USAID Mission may no longer be appropriate in some cases. Increasingly, we judge the success of management responses by managers' adaptability and effectiveness in a variety of development situations.

Our management systems tried to meet this test in 1996 in response to program challenges in southern Africa, Bosnia, Cambodia, Liberia, the new independent states, Rwanda, and the West Bank–Gaza, to name a few. We learned that reengineered systems demonstrate their value to the extent they help us meet such challenges with fewer resources and



staff. We tested our new management approaches in the heat of crisis and discovered we need to reassess the relationship between Washington and the field. Specifically, we need to clarify which functions are appropriate for headquarters and which are appropriate for field operating units.

We also need to look into developing the ability to manage activities without direct field presence. Despite formal changes in delegating authority and promoting empowerment, some Missions told headquarters that some decisions were more centralized in Washington than in years past and that workloads and paperwork were increasing. Severe budget and staffing constraints imposed by appropriations cuts were partly to blame for this situation. But we need to reassess internal decision-making and delegation of authority in this light. Our NGO partners, who often carry out AID-financed activities in countries where we have no Mission presence, have pointed out inconsistencies in the NGO–USAID partnership. They suggested ways to strengthen this relationship by improving

communications and making Agency operations more consistent with our core values.

1996 further demonstrated the technology-dependence of USAID’s reengineered management systems. Technology has a multiplier effect in being able to help us track financial resources and report on results. It is a powerful tool that allows us to work more efficiently in a team-based, empowered environment. The challenge is making technology live up to expectations. That said, our ability to implement management reforms is not hostage to having such technology fully in hand.

We are moving from the pilot phase to institutionalizing reform in our business areas. Of course, not all areas are moving at the same pace. Experience in both the public and private sectors demonstrates that reengineered organizations do not remake all of their systems at once. The challenge is rather to maintain coherence through effective coordination among all business areas. Problems appeared in 1996–97 in human resources (specifically, workforce planning and staff train-

ing), organizational management (the structure and staffing of Missions), procurement (removing rigidities from the procurement process), and information management. Groups of Agency employees have been organized to work on each of these problems.

Most important is the critical change in corporate culture that must be nurtured and sustained. People’s attitudes don’t all change at the same time. Even when attitudes do change, translating that into a new corporate culture or doctrinal change requires continuous behavior reinforcement and organizational self-evaluation. The past year has taught us that if we remain a learning organization, we will sustain our new systems. This means tolerating risk where called for, instilling controls where required, and rewarding achievement where demonstrated.





Annexes

