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Annex 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts country evaluations called Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national efforts for achieving development results. The purpose of an ADR is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP country programme
- Strengthen the accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen the accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ADRs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of the IEO is twofold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (b) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function, and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership. Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ADRs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

The first ADR for Jordan was conducted in 2006. UNDP Jordan has been selected for a second ADR since its country programme will end in 2017. The ADR will be conducted in 2016 to feed into the development of the new country programme.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is small country strategically located in the Middle East, sharing borders with Iraq, Israel, Saudi Arabia, the State of Palestine and the Syrian Arab Republic. The country has a relatively young, largely urban population of about 9.53 million, of which Arabs constituting various tribes who migrated from all directions form the majority. Administratively the country is divided into 12 governorates, and the system of governance is centralized power with some local coordination.

Jordan is a constitutional monarchy with extensive legislative and executive power conferred on the King as the Head of State. The bicameral national assembly consists of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Senate is appointed by the King while the House of Representatives is elected by direct vote of the people to a four-year term. The last parliamentary elections were conducted in 2013 while the next round was scheduled to take place in January 2017.

---

The country weathered well the regional unrest. In response to non-violent demonstrations in 2011 calling for more jobs and democracy, His Majesty King Abdullah II initiated immediate political and economic reforms. The reforms are ongoing and the most recent political reforms include a series of governance laws drafted in 2015, which propose changes to the electoral system. The proposed changes include the removal of the Independent Election Commission’s autonomy in recruiting, and placing this authority under the Civil Service Bureau, while on the Political Parties Law the threshold on founding members has been relaxed from 500 to 150 members, and quotas for women and youth removed.

Jordan has a free market-driven economy, with outward-oriented economic policies and an approach led by the private sector. The services sector constituted about 72 percent of the total gross domestic product, while industry represented 25 percent in 2014. It is an upper-middle-income country, with a per-capita gross national income of $5,160. The country has limited natural resources and is heavily dependent on external support. As one of the most open economies of the region, Jordan is well integrated with its neighbours through trade, remittances, foreign direct investment, and tourism. The country is thus vulnerable to regional volatility.

The country’s national agenda is captured in Vision 2025, launched in May 2015, and has the following main objectives: human resources development, social development, economic development, decentralization and governorate development. Vision 2025 is translated in the Executive Development Plan and the current workplan runs from 2016 to 2018. Vision 2025 places citizens at the heart of the development process, defining its main goal as improving the welfare of citizens. The development strategy emphasizes investment in human capital, and Jordan has been able to export its educated labour force to the Gulf States while simultaneously receiving a large number of expatriate workers to fill low-paid jobs.

MDG targets and indicators had been integrated and reported on in Jordan’s national development plans since the early 2000s. MDG achievement overall was satisfactory. According to Jordan’s second MDG Report in 2010 the country had achieved MDG 2 and was on track on MDGs 5 and 6 while MDGs 1, 3, 4 and 7 remained in reach with targeted policy actions. However, the regional insecurity and influx of refugees into Jordan as well as the impacts of the global financial crisis are thought to have affected the progress made on the MDGs. Jordan was one of more than 88 countries that carried out post-2015 national consultations, and the SDGs have been incorporated into Vision 2025.

On gender, the Constitution states that “All men and women are deemed to be equal as citizens”. Jordan has been working to realize this goal at a varied pace and with mixed results. In contrast to the country’s impressive human development indicators, its gender inequality index has a value of 0.478, ranking it 86 out of 188 countries (2016 Human Development Report). The GII is considered the loss in human development due to gender-based inequalities in the three dimensions: reproductive health, empowerment, and economic activity.

Jordan’s current development challenges emanate largely from adverse regional developments. Particularly the crises involving Syria and Iraq are the largest shocks affecting Jordan, reflected in the huge impact of the refugee influx, impact on the overall fiscal and economic situation, disrupted trade

---

6 It was preceded by the National Agenda 2006–2015.
7 UNDP in Jordan website.
routes and decline in tourism. These led to decreasing investments in Jordan, increasing debt and stagnating growth rates, among other effects.\textsuperscript{8} Unemployment is worsening and reached 12.5 percent in the first half of 2015.\textsuperscript{9} The country also faces greater social tensions, with increased radicalization and violent extremism. His Majesty King Abdullah II launched a seven-step campaign to fight violent extremism and radicalization.\textsuperscript{10}

The Syria crisis: According to government sources, the country hosts 1.4 million Syrian refugees, 630,000 of whom are registered by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (October 2015). This is in addition to 750,000 Syrians who lived in the country before the crisis. The Government of Jordan has maintained an open border policy and granted Syrian refugees free access to health and education. The majority of refugees (87 percent) live outside camps in some of the poorest areas of the country, and the resulting overcrowding and competition for housing and employment is causing social tensions in host communities.\textsuperscript{11} The Government adopted a comprehensive approach to address the Syria crisis, establishing the Jordan Response Platform for the Syria Crisis (JRPSC). It issued the Jordan Response Plan (JRP) 2015, which addresses both refugee assistance and resilience. A three-year rolling work plan has also been finalized (2016–2018).

3. **UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN JORDAN**

UNDP’s development assistance to the Government of Jordan is governed by the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement signed by both parties in 1976. Under this agreement UNDP develops a country programme of cooperation formalized in the country programme document (CPD) and the country programme action plan (CPAP). Since 2002 the Jordan–UNDP country programme is a component of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF is one of the tools of the United Nations reform processes to improve the coherence, efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations operational activities. It describes the collective response of the United Nations system to national development priorities. The UNDAF, CPDs and CPAPs are usually developed every five years.

The ongoing UNDP Jordan country programme 2013–2017 is the ninth programme since signature of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement. Based on the UNDAF for the same period, it maintains the same focus of the previous country programme (2008–2012) under three thematic areas: (i) governance; (II) environment and; (iii) poverty reduction (Millennium Development Goals 8, 7 and 1). The country programme sought to address these issues in an integrated manner, with a particular focus on women and young people. It was to be implemented at national, subnational and local levels following a “Local Development” approach at the local level ensuring strong local community empowerment, while strengthening targeted local institutions’ capacities and systems. Each project of the country programme in its design was to ensure a focus on national capacity development and use of national systems; exit strategies; and gender mainstreaming and a human rights-based approach. Local knowledge acquisition and dissemination were also strategies of the country programme.\textsuperscript{12}

Under the governance thematic area, UNDP planned to support intragovernmental institutions, including political parties and parliamentary committees to strengthen Parliament’s oversight, representative and legislative functions. UNDP also planned to provide electoral support to the newly
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\textsuperscript{8} UNDP, Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) 2015.
\textsuperscript{10} UNDP, ROAR 2015.
\textsuperscript{11} UNDP, ROAR, 2015.
established Independent Election Commission. At the governorate level planned support focused on review of local government systems and establishing innovative mechanisms to strengthen women’s and young people’s political participation. Also included under this pillar were capacity development of non-governmental organizations to empower them to take up a role in the development process, and support to the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation on aid effectiveness and donor coordination.

In the environment portfolio, UNDP planned to support the country’s transition to an energy-efficient low-carbon economy through the development of various national action plans, analysis of clean technology options and participation of the private sector. Support to water supply and water governance-related initiatives were also included. Under disaster risk reduction, UNDP envisioned focused support to urban planning in three cities (Aqaba, Petra and Irbid). Under poverty reduction, UNDP planned for continued support in improved poverty analysis and monitoring; youth empowerment through employment and civic engagement; and area-based development in two selected governorates. This programme also planned to support arriving Syrian refugees in host communities in the North (Irbid and Mafraq governorates).

The CPD and CPAP under examination did not include a specific programme area related to the response to the Syrian refugee crisis, as the issue was emerging when these documents were developed. However, since 2014 this component has grown and has become the largest component of the country programme. While the UNDP CPAP was not updated to include Syrian refugee response, the UNDAF 2013–2017 was updated in 2015. The new United Nations Assistance Framework (UNAF) 2015–2017 supersedes the original document because it addresses the Syrian refugee crisis and emphasizes resilience programming to reinforce Government institutions and services most affected by the crisis.

| Table 1. Country programme outcomes and indicative resources (2013–2017) |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Country programme outcome                        | Indicative resources (US$ million) |
|                                                  | Regular | Other |
| Governance                                       |         |       |
| Outcome 24 Jordan has undertaken political and   | 600,000 | 7,950,000 |
| institutional reform at national and subnational |         |       |
| levels in a participatory, transparent and       |         |       |
| accountable manner                               |         |       |
| Outcome 25 Jordan has institutionalized necessary| 480,000 | 8,800,000 |
| policies and mechanisms for effective and        |         |       |
| inclusive participation of young people in social|         |       |
| cultural, economic and political life            |         |       |
| Environment                                      |         |       |
| Outcome 26 Government and national institutions  | 670,000 | 10,200,000 |
| have operationalized mechanisms to develop and   |         |       |
| implement strategies and plans targeting key    |         |       |
| cultural, environmental and disaster risk        |         |       |
| reduction issues (including a transition to      |         |       |
| green economy)                                   |         |       |
| Socioeconomic                                   |         |       |
| Outcome 27 Jordan has institutionalized improved | 1,750,000 | 26,950,000 |
| social protection and poverty alleviation        |         |       |
| mechanisms for vulnerable people at national    |         |       |
| and subnational levels                          |         |       |
| Total                                            | 28,700,000 |       |

Source: UNDP Jordan CPD 2013–2017 (DP/DCP/JOR/2)

13 Ibid.
At design, the country programme had four planned outcome results (see table 1) with an indicative budget of $28.7 million ($1.75 million was to be UNDP core/regular funding). The country programme budget has since grown substantially and is $50 million as of April 2016.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This ADR will focus on the ongoing country programme (i.e., from 2013) while taking account of some longer-term activities that extend from the previous country programme cycle.

As the country-level, evaluation of UNDP ADRs will focus on the formal UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board and funded by all sources of finance, including core UNDP resources, donor funds and government funds. However, the scope of the ADR includes the entirety of UNDP’s activities at national and subnational levels and therefore also covers initiatives from the regional and global programmes. It is also important to note that a UNDP country office (CO) may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these ‘non-project’ activities may be crucial for the political and social agenda of a country.

Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of United Nations Volunteers and United Nations Capital Development Fund in joint work with UNDP. This information will be used for synthesis in order to provide corporate level evaluative evidence of performance of the associated fund and programme.

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology comprises two components: (i) assessment of UNDP’s contribution by thematic/programme area, and (ii) assessment of the quality of this contribution. The ADR will present its findings and assessment according to the set criteria provided below, based on an analysis by CPD/CPAP outcome area, to generate findings, broad conclusions and recommendations for future action.

• **UNDP’s contribution by programme areas.** The ADR will assess the effectiveness of UNDP in contributing to development results of Jordan through its programme activities. Specific attention will be paid to assessing the contribution related to UNDP’s overall vision of helping countries achieve poverty eradication and reduce inequalities and exclusion, and its contribution to furthering gender equality and women’s empowerment.

• **The quality of UNDP’s contribution.** The ADR will also assess the quality of UNDP’s contribution based on:
  - Relevance of UNDP’s projects and outcomes to the country’s needs and national priorities
  - Efficiency of UNDP’s interventions in terms of use of human and financial resources
  - Sustainability of the results to which UNDP contributed

---

14 Further elaboration of the criteria can be found in the ADR Manual 2011.

15 Using the UN System-wide Action Plan to improve gender equality and the empowerment of women across the UN system. www.unwomen.org/~/media/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/How%20We%20Work/UNSystemCoordination/UN-SWAP-Framework-Dec-2012.pdf.
Key explanatory factors: The ADR will also assess how specific factors explain UNDP’s performance, namely, the engagement principles and alignment parameters of the 2014–2017 UNDP Strategic Plan. For example, in addition to assessing UNDP’s contribution to gender equality and women’s empowerment, the evaluation will assess gender mainstreaming as a factor of UNDP’s performance for each country programme outcome. Second, UNDP strategic positioning will be analysed from the perspective of the organization’s mandate and the agreed and emergent development needs and priorities in the country. This will entail systematic analysis of UNDP’s position within the national development and policy space, as well as strategies used by UNDP to maximize its contribution. Finally, the ADR will assess how managerial practices impacted achievement of programmatic goals.

In assessing the above, the evaluation will also examine factors that are assumed to have had an impact on UNDP’s performance, including the impact of the Syria crisis on the design and implementation of the country programme.

Assessment at the outcome level: An outcome paper will be developed for each outcome noted in table 1 above, which examines the programme’s progress towards the respective outcome and UNDP’s contribution to that change since 2013. The outcome papers will assess UNDP’s contribution to the outcome, using the evaluation criteria, and identify outcome-specific factors that have influenced this contribution. Each outcome paper will be prepared according to a standard template provided by the IEO, which will facilitate synthesis and the identification of conclusions and recommendations in the ADR report for UNDP to consider together with main partners for future programming.

It should be noted that the examined CPD does not include any programme area related to the response to the refugee crisis, as this issue did not exist at the time of formulation on the CPD. Special emphasis needs to be undertaken to examine that part of programme intervention, as it has been the biggest outcome portfolio of the office since 2014.

Gender analysis: Gender is treated as a cross-cutting issue in the country programme to be mainstreamed in all programme components. The evaluation will undertake an analysis of UNDP’s contribution to gender equality and empowerment of women through its programmes and projects. The country office self-ratings per UNDP’s gender marker tool will be validated. The evaluation will also use the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES) to qualify UNDP’s contribution.

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data: An assessment was carried out for each outcome to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints and to determine the data collection needs and method. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available, indicating:

---

16 The Strategic Plan 2014–2017 engagement principles include: national ownership and capacity; human rights-based approach; sustainable human development; gender equality and women’s empowerment; voice and participation; South-South and triangular cooperation; active role as global citizens; and universality.

17 Using inter alia the Gender Marker data and the Gender Seal parameters based on UNDP/UNEG methods.

18 This information is extracted from analysis of the goals inputted in the Enhanced RBM platform, the financial results in the Executive Snapshot, the results in the Global Staff Survey, and interviews at the management and operations levels in the CO.

19 The gender results effectiveness scale (GRES) has been developed and applied as part of IEO’s “Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment” conducted in 2015. The GRES classifies gender results into five categories: gender-negative; gender-blind; gender-targeted; gender-responsive and; gender-transformative.
According to the CPAP 2013–2017, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the country programme will be undertaken in line with the UNDAF results matrix and M&E plan. The UNDAF M&E plan lists the surveys/studies, evaluations and M&E capacity-development activities of participating UN agencies. Whereas the indicators for monitoring progress of the UNDAF and the UNDP country programme results are described in the respective Results and Resources matrices, there is no mapping of which survey/study or evaluation will inform which indicator.

The UNDP CPAP 2013–2017 lists some 22 outcome-level indicators against the four outcome results. These are reported on annually in the ROARs. Most of the indicators are, however, more amenable to measuring output rather than outcome results, as they are focused on measuring the quantity of services produced, instead of the quality of services, and changes in individual or institutional performance. This will make it difficult to systematically measure (input-output-outcome) UNDP’s contribution. Moreover, 7 out of the 22 indicators had missing baseline data.

The costed evaluation plan of the CPD 2013–2017 listed 17 evaluations to be conducted over the country programme period: 3 outcome and 14 project evaluations. Of the 14 project evaluations, 9 were to be terminal evaluations. As of March 2016, UNDP Jordan completed 15 evaluations, and had pending 7, bringing the number of planned evaluations to 22. All completed activities were project evaluations; no outcome evaluations were conducted. Completed project evaluations will be important sources of information for the ADR insofar as they meet quality standards of the IEO.

Jordan’s national Department of Statistics produces updated national socioeconomic data. According to the World Bank’s Statistical Capacity Indicator Dashboard, Jordan maintained a steady overall statistical capacity from 2008 to 2015, and it performs as well or better than other countries in the region. Primary sources of data regarding the socioeconomic context and indicators of progress, where applicable, will be drawn from government sources.

There is a stand-alone monitoring platform on the Syrian refugee crisis.

There exists national evaluation capacity under the auspices of EvalJordan, which can potentially supply national consultants to the ADR.

Regarding the security situation in Jordan, Jordan “remains a stable kingdom and affords reasonable security and safety for UN staff.” It has “medium levels of risk from terrorism and hazards and low levels of risk from armed conflict, crime, and civil unrest.” However, the western Syrian-Jordanian border area has a security level of “low (2)”, while the western part of that same border including the Iraqi border is at a security level of “substantial (4)”. The ADR will take into consideration the security situation during the selection of project areas for field visits.

**Data collection methods:** The evaluation will mainly use qualitative approaches, including desk review of programme policies and plans, annual reports, relevant studies and evaluations (both published and grey literature), primary data collection (in-depth interviews and focus group discussions) and analysis. Specific evaluation questions for each evaluation criterion will be further detailed and outlined in the outcome papers. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviews will include government representatives, civil society organizations, private sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus groups will be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

---

20 UNDP, CPAP, October 2013.
24 Ibid.
The criteria for selecting places for field visits include:

- Programme coverage (projects covering the various components and cross-cutting areas)
- Financial expenditure (projects of all sizes, both large and smaller pilot projects)
- Proportionate geographic coverage (not only national-level and urban-based projects, but also those in the various regions)\(^{26}\)
- Maturity (covering both completed and active projects; the cut-off for completed projects will be 2012 but in a few cases will be earlier)\(^{27}\)
- Programme cycle (coverage of projects/activities from the past and mainly the current cycles)
- Degree of “success” (coverage of successful projects, as well as projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned)
- Accessibility and security clearance
- Implementation modality (direct and national implementation)

The IEO and the country office have identified an initial list of background and programme-related documents, which is posted on an ADR SharePoint website. The following secondary data will be reviewed: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP ROARs; and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners. The ADR will also support, where possible and appropriate, the ongoing data-collection endeavours being undertaken by UNDP projects for outcome monitoring.

**Validation:** The evaluation will use triangulation of information collected from different sources and/or by different methods to ensure that the data are valid.

**Stakeholder involvement:** At the start of the data collection field mission, a stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, as well as those who may not work with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. Each outcome paper will also develop a stakeholder analysis within the scope of the outcome.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

**Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP:** The UNDP IEO will conduct the ADR in consultation with the Government of Jordan, the UNDP Jordan country office and the Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS). The IEO evaluation manager will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ADR, including the cost of short-term support for logistics and translation of a person in the office for two months.

**Government of Jordan:** The Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation and other key government counterparts of UNDP in Jordan will facilitate the conduct of the ADR by providing necessary access to information sources within the Government; safeguarding the independence of the evaluation; and jointly organizing the final stakeholder meeting with the IEO when it is time to present

\(^{26}\) Given the territorial inequalities in the country and differences between urban and rural areas, the analysis will reach out and validate the results and development inequalities at the departmental level where UNDP (and national or UN partners) operate.

\(^{27}\) These are projects related to disabilities, which will be purposefully selected to contribute to an ongoing corporate thematic evaluation on disabilities.
findings and results of the evaluation. Additionally, the counterparts will be responsible within the Government for the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ADR process.

**UNDPI country office in Jordan:** The CO will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders; make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP’s programmes, projects and activities in the country; and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The CO will provide the evaluation team support in kind (e.g., arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; and assistance for the project site visits). The CO will be required to prepare a management response to address the recommendations generated by the ADR. The CO will also lead the organization of the stakeholder workshop to be conducted in Amman. To ensure the independence of the views expressed in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes, CO staff will not participate.

**UNDPI Regional Bureau for Arab States:** The RBAS will support the evaluation through information-sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

**Evaluation Team:** The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ADR. The IEO will ensure gender balance in the team, which will include the following members:

- **Evaluation Manager (EM):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for managing the ADR, including to: (i) prepare and design the evaluation (i.e., this TOR); and (ii) select the evaluation team and provide methodological guidance. The EM will cover the portion of the evaluation related to:
  - strategic positioning issues
  - coordination issues
  - preparation of reports for outcomes
  - the synthesis process
  - preparation of the draft and final reports
  - the stakeholder workshop

  The EM will travel to Amman for four weeks.

- **Associate Evaluation Manager (AEM):** The AEM will support the EM in:
  - preparation and design of the evaluation
  - the selection of the evaluation team
  - undertake synthesis with EM
  - review draft report
  - other aspects of the ADR process as may be required

  Specifically, the AEM will oversee data collection and analysis for one outcome area of the country programme. The AEM will travel to Amman for two weeks.

- **Consultants:** A team of two or three national/regional consultants will collect and analyse data for assigned thematic areas as well as the contribution to gender equality and empowerment of women. They will produce outcome/background papers based on the standard template prepared by the IEO.

- **Research Assistant (RA):** A research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and documentation.
The roles of the different members of the evaluation team are summarized in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/area</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic governance</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>EM and AEM</td>
<td>EM and AEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic/resilience</td>
<td>AEM</td>
<td>AEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and women's empowerment</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic positioning</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/management</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>EM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process as outlined in the ADR Methodology Manual. The following represents a summary of key elements of the process. Four major phases provide a framework for conducting the evaluation:

**Phase 1: Preparation.** The IEO prepares the TOR and the evaluation design, following desk review and discussions with the UNDP Jordan office and the RBAS.

Additional evaluation team members, comprising national/international/regional evaluators or development professionals, will be recruited once the TOR is complete.

**Phase 2: Data collection and analysis.** This phase will commence in mid-July. An evaluation matrix with detailed questions and means of data collection and verification will be developed to guide data collection. The following process will be undertaken:

- Pre-mission activities: Evaluation team members will conduct desk reviews of reference material, and prepare a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, and identify the outcome ToC, outcome-specific evaluation questions, gaps and issues that will require validation during the field-based phase of data collection.
- Data collection mission: The evaluation team will undertake a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission is four weeks in July and August 2016. Data will be collected according to the approach and responsibilities outlined in section 6.

**Phase 3: Synthesis, report writing and review.** Based on the outcome/background reports, the EM will undertake a synthesis process. The first draft of the ADR report will be prepared and subjected to the quality control process of the IEO. Once cleared by the IEO, the first draft will be further circulated with the CO and the UNDP RBAS for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for review.
The draft report will then be shared at a stakeholder workshop in Jordan, where the results of the evaluation will be presented to key national stakeholders. Moreover, the ways forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the lessons and recommendations from the report, and to strengthening accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder workshops, the final evaluation report will be prepared. The UNDP Jordan CO will prepare the management response to the ADR, under the oversight of the RBAS.

**Phase 4: Production, dissemination and follow-up.** The ADR report will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board by the time of its approval of a new CPD. It will be widely distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organizations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Jordan CO and the Government of Jordan will disseminate it to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website\(^{28}\) as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The RBAS will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.\(^{29}\)

### 9. TIME FRAME FOR THE ADR PROCESS 2016–2017

The time frame and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively\(^{30}\) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible party</th>
<th>Proposed timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR – approval by the IEO</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of other evaluation team members</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Data collection and analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis</td>
<td>RA/EM</td>
<td>March–April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of chapter 1(introduction, context analysis, UNDP country programme)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>May–July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>EM/AEM/Consultants</td>
<td>Mid July–mid August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and finalization of outcome reports</td>
<td>EM/AEM/Consultants</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3: Synthesis and report writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero draft ADR for clearance by IEO</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft ADR for CO/RBAS review (factual corrections)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft for national reference group review</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft management response</td>
<td>CO/RBAS</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder workshop</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4: Production and follow-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and formatting</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of the final report</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


30 The timeframe is indicative of the process and deadlines, and does not imply full-time engagement of the evaluation team during the period.
## Annex 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent did the project achieve its stated objectives?</td>
<td>1a. Results achieved/changes, if any brought about by the project at policy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institutional, individual and community levels as applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. Major factors contributing to the achievement of results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c. Key results not achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d. Major factors impeding the achievement of results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1e. Any positive or negative unintended results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent did the project reach vulnerable and excluded groups?</td>
<td>2a. Mechanisms/criteria applied by the project to reach the vulnerable (poor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minorities, disabled, youth, HIV/AIDS)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent did the project mainstream gender issues?</td>
<td>3a. Extent to which benefitted from the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How well aligned is the project/programme with national priorities as well</td>
<td>4a. National plan/policy/strategic framework the project objectives fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the needs of the community?</td>
<td>under, if any at all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b. How needs of the community and beneficiaries were assessed (e.g. needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assessment, consultations, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c. Participants in planning and design of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent is/was the project aligned with UNDP’s agenda in</td>
<td>5a. Criteria used in identifying project locations and beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressing inequality and exclusion and gender equality and women’s</td>
<td>5b. Did such criteria identify excluded and worse-off groups in villages (poor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowerment?</td>
<td>minorities, disabled, people living with HIV/AIDS)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, are they covered in the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5c. Integration of gender issues in project design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key questions</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Were baselines established for agreed indicators on reduction of inequalities?</td>
<td>Extent to which these were monitored and reported on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent were the approaches taken by UNDP appropriate in terms of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project design (including leveraging of synergies between projects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation approach (including DIM/NIM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balance between upstream and downstream, including in financial allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How efficiently has UNDP used the available resources to deliver high-quality outputs in a timely manner, and to achieve the targeted objectives?</td>
<td>7a. Extent required support (technical, financial, supplies, etc.) for producing results provided by UNDP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7b. If so, adequacy and timeliness of support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent did UNDP address implementation issues faced by the project?</td>
<td>8a. Implementation challenges faced by the project, if any? Extent to which UNDP took prompt action to solve these?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How is the current project management structure including reporting structure, oversight responsibility set up?</td>
<td>9a. M&amp;E activities of the project and how frequently are they conducted? How are the results from M&amp;E reported to UNDP, donors and other partners? What worked, what did not work and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent did UNDP initiate efforts to ensure synergies among various UNDP projects and with those of other partners?</td>
<td>10a. Extent to which UNDP ensured synergies among various interventions? What were the results of this? What were the contributing/hindering factors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent UNDP establish partnerships or coordination mechanisms with other key actors? (CSOs, private sector, UN agencies, donors, academia/research institutions)</td>
<td>11a. Frequency of coordination and progress review meetings with relevant stakeholders? Were these recorded? Any mechanism to follow up on action points?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent did the project address sustainability concerns in its designs?</td>
<td>12a. Plans to ensure continuity of the efforts in terms of funding, technical capacity, if any?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12b. Exit strategy that describes these plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent will project results be sustainable?</td>
<td>13a. Key enabling/constraining factors (e.g. political, economic / financial, technical, and environmental factors)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13b. How well UNDP identified and addressed such factors?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Government of Jordan

ABU AMEEREH, Ahmad, Libb Youth Centre, Madaba

ABU AWALI, Abdalla, Dr., Advisor for Coastal Management, Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (ASEZA)

ABU EISHEH, Khaled, Director of Planning and Architectural Studies, ASEZA

ABU HAZEEM, Lutfi, Assistant Secretary General, Ministry of Finance

ADWAN, Raed, Governor, Zarqa Governorate

AJARMEH, Ahmad, International Cooperation Officer, Ministry of Political Development

AL HASANAT, Hussein, Eng., Director of Research and Strategic Planning, Head of Disaster Risk Reduction Unit, PDTRA

AL KHAILDI, Mohamed, Ministry of the Interior

AL KHAARABSHEH, Saleh, Secretary General, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation

AL MUHAISEN, Fuad, Eng., Assistant Secretary General, Ministry of Agriculture

AL OMARI, Sharif, Director, Counter Extremism and Violence, Ministry of Culture

AL OURAN, Nedal, Project Officer (former), Mainstreaming Marine Biodiversity Conservation in Aqaba

AL QATARNEH, Ahmad, Secretary General, Ministry of the Environment

AL SABBAGH, Orouba, Policies & Strategies Department, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
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AL WRIEKAT, Rami, Minister, Ministry of Youth

AL ZABEN, Mahmoud, IT Manager, IEC

ARMOUTI, Khaled, Head of the Local Development Unit, Ministry of the Interior

DAAJA, Talal, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Officer, Civil Defense

DRABKAH, Ali, Secretary General, IEC

EMAT, Dr., Deputy Chief, Petra Development and Tourism Authority (PDRTA)

FASHHO, Nancy, Attorney and Legal Counsel, Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS)

GHARAIBEH, Feda, Director of Humanitarian Relief Coordination Unit, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
HIJAZIN, Emad, Deputy Chief, PDRTA
JWEIHAN, Aghadeer, Chief Executive Officer, Civil Society, Princess Taghreed Institute
KANAAN, Bassem, Director of Policies and Strategies, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
KHLIFAT, Lana, International Cooperation Officer, IEC
MHEIDAT, Hussein, Head of Solid Waste Management Unit, Ministry of Municipal Affairs
NAAMNEH, Mahmoud, Colonel, Public Security Directorate
NABULSI, Mohammad, Economic and Social Council
NIMS, Salma, Secretary General, Jordanian National Commission for Women
NSOUR, Mohammad, Director, Human Rights, Ministry of Justice
QAWASMEH, Lamia, Head of International Cooperation Unit, Ministry of Municipal Affairs
SALHI, Tahani, Natural Ressources Protection Director, PDTRA
SARAJ, Hussain, DRR Officer, Civil Defense
TOUKAN, Zeina, Director of International Cooperation, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
TWAL Salam, Coordination, Ministry of Municipal Affairs
ZAWIDEH, Nasser, ASEZA (Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Tourism Sector focal person)
ZOUBI, Qasem, Director General, Department of Statistics
The Mayor of Sabha and Dafyianeh, Local Development Unit staff, and several municipal council members

Programme beneficiaries (focus group discussions)

ABDULAFZ, Samira
AL HARAHSHEH, Ibtesam
AL ISSA, Hayat
AL MASAEED, Salm
AL QURASHI, Shatha
AL SARHAN, Nadia
AL SHARHAN, Falah
AL SHDIEFAT, Sokayneh
ATHAMNEH, Ahmed
AZAMAT, Salameh
BAYDREH, NoorELIAN, Dua’a
ELYMAT, Entisar
HUSSIEIN, Khitam
QOQAZEH, Amer
SARHAN, Narjis
SHOROFAT, Wael
TALAH, Mahmoud

**Donors and bilateral partners**

AL BAYAA, Jumana, Economic Analyst, Embassy of Japan
BOUDART, Olivier, Attaché Programme Manager, European Union (EU)
FARR, Mikhael, Senior Development Officer, Embassy of Canada
GARCIA-ARCOS, Sergio, Programme Manager, Danish International Development Agency
HIROSHI, Seto, Second Secretary, Embassy of Japan
KHOURY, Nayef, National Programme Officer, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
LAAFIA, Ibrahim, First Counsellor, Head of Cooperation, EU
MIDDLETON, Chris, Programme Officer, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
MOLLICA, Karen, Counsellor and Head of Cooperation, Embassy of Canada
SH. AL-HOMOUD, Amer, Dr., Project Management Specialist, Environment, United States Agency for International Development

**Civil society**

ABU ROUS, Sawsan, Project Manager, Jordan River Foundation
AL SAFADI, Ibrahim, Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Luminus for Education
AL SHRAIDEH, Fadi M, Regional Director, International Union for Conservation of Nature
ASI Rafat, Deputy Executive Director, Water and Environment Sector, Royal Scientific Society
BEREZAT, Yahya, Operations Department, Jordan River Foundation
DABANEH, Abeer, Director, Women’s Studies Centre, University of Jordan
EMAM, Nour, Independent Legal Adviser, Jordan Bar Association
GHANDOUR, Fadi, Chairman, Ruwwad for Development
GHARAIBEH, Mothanna, Youth Activist

GHAZALEH, Talal Abu, Chairman, Talal Abu Ghazaleh Organization

KHALED, Yehya, Director General, Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature

MUHIESEN, Khaled, General Manager, National Micro Finance Bank

RAMEEN, Nadrawein, Regional Manager, National Micro Finance Bank

SERHAN, Nujoud, Director, Luminus for Education

SHAWAWREH, Rami, Vice-President, Jordan Bar Association

UNDP

ABDALLAT, Mais, Programme Associate

ABED RABBOH, Walid, Dr., Senior Coordinator, Jordan Response Platform

ABDEL SHAFI, Khalid, Manager, Regional Hub, RBAS

AL ASSAF, Majida, Programme Manager

ALATOOM, Mohammad, Environment Programme Analyst

ALI-AHMAD, Zena, Country Director

AL MOUSSA, Ibrahim, Multi Sectoral Civil Engineer – Construction Management (Host Communities)

ALSHAWISH, Bilal, Operations Officer (Host Communities)

ANAKRIH, Mohammed, Project Manager (Host Communities)

AWAMLEH, Nadia, Socioeconomic Portfolio Analyst

BERIS, Yakup, Regional Programme Coordinator

CHAMBERS, Richard, Elections Team

DEEB, Ghimar, Project staff (Host Communities)

DE LA HAYE, Jos, Regional Cluster Leader, Governance & Peacebuilding, RBAS

FADEL, Diyaa, Programme Manager, Governance & Disaster Risk Reduction

HORANI, Zeina, Communications Team

JOHARY, Dina, Head of Financial Resources

JREISAT, Diana, Project Manager

KHADER, Najeeb, Youth Team Member

KHASAWNEH, Anas, Project Manager, Environment
MAJED, Hasanat, National Project Director, Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Tourism Sector Project
MANOME, Minako, Livelihoods and Recovery Specialist
MUBAIDIN, Yara, Socioeconomic Portfolio Associate
OWEIS, Maen, Finance Clerk
PRONYK, Jason, Development Coordinator, Sub-Regional Response Facility, RBAS
SAADEH, Hadeel, Governance Associate (former)
SABANEKH, Hiba, Operations Manager
SHAFI, Khaled Abdel, Hub Manager
SOUFAN, Zain, Project Manager, Integrated Socioeconomic Framework
SULTAN, Manal, Communications Team
ZANT, Faten Abu, Human Resources/Learning Manager

Office of the United Nations Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator
KALLON, Edward, UN Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator/UNDP Resident Representative
NATTA, Alberto, Programme and Planning Analyst
SOOMAR, Zainab, Special Assistant to the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Affairs Officer

Other UN agencies
ABU HAMDIEH, Sumayyah, National Project Officer for Teacher Education, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
ABU SIR, Layali, Programme Analyst, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
BAKER, Daniel, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator/Head of Jordan Country Office, UNFPA
CESARO, Giorgia, Project Officer, Culture Sector, UNESCO
FARINA, Costanza, Representative, UNESCO
HIGGINS, Ettie, Deputy Representative, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)
ISMAEL, Mohammad, Deputy Representative/Programme Officer, World Food Programme
MITA SUGI, Michiru, Chief, Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation, UNICEF
NUBANI, Randa, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF
WEEKS, Rachel, Deputy Representative/Recovery Specialist, United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women)
Annex 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

In addition to the documents named below, the evaluation team reviewed project documents, annual project reports, midterm review reports, final evaluation reports and other project documents. The websites of many related organizations were also searched, including those of UN organizations, Jordanian governmental departments, project management offices and others.


_____. Department of Statistics, 2015 Census.


_____. ‘Executive Development Programme 2011–2013’.


_____. ‘Thinking Differently about the Poor – Findings from poverty pocket surveys in Jordan’ (based on household expenditure and income survey 2010).


Pizzi, Michael, ‘Foreign Fighters Come Home to Roost in Jordan,’
http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/6/5/jordans-foreign-fighters-come-home-to-roost.html,
June 2015.


______. Evaluation website, web.undp.org/evaluation.

______. Results Oriented Annual Reports 2013–2015.


______. ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System,’ 2016.


United Nations Department of Safety and Security, Travel Advisory – Jordan,

United Nations Statistics Division, website for Millennium Development Goals indicators,


“Piloting Delivery of Justice Services to Poor Jordanians and Refugees in Host Communities,” May 2016.
Annex 5. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN (CPAP) OUTCOME INDICATORS

Table 3. Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of December 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome (#24): Democratic Governance</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome (#24): Democratic Governance</td>
<td># of pieces of legislation drafted in a participatory and transparent manner</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The draft anti-corruption commission law was posted on the legislative bureau website for public feedback. Data: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of national consultation processes engaging civil society held.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Draft political development strategy developed in consultation with civil society. Integrity Committee held discussions involving civil society. Data: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 ‘Outcome’, ‘indicator’ ‘baseline’ and ‘target’ are defined in the CPAP 2013–2017.
32 ‘Status and progress’ information was extracted from the 2013 ROAR for 2013. For 2014 and 2015, where there was no reporting in the ROAR, the information was extracted from the UNDP Corporate Planning System (https://intranet.undp.org/sites/JOR/sitepages/programmeplanmonitor.aspx?year=2016). Term ‘data’ for 2014 and 2015 indicates ‘quantity.’
33 Data: 7; Comment: A draft Electoral Law published in August 2015 proposed a new electoral system, involving open list proportional representation in governorate-sized districts and reducing the number of parliamentary seats to 130, maintaining the quota. A new Municipalities Law endorsed by Parliament in August 2015 established a new structure for municipal governance, including the establishment of directly elected Local Councils within each municipality. A draft Decentralization Law was released by the Government in March 2015, establishing a new structure for governorate-level authorities, including partially elected Governorate Councils. This draft is currently being reviewed by Parliament. In addition, the Law on Public Private Partnership was finalized and enacted in November.
34 Data: 4; Comment: A country consultation was conducted on 29 September 2015 involving governments, donors, international organizations, civil society organizations and the private sector, addressing key central topics of the Resilience Development Forum, which took place in November 2015. The consultation aimed at catalysing and capturing the state of debate on the impact and perspective of the Syria crisis in relation to the three topics: (a) making aid architecture fit for resilience; (b) social inclusiveness; and (c) private sector engagement. The outcome was a series of common and relevant action points/recommendations to feed the preparation of the resilience development forum.
Table 3. Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of December 2015)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of national institutions with functional accountability mechanisms</td>
<td>TBD in 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The property tax system was upgraded to accommodate the collection of over 20 taxes and fees that were collected individually by municipalities (ROAR). 1 corporate planning website. Some progress. 2013: Data: 1. 2014: No data. 2015: No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of local governance mechanisms for people participation established</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Governorate development plans and municipality strategies were developed through consultation processes with local communities. Significant progress. 2013: Data: 2. 2014: Some progress. 2015: Some progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome (#25)

Data: 10; Comment: Jordan continued to work on internal governance reforms revising several laws to improve service delivery and increase revenues. The Local Councils and Decentralization law was elaborated; the Independence of the Judiciary Law was endorsed to end decades of appointing leading judges by a Royal Decree, the Higher Investment Council, with public and private sector representatives, was created to encourage foreign direct investment. Further amendments were also enacted to expand the jurisdiction of the Independent Election Commission (IEC), to include municipal elections or any other general polls, in addition to managing parliamentary elections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of young people and marginalized groups engaging in voluntary civic/political activities and initiatives</td>
<td>N/A (National Youth Survey)</td>
<td>Target to be established based on the findings of the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of economically active young people (males and females)</td>
<td>Unemployment rate (age 15-24) is 50.1% (Jordan in figures 2010)</td>
<td>National execution plan target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome (#26): Environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Government and national institutions have operationalized mechanisms to develop and implement strategies and plans targeting key cultural, environmental and disaster risk</strong></td>
<td>Strategies and action plans for strategic environment assessment and DRR and DRM are established</td>
<td>1. National strategy for DRM under draft&lt;br&gt;2. National DRR action plans, platform and risk atlas do not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. National strategy for DRM finalized&lt;br&gt;2. National DRR action plans, platform and risk atlas in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Comment: The national disaster risk management strategy for Jordan was reviewed in April 2015, taking into account state-of-the-art practices worldwide. There is also a need to ensure a balance between efforts directed at preparedness and response and post-response.
### Table 3: Status of CPAP outcome indicators (as of December 2015)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reduction issues (including a transition to green economy)</td>
<td>Linking with climate change adaptation implemented in accordance with best practices &amp; international standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 or more projects in different regions implemented</td>
<td>Early warning system in Petra, ongoing Emergency Operation Centre in Aqaba, volunteers trained and equipped. Significant progress. See detailed comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Ministry-endorsed strategic planning documents that integrate climate change adaptation measures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some progress. See detailed comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of sustained green economy projects implemented</td>
<td>0 projects</td>
<td>At least 3 projects in each governorate</td>
<td>National green economy strategy is still under development by Ministry of Environment. See detailed comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- **37** Data: 3; Comment: 1. Community-based interventions for productive use of grey water in home farming; 2. Traditional water harvesting improves community resilience and climate change adaptation; 3. Reducing over-pumping from the basin to save it from dryness through improving access to safe water by rehabilitating water networks at household level.
- **38** Data: 3; Comment: More community support was given to enhance sustainable water harvesting solutions as a means to adapt to climate change impacts. More than 20 households have benefited from water harvesting support provided by UNDP.
- **39** Data: 3; Comment: Ministry of Environment has endorsed and launched a national report on an integrated investment framework for sustainable land management. The report integrates climate change with land degradation issues and sets out national priorities for sustainable land management.
- **40** Data: 3; Comment: 1. Energy efficiency standards and labelling for electrical appliances; 2. Setting up policy framework for e-waste in Jordan; 3. Support to sustainable energy solution in communities, with focus on solar water heaters.
- **41** Data: 3; Comment: UNDP continues its support to key green economy sectors, particularly tourism. UNDP promotes the sustainable tourism approach in the country. These efforts eventually resulted in the establishment of a green unit under the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities. The unit, which has been officially approved by the Ministry, will contribute to mainstreaming natural heritage into the tourism industry by supporting licensing procedures, building and applying a system of incentives for tourism developers, and monitoring and evaluating environmental indicators within the tourism sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status/Progress&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Awaiting donor approval on the project document to advance the work on this indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of new buildings implementing green building codes</td>
<td>No active green building codes</td>
<td>2-3 new green building codes implemented at subnational level</td>
<td>New project concept note has been developed to tackle energy efficiency in building codes.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% increase of waste chemicals and e-waste that is safely reused/recycled/disposed in accordance with the waste management hierarchy</td>
<td>60% of hazardous waste is treated, including medical and chemical waste (to be updated in 2013 with more accurate baseline)</td>
<td>70% of hazardous waste is treated, including medical and chemical waste</td>
<td>Surveying all potentially contaminated oil transformers in the utility sector and major private industries in Jordan</td>
<td>Data: 65</td>
<td>Data: 70</td>
<td>Data: 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: 1. Collection and transfer of e-waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Disposal of 40 tons of PCB-contaminated transformers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extra amount of 57 tons of chemically-polluted oil, soil and devices have been environmentally disposed outside the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of relevant energy and environment laws reviewed</td>
<td>Environmental laws and by-laws drafted</td>
<td>Review environment laws and by-laws</td>
<td>New regulations and guidelines for PCBs and energy-efficient appliance regulations National hunting by-laws reviewed</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Significant progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy laws approved</td>
<td>Draft energy by-laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No energy by laws in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome (#27): Socio-economic/resilience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of governorates implementing and tracking sustainable and equitable local economic development plans in a participatory and inclusive manner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 municipalities are targeted to have local economic development plans in the next 2 years as part of the National Resilience Plan to respond to the Syrian refugee crisis. Data: 2 Data: 2 Some progress Some progress No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of methodologies in use to measure and assess poverty and vulnerability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 methodologies in use to assess poverty and vulnerability Data: 2 Data: 3 Significant progress Significant progress Target reached or surpassed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDP Corporate Planning System