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1. **Executive Summary**

**Project Overview**

Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Host Community project (Hereinafter HC Project) began in 2013 and is expected to continue until the end of 2017. The project’s budget until March 2016 has reached USD 46,377,487. The project has three main pillars focused on livelihoods and employment, social cohesion and prevention of violent extremism, and support to municipalities and solid waste management. The programme has 8 expected outputs.

The HC project started as an emergency programme providing support GoJ to respond to the Syrian Refugee Crisis. The programme since its inception in 2013 has grown to encompass various components and interventions. The project includes policy and operation components.

**Evaluation Methodology**

A mid-term evaluation of this programme was implemented. The purpose of the evaluation is to build on the outputs results as the programme has been extended vertically and horizontally and resources were mobilized to implement more outputs until the second quarter of 2017. The evaluation adopted a mixed methods approach. The evaluation focused on using qualitative data collection methods including review of document, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews with stakeholders and key programme informants. In addition, wherever possible quantitative data was drawn from existing project documents.

**Relevance & Appropriateness**

The HC project was the first project to directly and predominantly target the host communities in Jordan. The project was designed to support the Jordanian government deal with the economic, environmental and social problems arising from the influx of Syrian refugees into Jordan. In this sense the project is fully in line with the objectives of UNDP and its vision and strategic directions.

HC project provided both policy and operational support to the government of Jordan. The HC project supported the development of laws to support social cohesion within Jordanian society and respect for the rule of law. In addition, the project supported the development of a Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) strategy to support national effort to address the phenomena. At the operational level, the programme provides grants to CBOs to foster social cohesion and re-integration of former extremists in the communities (to name a few actual and planned interventions). In parallel the project provided livelihoods opportunities and support to local municipal councils and service councils in dealing with the Syrian refugee crisis. This holistic approach and interventions makes the project relevant to the context in which it operates. The HC project is directly relevant to the strategic and global objectives of UNDP which focus on livelihoods creation, basic service delivery, improved governance and trust, social cohesion, and enhanced community security. The main mission of UNDP is to support governments and provide technical assistance to alleviate poverty. Hence this project is directly relevant to the overall strategic objectives of UNDP.

Interviewed government officials, both at the national and municipal levels, explained that the programme was timely and highly appropriate. They explained that the holistic approach adopted by UNDP, the involvement in the planning and the regular exchange makes the problem more relevant and appropriate to the local needs and priorities.

UNDP theory of change logic for this programme focuses on enhancing and supporting social cohesion within the communities mostly affected by the Syrian refugee crisis. As such, the programme works correctly targeted the locations and communities that received the bulk or was affected the most by Syrian presence. The selection of the project intervention sites is logical and relevant to the overall objectives of the programme. The project focuses on the northern parts of Jordan (Mafraq, Zarqa & Irbid) where most Syrian refugees reside and where the infrastructure is suffering the most. Hence the selection of the AlKeider dump fill to renovate is seen by stakeholders as relevant and timely.

**Programme Design**

The programme initially included three main pillars focusing on promoting livelihoods; support to local municipalities; and supporting aid coordination. The programme since its inception has grown to include various elements such as combating violent extremism and promoting social cohesion in the communities and promoting the rule of law through support for legal reform. Currently the programme has three main pillars livelihoods and employment, social cohesion and prevention of violent extremism, and support to municipalities and solid waste management The design of the programme is very broad. The broadness of the programme could be perceived as a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it enables UNDP to capitalize on existing resources and mobilize others and on the other hand it affects its ability to focus on clear targets to achieve its goals. Improving the programme design entails creating the necessary linkages between the various components of the programme. Whereas support to livelihoods and support to municipalities are coherently and logically related, legal reform and combating PVE appears to be mismatched with the other two predominantly socio-economic components of the programme.

Each programme component has its own objectives and clear implementation strategies. However, how they all contribute to one or two clear UNDP objectives or targets in Jordan is less clear. The inability of UNDP, due to administrative restrictions, to create independent projects make it harder for the organization to consistently monitor and capitalize on several interventions. For example, promoting livelihoods can be one of the tools of social cohesion. At the moment, this is not perceived as such.

The design of the implementation strategies is appropriate for the context in which the programme operates. UNDP implementation strategy in all component is built around participatory methods. A substantial time is allocated to conducting participatory studies to ensure that the programme is responding to the needs as expressed by the stakeholders. Although this at times leads to some delays in implementation, yet it ensures that the programme remains relevant for the different stakeholders

**Effectiveness**

The rehabilitation of the Al-Ekeidar landfill is one of the key achievements of the programme. The support comes as part of the support to and collaboration with the Ministry of Municipalities Affairs. In addition to the rehabilitation and upgrading of the landfill, the programme provided support to 36 municipalities of the Governorates of Mafraq and Irbid enabling them to conduct community outreach, identify and prioritize the community needs, and plan and implement local development projects. In addition to rehabilitating the largest landfill in the northern of Jordan along with the transfer stations.

The project focused on building viable economic approaches that can be positively contribute to the improvement of the living conditions of vulnerable Jordanians. UNDP introduced the multifaceted 3x6 approach as an alternative emergency employment model with stronger emphasis on effectiveness and potential sustainability of income generation activities. The approach also encompasses a strong community services component that aims to strengthen citizen-state relationship and support the programme’ s overall focus on promoting social cohesion. It is worth noting that the community service activities respond to immediate needs identified by the local communities.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Intervention | Progress |
| Emergency Employment (3x6) | Employment project has resulted in creating emergency employment opportunities for around 1500 men and women in 12 municipalities in the Governorates of Mafraq and Zarqa, where the beneficiaries rehabilitated key socio-economic infrastructures. It increased the income of beneficiaries’ households by almost 54 percent. Around 50 percent of the participants in the cash for work phase (Phase I) further moved to the establishment of microbusinesses (Phase II), for whom UNDP continues to provide support to ensure the sustainability of the supported businesses. |
| Demand-Driven Vocational Training  | A total of 525 Jordanians (women: 61 percent) were provided with demand-driven vocational training and employment in the sectors of HVAC, retail, sewing, mechanics, and hospitality, 80 percent of them moved to the on-the-job training opportunities, and 65 percent were employed.  |
| Entrepreneurship Support & Microbusinesses Establishment (Micro-Equity Investment Approach) | Entrepreneurship development project in partnership with a micro-venture fund provided 329 Jordanians (women: 40 percent) in the Governorates of Mafraq, Irbid and Ramtha with entrepreneurship training, and 80 of them were supported with microbusiness start-up in partnership.  |
| between Jordanians and Syrian refugees | Skills exchange project has been launched in 2016, currently targeting a total of 750 beneficiaries (500 Jordanians and 250 Syrians, 50 % women) in the Governorates of Mafraq and Irbid. |

Figure 1 Outcomes of Livelihood Interventions 2016, Source UNDP

In terms of activities related to social cohesion and PVE, the programme is rather large and many activities have been carried out. UNDP staff reported during the evaluation the completion of The Conflict Development Analysis maps to identify the root causes of conflicts and instabilities in host communities. The maps were developed in five Governorates Mafraq, Irbid, Zarqa, Ma’an and Tafileh, and a Community Cohesion Grant Mechanism has been established to fund 130 CBOs to implement quick interventions and projects at high tension areas. At mid-term 186 persons representing 34 CBOs had received prior to receiving the grants a detailed 3-months training programme to build their capacities and enable them to successfully implement the activities of their grants. Within the same pillar, the programme partnered with the government to develop the national strategy for preventing violent extremism. According to project documents, the HC project has also concluded agreements with several relevant institutions to work on counter narrative to prevent violent extremism and implementing different programmes targeting youth in the area of countering and preventing violent extremism.

Last but not least, HC project enabled UNDP to render support to GoJ to manage and coordinate aid. The conceptualization and development of the Jordan Response Plan enables GoJ to capitalize on the support provided to Jordan to increase the resilience of communities in the face of the Syrian Refugee Crisis.

UNDP developed a highly commendable implementation strategies. The focus of the programme was to increase coordination and participation with stakeholders. Accordingly, UNDP developed implementation strategies that were highly participatory of the GoJ. Municipality needs assessment were conducted in a participatory manner. In addition, the programme adopted a “scientific” implementation logic to support capacity building of CSOs, conducting needs assessment, developing adequate selection criteria for beneficiaries among other well-studied implementation approaches. This systematic approach ensured a high level of effectiveness of programme interventions.

The programme focus on integrity and efficiency is commendable. However, the selection of service providers for the provision of none-financial services to beneficiaries requires re-assessment. It is not sufficient to select an organization based on the price only (procurement procedures). Rather, some organizations could be treated as partners due to their track record and feedback from beneficiaries. It is also important to consider other factors such as ability of an organization to work with the poor and ultra-poor.

**Implementation Challenges**

The HC project faced a series of implementation challenges many of which could not be envisaged by the programme at the onset. one of the key challenges is the type of funding available to the programme. The HC programme started with support from the Japanese government in 2012 and has since expanded to be supported by 7 different donors. These funds are “emergency funds” as such, the programme needs to spend the allocated funds in 12 to 18 months’ maximum. This affects the effectiveness of implementation and forces the programme to be focused on delivering results and numbers of beneficiaries as opposed to focus on impact, outcome and quality of interventions.

In addition to the growing Syrian Refugee crisis and the spillover effects of the Arab Spring, the programme needed to also address the skepticism of government vis a vis CSOs; the weakness of the CSO sector in Jordan in general as well as the bureaucratic process to receive acceptance for new project (whether UNDP or CSOs from MOSD). The programme focused on bridging the gap between government and CSOs to build trust between the different partners. UNDP successfully leveraged the credibility and acceptance they enjoy from the different stakeholders (government, donors, and CSOs) to build a platform of support amongst them to increase effectiveness of the programme.

**Efficiency**

UNDP has successfully built sound and strong partnerships at various levels to ensure efficiency of interventions. The participatory implementation strategies adopted by UNDP has increased the efficiency of the programme.

UNDP was commended by all interviewed stakeholders for the high level of coordination and flexibility and focus on building partnerships with all stakeholders. Interviewed donors during the evaluation explained that they were very satisfied with the reporting and responsiveness of UNDP to requests for information and for the quality of work. Few commented on the reporting explain that they prefer that reporting be done against objectives and indicators. Nonetheless, donors believed that UNDP is highly capable and a serious partner in development in Jordan.

The management of the project could be enhanced by developing a comprehensive M&E system. Monitoring and evaluation functions refer to systematic data collection against indicators identified in the logical framework of the project and ensuring systematic reporting against indicators. M&E functions documents progress and challenges and could also assess impact of project interventions. In that sense, M&E is not available in project activities to date. However, this is not to suggest that some basic M&E activities are taking place. The project does not have a monitoring system beyond the development of the logical framework. There is no evidence to suggest that ample attention is afforded to monitoring and evaluation functions for the programme. The programme focuses on conducting studies to review the progress and impact of the interventions which cannot be said to be sufficient. Due to the importance of M&E function in the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation cannot be overstated. As such, a specialized manager should assume the functions and develop programme specific tools to ensure effective and efficient reporting on project indicators. Indicators should reflect the overall rational of interventions, measure progress against targets and support the theory of change of the programme.

However, the above does not suggest that the programme is not focusing on constantly understanding and documenting the impact of its interventions. the programme developed good baseline data and several studies to provide data about host communities in target areas. The programme also has a basic database of beneficiaries where services and progress is documented. However, these tools are only useful for following up on delivery of services as opposed to a fully developed M&E system that provides overview of both process and outcome levels.

**Impact & Sustainability**

One of the key changes that the programme helped establish is to increase donor attention to supporting host communities in Jordan. The focus on mitigating the impact of Syrian refugee crisis while supporting the refugees themselves was a responsible response from UNDP. This approach of recognizing the pressure faced by host communities and attempting to address it afforded UNDP a high level of credibility vis a vis all relevant stakeholders.

Mitigating the impact of Syrian refugee Crisis on Host community has to date successfully implemented various activities that suggest that the programme has resulted in positive change in the lives of partners and beneficiaries alike. Most notably the expected resulted of the rehabilitation of El-Akeider are expected to have wide reach an impact. Donors and government officials explained that the pressure on the landfill was a serious health and environmental hazard. The rehabilitation of the landfill, training of the JSC and upgrading of the transfer stations are expected to have a positive impact for the communities living in neighboring areas.

Many (if not all) HC project interventions have good potential for sustainability. At the moment, the programme does not have an exit strategy with clear milestones for handing over some activities to the government. For example the coordination of development aid should eventually be handed over to the government along with the management of the El-Akeider landfill. However, plans to do so do not appear to have been developed. Nonetheless, it is important to point out that the capacity building of relevant staff at the different ministries is ongoing within the programme in preparation for handing over some activities to the government. This could be supported by developing handing over plans including arrangements for transitional phases to ensure sustainability.

The programme focused participatory approaches and focus on creating local ownership of interventions will increase the potential for sustainability. This is particularly the case of the solid waste management and the eventual implementation of the PVE strategy and other social cohesion activities. Contribution to justice reform through the drafting of laws (legal aid/arbitration/mediation) although not endorsed yet by GoJ is considered but a step in the right track. When adopted and implemented could also lead to sustainability.

**Lessons Learned**

* Networking with various stakeholders in the development of national strategies is a sound strategy to ensure local ownership as well as speed-up the process of implementation.
* Providing concrete support in improving infrastructure and services helps build the reputation of international organizations, increase their credibility and positions them well as a serious interlocutor vis a vis the government when more sensitive issues need tackling.
* Developing clear roles and responsibilities when working with government ensures consistency and absence of misunderstandings and expectations. Engagement of line ministries at the local level ensures adequate support to community initiatives.

**Key Recommendations**

* Developing a 5 year emergency strategic intervention plan that builds on UNDP expertise over the coming years and the number of studies conducted. This plan should have objectives, expected outputs and indicators. This will facilitate coordination within UNDP. Consider holding a retreat to revise the programme’ s logical framework and develop appropriate and relevant indicators and reporting mechanisms.
* Reconsider the various pillars. For example, PVE needs to be a standalone programme that is not related to resilience of host communities.
* Link PVE and livelihood interventions. Linkages between and amongst project components appear missing at this stage as a result of the absence of a coherent M&E.

1. **Introduction & Background**

Considered as the world’s most harmful humanitarian disaster with its continuous spill over effect to neighbouring countries, the war in Syria is a protracted and serious crisis, while peace does not appear close to achieve. This violent war is also considered as a serious challenge in the face of development in the region, including Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Turkey. Today, large territories in the region are controlled by radical militias, where population fabrics and demographics have changed with little hope to recover, which all resulted into large movements of displaced people and refugees searching for safe havens around a war-torn Syria. Refugees fled Syria are mostly living in urban settings in neighbouring countries, and often in already-over-populated areas with high level of society tension, poverty and unemployment.

Jordan has been particularly affected by the influx of refugees from Syria, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities within the country. UNHCR-Jordan has registered more than 630,000 Syrians, of which approximately 15 per cent of Syrian refugees reside in refugee camps, while the remaining live in host communities. The latest national census in 2015 indicates that out of Jordan’s total population of 9.5 million, the number of Jordanians is around 6.6 million, while the number of non-Jordanians who reside in the country is around 2.9 million, representing 30.6 per cent of overall population. Of the total non-Jordanian population, 1.265 million are Syrians, followed by Egyptians, totalling 636,270 representing 6.68 per cent of the population and Palestinians who do not have national ID numbers with 634,182 representing 6.65 per cent of the population. On the distribution of Syrians living in Jordan, 435,578 Syrians live in Amman, 343,479 in Irbid, 207,903 in Mafraq, 175,280 in Zarqa and the rest are distributed across the country’s other governorates.

The present situation places a clearly heavy burden on local host communities, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities, national resources and the governmental and sub-national budgets. As Syrian refugees are granted access to basic public services, the pressure on water and electricity supply, education, health, sanitation and solid waste management as well as the scarce employment opportunities, has drastically increased where refugees have settled. As the war in Syria has become a protracted crisis, and due to decreasing aid resources to support refugees, the international community and the Government of Jordan are now looking at innovative ways to help refugees sustain their livelihoods without jeopardizing the labor market for Jordanians.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the lead development agency in the UN system and the lead on the resilience axis within the JRP and 3RP, and all engagements proposed in the context of this programme complement UNDP ongoing work in countries across many Arab States. UNDP enjoys International recognition for successful initiatives on stabilization and livelihoods creation programmes. UNDP also leads the UN development agencies in the preparation of the Resilience Chapters of the Jordan Response Plan. Through its work in Jordan over the past three years on host communities’ concerns, UNDP fostered a substantive network of partnerships with all stakeholders at the national, sub-national and local levels, with government and non-governmental authorities.

In Jordan, since 2013, UNDP has been leading a significant programme to support Jordanian host communities mitigate the impact of the Syria refugee crisis on the country (Programme Title: “Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis through Support to Host Communities”), through leveraging the absorption capacity of public services and improving the standards of living for local communities and enhancing social cohesion. The programme has grown over the last few years to become a multi-donor multi-UN platform for support to host communities through several pillars, namely:

1. Employment opportunities created and economic recovery initiatives developed geared towards improvement of livelihoods and basic social services delivery.

2. Improved delivery of municipal and social services

3. Strengthened trust-ship between stakeholders through conflict transformation, social cohesion, and rapid response mechanisms

4. Community Security and Access to Justice strengthened

5. Technical support for the government in effective aid coordination in response to Syrian Crisis

6. Support to Counter-terrorism, Counter violent extremism and enhance stabilization

1. **Project Description**

Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Host Community project began in 2013 and is expected to continue until the end of 2017. The project’s budget until march 2016 has reached USD 46,377,487.

The project has eight expected outputs as follows:

Output 1: Short-term employment opportunities created and economic recovery initiatives developed geared towards improvement of livelihoods and basic social services delivery.

Output 2: Enhanced local economic development through skills-matching and exchange, MSMEs growth and capacity development

Output 3: Enhanced skills exchange between Jordanians and Syrian refugees

Output 4: Improved delivery of municipal and social services

Output 5: Strengthened trust-ship between stakeholders through conflict transformation, social cohesion, and rapid response mechanisms.

Output 6: Enhancing community security and crime prevention & Support to legal aid in Jordan

Output 7: Technical support for the government in effective aid coordination in response to Syrian Crisis

Output 8: Support to Counter-terrorism, Counter violent extremism and enhance stabilization.

The project has three main pillars focused on livelihoods and employment, social cohesion and prevention of violent extremism, and support to municipalities and solid waste management.

The programme provides both policy and operational support to the government of Jordan. At the policy level UNDP has supported the Government in building its capacity in aid coordination resulting in the creation and monitoring of the Jordan National Response Plan (JRP) 2015-2016, 2016-2018 Response.

The great majority of UNDP’s support comes at the operational level by assisting Governorates and municipalities to expand access to over-stretched social services, and to increase livelihood opportunities for vulnerable communities, in particular through the Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Vulnerable Host Communities project. UNDP also provides support for enhancing relations between local and refugee populations and boosting access to justice in order to foster social cohesion.

According to programme documents, thus far the work of UNDP Jordan in response to the Syria crisis has supported 11 of Jordan’s 12 Governorates, and 45 municipalities, reaching approximately 2.4 million people directly, mostly local but also including some 300,000 refugees from Syria. This support for resilience is tightly integrated into UNDP’s overall work in the country, which since 2013 has focused on institutional reform, social protection and services, youth empowerment and environmental sustainability.

The programme has two main pillars one focused on livelihoods and the second on local governance. the first encompasses four interventions as follows:

* Emergency employment (3x6 Approach)
* Demand-Driven Vocational Training and Employment
* Entrepreneurship Support & Microbusinesses Establishment (Micro-Equity Investment Approach)
* Skills-Exchange between Jordanians & Syrian refugees

Local governance incudes three distinct components namely;

* Support Municipal planning & community outreach
* Preventing Violent Extremism and Social Cohesion
* Access to Justice
* Solid Waste Management
1. **Evaluation Purpose and Methodology**

## 4.1 Evaluation Objectives

A mid-term evaluation of this programme was implemented. The purpose of the evaluation according to the advertised terms of reference (ToRs) is to build on the outputs results as the programme has been extended vertically and horizontally and resources were mobilized to implement more outputs until the second quarter of 2017. The objectives of the mid-term evaluation were:

* Evaluating the achievements of the project outputs and target indicators and their contribution to the outcome.
* Assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the project.
* Identifying issues encountered through implementation.
* Drawing lessons learned through the project implementation, and proposing further areas of intervention the project might need to respond to and embark on.
* Evaluating the M&E programme tools.
* Identifying the national institutions that would benefit from the evaluation and recommend types of actions needed.
* Identify the level of engagement and role of the programme stakeholders.
* Programme exit strategy and sustainability mechanisms.
* Programme ownership at the level of different interventions.

## 4.2 Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation adopted a mixed methods approach. The evaluation focused on using qualitative data collection methods including review of document, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews with stakeholders and key programme informants. In addition, wherever possible quantitative data was drawn from existing project documents.

Key activities carried out by the evaluation included:

1. Review of all relevant documents including: documents on national policies related to the programme, the Project Documents, agreements, progress reports, and all relevant documentation related to implementation including: gap analysis, assessment reports and activity reports.
2. Conduct interviews and roundtable meetings with programme stakeholders and partners.

## 4.3 Data Collection Tools/Evaluation Questions

The methodology for this mid-term evaluation included both desk and field research. The desk research focused on document reviews, and the field review included meetings with project stakeholders and beneficiaries to assess performance and outcomes.

Documents that have been accessed include:

1. Project Document
2. Summary of Project Progress
3. Project Progress Report 2015

Other documents reviewed include: (Annex 3 includes a full list of documents consulted)

* Specific Project Proposals (Solid Waste Management – Rule of Law)
* Project Organigram
* Livelihood Beneficiary Selection Criteria
* Assessment reports
* Other documents as necessary

The evaluation was guided by the Results Based Management (RBM) framework and assessed relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, change/impact and potential for sustainability. Guiding questions were used during meetings and informal focus groups for open discussion to encourage participants to elaborate on information provided in project documents and to discuss challenges and support mechanisms. Key questions guided the evaluation were:

**Relevance & Appropriateness**

* Was the programme relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and challenges?
* Was the programme relevant, appropriate and strategic to UNDP mandate?
* Was the outcome and associated activities relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals, and UNDP mandate?
* Are the programme Management arrangements and set-up appropriate to carry out its responsibility of implementation, monitoring, reporting and establishing partnerships?

*Additional questions include*:

1. How does the project fit with the overall strategic development goals for Jordan?
2. How were the implementation locations selected?
3. What is the project’s management structure? Is it relevant to project outcomes? (further management questions are dealt with in the Efficiency section)
4. How does this project fit with UNDP strategic objectives, other UN agencies, UNDAF?

**Programme Design**

* To what extent did the design of the programme help in achieving its own goals?
* Was the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed while designing the programme?
* Were there clear objectives and strategy?
* Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmarks for performance?
* Was the process of programme design sufficiently participatory? Was there any impact of the process?

*Additional Questions include:*

1. Is the project design appropriate for the context in which it was perceived?
2. How was gender factored into the project design/activity implementation?
3. Were the planned interventions indicative of needs stated by target group? How were those determined? Was a baseline conducted?

**Effectiveness**

* Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
* Were there any lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities? What might have been done better or differently?
* How did the programme deal with issues and risks?

*Additional questions include*:

1. How much of the project workplan has been implemented? What are the outcomes to date?
2. What are the implementation strategies of the project? Are they effective?
3. What types of partnerships has the project built? Have they been effective?
4. Do the beneficiaries feel they have gained from project interventions/ if so, in what ways?
5. Are the stakeholders effectively communicating with each other? How?
6. What have been the main obstacles to date? Have they been resolved, and how? Who were the main actors in this resolution and what were the outcomes?
7. How has the project structure changed, if any, during its life? Have there been changes in project partners, focal points?
8. Has there been a change in beneficiaries? If so in what ways? How was this dealt with?

**Efficiency**

* The quality of day-to-day management; coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors/projects.
* The validity of the M&E system and tools in terms of providing useful data to assess the change in beneficiaries’ conditions.
* The extent by which the project’s data collection and documentation provide data about host communities in target areas.
* The adequacy of baseline information, the quality of data base, information management and reporting
* Are costs justified by benefits in comparison to similar projects / alternative approaches?
* Were the outputs achieved in a timely manner?
* Were the resources utilized in the best way possible?

*Additional questions include*:

1. What is the management structure of the project? The location of the implementing NGO, training facilities, locality of beneficiaries?
2. What is internal project communication like? How does the implementing team communicate with stakeholders? What is the frequency of meetings, discussions?
3. What is the usual approach to identification and problem solving?
4. What are the key performance indicators of the project? And are they reflective of the activities implemented?
5. How useful is the M&E system? How was it set up? Is it providing information on beneficiaries? how is data collected? how frequently is the database updated?
6. What is the reporting system in place? How frequent is reporting? What is the quality of reports provided?
7. How is the budget allocated? Is there an auditing mechanism?
8. Has workplans been implemented timely?

**Impact & Sustainability**

* Will the outputs/outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing programme?
* Were the actions and results adopted by the local partners and stakeholders?
* Was capacity built through the actions of the programme?
* Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to promote sustainability of the results achieved?

*Additional questions include*:

1. How do beneficiaries feel about the project? What real or perceived benefits have they gained?
2. To what extent are partners involved in project implementation?
3. To what extent have partners felt that the project has enhanced their capacities? In what ways?
4. Are there certain capacities that stakeholders feel they need, to help them better work on project implementation?
5. How have political/economic events impacted the project?
6. How was the workplan adapted, if at all?
7. Has there been an institutionalization of the project in the partner institutions? In what ways?
8. Is there a perceived exit strategy, in terms of handover, sources of funding, staff? What are the details, if any?
9. What is the attrition rate of beneficiaries?
10. What is the system in place for tracking beneficiaries once they finish training, or receive other services from the project?
11. **Summary of Findings**
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		4. According to UNDP staff and government officials interviewed during this evaluation, the programme successfully highlighted the importance of balancing relief support to refugees with providing support to the needy and ultra-poor within Jordanian host communities. This is in line with international practices that supports the treatment of refugees in the same manner as poor host community populations.
		5. Interviewed government officials, both at the national and municipal levels, explained that the programme was timely and highly appropriate. They explained that the holistic approach adopted by UNDP, the involvement in the planning and the regular exchange makes the problem more relevant and appropriate to the local needs and priorities.
		6. The programme encompassed a strong element of capacity building for all involved stakeholders including the beneficiaries themselves. This dimension was highly relevant and needed by the stakeholders. It indicates that the programme design takes in consideration the local realities and focuses on addressing these challenges to increase relevance and potential impact.
		7. Programme design (as will be discussed in section 5.2 of this report) has affected the relevance of the programme in the sense that several components were implemented in a holistic manner without creating the necessary linkages amongst them or between them. However, this is not to suggest that each programme component was not relevant. As will be discussed below, each component was relevant and timely in its own merit. However, the weakness of linkages amongst them affected the overall relevance and potential impact of the programme. The theory of change of the programme is to foster social cohesion and support the GoJ to mitigate the impact of the current crisis hence lining livelihoods and PVE would increase the relevance of the programme. For example referral system could be established between organisations working with ex-radicals and the livelihoods programme. Other examples could include developing counter narratives that promote livelihoods to support PVE and livelihoods.
		8. Interviewed government and CSOs during the evaluation reiterated the importance of the programme. Government officials praised the timeliness and relevance of providing support to key infrastructure and environmental aspects of the crisis. The joint service council explained that the training and capacity building received by the programme was highly needed. Likewise, CSOs explained that the topics chosen for capacity building were relevant and much needed for the upgrading their skills and abilities.

*“Solid Waste Management is a key government priority as a direct result of the Syrian Refugee Crisis. UNDP is the first international organization to support the municipalities with new equipment to support our efforts.”*

*Government Official*

* + 1. The development of a strategy to prevent violent extremism (PVE) was named by the government as a highly-needed priority for Jordan. Representatives from the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Culture interviewed explained that this intervention is timely and highly supportive of the Government of Jordan interventions in this regard.
		2. In an attempt to remain relevant and innovative, HC project introduced four different models for livelihood support to enable UNDP to build an appropriate text-book model for improving the living conditions for host communities. According to UNDP staff the livelihood interventions up to this point focused on testing different models through piloting and testing to develop a viable economic model that can be handed over to the government. This is a very relevant approach. The flexibility and agility of the livelihoods component and its focus on reviewing different models and engaging various stakeholders is highly commendable.
		3. UNDP theory of change logic for this programme focuses on enhancing and supporting social cohesion within the communities mostly affected by the Syrian refugee crisis. As such, the programme works correctly targeted the locations and communities that received the bulk or was affected the most by Syrian presence. The selection of the project intervention sites is logical and relevant to the overall objectives of the programme. The project focuses on the northern parts of Jordan (Mafraq, Zarqa & Irbid) where most Syrian refugees reside and where the infrastructure is suffering the most. Hence the selection of the AlKeider dump fill to renovate is seen by stakeholders as relevant and timely.
		4. As previously discussed in this report, the HC project has clear objectives and expected outputs. However, the programme does not have a holistic monitoring and evaluation system with clear targets and indictors to measure impact at the outcome level. In addition, due to administrative constraints, out of the control of UNDP, the programme is large and lacks the necessary linkages within and amongst the various components. This issue was discussed with UNDP staff during the evaluation and they explained that they are aware of this shortcoming and will focus in the coming phase on strengthening the linkages between the various components particular between PVE and livelihood support to vulnerable populations.
		5. The programme design places solid waste management (SWM) in the same pillar as PVE. The rational is that all these interventions support social cohesion and stability in Jordanian communities. Whereas logically this is a valid argument, however, the coherence of the programme is affected PVE is a large component and requires particular M&E systems to ensure that it is well monitored and reviewed as necessary to increase its potential impact.
		6. In sum, Mitigating the Effects of the Syrian Refugees on Host Communities in Jordan is a timely and appropriate programme/project. The HC project is relevant to all stakeholders interviewed during the course of the evaluation. The project adopted a holistic approach and successfully focused on building the capacity of government; support policy reform as well as operational practical interventions. In this manner, the project is relevant and appropriate to the development objectives and strategies of Jordan and UNDP. Relevance and appropriateness can be increased by creating the necessary linkages amongst the different pillars of the programme and ensuring that outcome level indicators are developed and regularly reported against.

*The training on writing project proposals, developing a budget and conflict management and resolution contributed t building the capacity of CSOs in Jordan. It was very relevant to our needs.*

*Jordanian CSO Representative*

* 1. **Programme Design**
		1. Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Host Communities in Jordan started as an emergency programme providing support GoJ to respond to the Syrian Refugee Crisis. The programme since its inception in 2013 has grown to encompass various components and interventions. The project includes policy and operation components.
		2. The programme initially included three main pillars focusing on promoting livelihoods; support to local municipalities; and supporting aid coordination. The programme since its inception has grown to include various elements such as combating violent extremism and promoting social cohesion in the communities and promoting the rule of law through support for legal reform. Currently the programme has three main pillars livelihoods and employment, social cohesion and prevention of violent extremism, and support to municipalities and solid waste management The design of the programme is very broad. The broadness of the programme could be perceived as a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it enables UNDP to capitalize on existing resources and mobilize others and on the other hand it affects its ability to focus on clear targets to achieve its goals. Improving the programme design entails creating the necessary linkages between the various components of the programme. Whereas support to livelihoods and support to municipalities are coherently and logically related, legal reform and combating PVE appears to be mismatched with the other two predominantly socio-economic components of the programme.
		3. Each programme component has its own objectives and clear implementation strategies. However, how they all contribute to one or two clear UNDP objectives or targets in Jordan is less clear. The inability of UNDP, due to administrative restrictions, to create independent projects make it harder for the organization to consistently monitor and capitalize on several interventions. For example, promoting livelihoods can be one of the tools of social cohesion. At the moment, this is not perceived as such.
		4. This is not to suggest that at the onset the programme did not have clear objectives and strategies. Rather the objectives of the programme increased and became more diverse over the years. The coherence of the programme remains intact. However, in order to limit the confusion and increase performance it is important to create linkages wherever possible and to reduce interdependence of programmes that do not appear complimentary. For example, livelihoods, can bridge the logical link between support to municipalities and promoting social cohesion. The design of the implementation strategies will need to take this into account. In terms of legal reform, it will be important to in addition to supporting policies and legislations to combat violent extremism and rule of law, to also focus on developing appropriate policies to support micro-enterprise. For example, tax cuts for micro-enterprise or reduced administrative fees for registering businesses…etc. These interventions would increase the relevance and coherence of the programme and ensures that the design is contributing to achieving the overall programme goals.
		5. The design of each component is multifaceted and adopts a holistic approach. For example, the livelihoods component (emergency employment through 3x6 approach) is well thought out and encompasses various elements that could contribute to economic improvement in Jordan (if/when scaled up).
		6. The approach provides none-financial services to entrepreneurs enabling them to build viable businesses. The same thoughtful approach of building capacity prior to providing funds was adopted for other components of the programme. For example, the social cohesion component by providing CSOs with three months training to ensure their preparedness to manage funds and implement projects. Another important model that the programme has adopted in the demand-driven vocational training. The vocational training curriculum, developed through the engagement of the business community and employers, is composed of vocational and soft skills training and on-the-job training with the aim to equip young women and men with market-driven skills and attitudes to improve their ability to transition to the workforce.

Figure 21: Livelihoods & Employment Report November 2016, UNDP

Figure 2 shows the distribution of vocational training and employment beneficiaries per sector over the period from 2013 to 2015. Female beneficiaries constituted around 61 percent compared to 39 males. Job placement rate reached around 90 percent. The design of the demand-driven vocational training and employment and the 3x6 approach has contributed to the achievement of goals. Whereas, one of the weaknesses of the micro-equity investment approach lies in adopting a design that may not have been appropriate to all target groups. It is rather too soon to review the skills-exchange programme.

* + 1. The design of the implementation strategies is appropriate for the context in which the programme operates. UNDP implementation strategy in all component is built around participatory methods. A substantial time is allocated to conducting participatory studies to ensure that the programme is responding to the needs as expressed by the stakeholders. Although this at times leads to some delays in implementation, yet it ensures that the programme remains relevant for the different stakeholders. UNDP conducted municipality needs assessment, labor market surveys, conflict development analysis (just to name a few). These studies ensured that the programme design reflected the needs of stakeholders as much as possible. However, these studies did not support the establishment of performance indicators. The programme has clear objectives and expected outputs, however, it did not develop indicators to measure progress and outcomes. For example, the programme did not set a target against which to measure success in the livelihoods components. Examples of these indicators could include % of increase of household income - # of businesses continuing after 6 months of last communication - % of businesses creating additional employment.

 *There are many donors who are interested in supporting the municipalities. The strength of UNDP is their adoption of participatory methods, flexibility and willingness to coordinate and keep us informed.*

*Government Staff at Al-Akeider Landfill*

* + 1. Available project documents do not indicate that gender was specifically targeted in the project design. Nonetheless, it was a key implementation strategy of the programme. The programme implementation ensured equal opportunity for participation of women and men in the various activities. In addition, the programme ensured that traditional stereotypical roles of women were challenged in some communities leading to a sense of empowerment and acceptance of new gender roles in some communities in Jordan.
	1. **Effectiveness**
		1. **Progress to Date**
			1. According to available project documents, the project is progressing according to work plan with some delays in some components mainly related to PVE. However, in terms of livelihoods, social cohesion and solid waste management, the programme is progressing. One of the reasons for this delay include that the recruitment of a PVE specialist only occurred in April 2016. Other reasons include that the adoption of the PVE agenda only occurred in 2015 as well as government changes.
			2. The programme conducted several studies to ensure the effectiveness of the targeted interventions. This is particularly the case for the livelihood interventions where the project implemented four different schemes to enable the inclusion of wide number of beneficiaries.
			3. As previously discussed, the project focused on building viable economic approaches that can be positively contribute to the improvement of the living conditions of vulnerable Jordanians. UNDP introduced the multifaceted 3x6 approach as an alternative emergency employment model with stronger emphasis on effectiveness and potential sustainability of income generation activities. The approach also encompasses a strong community services component that aims to strengthen citizen-state relationship and support the programme’s overall focus on promoting social cohesion. It is worth noting that the community service activities respond to immediate needs identified by the local communities.
			4. To date (December 2016) the HC project has concluded Phases I & II of the 3x6 emergency employment approach and will soon start the implementation of Phase III (focused on sustainability) of the approach.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Intervention | Progress |
| Emergency Employment (3x6) | Employment project has resulted in creating emergency employment opportunities for around 1500 men and women in 12 municipalities in the Governorates of Mafraq and Zarqa, where the beneficiaries rehabilitated key socio-economic infrastructures. It increased the income of beneficiaries’ households by almost 54 percent. Around 50 percent of the participants in the cash for work phase (Phase I) further moved to the establishment of microbusinesses (Phase II), for whom UNDP continues to provide support to ensure the sustainability of the supported businesses. |
| Demand-Driven Vocational Training  | A total of 525 Jordanians (women: 61 percent) were provided with demand-driven vocational training and employment in the sectors of HVAC, retail, sewing, mechanics, and hospitality, 80 percent of them moved to the on-the-job training opportunities, and 65 percent were employed.  |
| Entrepreneurship Support & Microbusinesses Establishment (Micro-Equity Investment Approach) | Entrepreneurship development project in partnership with a micro-venture fund provided 329 Jordanians (women: 40 percent) in the Governorates of Mafraq, Irbid and Ramtha with entrepreneurship training, and 80 of them were supported with microbusiness start-up in partnership.  |
| between Jordanians and Syrian refugees | Skills exchange project has been launched in 2016, currently targeting a total of 750 beneficiaries (500 Jordanians and 250 Syrians, 50 % women) in the Governorates of Mafraq and Irbid. |

Figure 1 Outcomes of Livelihood Interventions 2016, Source UNDP

* + - 1. According to interviewed government and donor stakeholders in Jordan, the rehabilitation of the Al-Ekeidar landfill is one of the key achievements of the programme. The support comes as part of the support to and collaboration with the Ministry of Municipalities Affairs. In addition to the rehabilitation and upgrading of the landfill, the programme provided support to 36 municipalities of the Governorates of Mafraq and Irbid enabling them to conduct community outreach, identify and prioritize the community needs, and plan and implement local development projects. In addition to rehabilitating the largest landfill in the northern of Jordan along with the transfer stations, the programme intends to link livelihoods with municipality support through support to composting and waste bank development. UNDP is also advocating for improved working conditions and increased protection and welfare of waste pickers.

*The SWM encompasses many things we support, livelihoods, environment, labor rights, and human rights. We are very satisfied with the satisfied.*

*Donor Representative*

* + - 1. In terms of activities related to social cohesion and PVE, the programme is rather large and many activities have been carried out. UNDP staff reported during the evaluation the completion of The Conflict Development Analysis maps to identify the root causes of conflicts and instabilities in host communities. The maps were developed in five Governorates Mafraq, Irbid, Zarqa, Ma’an and Tafileh, and a Community Cohesion Grant Mechanism has been established to fund 130 CBOs to implement quick interventions and projects at high tension areas. At mid-term 186 persons representing 34 CBOs had received prior to receiving the grants a detailed 3-months training programme to build their capacities and enable them to successfully implement the activities of their grants. Within the same pillar, the programme partnered with the government to develop the national strategy for preventing violent extremism. According to project documents, the HC project has also concluded agreements with several relevant institutions to work on counter narrative to prevent violent extremism and implementing different programmes targeting youth in the area of countering and preventing violent extremism.
			2. Last but not least, HC project enabled UNDP to render support to GoJ to manage and coordinate aid. The conceptualization and development of the Jordan Response Plan enables GoJ to capitalize on the support provided to Jordan to increase the resilience of communities in the face of the Syrian Refugee Crisis.
		1. **Effectiveness of Implementation Strategies**
			1. UNDP developed a highly commendable implementation strategies. The focus of the programme was to increase coordination and participation with stakeholders. Accordingly, UNDP developed implementation strategies that were highly participatory of the GoJ. Municipality needs assessment were conducted in a participatory manner. In addition, the programme adopted a “scientific” implementation logic to support capacity building of CSOs, conducting needs assessment, developing adequate selection criteria for beneficiaries among other well-studied implementation approaches. This systematic approach ensured a high level of effectiveness of programme interventions.
			2. The selection criteria of livelihood beneficiaries were very positively received by stakeholders and partner organization. During the evaluation, partners explained that they were very satisfied with the level of coordination and support they received from the programme. They explained that whenever needed some criteria of eligibility were revised to respond to local needs. For example, based on the recommendations from stakeholders, the programme agreed to include unemployed university graduates in the 3x6 approach which was initially not envisaged..
			3. The programme focus on integrity and efficiency is commendable. However, the selection of service providers for the provision of none-financial services to beneficiaries requires re-assessment. It is not sufficient to select an organization based on the price only (procurement procedures). Rather, some organizations could be treated as partners due to their track record and feedback from beneficiaries. It is also important to consider other factors such as ability of an organization to work with the poor and ultra-poor. For example, Migrate seem very organized with clear ideas and approaches. Whether they will be able to support 3x6 approach beneficiaries remains to be seen. Whether they speak the same language and understand the same culture requires careful monitoring to increase effectiveness. The regular change of partners is reducing the effectiveness of the programme as lessons learned from one location are not easily transferred to other locations. The selection process of service providers/partners requires a re-examination.
			4. The programme developed adequate selection criteria for beneficiates of the livelihood interventions. The selection criteria for the beneficiaries of this pillar is the same accordingly, it isn’t clear why then attempt to implement 4 different intervention livelihoods approaches. This issue was discussed with UNDP management and they explained that the focus was on designing a model. Trying to figure out what works best in which context to present a viable model and not just a “text-book” model with no relation to the local context. Based on this approach for example, the Micro-Equity Investment Approachwas discontinued and new approaches are currently being investigated. This include for example, building a relationship with the national microfinance bank to support graduates of the 3x6 approach of those opting to start their businesses after the demand-driven vocational training. The revision of the logic is commendable and is an effective management tool that will improve programme outcomes.
			5. Jordan enjoys a high literacy rate in comparison to the region. However, it is important to recognize that although participants can read and write, yet some of the training topics they receive through the 3x6 approach does not differentiate between the various levels of education and exposure. To increase effectiveness and impact of the programme the duration of Phase II of the 3x6 approach should be expanded and a differentiation in the level of participants attending the same sessions should also be considered. In addition, support to local CSOs to provide ongoing support to newly established businesses (particularly those spearheaded by women) could also promote the effectiveness of the livelihoods interventions.
			6. The implementation strategy adopted for the social cohesion component and addressing violent extremism focused on building partnerships with a wide spectrum of stakeholders to ensure the ownership of the process and of the PVE strategy. Effectiveness of the programme was enhanced by ensuring that the group of CBOs (34 at the time of the evaluation) are well trained and synthesized regarding project implementation. The programme can enhance the focus on social cohesion and fighting extremism by supporting CSOs/CBOs in recognizing the causes of conflict within their communities and developing project that directly address these root causes of conflict. There are some selected projects that may not be directly relevant to the overall objective of the component namely increasing social cohesion and preventing violent extremism. It is worth noting that UNDP does not concur with this finding. The logic of the programme is that any project will lead to social cohesion and PVE. The logic of this approach should be examined during the finale evaluation to ensure validity of the theory.
			7. The development of the PVE strategy was conducted in an effective manner where the focus on holding consultations with a wide range of stakeholders to build common understanding regarding the manner to combat PVE. The strategy recognizes the different drivers of PVE while also addressing the manners in which PVE can be addressed. The effectiveness of the process should be complemented by ensuring that roles and responsibilities of the various actors are clearly defined and that a holistic monitoring and evaluation system is in place to support the regular review of progress and achievements at the outcome levels. The programme also supported the GoJ in developing a legal aid law and alternative dispute resolutions policies. The programme partners with a strong and highly effective royal NGO that has the potential to render support for the adoption of the law. The programme also reviewed the arbitration and mediation laws that complement the holistic approach of supporting social cohesion through improving access to justice. Access to justice was not without its challenges as will be discussed in section 5.3.3.
	1. **Implementation Challenges**
		+ 1. The HC project faced a series of implementation challenges many of which could not be envisaged by the programme at the onset. one of the key challenges is the type of funding available to the programme. The HC programme started with support from the Japanese government in 2012 and has since expanded to be supported by 7 different donors. These funds are “emergency funds” as such, the programme needs to spend the allocated funds in 12 to 18 months’ maximum. This affects the effectiveness of implementation and forces the programme to be focused on delivering results and numbers of beneficiaries as opposed to focus on impact, outcome and quality of interventions.

*“The funds are emergeNcy funds but many of the actions are development and require additional time which we don’t always have.”*

*UNDP Staff*

* + - 1. The expansion of the programme over the course of the last 3-4 years from USD 4 million seed und from the Government of Japan in 2012 to a cumulative USD 48 million from 7 different donors including the Government of Canada, the Government of Kuwait, Swiss Development Cooperation, Finland and RDPP/DANIDA. In addition to funding from other UN agencies such as UN Women, WFP, World Bank, OCHA, and UNDP own funds. The expansion of the programme within the “emergency” nature increased the pressure on UNDP to deliver. UNDP is highly commended for being able to coordinate all the available funds in an effective manner. Effectiveness could be increased by reviewing the initial programme document and aligning it with all the new activities carried out. Whereas it is recognized that the funds are mainly emergency and hence it is hard to anticipate the amount of resources, yet it is important that the programme develops some holistic strategic objectives with clear expected outputs and outcomes measurable by SMART indicators. This will enable UNDP to use a regular M&E system to inform management decisions and increase effectiveness of interventions.
			2. Whereas the administrative challenges are well recognized by the evaluation, yet the programme should be careful not to increase stigma against refugees by linking a programme focusing on addressing the impact of a refugee crisis with combating violent extremism. Funds for PVE and social cohesion warrant a stand-alone project. Alternatively, careful disassociation between refugees and PVE should be consistently made to ensure that it is not used to discriminate or stigmatize refugees in the country.
			3. In addition to the growing Syrian Refugee crisis and the spillover effects of the Arab Spring, the programme needed to also address the skepticism of government vis a vis CSOs; the weakness of the CSO sector in Jordan in general as well as the bureaucratic process to receive acceptance for new project (whether UNDP or CSOs from MOSD). The programme focused on bridging the gap between government and CSOs to build trust between the different partners. UNDP successfully leveraged the credibility and acceptance they enjoy from the different stakeholders (government, donors, and CSOs) to build a platform of support amongst them to increase effectiveness of the programme.
			4. The events of the Arab Spring affected Jordan in the number of cabinet reshuffles and disolution of parliament and the subsequent new election. Many of these events entailed also changes in ministers and ministers’ advisors which affects the progress of the programme. Despite these challenges that are beyond the control of UNDP, the programme successfully established good and strong working relationships within the various line ministries enabling the programme to face minimal delays in implementation. In addition, programme staff are well positioned to navigate the sensitive issues that these changes resulted in.
			5. The Syrian Refugee Crisis increased donors’ interest in supporting the government of Jordan. This also lead to increased activities taking place by various donors in the same areas thus creating a situation of “funding fatigue” or “funding shopping” by local communities. The programme had to present viable support beyond trainings and workshops to ensure the regular engagement of both government and communities alike.

 *At the beginning of my project there was no profit at all. After some work and focus now I am generating 300 JDs every 50 days.*

 *Micro Equity Investment Approach Beneficiary from Mafraq*

* + - 1. The programme has supported the mainstreaming of women and their concerns in several components of the programme particularly within the livelihoods sector. However, the same cannot be said to have been considered for PVE, social cohesion and support to municipalities. The effectiveness of the programme could be increased by developing a mainstreaming policy/approach to ensure that the programme is going beyond equality to support equity.
			2. Regarding livelihoods, what is the impact beyond emergency employment? It is important not to overstate the possible achievements. Livelihoods without policy review or reform (tax cuts for these types of micro-businesses for example) will not be sustainable. The programme could increase effectiveness by reviewing and aligning the different objectives of the different components.
			3. The selection criteria for beneficiaries benefiting from the Micro-venture capital was not very effective. UNDP staff explained that each of the livelihoods interventions require different targeting and selection criteria. Whereas some interventions are appropriate for people with basic education, others – such as the micro equity investment approach, requires higher levels of education and expertise. In addition, according to the beneficiaries the training received to develop their businesses was not sufficient. The oversight of UNDP to ensure do-no harm could have been better positioned. For example, newly established businesses did not fully understand the implications of registering their businesses on the short and long terms. The requirement of formalization of businesses should be re-considered. It should not be the starting point, but it should be promoted for sure but not enforced.

 *The requirements of Ruwwad were not clear to me from the beginning. Although I am not making a lot of money now, but I gained self confidence and ability to depend on myself.*

*Micro Equity Investment Approach Beneficiary*

* 1. **Efficiency**
		1. **Managing Partnerships**
			1. Interviews conducted during the course of the evaluation with relevant stakeholders indicate that UNDP has successfully built sound and strong partnerships at various levels to ensure efficiency of interventions. The participatory implementation strategies adopted by UNDP has increased the efficiency of the programme.
			2. UNDP was commended by all interviewed stakeholders for the high level of coordination and flexibility and focus on building partnerships with all stakeholders. Interviewed donors during the evaluation explained that they were very satisfied with the reporting and responsiveness of UNDP to requests for information and for the quality of work. Few commented on the reporting explain that they prefer that reporting be done against objectives and indicators. Nonetheless, donors believed that UNDP is highly capable and a serious partner in development in Jordan.

* + - 1. Other partners also highly commended UNDP for engaging with them in the day to day activities. The Joint Services Councils commended the flexibility of UNDP and their responsiveness to changes in plans to ensure meeting the needs of the municipal councils. Other partners expressed satisfaction with the level of coordination and flexibility. Beneficiaries also explained that whenever they faced a problem with the training or the service providers, UNDP was willing to listen and provide support.
			2. The programme has a wide range of partners and stakeholders. The programme works with both Royal NGOs as well as community based organizations in the target areas. The trainings are conducted in places suitable to the target populations (whether inside the community or near by). In the case of need for transportation, a transportation allowance is provided by the programme this ensures higher levels of attendance of training events.
		1. **Programme Management & Structure**
			1. The HC project has a clear management structure. The programme is overseen by a programme analyst. Staffing includes two specialists; one responsible for livelihoods interventions with support from 4 staff members. The second specialist is responsible for local governance and is supposed to be supported by 9 staff members. However, the available organigram provided during the evaluation shows that this pillar has 3 available vacancies one of which is the vacancy of an Access to Justice Officer.[[1]](#footnote-1) The programme also includes an operations manager and 4 admin support staff and 4 drivers the project also has 7 field officers following up on all components in the field. The biggest component of the programme is the local governance covering PVE and social cohesion, access to justice and Solid waste management. Management structure is clear with staff aware of roles and responsibilities. Staff is perhaps the biggest asset of the project. Staff turnover has been relatively limited allowing for sustained review of interventions. available staff is well positioned programmatically to ensure high commitment of various stakeholders. Each section meets regularly to ensure consistency and senior staff meetings for coordination and planning purposes occur regularly.
			2. The management of the project could be enhanced by developing a comprehensive M&E system. Monitoring and evaluation functions refer to systematic data collection against indicators identified in the logical framework of the project and ensuring systematic reporting against indicators. M&E functions documents progress and challenges and could also assess impact of project interventions. In that sense, M&E is not available in project activities to date. However, this is not to suggest that some basic M&E activities are taking place. The project does not have a monitoring system beyond the development of the logical framework. There is no evidence to suggest that ample attention is afforded to monitoring and evaluation functions for the programme. The programme focuses on conducting studies to review the progress and impact of the interventions which cannot be said to be sufficient. Due to the importance of M&E function in the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation cannot be overstated. As such, a specialized manager should assume the functions and develop programme specific tools to ensure effective and efficient reporting on project indicators. Indicators should reflect the overall rational of interventions, measure progress against targets and support the theory of change of the programme.
			3. However, the above does not suggest that the programme is not focusing on constantly understanding and documenting the impact of its interventions. the programme developed good baseline data and several studies to provide data about host communities in target areas. The programme also has a basic database of beneficiaries where services and progress is documented. However, these tools are only useful for following up on delivery of services as opposed to a fully developed M&E system that provides overview of both process and outcome levels. As previously mentioned, impact is measured through studies and reviews that are not regular and do not cover all programme interventions. The commissioning of studies is not an efficient way of monitoring programme interventions as it does not cover all aspects and activities carried out by the programme.
			4. Reporting to the donor(s) is done regularly either through a holistic report sent to all donors or by specific reports sent to donors. The reporting format should be revised to give a clear indication of progress against indicators For example some of the interviewed donors during the course of the evaluation explained that they worked with UNDP to develop the reporting mechanism and ensure that reporting is done against indicators. This could be done across the programme and not only when requested by donors.
			5. As previously discussed the type of funding that is available to the programme is emergency funding which is usually up to 12 months. According to the reviewed budget of 2016, by the end of December 2016, the project burn rate was 90.07%. Progress in all project components indicate good progress except for the Women Economic Empowerment component with implementation rate was at 21% at the end of December 2016. However, there were committed funds at the time of the evaluation that would make the burn rate of this component reach 44%. According to UNDP staff this rate was likely to increase as grants are disbursed to CSOs working on social cohesion.
	1. **Impact & Sustainability**
		1. **Achievements to Date**
			1. One of the key changes that the programme helped establish is to increase donor attention to supporting host communities in Jordan. The focus on mitigating the impact of Syrian refugee crisis while supporting the refugees themselves was a responsible response from UNDP. This approach of recognizing the pressure faced by host communities and attempting to address it afforded UNDP a high level of credibility vis a vis all relevant stakeholders.
			2. Mitigating the impact of Syrian refugee Crisis on Host community has to date successfully implemented various activities that suggest that the programme has resulted in positive change in the lives of partners and beneficiaries alike. Most notably the expected resulted of the rehabilitation of El-Akeider are expected to have wide reach an impact. Donors and government officials explained that the pressure on the landfill was a serious health and environmental hazard. The rehabilitation of the landfill, training of the JSC and upgrading of the transfer stations are expected to have a positive impact for the communities living in neighboring areas.
			3. The attempts to improve the working conditions of waste pickers is highly appreciated by the donor and is appropriate for UNDP. However, discussions with the members of the JSC interviewed during the evaluation indicate that they do not see a role for themselves in ensuring the rights and the appropriate working conditions for waste pickers. In order to promote the impact and potential sustainability of this important intervention, JSC members should be synthetized regarding their role and obligation towards the waste pickers even if hired by an external contractor.
			4. The trainings and capacity building activities carried out by the programme whether targeting government at the municipal or national levels and the support and training programme provided to CBOs is highly appreciated by those receiving the training. CSOs explained that their skills have been enhanced by this training. JSC staff explained that they were introduced to new topics and new approaches that will improve their work performance.
			5. The programme has successfully altered perceptions about women role in communities. The programme supported the involvement of women in labor intensive cash-for-work schemes which has changed the perceptions of both women and men within the community concerning gender roles. The focus on providing services to local municipalities has also improved the relationship between citizens and municipalities. According to a municipality mayor interviewed during the evaluation, the programme supported building a level of trust between the municipality and the community. This has made the community more interested in participating in municipality activities.

 *The benefit of the 3x6 approach is that it increased the trust of community on women’s and girls’ abilities. It changed the community culture in this regard.*

*The strength of UNDP is that they work directly with communities and they are credible*

*Municipality Official*

* + - 1. According to UNDP documents, livelihood interventions have increased household incomes. According to interviewed beneficiaries, this statement is true however, the degree to which this increase has affected all beneficiaries cannot be established for lack of M&E data. UNDP explained that a beneficiary database is currently being developed and there are plans to conduct impact assessments in the future. Available documents indicate that the total number of beneficiaries of the 3x6 approach reached 739 beneficiaries in May 2016. Of those 333 beneficiaries moved to the second phase and became entrepreneurs according to UNDP.
			2. A recent study commissioned by UNDP regarding the impact of the livelihoods programme[[2]](#footnote-2) (shared with the evaluation team after field work) indicate that a total of 371 income generating projects businesses have created a total of 708 job opportunities. Only 10 businesses were reported to hire more than 4 employees, and around 80% of the surveyed businesses hire a maximum of two individuals. Of the created jobs, 56% went to females, and 99% to Jordanian citizens. 76% of the beneficiaries with income-generating projects reported being the sole owner of the business, and the remaining 24% reported having 1 and 2 other partners. For all but one beneficiary, those partners were also beneficiaries of UNDP’s 3x6 programs. Of important significance is the review of the additional income reported by the survey. According to the results presented by the survey, the projects bring in on average 163.7 JOD per beneficiary per month: 25% of the businesses make less than 100 JOD per month, 60% of the businesses make a maximum of 150 JOD per month and 95% of the businesses make up to 350 JOD per month for the beneficiary. The total amount generated by the interviewed businesses, on average, was reported to be 60,745 JOD each month. Micro-Venture capital-supported businesses are a little larger (average of 2.5 employees vs. 1.7 employees for 3x6 approach -supported business) and generated a 73% higher average monthly income than 3x6 approach beneficiaries. The survey does not indicate whether these figures are additional income or sole income of the households. Regarding the demand-driven vocational training, UNDP reports that the total number of beneficiaries in 2015 reached 261.
			3. It is also relevant to point out that some beneficiaries believed that the financial training was not sufficient, some were concerned with the legal obligations, some complained from lack of support from one of the service providers Ruwwad. Others explained that the training was sufficient. This could be attributed to age and education. Nonetheless, it is important to point out that the recently commissioned UNDP study referenced above indicate that on average, the Micro-Equity Investment Approach beneficiary’s households had 15% higher average monthly income than 3x6 approach beneficiaries (old intake), and 38% higher than demand-driven vocational training beneficiaries and the new intake of 3x6 approach beneficiaries. This confirms earlier findings and statements made by UNDP staff that the selection criteria of this particular approach require adjustment. The same report indicate that Micro-Equity Investment Approach beneficiaries reported being better off than did the 3x6 and demand driven vocational training beneficiaries; and this could be attributed to the targeting of the programs where 3x6 and VT&E target households and individuals more vulnerable to living in poverty, including women and youth. Micro-Equity Investment Approach beneficiaries are older in age, more likely to be heads of households, have more years of work experience, and are less likely to receive welfare. 3x6 beneficiaries are 3 times more likely to be female-headed than Micro-Equity Investment Approach beneficiaries and 5 times more likely to have received cash assistance in the last 12 months.
		1. **Potential for Sustainability**
			1. HC project is mostly funded through emergency funds received by various donors. Accordingly, the duration of each project cycle does not go beyond 18 months at best. This makes it rather difficult to address issues of sustainability. However, in light of the protracted nature of the Syrian refugee crisis, it is important to consider sustainability even within a seemingly “emergency” programme.
			2. Many (if not all) HC project interventions have good potential for sustainability. At the moment, the programme does not have an exit strategy with clear milestones for handing over some activities to the government. For example the coordination of development aid should eventually be handed over to the government along with the management of the El-Akeider landfill. However, plans to do so do not appear to have been developed. Nonetheless, it is important to point out that the capacity building of relevant staff at the different ministries is ongoing within the programme in preparation for handing over some activities to the government. This could be supported by developing handing over plans including arrangements for transitional phases to ensure sustainability.
			3. The programme focused participatory approaches and focus on creating local ownership of interventions will increase the potential for sustainability. This is particularly the case of the solid waste management and the eventual implementation of the PVE strategy and other social cohesion activities.
			4. Contribution to justice reform through the drafting of laws (legal aid/arbitration/mediation) although not endorsed yet by GoJ is considered but a step in the right track. When adopted and implemented could also lead to sustainability in access to justice for poor communities in Jordan.
			5. Sustainability of livelihood interventions particularly of the skills-exchange scheme should be carefully examined to ensure absence of tensions in the different communities. The sustainability of the livelihoods components is determined by many factors that are beyond UNDP control. As such, setting some realistic targets and indicators to measure progress is needed.
1. **Lessons Learned**
* Networking with various stakeholders in the development of national strategies is a sound strategy to ensure local ownership as well as speed-up the process of implementation.
* Providing concrete support in improving infrastructure and services helps build the reputation of international organizations, increase their credibility and positions them well as a serious interlocutor vis a vis the government when more sensitive issues need tackling.
* New livelihood interventions should be clearly linked to detailed information about the profiles of beneficiaries. Some areas could benefit from schemes and others not. Harmonization is not always the best implementation strategy.
* Conducting trainings of beneficiaries inside factories and in the work place supports the engagement of women in the labor force after the training.
* Developing clear roles and responsibilities when working with government ensures consistency and absence of misunderstandings and expectations. Engagement of line ministries at the local level ensures adequate support to community initiatives.
1. **Recommendations**
	1. **Programme Design/Policy Recommendations**
* Reconsider the various pillars. For example, PVE needs to be a standalone programme that is not related to resilience of host communities.
* Relabel the name of the project to ensure that Syrians are not connected to issues of PVE or other “stigmatizing” concepts.
* Link PVE and livelihood interventions. Linkages between and amongst project components appear missing at this stage as a result of the absence of a coherent M&E.

* Developing a 5 year emergency strategic intervention plan that builds on UNDP expertise over the coming years and the number of studies conducted. This plan should have objectives, expected outputs and indicators. This will facilitate coordination within UNDP. Consider holding a retreat to revise the programme’ s logical framework and develop appropriate and relevant indicators and reporting mechanisms.

* Consider promoting CSR and livelihoods within Al-Hassan industrial zone. This can take the form of study tours to promote recycling and/or green activities that would help reduce the pressure on Elakaider as well as promote sustainable livelihoods and the environment.

* Consider unifying the definitions of Social Cohesion (some believe it to be Jordanian-Jordanian others Jordanian-Syrian). Provide additional support to CSOs in designing and developing programmes for social cohesion.

* Invest sufficient time building the exit strategy. This will ensure better chances of sustainability.
* Linking gender and livelihoods with recycling is a key priority for Canada that UNDP can tap into.
* Advocate for policy change for micro-enterprise. This can include tax deductions, administrative fee exemptions for registering businesses and other none-financial support to encourage entrepreneurship in Jordan.
	1. **Implementation related Recommendations**
* While developing a mediation practice to increase social cohesion and reduce tension in communities, it is important to ensure that the legal counseling and support to women is dine within established laws and through adherence to the law and women’s rights. Whereas mediation and traditional means of conflict resolutons are well respected it should not replace or affect rights gained by women or encourage women to accept situations where her rights are violated.
* Recognize the value added of the different partners. Migrate, JRF, BDC…etc. and create the necessary linkages amongst them. If one takes care of step 1 and another steps 2 and 3, they need to have a holistic understanding of the programme and the beneficiaries.

* If the overall purpose of the programme is to increase social cohesion, it is important to develop other programmes for those who will not benefit from livelihood interventions (those who get rejected).
* Re-examine the impact of the skills-exchange programme to ensure that access to funds by Syrians is complemented by other income generating activities so when funds stop they can continue to cope.
* Develop appropriate selection criteria for each livelihood interventions. Some of the interventions (such as the entrepreneurship approaches) require different criteria than 3x6 approach for example.
* Increase the number of days allocated to monitoring the situation of beneficiaries after they finish the training programme or job/placement. This will enable service providers to provide more support and better understanding of the retention rate.
* Reconsider the way service providers are selected and ensure that all can work together.
* The amount of seed fund available to 3x6 beneficiaries is very limited and will not lead to viable economic opportunities. Consider reducing the number of beneficiaries to increase amount or develop revolving funds and organic clusters to promote viable economic models. Ensure that funding is dependent on the type of project and not a consistent amount to all.
* Selection of awardees during the pitching sessions should place additional weight on some subjective criteria such as the business idea, the willingness of the presenter and his character…etc.
* Provide consistent mentoring and coaching to the different businesses. There needs to be equal time allocated to the initial start-up, mentoring and coaching as well as final wrap-up of the support.
1. **Annexes**

## Annex 1: TORs

****

**TERMS OF REFERENCES**

**For an International Consultant to conduct a Mid-term Evaluation for the Programme:**

**“Mitigating the Impact of Syrian Refugee Crisis through Support to Host Communities”**

# BACKGROUND

# Considered as the world’s most harmful humanitarian disaster with its continuous spillover effect to neighbouring countries, the war in Syria is a protracted and serious crisis, while peace dos not appear close to achieve. This violent war is also considered as a serious challenge in the face of development in the region, including Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Turkey. Today, large territories in the region are controlled by radical militias, where population fabrics and demographics have changed with little hope to recover, which all resulted into large movements of displaced people and refugees searching for safe havens around a war-torn Syria. Refugees fled Syria are mostly living in urban settings in neighbouring countries, and often in already-over-populated areas with high level of society tension, poverty and unemployment.

# Jordan has been particularly affected by the influx of refugees from Syria, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities within the country. UNHCR-Jordan has registered more than 630,000 Syrians, of which approximately 15 per cent of Syrian refugees reside in refugee camps, while the remaining live in host communities. The latest national census in 2016 indicates that out of Jordan’s total population of 9.5 million, the number of Jordanians is around 6.6 million, while the number of non-Jordanians who reside in the country is around 2.9 million, representing 30.6 per cent of overall population. Of the total non-Jordanian population, 1.265 million are Syrians, followed by Egyptians, totalling 636,270 representing 6.68 per cent of the population and Palestinians who do not have national ID numbers with 634,182 representing 6.65 per cent of the population. On the distribution of Syrians living in Jordan, 435,578 Syrians live in Amman, 343,479 in Irbid, 207,903 in Mafraq, 175,280 in Zarqa and the rest are distributed across the country’s other governorates.

The present situation places a clearly heavy burden on local host communities, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities, national resources and the governmental and sub-national budgets. As Syrian refugees are granted access to basic public services, the pressure on water and electricity supply, education, health, sanitation and solid waste management as well as the scarce employment opportunities, has drastically increased where refugees have settled. As the war in Syria has become a protracted crisis, and due to decreasing aid resources to support refugees, the international community and the Government of Jordan are now looking at innovative ways to help refugees sustain their livelihoods without jeopardizing the labor market for Jordanians.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the lead development agency in the UN system and the lead on the resilience axis within the JRP and 3RP, and all engagements proposed in the context of this programme complement UNDP ongoing work in countries across many Arab States. UNDP enjoys International recognition for successful initiatives on stabilization and livelihoods creation programmes. UNDP also leads the UN development agencies in the preparation of the Resilience Chapters of the Jordan Response Plan. Through its work in Jordan over the past three years on host communities’ concerns, UNDP fostered a substantive network of partnerships with all stakeholders at the national, sub-national and local levels, with government and non-governmental authorities.

In Jordan, since 2013, UNDP has been leading a significant programme to support Jordanian host communities mitigate the impact of the Syria refugee crisis on the country (Programme Title: “Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis through Support to Host Communities”), through leveraging the absorption capacity of public services and improving the standards of living for local communities and enhancing social cohesion. The programme has grown over the last few years to become a multi-donor multi-UN platform for support to host communities through several pillars, namely:

1. Employment opportunities created and economic recovery initiatives developed geared towards improvement of livelihoods and basic social services delivery.

2. Improved delivery of municipal and social services

3. Strengthened trust-ship between stakeholders through conflict transformation, social cohesion, and rapid response mechanisms

4. Community Security and Access to Justice strengthened

5. Technical support for the government in effective aid coordination in response to Syrian Crisis

6. Support to Counter-terrorism, Counter violent extremism and enhance stabilization

Thus far, the programme has arrived at the significant achievements including the following:

* Emergency Employment project has resulted in creating emergency employment opportunities for around 1500 men and women in 12 municipalities in the Governorates of Mafraq and Zarqa, where the beneficiaries rehabilitated key socio-economic infrastructures. It increased the income of beneficiaries’ households by almost 54 percent. Around 50 percent of the participants in the cash for work phase (Phase I) further moved to the establishment of microbusinesses (Phase II), for whom UNDP continues to provide support to ensure the sustainability of the supported businesses.
* Skills exchange project has been launched in 2016, currently targeting a total of 750 beneficiaries (500 Jordanians and 250 Syrians, 50 % women) in the Governorate of Mafraq and Irbid.
* Entrepreneurship development project in partnership with a micro-venture fund provided 329 Jordanians (women: 40 percent) in the Governorates of Mafraq, Irbid and Ramtha with entrepreneurship training, and 80 of them were supported with microbusiness start-up in partnership.
* A total of 525 Jordanians (women: 61 percent) were provided with demand-driven vocational training in the sectors of HVAC, retail, sewing, mechanics, and hospitality, 80 percent of them moved to the on-the-job training opportunities, and 65 percent were employed.
* Local Development Units of all the 36 municipalities of the Governorates of Mafraq and Irbid capacitated to conduct community outreach, identify and prioritize the community needs, and plan and implement local development projects.
* The Conflict Development Analysis to identify the root causes of conflicts and instabilities in host communities conducted in the five Governorates of Mafraq, Irbid, Zarqa, Ma’an and Tafileh, and a Community Cohesion Grant Mechanism has been established to fund 130 CBOs to implement quick interventions and projects at high tension areas.
* Mapping of Resources and Risks of municipalities conducted in 16 municipalities in the Governorates of Mafraq , Irbid, Zarqa,Ajloun Jerash,and Amman.
* The largest landfill in the northern of Jordan (Al-Akeider Landfill) is being rehabilitated together with transfer stations, and coupled with waste livelihoods such as composting and waste bank development and promotion of welfare of waste pickers.
* Partnering with the government on developing the national strategy for preventing violent extremism
* Agreements are conducted with several relevant institutions to work on counter narrative to prevent violent extremism and implementing different programmes targeting youth in the area of countering and preventing violent extremism

**The program objectives are:**

**The overall goal** of the programme is to contribute to sustaining social and economic stability, and to safeguard the hard won human development gains of Jordanians.

**The immediate objective** of the programme is to respond to urgent needs of crisis-affected Jordanian host communities, and thus supporting Jordanian host communities to increase their absorption capacity, while contributing to preserving the humanitarian protection space for the Syrian refugees, and mitigating any possible tensions between Syrian refugees and hosting communities.

# Purpose of mid-term evaluation

A mid-term evaluation of this programme is needed to build on the outputs results as the programme has been extended vertically and horizontally and resources were mobilized to implement more outputs until the second quarter of 2017. The objectives of the mid-term evaluation will mainly focus on:

* Evaluating the achievements of the project outputs and target indicators and their contribution to the outcome.
* Assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the project.
* Identifying issues encountered through implementation.
* Drawing lessons learned through the project implementation, and proposing further areas of intervention the project might needs to respond to and embark on.
* Evaluating the M&E programme tools.
* Identifying the national institutions that would benefit from the evaluation and recommend types of actions needed.
* Identify the level of engagement and role of the programme stakeholders.
* Programme exit strategy and sustainability mechanisms.
* Programme ownership at the level of different interventions.

# SCOPE OF WORK:

Within the context outlined above, UNDP seeks to recruit an international consultant to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the programme: “Mitigating the Impact of Syrian Refugee Crisis through Support to Host Communities” The scope of the evaluation should cover the following:

* The programme objectives, inputs, outputs and activities and their relevance to the outcome statement.
* The implementation and selection at geographic areas, and target groups.
* Issues and challenges related to the implementation of the programme.
* Level of cooperation and support of the responsible and relevant parties.

# METHODOLOGY

The consultant is expected to work with the programme team and with the Socio- Economic Analyst at UNDP Jordan. Based on the objectives and scope of work outlined above, the consultant is expected to undertake the following tasks during the evaluation process:

1. Review of all relevant documents including: documents on national policies related to the programme, the Project Documents, agreements, progress reports, and all relevant documentation related to implementation including: gap analysis, assessment reports and activity reports.
2. Conduct interviews and roundtable meetings with programme stakeholders and partners.
3. Any other methods the consultant finds valuable to determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analyzing data.

Below are the criteria to be considered for the evaluation process and the main questions to be addressed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Main questions** |
| Programme Management  | * Are the programme Management arrangements and set-up appropriate to carry out its responsibility of implementation, monitoring, reporting and establishing partnerships? (*This is not an evaluation of individual performance and capacity but of the appropriateness of the structure and set-up in addressing the management*
 |
| Programme Design  | * To what extent did the design of the programme help in achieving its own goals?
* Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed while designing the programme?
* Were there clear objectives and strategy?
* Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmarks for performance?
* Was the process of programme design sufficiently participatory? Was there any impact of the process?
 |
| Relevance and appropriateness  | * Was the programme relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals and challenges?
* Was the programme relevant, appropriate and strategic to UNDP mandate?
* Was the outcome and associated activities relevant, appropriate and strategic to national goals, and UNDP mandate?
 |
| Effectiveness and efficiency | * Was the programme effective in terms of design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, identifying challenges, constraints and success factors and providing conclusions and lessons learnt?
* Were the actions to achieve the outputs and outcomes effective and efficient?
* Were there any lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities? What might have been done better or differently?
* How did the programme deal with issues and risks?
* Were the outputs achieved in a timely manner?
* Were the resources utilized in the best way possible?
 |
| Impact and sustainability | * Will the outputs/outcomes lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing programme?
* Were the actions and results adopted by the local partners and stakeholders?
* Was capacity built through the actions of the programme?
* Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to promote sustainability of the results achieved?
 |

# DURATION OF MISSION

# This assignment will consist of 30 working days to conduct necessary meetings and finalize the mid-term evaluation report.

# OUTPUTS AND TIMEFRAME

Below are the required activities and expected outputs, based on the objectives and scope of work stated above, respective timelines/deadlines and number of working days:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output** | **timeline** |
| 1. Evaluation inception report containing proposed methods, proposed sources of data, and data collection procedures, proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables in addition to evaluation matrix
 | After conclusion of necessary meetingsAfter Review of documents.Within 5working days |
| 1. A first draft of the evaluation results, including findings/ recommendations that should be considered in any next phase of the programme.
 | within 10 working days |
| 1. Final evaluation report: the report should include the following sections:
* Title page
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Table of contents, including list of annexes
* Executive summary
* Introduction: background and context of the programme
* Description of the project – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success
* Purpose of the evaluation; key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations
* Approach and methodology
* Findings; summary and explanation of findings and interpretations
* Conclusions and recommendations; lessons learned.
* Annexes
 | within 10 working days  |
| 4.Debriefing meeting on evaluation results with stakeholders | Within 5 working days  |

# QUALIFICATIONS

* Advanced university degree in public administration, social science, economics, development, or a related discipline;
* Experience in development Issues and earlier experience in evaluation.
* Fluency in English is required, Arabic is a plus
* Full computer literacy

**General professional experience**

* Extensive experience in the field of resilience and development.
* Solid knowledge of the Jordanian natural context, government structure and national policies.
* Similar experience in evaluating development projects, within a crisis context.

**Competencies**

The candidate should be able to:

* Work under pressure against strict deadlines,
* Think out-of-the-box,
* Present complex issues persuasively and simply.
* Contextualize global trends in accordance with the dynamics of the operating (working) environment.

# EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal.
The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria – 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

* Technical expertise – maximum points: 15
* Relevant professional experience – maximum points: 20
* Knowledge and experience in international development – max points: 15
* Previous working experience on similar assignments – max points: 20
Financial Criteria – 30% of total evaluation – maximum 30 points.

**Annexes**

1. **Quality Criteria for Evaluation Reports**
2. **Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**

## Annex 2: Field Work Schedule

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Day** | **Date** | **Time** | **Interviewee**  | **Position/Organization** |
| Monday | 5 December | 9:00- 10:30 | Majida Al AssafGhimar DeebMinako ManomeBilal Al Shaweesh | Programme |
|  |  | 12:00- 13:00 | Mohammad Noor Khrais | PVE National Officer |
|  |  | 13:15-14:15  | Yasar Qatarneh | PVE consultant-drafting the national PVE Strategy |
|  |  | 14:15- 15:15 | Eng. Ammar Abu-Drais | Government advisor on Environment and Solid Waste Management+ Advisor on the National Strategy of SWM |
|  |  | 15:30-16:30 | Minako Manome | Livelihood Specialist |
| Tuesday | 6 December | 8:00 -9:00 | Ghimar Deeb | Governance Specialist (PVE-SWM and Municipal Services-Rule of Law- Social Cohesion) |
|  |  | Departure from Amman at 9:00 to go to Al-Akaider | Eng. Ibrahim MousaEng. Sanaa Bsul | Solid Waste Management (SWM) |
|  |  | 1:00 departure from Al Akaider to Al Mafraq | Mayor Bakheet Al Issa | Skills ExchangeRapid Employment |
|  |  | 3:30-4:30 | Nadia Al Awamleh | Socio-Economic Portfolio |
| Wednesday | 7 December | 9:30-11:30 CCGM  | Al-Aman NGOAl-Ayadi El-Baydaa | CCGM (Social Cohesion) |
|  |  | 12:00-13:30 beneficiaries | 3x6 beneficiaries | Rapid Employment and Microbusinesses  |
|  |  | 13:30 -14:30  | Mohammad Jaber | CCGM Social Cohesion and Livelihood |
|  |  | 15:30- 16:30 | Aghadeer Juweihan | CCGM and livelihood |
| Thursday | 8 December | 8:00- 9:00 am | Mohammad Anakrih | Livelihood National Officer |
|  |  | 9:00am – 10:15am | Ghadeer Al Ghuffash  | Vocational Training |
|  |  | 10:45am – 12:00pm | Diana Abu Obaid  | Emergency Employment-Microbusinesses Sustainability |
|  |  | 12:30pm – 1:45pm | Talat Salha | Microbusiness |
|  |  | 2:15pm – 3:30pm | Yahya Brazat  | Emergency Employment-Community Initiative-Implementation and Microbusiness establishment. |
|  |  | 16:00- 16:45 | Christopher Middleton  | Social Cohesion-CCGM |
| Sunday  | 11 December | 9:00-10:00 | H.E. Sharif Al Omari | PVE |
|  |  | 10:30-11:30 | Mr. Mikhael Farr | Solid Waste Management |
|  |  | 12:00-13:00 | Noor Al Emam | Access to Justice  |
|  |  | 13:30- 14:30  | Dr. Walid Abed Rabbouh | Jordan Response Plan |
| Monday | 12 December | 8:30-10:30 | Bilal Al-Shaweesh |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 13:30 – 15:30 | Debriefing | UNDP Staff |
| Tuesday | 13 December | 9:00-10:30 | Eng. Ibrahim Obeidat  | Social Cohesion-CCGM |
|  |  | 11:00- 12:30 | Eng. Salam Al-Twal and Basem Saaydeh | SWM-Municipal Services |
|  |  | 14:30:15:30 | Hiroshi Seto | PVE |
| Sunday | 18 December | 3:00 -4:30 |  | National Microfinance Bank |
| Tuesday | 20 December | 9:00 -10:30 | Ms. Lina Hammad | DANIDA (regional response programme) |

1. UNDP explained that this particular output has been closed and has no current funding at the moment. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Analytical Report: Designing and Implementing Excel of Access Database of Beneficiaries. UNDP. December 2016 (draft). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)