



Evaluation of the Country Office Livelihoods Outcome –
UNDP Jordan

Final Report



17 September 2020

Submitted to:
UNDP Jordan CO

Submitted by:
Nahla Hassan with support from Anouchka Baldin and Marwa Ershaidat

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	3
II. Programme Background	3
III. Programme Description	9
IV. Evaluation Purpose and Methodology	11
<i>4.1 Objectives of the Evaluation</i>	11
<i>4.2 Study design:</i>	12
<i>4.3 Sampling and characteristics of Evaluation participants</i>	12
<i>4.4 Data Collection and Analysis</i>	13
<i>4.6 Ethical Standards</i>	13
<i>4.7 Limitations</i>	13
V. Evaluation Findings	14
<i>5.1 Relevance and Appropriateness</i>	14
<i>5.2 Effectiveness</i>	17
<i>5.3 Efficiency</i>	26
<i>5.4 Impact</i>	28
VI. Conclusions	35
VII. Recommendations	36
VIII. Annexes	38
<i>Annex 1: Final Work Plan and Evaluation Schedule,</i>	38
<i>Annex 3: Final Data Collection Tools</i>	39
<i>Annex 4: Documents Consulted</i>	44
<i>Annex 5: Evaluation Matrix</i>	45
<i>Annex 6: Terms of Reference</i>	50

I. Executive Summary

Programme Background

UNDP has been intervening in Jordan in the context of the conflict and humanitarian situation in neighbouring Syria, which has significantly impacted in Jordan. The country has been particularly affected by the massive influx of refugees fleeing Syria since 2011. Despite the establishment of camps and transit facilities, the vast majority of the Syrian refugee population has been hosted within Jordanian communities. More than 70% of the refugees have settled in urban areas, mainly in the governorates of Irbid, Mafraq, Amman and Zarqa. As the crisis went on, new arrivals have increasingly been destitute and vulnerable Syrian families.

Programme Description

Within this 2013-2017 plan, UNDP Jordan conducted interventions aimed to improve livelihoods. It is important to point out that the livelihoods component/ activities were part of a wider inclusive growth and economic development. The programme intended to build resilience and fair distribution of economic opportunities. Besides traditional interventions aimed to enhance access to livelihoods and income-generation activities, UNDP conducted market-based livelihoods interventions supporting social cohesion/stability, community resilience and self-reliance. It also supported the youth and women in accessing sustainable livelihoods opportunities. The key complimentary interventions aimed at improving livelihoods opportunities and resilience-building outcomes for men and women, implemented by UNDP, were the following: demand-driven vocational training and employment; micro-equity (venture capital); 3x6 approach: including access to markets, emergency employment, social cohesion ; and skills exchange between Jordan and Syrian refugee communities¹.

The interventions were conducted as part of the programme “Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Jordanian Vulnerable Host Communities” (2013-2017) derived from the Country Programme Document 2013-2017. Several projects were implemented under this programme, which all included livelihoods-related activities contributing to the livelihoods-related objectives of the Country Programme document:

- The “Solid Waste Management and Income Generation in Host Communities and Rehabilitation of Al Alakedir Landfil” project, in line with the UNDAF and CP Outcomes “Government and national institutions have operationalized mechanisms to develop and implement strategies and plans targeting key cultural, environmental and disaster risk reduction issues (including a transition to green economy)” and “Jordan has institutionalized improved social protection and poverty alleviation mechanisms for vulnerable people at national and sub-national levels”;
- The project “Support to Counter-Terrorism, Stabilization, and Counter-Radicalization in Jordan”;
- The project “Skills Exchange of Vulnerable Host Communities and Syrian Refugees for Enhancing Livelihoods and Social Cohesion”.

Four additional projects included livelihoods-related components were implemented by UNDP:

- The “Decentralization and Local Development Support Programme (DLDSP);
- The “Restoration of Sustainable Livelihoods Creation and Natural Resource Management in Badia Communities Project through enhancement of the sheep dairy production” project;
- The “Fostering Food Processing Services to enhance local Economic Development in Tafileh and Ajloun” (PLEDJ – FP) project;
- The “Fostering Tourism Services to support local economic development in Tafileh and Ajloun” (PLEDJ – TS) project.

Evaluation Purpose and Methodology

The purpose and overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the livelihoods and inclusive growth interventions implemented by UNDP Jordan during the 2013-2017 CPD cycle. In addition, the evaluation considers contributions towards Outcome 3 of the current UNSDF “Enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the economic, social, environmental and political spheres”. It assesses the performance of the UNDP livelihoods interventions, their achievements and quality of results, as well as measure the achievements in terms of enhanced self-reliance of vulnerable populations and social cohesion/stability among affected communities (through the resilience lens, in line with the Resilience definition as applicable in the NRP/3RP). In addition, the evaluation examines the concept of Inclusive Growth which was based on inclusive local economic development.

¹ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Jordan (2013-2017), 24 May 2012.

The evaluation also assesses whether there were any policy, advocacy or ecosystem interventions that enabled inclusive local economic development for refugees and migrants inclusion in local development strategies, plans and productivity programming at the local level.

In light of the COVID-19 situation, the evaluation was conducted remotely i.e. through the use of Zoom/Skype for meetings and interviews with key stakeholders and key informant interviews including beneficiaries. This did not affect the methodology for data collection although it required the elimination of FGDs as it was impossible for health reasons to gather a group of beneficiaries in the same room. Nonetheless, the evaluation adopted a mixed-methods approach focusing on collecting qualitative data from project stakeholders and participants while building on existing analysis of standardized, quantifiable and classifiable regular data linked to monitoring systems. In particular the evaluation considered the project's results framework examining selected indicators and verifying progress according to the original project design.

Evaluation Findings

Relevance and Appropriateness

The livelihoods interventions implemented under the programme "Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Jordanian Vulnerable Host Communities (2013-2017) are aligned with the priorities of the Government of Jordan (e.g. as set up in the National Agenda 2006-2017). The livelihoods interventions are in line with the challenges and issues identified in the Country Programme Document 2013-2017 (e.g. Outputs and Results of the programme "Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis through Support to Host Communities" to support livelihoods, Outcome 2, Output 2.1, 2.2, Outcome 3, Output 3.1 of the Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) project, and the livelihood-related interventions of the Solid Waste Management (SWM) project respond to the issues identified in the CPD). Yet, the CPD does not really tackle the Syria crisis and is more about reform and living conditions improvement overall. Considering that the Syria crisis and influx of refugees has made the situation worse for Jordanians, addressing the impact of the crisis ("Mitigating ...") addresses the existing issues, yet this focus on mitigating the impact of the crisis is not really what dominates in the CPD.

The Outcome interventions went through different phases during the first CPD (2013-2017) and (2018-2022). At the beginning of the interventions were focused on mitigating the impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis by creating emergency employment schemes to generate income and reduce the economic impact of the crisis. The HC project continued to be the largest portfolio of the country office with a stronger focus on the supply side and less so on the demand side. Some interventions considered supply and demand. For example, the education for employment component started off with training followed by interviews to decide which track the trainees would engage in (job placement or self-employment). *"We know from the start where they are going. We had more flexibility in UNDP and when the student had the technical skills we were able to see where they will go"*. However, the education for employment was a small component under the livelihoods programme and does not speak of all the livelihoods interventions such as skills exchange or 3x6 which focused more on the supply side and less so on the demand side. By 2015-2016 a stronger focus was placed on local economic development through the smaller economic development projects such as PLEDJ and Badia projects while continuing to focus on income generating activities for the most vulnerable.

Effectiveness

The design of the HC programme is very broad. The broadness of the programme could be perceived as a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it enabled UNDP to capitalize on existing resources and mobilize others and on the other hand it affected its ability to focus on clear targets to achieve its goals. Each project/programme component has its own objectives and clear implementation strategies. However, **how they all contribute to the overall achievement of the Outcome Objectives in Jordan is less clear.**

The livelihoods interventions of each project within the HC programme and other programmes were implemented effectively which contributed to the achievement of the expected results of the different projects. Livelihoods related targets were achieved in each project. It is important to point out that **there is no one livelihoods / economic development strategy to which each project contributes in a systematic manner. Outcome interventions whether 3x6, demand-driven training and skills exchange have contributed to increasing access to employment and diversification of opportunities for individuals and CBOs. However, they did not necessarily target a specific sector or address challenges in the ecosystem for local economic growth.**

Available indicators do not provide the full extent of the work done by UNDP because while the economic growth activities shifted from inclusive growth and economic development as initially envisaged in the CPD document to livelihoods interventions and job creation, this was not translated into a revised CPD document with clear expected outputs and indicators to measure progress and development.

In terms of implementation of economic opportunities UNDP has worked in a number of priority areas including solid waste management, vocational training, employment and entrepreneurship support. Through the different economic interventions presented by UNDP, the aim was to introduce the different stakeholders to different models that could be adopted for increasing economic growth. These included demand-driven vocational training; Emergency employment entrepreneurship and micro-businesses. These interventions focused on the humanitarian-development nexus and benefited both Jordanian and Syrian refugees. Available evidence from project documents and discussions with UNDP team indicate that the livelihoods interventions did not target a specific sector or a specific area for local economic development. The livelihoods interventions continued to operate as “emergency intervention” with limited focus on sectoral development and/or local economic development. There has not been a holistic assessment of skills gaps of beneficiaries and no assessment of the private sector.

The activities under the Outcome have generally not been market driven. The 3x6 approach focused on injecting money into the economy through emergency employment schemes, provision of seed funding for entrepreneurship creation without necessarily considering the business ecosystem or the laws and regulations that could help or hinder the development of private enterprises. As highlighted by the Mid-term evaluation of the HC programme, “HC project focused on building viable economic approaches that can positively contribute to the **improvement of the living conditions of vulnerable Jordanians and Syrians. Some of the projects under the Outcome are predominantly solid waste management projects and/or PVE projects where livelihoods interventions are mainstreamed and not used as a tool for the achievement of the overall specific project intervention and not as part of an overall vision and approach to improving economic conditions in a specific area.** This could explain the absence of clarity as to how livelihoods models are chosen/selected in certain areas and in specific contexts. The factors contributing to the achievement or no achievement of intended outcomes can only be assessed based on the context of each project and in each target area.

Between 2013-2017 UNDP country office did not have a gender strategy. However, a gender mainstreaming strategy was in place. UNDP gender strategy was developed only in 2019. The attention paid to gender equality and women empowerment has increased over the years especially with the hiring of gender focal point. Attention of the livelihoods interventions to gender issues has seen a steady improvement as the focus gradually shifted from considering the number of women vs. men who benefit from interventions to a more systematic focus on involving women at different levels. Anecdotal accounts from the different projects examined as part of this evaluation indicate that although gender and rights-based approaches are considered by UNDP in the different activities, this is not done in a coherent and systematic manner that can yield to actual change in the lives of women.

UNDP approach for the livelihoods interventions has been focused on building models and then advocating for the implementation of these models with other partners and with the GOJ. Projects are approached as testing grounds that can form a base for viable economic interventions. However, identified barriers are not addressed which limits the validity of the pilot models. For example, in a recent rapid assessment of Impact of COVID19 on UNDP the majority of UNDP beneficiaries were found to be engaged in informal businesses which impeded them from accessing government business continuity and protection measures or access to finance.

Efficiency

The financial resources allocated for the CPD 2013-2017 were adequate and sufficient for the achievement of the Outcome activities. UNDP benefited from a surge in funding opportunities that were a direct result of the Syrian Refugee Crisis. UNDP successfully leveraged resources for both humanitarian and development approaches which contributed to the successful implementation of the outcome activities. The country programme between 2013-2017 was substantially larger than UNDP anticipated during preparation of the CPD and CPAP for 2013–2017. Between 2012 and 2015 the size of the programme in terms of throughput more than doubled, from just over \$5

million to over \$11.5 million annually.² In 2013 UNDP developed the project proposal on mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordanian vulnerable host communities, which was funded by the Government of Japan. Since then the project has expanded horizontally and vertically and become a multi-donor programme for all host community related interventions. UNDP presence in the affected host communities in the northern regions since 2013 is helping to attract donor funding.³

However, as donors focus started to shift in 2017-2018 since the London Conference, there seems to be some challenges in resource mobilisation. According to UNDP team *“We focus on providing proposals for call for proposals and this limited the amount of technical and financial resources here in comparison to previous phases. We should not be competing for calls for proposals. Everyone is going towards localisation and so donors are interested in CBOs and CSOs.”* UNDP should be providing technical assistance to the government who are receiving funds from different donors. None of the CBOs and CSOs can support the government. This is UNDP’s niche, and this is where the CO should be working.

Staff turnover, absence of adequate capacity for M&E and gender within the country office contributed to a reduction in the efficiency and effectiveness of the interventions and the achievements of intended results especially in what concerns gender mainstreaming and rights-based approaches. The evaluation recognises that UNDP CO contributions to livelihoods and the linkages created between livelihoods and other pillars are commendable, yet the current M&E framework does not mirror the efforts and the outcomes of these activities and interventions.

Impact

The overarching activities of the livelihood’s component fall within the “emergency” lens. It is thus difficult to speak about long term impact. Nonetheless, each of the projects contributing to the outcome activities have contributed to the desired change overtime especially in terms of short-term impact on improving coping mechanisms of target beneficiaries. Stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation (implementing partners, government, CBOs, beneficiaries) have all reported some level of positive change that has occurred to them and their communities because of the Outcome activities (projects).

Outcome interventions helped strengthen service delivery at the local level. The local institutions at the beginning of 2012-2013 the municipalities were not ready for development or humanitarian assistance. They did not have preparedness or knowledge on how to deal with a crisis. Some of the departments for social development were not ready.

Social cohesion was enhanced through the interventions of the PVE programme as well as the 3x6 activities. The integration of both Syrian and Jordanian beneficiaries helped strengthen the relations between them and diffuse potential conflicts by engaging them in the same activities to provide services for the community. All beneficiaries, from all projects, appreciated meeting the other beneficiaries. The network created between candidates, whether it was while working together on improving their area through initiatives, or building their projects, meeting each other made a difference on both the personal and professional level. Beneficiaries reported resorting to their peers for issues related to registration and governmental process. There were partnerships formed during the training (for both initiative and projects) and cooperation, despite certain interviews reporting disputes between candidates.

The Outcome interventions through the different projects contributed to a stimulation of the local market through the introduction of different livelihoods models. **The work of UNDP during 2013-2017 was not necessarily aiming to contribute to labour market development but it intended and succeeded in working in host communities affected by the Syrian refugee crisis through cash injection to improve the livelihoods for persons and the communities.**

The implementation modality of the livelihoods interventions since 2013 continued without a specific focus on developing a specific sector or on a comprehensive economic growth approach. Support to an enabling business ecosystem was not considered or implemented. Despite identifying some barriers such as access to finance, registration fees, sustainability and informality, there has not been advocacy and policy work to address these

² ADR 2017

³ ADR 2017

barriers. UNDP work needs to pay stronger attention on inclusive economic growth and not only on livelihoods. Examples and lessons could be drawn from smaller interventions such as PLEDJ or Badia. As Jordan moves towards a protracted crisis and Syrians are moving from border areas to internal migration. It would be important to focus on rural communities as well as bigger cities such as Zarqa, Irbid and Amman. There is a need to focus on bigger urban centers and address widening inequalities in cities. Livelihoods interventions in general need to focus more on the demand side especially the enabling environment to enable market based (demand) approaches to generate jobs, sustain livelihoods through export development, access to markets, economic recovery of key sectors, investment and strengthen fiscal stability at national and subnational level.

Sustainability

The sustainability of the employment opportunities provided is mixed. Some employment opportunities continued after the life of the projects and even during the COVID-19 lock-down in Jordan and others stopped. A survey conducted by UNDP looking at the effects of COVID-19 on businesses supported through UNDP interventions indicated that 15% of businesses (out of 400 businesses) managed to continue to function after COVID-19. In terms of the micro-venture fund, UNDP and Ruwad report that 60% of 150 businesses created continued to function (reports from pre-COVID-19 situation). However, it is important to point out that these businesses are within the informal sector and whether they will be sustainable in the midst of a global pandemic and beyond remains to be seen. Whereas, two of the CBOs engaged in the Dairy Production in the Badia have explained that they have to cut four out of the six job opportunities created as a result of the difficulties in marketing and selling during the COVID-19 lockdown.

Conclusions

The CPD 2013-2017 and 2018-2022 is well suited to the context in Jordan. CPDs were designed in a participatory process taking into considerations the needs, requirements and priorities of the Government of Jordan and the various stakeholders. The CPD document was not revised to reflect the changing dynamics caused by the Syrian refugee crisis. The 2018-2022 CPD also does not consider the Syrian refugee protracted crisis explicitly.

Livelihoods related targets were achieved in each project. It is important to point out that there is no one livelihoods / economic development strategy to which each project contributes in a systematic manner. Some interventions focused on Syrian refugees and successfully reached them while others focused on Jordanian host communities, and a third attempted to work with both refugees and host communities. Depending on the selected target group, each individual project was able to reach its targeted population (s) and achieve its expected results.

However, the effectiveness of the interventions was affected by a number of factors such as the absence of a comprehensive livelihoods' strategy focusing on economic growth in addition to the absence of detailed gender analysis to inform the women's empowerment and gender equality aspects of the work. The situation was further exacerbated by a weak monitoring and coordination system that focuses more on information sharing, creating synergies and less on collective programme design and implementation.

The largest portfolio and budget were for 3x6, host communities project and PVE1-4 programs with smaller interventions in the form of area specific or sector specific interventions such as PLEDJ and Badia. These two interventions albeit small in comparison to 3x6 or PVE related livelihoods interventions seem to have a clearer approach. This could be explained due to the fact that they are multi-year projects; are either area specific or sector specific; were preceded by thorough needs assessment and identification of local economic development needs; and have managed to partner with strong partners made them successful (as far as the evaluation could tell). On the other hand, 3x6 approach appear sporadic and does not have a clear strategy (it is not planned interventions based on specific identified needs and it is never a multi-year project because most of the funds for it are emergency funds at best 18 months in duration making sustainability very unlikely because the emergency by definition should not be sustainable). On the other hand, PLEDJ, SWM and Environment interventions (Badia) had clear livelihoods outputs with resilience impact i.e. infrastructure, capacity building, LED and should be further examined for scalability and replication.

The impact of the livelihood's interventions could be seen at many levels. On the strategic level the engagement and support to the GoJ has created a high level of trust between UNDP CO and the government opening the door for UNDP to work on policy reform should it wish to do so. It is also clear from the feedback from government at

the local level that the economic opportunities have strengthened local government as well as businesses and created stimulation in local markets. The activities of 3x6 have helped inject funds into local markets and supported the livelihoods of individuals. Beneficiaries interviewed reported intended and unintended results in the form of improved livelihoods, better communication skills, ability to manage personal problems and high degree of confidence and optimism about the future of their families. Women were very vocal about the impact of engagement with UNDP economic activities in providing them with a voice and ability to have agency within their households.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Livelihoods outcomes do not have a holistic framework for local economic development. There needs to be a clear framework or strategy that all projects contribute towards achieving. This could include the scaling up of some models, the introduction of innovation and acceleration labs or other methods that all projects could contribute to in a coherent and systematic fashion.

Recommendation 2: The CPD for 2013-2017 did not include an outcome/outputs specifically targeting Syria refugees' livelihoods/inclusive growth, neither does CPD 2018-2022. The Syrian refugee situation has become a protracted crisis that requires a specific focus by development practitioners. There is a need to realign the objectives and outputs of the CPD to the reality on the ground. This could be done either through an evaluation or an internal review and update of the CPD document itself. It is important to realign the objectives and outputs and adjust to rapidly changing socio-economic landscape, challenges, and national priorities

Recommendation 3: UNDP has taken large strides to increase women economic participation and empowerment. However, these attempts are disjointed and lack a coherent and systematic approach. There is a need to ensure that all projects encompass strong gender analysis at the design stage and the capacity of the different teams are aware of key concepts in gender mainstreaming such as do no harm.

Recommendation 4: UNDP has developed a system for monitoring and evaluation. Further efforts need to be exerted to ensure the development of common indicators and data collection methods to improve data quality and reporting.

Recommendation 5: UNDP has introduced many economic development models to the Jordanian landscape without assessing the value for money of each of the models. There is a need to move beyond the emergency employment schemes into more economic growth and market dynamics. UNDP should focus on rendering technical support to the GOJ on improving the labour market and developing sector strategies or area-based approaches.

Recommendation 6: UNDP has successfully worked on promoting SMEs in Jordan. There is a need to work on the policy reform agenda to ensure the adequate support and access to finance for newly established SMEs. UNDP should focus on creating an enabling environment for businesses by working on legal reform, IT support and software and other key requirements for the development of a sustainable economic growth.

Recommendation 7: Data generated from this evaluation indicate a level of success of smaller projects implemented at the governorate levels such as PLEDJ and the Dairy Production initiatives. It is recommended that the model be studied and replicated through partnership with the government and the private sector in other sectors and in other governorates.

Recommendation 8: MOPICs institutional capacity building for Jordan Response Plan was a positive partnership model developed and supported by UNDP at the onset of the Syrian refugee crisis. To ensure the continued relevance of the interventions the relationship needs to be enhanced considering the protracted nature of Syria crises and multiplicity of challenges facing Jordan.

II. Programme Background

UNDP has been intervening in Jordan in the context of the conflict and humanitarian situation in neighbouring Syria, which has significantly impacted in Jordan. The country has been particularly affected by the massive influx of refugees fleeing Syria since 2011. Despite the establishment of camps and transit facilities, the vast majority of the Syrian refugee population has been hosted within Jordanian communities. More than 70% of the refugees have settled in urban areas, mainly in the governorates of Irbid, Mafraq, Amman and Zarqa. As the crisis went on, new arrivals have increasingly been destitute and vulnerable Syrian families.

This situation has been placing a considerable burden on Jordanian host communities. It has stressed fiscal and natural resources, put pressure on water and electricity supply, education, health, sanitation and solid waste management. Local market dynamics have also been strained to the limit, particularly the job and housing markets. As a result, pre-existing vulnerabilities of the Jordanian communities have been exacerbated. This is particularly the case of the Northern Governorates of Irbid, Mafraq and Zarqa; and especially in the cities of Ramtha and Mafraq.

This crisis has worsened the already difficult economic situation of the country. Indeed, Jordan was already facing significant economic and social challenges, despite efforts to engage in economic stabilization and liberalization. These include, among others, a large budget deficit, high level of public debt, dependency on foreign aid and remittances, high inflation, persisting high unemployment levels with a mismatch between demand and supply in the labour market (despite a young and increasingly skilled population), and remaining high poverty levels.

Besides its own structural challenges, which the Syrian crisis has only worsened, Jordan finds itself in a very instable regional context and neighbourhood in the middle of multiple crises. "The indicators of the country's socio-economic status are worrying; unemployment rate of 18.6%; 38.9% among youth, informal poverty rate that stands at 25%, and a rising real cost of living in contrasts to the declining income average. Jordanian education and infrastructure services are overstretched; access to and quality of services have been negatively impacted, and many young Jordanians cannot find work. In addition, there are currently wide regional disparities in Jordan regarding local economic development and social, cultural and political engagement. There are significant complaints of corruption in politics and business, as well as criticism of ineffective economic policies and laws that have not been able to find solutions to rising unemployment and the costs of living, with substantial economic and social disparities between different regions and between different groups of society."

In the very difficult context that characterizes Jordan, at the heart of a deeply unstable region facing multiple crises, demonstrations have arisen in the country to call for political and social justice reform, the need for which the Government had recognized long before (notably when setting out its reform vision and National Agenda 2006-2015". While political reform has been delayed due to the complex context, and significant gains have been made on the education and infrastructure pillars, socio-economic challenges remain high, demand for better governance and stronger accountability mechanisms in the people-state relationship has not been satisfied, and Jordan is still facing many environmental challenges .

III. Programme Description

UNDP has developed its Country Development Programme 2013-2017. The programme focus was derived from the five outcomes laid out in the 2013-2017 UNDAF:

- Systemic reform: Jordan has undertaken political and institutional reform at national and subnational levels in a participatory, transparent and accountable manner;
- Social protection: Jordan has institutionalized improved social protection and poverty alleviation mechanisms for vulnerable people at national and subnational levels;
- Social services: Jordan is providing equitable delivery of quality social services for all people;
- Young people: Jordan has institutionalized necessary policies and mechanisms for the effective and inclusive participation of young people in social, cultural, economic and political life;
- Environment: Government and national institutions have operationalized mechanisms to develop and implement strategies and plans targeting key cultural, environmental and disaster-risk-reduction issues (including transitioning to a green economy) at national and subnational levels⁴.

⁴ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Jordan (2013-2017), 24 May 2012.

The country programme focused on accelerating process on SDG 1, 5 and 8 (previously MDG 1, 7 and 8). Its focus responded to national priorities for political development and inclusion, investment development, employment support, vocational training, social welfare and infrastructure, as outlined in the National Agenda. The youth and women's issues were prioritized. Aid coordination and effectiveness as well as disaster risk reduction were also aimed to be strengthened through the CDP⁵. Decentralisation and regional development were key national priorities during this time including local and regional economic development.

Within this 2013-2017 plan, UNDP Jordan conducted interventions aimed to improve livelihoods. It is important to point out that the livelihoods component/ activities were part of a wider inclusive growth and economic development. The programme intended to build resilience and fair distribution of economic opportunities. Besides traditional interventions aimed to enhance access to livelihoods and income-generation activities, UNDP conducted market-based livelihoods interventions supporting social cohesion/stability, community resilience and self-reliance. It also supported the youth and women in accessing sustainable livelihoods opportunities. The key complimentary interventions aimed at improving livelihoods opportunities and resilience-building outcomes for men and women, implemented by UNDP, were the following: demand-driven vocational training and employment; micro-equity (venture capital); 3x6 approach: including access to markets, emergency employment, social cohesion ; and skills exchange between Jordan and Syrian refugee communities⁶.

The interventions were conducted as part of the programme "Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Jordanian Vulnerable Host Communities" (2013-2017) derived from the Country Programme Document 2013-2017. Several projects were implemented under this programme, which all included livelihoods-related activities contributing to the livelihoods-related objectives of the Country Programme document:

- The "Solid Waste Management and Income Generation in Host Communities and Rehabilitation of Al Alakedir Landfil" project, in line with the UNDAF and CP Outcomes "Government and national institutions have operationalized mechanisms to develop and implement strategies and plans targeting key cultural, environmental and disaster risk reduction issues (including a transition to green economy)" and "Jordan has institutionalized improved social protection and poverty alleviation mechanisms for vulnerable people at national and sub-national levels";
- The project "Support to Counter-Terrorism, Stabilization, and Counter-Radicalization in Jordan";
- The project "Skills Exchange of Vulnerable Host Communities and Syrian Refugees for Enhancing Livelihoods and Social Cohesion".

Four additional projects included livelihoods-related components were implemented by UNDP:

- The "Decentralization and Local Development Support Programme (DLDSP);
- The "Restoration of Sustainable Livelihoods Creation and Natural Resource Management in Badia Communities Project through enhancement of the sheep dairy production" project;
- The "Fostering Food Processing Services to enhance local Economic Development in Tafileh and Ajloun" (PLEDJ – FP) project;
- The "Fostering Tourism Services to support local economic development in Tafileh and Ajloun" (PLEDJ – TS) project.

In 2017 the CPD 2013-2017 was reviewed and the new CPD (2018-2022) formulated based on lessons learned. The 2017 Assessment of Developments Results (ADR) found that the country programme was relevant and responsive to the country's national and development priorities and played a crucial role in assisting the Government in placing the resilience-building approach on the international agenda; supported the MOPIC in establishing a multi-stakeholder coordination structure that serves as an integrated and innovative mechanism for stabilisation, policy resilience and aid responsiveness to regional crises, linking short-term coping solutions with longer-term initiatives to strengthen local and national resilience capacities; provided support to the elaboration of resilience policies and national strategies that impacted positively on systemic reform (e.g. 2014 National Resilience Plan, 2017 Preventing Violence Extremism Strategy); delivered support on livelihoods, poverty reduction, job creation and skills-training initiatives among host communities, which were assessed as timely, relevant and appropriate; provided sustainable and effective technical assistance to the Independent Election Commission (IEC); supported environmental outcomes and capacity building on disaster risk reduction. Recommendations for the following CPD drawn from the review of the CPD 2013-2017 included: preparing

⁵ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Jordan (2013-2017), 24 May 2012.

⁶ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Jordan (2013-2017), 24 May 2012.

effectively for different scenarios for changes to national priorities; with an approach for mainstreaming gender-equality and women’s empowerment; enabling more joint programming to ensure the delivering-as-one approach and UN flagship programmes; and supporting advocacy on sensitive issues (e.g. the wider engagement of civil society)⁷.

In order to continue to address development challenges of exclusion and vulnerability to achieve the outcome of a more inclusive and resilient Jordan, the CPD 2018-2022 has defined three priority areas: inclusive participation and social cohesion; resilient communities, livelihoods and environment; and enabling an institutional framework for the realisation of the 2030 Agenda. These priorities are in line with the national priorities of Vision 2025 and the three joint outcomes of the United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDF) (institutions in Jordan at national and local levels are more responsive, inclusive, accountable, transparent, and resilient; people, especially the most excluded and vulnerable, proactively claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities for improved human security and resilience; enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the social, economic and political spheres). The new programme aims to “drive change through strengthened citizens’ participation and structures to sustain social cohesion and by building resilient communities and institutions through enhanced opportunities for employment, livelihoods and local economic development, especially for vulnerable host communities”. These approaches are complemented by UNDP’s advocacy for inclusive durable and resilience-based solutions, in line with the humanitarian-development nexus, as well as for policies to achieve women’s empowerment and greater youth involvement⁸.

IV. Evaluation Purpose and Methodology

4.1 Objectives of the Evaluation

The purpose and overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the livelihoods and inclusive growth interventions implemented by UNDP Jordan during the 2013-2017 CPD cycle. In addition, the evaluation considers contributions towards Outcome 3 of the current UNSDF “Enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the economic, social, environmental and political spheres”. It assesses the performance of the UNDP livelihoods interventions, their achievements and quality of results, as well as measure the achievements in terms of enhanced self-reliance of vulnerable populations and social cohesion/stability among affected communities (through the resilience lens, in line with the Resilience definition as applicable in the NRP/3RP). In addition, the evaluation examines the concept of Inclusive Growth which was based on inclusive local economic development. The evaluation also assesses whether there were any policy, advocacy or ecosystem interventions that enabled inclusive local economic development for refugees and migrants inclusion in local development strategies, plans and productivity programming at the local level.

The evaluation outlines lessons learned, challenges and recommendations, and provide guidance for future actions and potential adjustment of the approach for increased results, as well as serve the purpose of accountability to the main stakeholders.

In terms of scope, the evaluation focuses on the livelihoods and resilience interventions implemented by UNDP Jordan during the 2013-2017 CPD cycle. It also considers advancements made under Outcome 2 of the UNDAF. Interventions conducted as part of the new CPD cycle, as well as contributions towards Outcome 3 of the current UNSDF, were considered. The amount of progress delivered by these interventions towards the SDGS 1, 5 and 8 was also considered.

As per the ToRs for this assignment, the evaluation focused on the following areas:

- The way exogenous factors (political, social, economic, legal, etc.) could have affected the attainment of outcomes, positively or negatively.
- The contributions of UNDP to progress towards the achievement of social protection outcomes, including resilience-building achievements and analysis of strategic prepositioning of UNDP support to Jordan in adding value to the evolving national priorities and development context.

⁷ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Jordan (2018-2022), 22 November 2017.

⁸ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Jordan (2018-2022), 22 November 2017.

- The extent to which the livelihoods interventions addressed problems/needs of the targeted areas and beneficiaries.
- The extent to which the livelihoods interventions were able to provide sustainable employment opportunities for the targeted groups.
- The extent to which the livelihoods interventions contributed to strengthening resilience and capacities at individual, community and institutional level;
- The extent to which the livelihoods interventions were able to contribute to strengthening youth and women's empowerment.
- The extent to which the livelihoods interventions were linked to the national social protection frameworks.
- The contribution UNDP made to the enhancement of the implementing partners' capacities.
- The extent to which the outcomes were achieved in terms of improving beneficiaries' living conditions, access to basic needs and quality of services.
- The relevance of monitoring and evaluation indicators and their adaptation to the measurement of outcomes and of resilience (as defined in the NRP/3RP).
- The validity and resilience of risks and assumptions identified.
- The resources mobilization and partnerships' strategies and achievement(s) against the set targets and further prospects.
- The long-term impact of the interventions and whether they have been effective and contributed to the desired changes over time.
- The unintended outcomes of the interventions.

4.2 Study design:

The livelihoods interventions are assessed using the OECD-DAC ⁹criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Additional criteria include human rights, gender equality and coordination.

The achievement of resilience-building, the linkages with other UNDP-supported interventions, national social protection frameworks and partnerships with stakeholders (national and international, governmental and non-governmental) were also considered. The way cross-cutting issues were considered in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the interventions were also assessed.

In light of the COVID-19 situation, the evaluation was conducted remotely i.e. through the use of Zoom/Skype for meetings and interviews with key stakeholders and key informant interviews including beneficiaries. This did not affect the methodology for data collection although it required the elimination of FGDs as it was impossible for health reasons to gather a group of beneficiaries in the same room. Nonetheless, the evaluation adopted a mixed-methods approach focusing on collecting qualitative data from project stakeholders and participants while building on existing analysis of standardized, quantifiable and classifiable regular data linked to monitoring systems. In particular the evaluation considered the project's results framework examining selected indicators and verifying progress according to the original project design.

The evaluation examined UNDP's livelihoods interventions in their own merit as well as their contribution to wider objectives of UNDP such as resilience building, advancing economic growth, women's rights and specific UNDAF objectives and identified SDGs.

4.3 Sampling and characteristics of Evaluation participants

The evaluation approach will be transparent and participatory, involving and incorporating feedback from various stakeholders and partners. The evaluation aimed to speak with a wide range of stakeholders to ensure a balanced representation of views and perceptions. The sampling approach including project teams, UNDP senior management, UNDP specialists and analysts, implementing partners, government officials, civil society organisations and beneficiaries (individuals and CBOs). A complete list of those interviewed during the evaluation is available in Annex 1.

⁹ For further details about the OECD-DAC criteria please see: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

4.4 Data Collection and Analysis

The evaluation was conducted using the following methods:

1. **An in-depth desk review** and analysis of available qualitative and quantitative secondary data, including annual reports, project documents, mission reports, and strategic country development documents. The evaluation used available data to the greatest extent possible.
2. This was completed **by remote qualitative data collected** during a remote data collection phase. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were conducted via Zoom/skype or phone (especially for project beneficiaries) with project's stakeholders including project beneficiaries, relevant stakeholders such as trainees, participating ministries, departments and agencies, implementing partners, personnel, and CBOs/NGOs as relevant. (a list of stakeholders interviewed is available in Annex 2) A stakeholders' mapping was conducted as part of the Inception Phase to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are included. In order to conduct these KIIs the team developed data collection instruments (questionnaires) during the Inception Phase, which were submitted to UNDP Jordan as part of the Inception Report for feedback. Once feedback was received, the tools were revised and finalised before the data collection phase began.
3. **Quantitative data** is drawn from standardised and quantifiable data collected by the project through its results framework and indicators.

4.5 Data Analysis

Verification and triangulation of data was done through correlation of data obtained from (a) different (groups of) stakeholders, as well as (b) different methods. The team ensured that findings are backed by a combination of sources and methods, to ensure validity and reliability.

The following principles guide the data analysis process in general:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholders' perspectives was triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions. This included asking similar questions to different stakeholders and in different locations noting similarities and differences.
2. Although a consistent approach was followed to ensure grounds for a good qualitative analysis, the assessment also incorporated a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders.

4.6 Ethical Standards

International data collection methods were followed. These include ensuring the consent of the participants for participating in the evaluation process. Anonymity and confidentiality were highlighted to interviewees and no personal identifying data was stored. This was done by reading a consent form to the participants at the beginning of the meetings and ensuring their approval to participating. The evaluation adhered to the standards of UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System.

4.7 Limitations

- Availability of participants for interviews;
- Level/validity of information willingly shared.
- Remote data collection is not without its challenges. These include the inability to collect data through FGDs, which reduces the amount of data available. To overcome this hurdle, all possible means of communication were used by the evaluation team, including the use of phones to reach beneficiaries and key stakeholders who were not able to join Zoom/Skype.

V. Evaluation Findings

5.1 Relevance and Appropriateness

EQs: To which extent were the Outcome activities aligned with the national priorities, plans, strategies as well as emerging priorities/challenges faced the development progress in Jordan e.g. the National Resilience Plan 2014 – 2016 and the Jordan Response Plan 2016-2018? To which extent were the Outcome activities designed properly to address the issues identified in the CPD 2013 - 2017? To which extent were the activities and outputs consistent with the intended impact/results?

The livelihoods outcome (hereinafter The Outcome) encompassed a wide range of activities under different projects. Some focused on solid waste management, some focused on local economic development, some focused on preventing violent extremism (PVE), and some were models of emergency employment schemes such as Demand-driven Vocational Training and Employment, Micro-Equity (Venture Capital), 3 x 6 Approach: Emergency Response and Sustainable Employment, Skills Exchange between Jordanian and Syrian refugee communities. Each of these interventions were relevant to the local context as well as to the overall national priorities, plans and strategies. Some were more relevant to addressing the Syrian Refugee Crisis and others (especially the local economic development interventions in Ajloun and Tafileh) were more geared towards the host communities affected by the Syrian Refugee Crisis.

The 3x6 Approach consists of **three** organizing principles and **six** fundamental steps that are implemented in **three** distinct phases, which aims to support the transition from emergency development efforts (such as 'cash for work') to sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable population groups during transition or in crisis or post-crisis contexts (for example, conflict and disaster). The 3x6 approach considers participants as active partners in their own socio-economic recovery and development. This sense of ownership and choice is an essential element of the approach.



Box 1: 3x6 Overview

For example the livelihoods interventions implemented under the programme “Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Jordanian Vulnerable Host Communities (2013-2017) are aligned with the priorities of the Government of Jordan (e.g. as set up in the National Agenda 2006-2017). They are also aligned with the socio-economic context and challenges of the country (already existing and worsened by the Syrian crisis context) (high unemployment, pressure on economic resources, pressure on existing public services and facilities (e.g. for waste management), increased economic vulnerability of host communities, rising local tensions, high unemployment of the youth and risk of radicalization).

The livelihoods interventions are in line with the challenges and issues identified in the Country Programme Document 2013-2017 (e.g. Outputs and Results of the programme “Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis through Support to Host Communities” to support livelihoods, Outcome 2, Output 2.1, 2.2, Outcome 3, Output 3.1 of the PVE project, and the livelihood-related interventions of the SWM project respond to the issues identified in the CPD). Yet, the CPD does not really tackle the Syria crisis and is more about reform and living conditions improvement overall. Considering that the Syria crisis and influx of refugees has made the situation worse for Jordanians, addressing the impact of the crisis (“Mitigating ...”) addresses the existing issues, yet this focus on mitigating the impact of the crisis is not really what dominates in the CPD. As stated by the ADR of 2017 “The UNDP socioeconomic/resilience programme has evolved over the years to respond to the Syria crisis. In this regard, though the planned outcome statement in the CPD 2013–2017 remained unchanged, UNDP’s interventions have shifted to focus more on the crisis response and support to the host communities” however, as clearly stated in the ADR the outcome indicators in CPD document do not capture the full spectrum of UNDP activities in this regard.

EQ: To what extent did the Outcome objectives remain valid and relevant through the implementation phase? On which basis were the targeted governorates/areas selected?

The livelihoods interventions were implemented in the most relevant areas in the context of the impact of the Syrian crisis on Jordan, which were carefully selected: the most affected Northern governorates of Ma'raq, Irbid and Zarqa, Ramtha (as well as Tafeeleh and Ma'an which were specifically selected because of high unemployment, youth protests and PVE tensions)

The Northern governorates were selected because they have the highest concentration of refugees, at the time as well as higher poverty and unemployment rates, potential for labour absorption/creation identified through labour market analysis. Municipalities with weak and very limited resources and cannot provide for the increasing needs for services (e.g. SWM), host communities which have reached the limits of their absorption capacity. The areas identified for the PVE project were high priority areas by the Conflict Development Analysis (CDA) conducted by UNDP in 2015.

Likewise, the local economic development projects focusing on Dairy production were also implemented in the most relevant dairy and rangeland dependent producing governorates in the Badia in the North, Middle and South of the Kingdom.

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities, outputs/expected results correspond with the needs and problems of targeted governorate(s)? To which extent did the Outcome activities take into consideration the skills and competencies of targeted group?

The livelihoods interventions were in line with the needs and problems of the targeted governorates. Several assessments and surveys were conducted to identify programming based on needs, interventions were tested and validated through wide consultation at the national and sub-national levels, with local authorities, community leaders, NGOs and CBOs. Where they existed, selection of interventions was guided by the governorate development plans and the Local Action/Development Plans. Interventions were also validated through the Local Coordination Committees, in coordination with the Ministries of Municipalities and Interior.

Interviewed government officials explained that the livelihoods interventions were well suited for the needs and priorities of the target governorates. According to one of the interviewed government officials: *"The strength of UNDP is that they ask for our priorities and our ministry and there is always a strong feedback"*.

The largest portfolio of UNDP programmes under the livelihoods component is the Mitigating the Impact of Syrian Refugee Crisis on Host Communities (HC). HC project provided both policy and operational support to the government of 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 was fully in line with the objectives of UNDP and its vision and strategic directions. 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 provided 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 make the project relevant to the context in which it operates.

Interviewed beneficiaries all agreed to the relevance of the project to their local contexts (communities, areas and villages). They also confirmed its relevance to the Jordanian context in general. Most of Syrian and Jordanian beneficiaries who were engaged in 3x6 projects, demand-driven vocational training and skills exchange programmes reported that the training and capacity-building aspect taught them new concepts and how to come up with a project. Most of the beneficiaries, of both interviewed genders, from all areas, particularly focused on the encouraging of creativity. They explained that they needed that, and that the fund or grants provided by UNDP, ensured a first "push" for them to start somewhere. Although the relevance of the grant and funding was confirmed by beneficiaries, there seems to have been some lack of understanding regarding the process of fund distribution of some livelihood's activities (mainly 3x6 interventions please see box 1 for details about 3x6 approach).

Since 2013, the major funding was available to HC project. Other livelihoods interventions were outcomes of other pillars. For example, PLEDJ was a project under the environment portfolio. Interviewed CBOs engaged in

smaller livelihoods projects such as the Badia Dairy Production project explained that their areas needed this project due to the high presence of sheep and small ruminants livestock and the limited experience on how to use the milk and process it in a hygienic manner. For their part government officials engaged in the Promoting Local Economic Development in Jordan (PLEDJ) project explained that the project was well suited for the needs of the targeted governorates. Furthermore, for PLEDJ and Badia, the projects encompassed a strong component focusing on capacity building that was deemed well suited by the recipients and ensured that the required skills and competencies of the targeted beneficiaries (individuals, CBOs or private sector) were well suited for the projects.

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities consider the pre-existing capacities of the implementing partners?

The livelihoods interventions considered the pre-existing capacities of the implementing partners. A mapping of possible implementation institutions per output/activity was performed including the capacity to deliver, ability to represent local needs, and sustainability. Criteria for selection included: mandated role and prior experience of the institution (in particular for public authorities), comparative advantage (including cost, skills, local presence and trust), better prospect for sustainable solution.

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities consider broader resilience-building challenges?

Some of the Outcome (livelihoods) interventions considered resilience-building concepts in their design and implementation. According to UNDP team interviewed during the evaluation resilience is defined as building the capacities of national institutions on how to cope with crisis or the nature of the crisis. UNDP engages in building the national institutional capacity and by laws and regulations.

This was particularly the case for the Solid Waste Management (SWM) interventions which encompassed a wide variety of interventions that were geared towards resilience and sustainability. According to government officials interviewed El Ekaider Landfill project which was an environmental hot spot and hazard according to government officials interviewed during the evaluation and was *“the most relevant. It is a landmark for success in Jordan because it is a multilateral work the joint services the municipalities and the ministry of environment. It helps the merchants and it is close to an industrial area”*. Furthermore, the project considered the resilience challenges at the long run by integrating sorting of solid waste to ensure that the capacity of the landfill is not compromised over a short period of time. One of the interviewed government officials explained: *“We want to reduce the amount of waste in the landfill. So the sorting is useful it is complementary. We want to reduce the amount going to the landfill. There are the transfer stations and the sorting and all these will reduce the waste going to the landfill”*.

Whereas the livelihoods activities within the SWM projects considered the resilience-building challenges at the institutional level which included building the capacities of municipalities, local councils and civil society organisations, the same cannot be said for all Outcome interventions at the individual level. For example, the emergency employment schemes attached to the 3x6 livelihoods interventions consider social cohesion during the implementation of the activities however, whether this led to resilience of the communities i.e. the ability of individuals to move from coping with a crisis to recovering and subsequently being resilient in dealing with shocks and economic crisis cannot be assessed at this time.

This is partially because assessing resilience requires time and secondly because the Outcome monitoring systems lack a focus on this aspect (as will be discussed in section 5.2 below). According to government officials interviewed during the evaluation the improvement in SWM and being able to create livelihoods interventions is an important priority for the Jordanian government as those linkages help with the resilience of the communities *“If we can improve infrastructure and also income generation these are all important economic activities to improve the economy”*.

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities take into consideration supply and demand?

The Outcome interventions went through different phases during the first CPD (2013-2017) and (2018-2022). At the beginning of the interventions were focused on mitigating the impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis by creating

emergency employment schemes to generate income and reduce the economic impact of the crisis. The HC project continued to be the largest portfolio of the country office with a stronger focus on the supply side and less so on the demand side. Some interventions considered supply and demand. For example, the education for employment component started off with training followed by interviews to decide which track the trainees would engage in (job placement or self-employment). *“We know from the start where they are going. We had more flexibility in UNDP and when the student had the technical skills we were able to see where they will go”*.

However, the education for employment was a small component under the livelihoods programme and does not speak of all the livelihoods interventions such as skills exchange or 3x6 which focused more on the supply side and less so on the demand side. By 2015-2016 a stronger focus was placed on local economic development through the smaller economic development projects such as PLEDJ and Badia projects while continuing to focus on income generating activities for the most vulnerable.

The Jordanian labour market was already challenged prior to the Syrian Refugee crisis. One of the main challenges of the Jordanian economy is its persisting high unemployment level, and the specific patterns of its labor market that incurs an enduring mismatch between demand and supply. The labour participation rate is 67 percent among men, and 18 percent among women, which is one of the lowest in the world and lower in the region (2014)¹⁰.

Unemployment rates reached, during the first quarter of 2016, 14.6 percent and 23.7 percent among women¹¹. Unemployment rates are even higher among youth, with 42.6 percent and 33.0 percent for the age groups of 15-19 years and 20-24 years, respectively.

On the demand side, the sector of public administration and defence remains the country’s first employer with 26.9 percent of the employed, followed by the private sector in particular the service sectors, and the private sector remains less developed to create sufficient employment (2016). The inability of the economy to create highly skilled work, insufficient or inadequate technical education, lack of on-the-job training by Jordanian employers, and the inappropriate content and delivery of education partly explain this situation of high unemployment and low labour market participation. Higher education does not secure employment in Jordan, as it is shown that the unemployment rate is high amongst university degree holders at the rate of 22.2 percent, and 76.7 percent for women (2016)¹².

In addition, what is often described as a “culture of shame” is an important factor to take into consideration. For a variety of possible cultural reasons, Jordanians are reported to be less inclined to accept positions that they may perceive as degrading or that would constitute for them a lowering of their social standing. It is in this context that one may explain the large historical influx of foreign workers that were required to replace Jordanians for these jobs. Youth tend to wait for the right job, which would result in longer period of unemployment, especially for educated youth, who may require more time to find a good job match for their skills.

The initial focus of the CPD 2013-2017 aimed at addressing the above challenges. However, the Syrian refugee crisis could not be ignored as it added more pressure on the fragile economic conditions in Jordan at the time. The CPD activities shifted more towards livelihoods and less on economic growth and development.

5.2 Effectiveness

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities reach its targeted population(s)? To which extent were the capacities of implementing partners developed regarding knowledge, attitudes and practices on LED?

The livelihoods interventions of each project were implemented effectively which contributed to the achievement of the expected results of the different projects (trainings/capacity building completed, livelihoods opportunities/employment achieved, new market opportunities, contributed to enhanced economic opportunities and relieved stress on demand on services). Livelihoods related targets were achieved in each

¹⁰ Regional Response Plan 2015; UNDP and UNHCR

¹¹ Department of Statistics, the Government of Jordan, 2016

¹² Ibid

project. It is important to point out that **there is no one livelihoods / economic development strategy to which each project contributes in a systematic manner**. Some interventions focused on Syrian refugees and successfully reached them while others focused on Jordanian host communities, and a third attempted to work with both refugees and host communities. Depending on the selected target group, each individual project was able to reach its targeted population (s).

By March 2017, the biggest livelihoods portfolio was within the HC project. The portfolio included different job creation and employment opportunities.

- The emergency employment (3x6) project worked on two main governorates and over 15 municipalities as follows: **Mafraq Governorate:** Umm Al Jimmal, Al Salihiah & Nayfeh, Sabha & Dafyianeh, New Rehab, Hosha, Al Sarhan, Al Khaldieh, and Mansheyat Bani Hassan.
- **Zarqa Governorate:** Al Halabat, Al Dlail, Al Hashmeyah, and Bireen.

A total of 13,350 beneficiaries were selected. According to UNDP documents the number of beneficiaries is segregated as follows:

Table 1: Breakdown of 3x6 emergency employment by gender and municipality.

Municipality	Female	Male	Total
Umm Al Jimmal	50	50	100
Al Salihiah & Nayfeh	50	50	100
Sabha & Dafyianeh	50	50	100
New Rehab	69	31	100
Hosha	64	36	100
Al Sarhan	167	83	250
Al Khaldieh	59	41	100
Mansheyat Bani Hassan	80	20	100
Al Halabat	50	50	100
Al Dlail	50	50	100
Al Hashmeyah	50	50	100
Bireen	50	50	100
Total	789	561	1,350

The HC portfolio also encompassed demand driven vocational training, micro-venture activities and Skills exchange. Table 2 below provides an overview of the different interventions.

Table 2: Overview of Livelihoods Interventions up to March 2017

Intervention		
Demand-Driven Training	Vocational	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 & Microbusinesses (Micro-Equity Approach)	Support & Establishment Investment	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.
Skills exchange between Jordanians and Syrian refugees		Skills exchange project has been launched in 2016, targeting a total of 750 beneficiaries (500 Jordanians and 250 Syrians, 50 % women) in the Governorates of Mafraq and Irbid.

All projects had a strong element of capacity building to strengthen knowledge and practices related to economic activities. However, the extent of the outcomes of the capacity building differs between projects. For example, in the Badia Milk Production Project trained CBOs explained that the technical trainings were most useful and relevant as they provided the know-how for cheese manufacturing as well as standards for hygiene. *“The most relevant training to us was taking us to the Tafileh where we learned how to make Cheese, and this was very useful, and this was theoretical and practical. We exchanged the experiences and we were 10 CBOs and this exchange was useful and we learned the new technicalities* explained one of the interviewed CBOs.

Likewise, the PLEDJ built the capacity of local municipalities and increased their knowledge regarding practices about local economic development. According to government officials interviewed the trainings provided by the project enabled the municipalities to coordinate their budgets with the needs of their communities *“The municipalities have budgets and many from different sources but now they coordinate together and there is a strategic plan for the governorates and so they can plan their work and the budgets and what is spent would be good and serving the citizens. Each can work together the municipalities and also local councils,”* explained one government official interviewed. The management and implementation approach of PLEDJ project contributed to increased awareness of the local economic development. Interviewed government officials engaged in the implementation of the PLEDJ project explained that this type of project is important because it allows citizens who have ideas to access funds that can enable them to start new businesses. Government officials also explained at length the different aspects required in the development of sustainable businesses such as the importance of having criteria for selection, networking, partnership creation and the value of monitoring and evaluating the progress of businesses.

CBOs and other entities engaged in the HC portfolio (mainly the 3x6 interventions) have explained that no systematic capacity building was provided to them beyond the explanation of what is required from them in terms of delivery of services and that capacity building was provided to end beneficiaries and not to the CBOs themselves. According to the March 2017 Donor report : UNDP designed and implemented an evaluation framework, which includes operational and financial performance. It aimed to carry out institutional assessment of the local Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in order to select the most capable CBO as a supporting agency for the youth and their implementation of community initiatives.

EQ: To which extent were the Outcome activities implemented effectively, thereby contributing to the achievement of the expected results and support the diversification of economy, specifically at the local community level?

Outcome interventions covered a wide range of sectors and built on existing resources within the local community as well as introduced new concepts in some of the interventions. The SWM projects explored and introduced at Al Hussainiyat Landfill and Al Khalideyeh areas where efforts were made to develop composting facilities and promote women economic engagement. It is worth pointing out that the weight of the Outcome activities is not uniform. PLEDJ and Badia are small interventions in comparison to HC or PVE related livelihoods interventions. Hence the progress made by the smaller interventions could be studied to increase the effectiveness of the larger portfolios.

PLEDJ project worked on improving the existing structures in the community by promoting eco-tourism as well as food manufacturing. PLEDJ also introduced the concept of incubators to support the achievements of the expected results. This has enabled businesses to access technical expertise and support during their start-up phases. Likewise, the Badia project focused on increasing the productivity of existing resources at the local level by regulating and standardizing milk collection and production.

Other Outcome interventions whether 3x6, demand-driven training and skills exchange have also contributed to increasing access to employment and diversification of opportunities for individuals and CBOs. However, they did not necessarily target a specific sector or address challenges in the ecosystem for local economic growth.

Implementation of the projects were not without their challenges as will be discussed below. According to the ADR report, the results of and the achievements of the socio-economic component of the CPD 2013-2017 was mixed and the number of beneficiaries was limited (around 2,000 in total). Nonetheless, it also clearly states that the “The cash-for-work programme has had positive impact, while entrepreneurship support through the micro-equity investment approach has faced numerous challenges. According to the ADR 2017 beneficiaries reported that they faced many problems in handling their start-up business, including paying for business licenses. They also complained about the financial scheme, given that Ruwwad has 16.6 percent of ownership. They felt strongly that they received too little support from Ruwwad and that the cost was too high. UNDP’s presence and close follow-up of activities is reported to be a key factor in the effectiveness of its interventions.”¹³ The challenges

EQ: To which extent did the monitoring of Outcome activities implementation contribute to learning and accommodated changes throughout the implementation? To what extent were programme indicators able to measure achievements of the Outcome activities listed above using the Resilience definition as applicable in the NRP/ 3RP?

CPD 2013-2017 had the following livelihoods related Outcome: *Jordan has institutionalized improved social protection and poverty alleviation mechanisms for vulnerable people at national and subnational levels.* The Outcomes’ indicators:

of governorates implementing and tracking sustainable and equitable LED plans in a participatory and inclusive manner;
new methodologies developed and implemented to measure and assess poverty and vulnerability.

Expected outputs were:

Output 1: Targeted governorate institutions have improved capacities to undertake LED focusing on youth and women.

Output 2: Women and youth in targeted poor communities have improved knowledge and skills to access financing and other resources for improved livelihoods.

Output 3: Government is better able to undertake assessment of socioeconomic vulnerabilities and review related policies and strategies.

During the implementation of CPD 2013-2017 the focus of the programme shifted to mitigating the impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis by creating linkages between the socio-economic outcome and political strengthening of the Jordan of Government by providing support in the development of the Jordan Response Plan and provision of leadership in managing the response to the crisis. Monitoring systems within UNDP CO include regular reporting, field visits as well as internal coordination meetings to review progress and discuss challenges. This makes it difficult to assess to which extent the expected outputs as articulated by the CPD were achieved. According to the 2017 ADR “the planned outcome statement in the CPD 2013–2017 remained unchanged (despite the Syria Refugee Crisis), UNDP’s interventions have shifted to focus more on the crisis response and support to the host communities. Therefore, the outcome indicators in CPD document do not capture the full spectrum of UNDP activities.”

The monitoring system of the livelihoods component is challenging this is attributed to the challenges in the monitoring system within UNDP in general. It is important to point out that until 2020 the country office did not have a central M&E team nor a designated M&E officer. Monitoring was the task of project teams and there was limited general capacity for M&E. The central team was formed in January 2020; based on lessons learned of the absence of a unified monitoring system. The central team is envisioned to enable better capturing and consolidating of results at the programme and results level and to support project teams in strengthening project and output level monitoring and reporting through advice and review.

¹³ Assessment of Development Results, Jordan. Independent Evaluation Office: UNDP 2017.

CPD 2013-2017 and CPD 2018-2022 are composed of a varied number of projects and programmes. For example, the flagship programme of UNDP 2013-2017 the HC 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.

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 enabled UNDP to capitalize on existing resources and mobilize others and on the other hand it affected its ability to focus on clear targets to achieve its goals. Each project/programme component has its own objectives and clear implementation strategies. However, how they all contribute to the overall achievement of the Outcome Objectives in Jordan is less clear. The inability of UNDP, due to administrative restrictions in acquiring government approvals for new projects¹⁴ and resource mobilization challenges, 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 fragmentation of the data systems within UNDP make it also difficult to ensure data quality across all projects and programmes and enables an adequate review and monitoring of progress. ROAR reports at the end of each year helps UNDP create the linkages by attempting to answer specific questions about the country programme as a whole. Nonetheless, ROAR reports examine the bigger impacts of interventions and programmes and it doesn't look at the micro-level details of projects which is a gap as acknowledged by UNDP staff interviewed. "When it comes to tracking data for the beneficiaries there is a gap in how we collect and store this data" explained UNDP staff. Common indicators concerning livelihoods cascaded to implementing partner with uniform M&E and performance reporting matrixes and templates are not available in all projects. Each project has its own system for managing and defining indicators which ultimately could influence the quality of data collected and reported and subsequently affecting the reporting on the progress of the CPD.

Available indicators do not provide the full extent of the work done by UNDP because while the economic growth activities shifted from inclusive growth and economic development as initially envisaged in the CPD document to livelihoods interventions and job creation, this was not translated into a revised CPD document with clear expected outputs and indicators to measure progress and development. This is the case at the project and the programme levels. For example, within the effects of livelihoods interventions on PVE or within the SWM projects seem to be missing although the rationale for including livelihoods within these projects is valid, coherent, and relevant.

Reporting on the livelihoods interventions does not go beyond reporting on numbers of those benefiting and does not consider the wider humanitarian-development nexus or the resilience lens. Available data from the projects is not validated by the central M&E team for lack of time and resources. Finally, projects reporting systems are designed to meet the requirements of the different donors. As such, the quality and depth of data for monitoring systems vary according to donor requirements. There is no streamlining of data collection methods and no data quality checks. This affects the overall quality of the monitoring system and in several instances does not reflect the actual work and achievements of UNDP CO.

Findings from this evaluation correspond to the findings from the ADR 2017 which concluded that *"Technical soundness of the country programme monitoring and evaluation framework: The inadequate attention given to results-based management in planning, monitoring and reporting on UNDP interventions hampered the design of an integrated and holistic country programme, as well as monitoring and reporting on results."*¹⁵

EQ: What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outcome? To which extent did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the implementation of Outcome activities?

¹⁴ The HC programme started with support from the Japanese government in 2012 and has since expanded to be supported by 7 different donors. UNDP was unable to create a different project under each donor due to the time needed for acquiring government approvals for new project. Hence UNDP added new activities with each new funding opportunity/cycle while the main project remained unchanged.

¹⁵ Assessment of Development Results, Jordan. Independent Evaluation Office: UNDP 2017

The Outcome activities are composed of different projects, interventions either as standalone or as outputs for other outcomes (e.g. livelihoods within the Environment Pillar). The biggest contribution to the Outcome activities has been **the HC portfolio and later all the PVE-related livelihoods interventions**. Available evidence from project documents and discussions with UNDP team indicate that the livelihoods interventions did not target a specific sector or a specific area for local economic development. The livelihoods interventions continued to operate as “emergency intervention” with limited focus on sectoral development and/or local economic development. There has not been a holistic assessment of skills gaps of beneficiaries and no assessment of the private sector.

The activities under the Outcome have generally not been market driven. The 3x6 approach focused on injecting money into the economy through emergency employment schemes, provision of seed funding for entrepreneurship creation without necessarily considering the business ecosystem or the laws and regulations that could help or hinder the development of private enterprises. As highlighted by the Mid-term evaluation of the HC programme, “HC project focused on building viable economic approaches that can positively contribute to the **improvement of the living conditions of vulnerable Jordanians and Syrians**. 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 strategy and modality of implementation of the largest portfolio has not been revised since its inception. As previously stated, there is no LED strategy or a livelihoods sectoral strategy to which all outputs and projects contribute in a systematic manner.

The funding modality of livelihood interventions is considered a challenge for planning and implementation of inclusive economic growth. The total country programme annual expenditure increased from just over \$5 million in 2013 to \$11.5 million in 2015. However, the increase in funds was mainly as a response to the emergency of the Syrian Refugee Crisis. 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 numbers of beneficiaries as opposed to focus on results, impact, outcome and quality of interventions.

The Outcome interventions for CPD 2013-2017 and 2018-2022 are implemented through seven different projects each focusing on a specific sector and with its own implementation strategies and modalities. **Some of the projects are predominantly solid waste management projects and/or PVE projects where livelihoods interventions are mainstreamed and not used as a tool for the achievement of the overall specific project intervention and not as part of an overall vision and approach to improving economic conditions in a specific area**. This could explain the absence of clarity as to how livelihoods models are chosen/selected in certain areas and in specific contexts. The factors contributing to the achievement or no achievement of intended outcomes can only be assessed based on the context of each project and in each target area.

Although enabling factors and challenges are project specific, yet UNDP acquired many lessons between 2013-2017 which increased the performance of the various projects. The 2013-2017 CPD also enabled UNDP to become closer and more familiar with mayor and local councils. Prior to 2013, the bulk of UNDP’s work was focused on Amman and its surroundings. The Syrian refugee crisis enabled UNDP to move its work and interventions to remote areas and rural communities which enabled UNDP to really get a feel of the needs of the communities and what they need. Understanding the local context and ability to network with CBOs, government and local units and local universities in the different governorates increased trust between local communities and UNDP and formed an enabling factor for the achievement of the intended results. According to stakeholders interviewed *“The enabling factors was UNDP experience in working with local communities and local context. They (UNDP) also had local officers from the same area where they work, and they know us and know the context well.”*

A second enabling factor is the synergies adopted within UNDP to increase activities focusing on livelihoods and economic growth. It was noted that collaboration and synergies between the different portfolios enabled the increase in livelihoods interventions. There was a motivation to start thinking jointly and now the different pillars/portfolios work on different projects together to link livelihoods to various portfolios (environment, PVE). Communities felt the impact of the UN interventions within the SWM which helped build trust and enabled UNDP to work with different communities.

In addition to specific project challenges such as (e.g. lack of data and comprehensive information on violent extremism, including key drivers, delays due to increased necessary coordination efforts on the issue of PVE, cabinet reshuffles and parliamentary elections, length in establishing partnerships to engage with religious leaders and institutions, and specifically for livelihoods huge number of applicants due to limited income generation opportunities making the selection process difficult and requiring high level of transparency and cooperation), specific to the PVE programme and cannot be said to apply to the rest of the projects; and the cultural constraints regarding women's work in the South, weakness in planning and management of livelihoods interventions for PLEDJ and Milk production projects, **all projects encountered the challenges of the weakness of the CSO sector in Jordan**. UNDP teams interviewed from the different projects listed the weakness of the CSOs and CBOs as one of the main challenges encountered by their projects. *"not all have the same capacity and commitment to work. Despite the fact that CBOs/CSOs/Cooperatives are very active but from 2011-2012 with the Syrian crisis there were so many who were established only because there were a lot of money coming into the country and they saw the benefits"* but they lacked planning and procurement procedures and the institutional capacity in general. UNDP offered institutional capacity building in financial and procurement and reporting and M&E at their institutions, yet their capacities remain somehow weak in terms of networking, knowledge sharing and marketing in general. Government officials interviewed also agreed that CBOs need further development and support to enable them to be active players in the development sectors. *"The capacities of many CBOs are limited especially the charity and the small ones need to continue to work. They cannot manage grants properly because they do not see interventions are livelihoods but an activity that will stop."*

Culture was listed by UNDP and implementing partners as both an enabling factor as well as a challenge. For PLEDJ for example (a smaller intervention than HC portfolio) in the north people are more accepting of the role of women and ability to work with them. This helped the project. In the south, there are reservations to having women in the business and there is a gap in the south due to culture and hence UNDP had to have a man (field officer) in the area. The field officers were able to work well with the grantees. They were also able to coordinate with the governorate. The implementation was smooth in general because UNDP considered the cultural requirements of each region. For the milk production project, stakeholders maintained that it was difficult for women to come to a training in Amman or a bazaar or a fair for 2 days. It is unacceptable for women to go outside their communities for networking purposes.

The mid-term review of the Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Host Communities, the flagship programme of UNDP between 2013 and 2017 pointed out that the impact of livelihoods, beyond emergency employment, is questionable without policy review or reform.¹⁶ Stakeholders interviewed as part of this Outcome evaluation pointed out that registration and licensing of businesses was one of the key challenges encountered by the different projects.

Smaller interventions had a higher rate of success. For example, the Milk Production project although registration and licencing was difficult for many entities because many of the CBOs did not have the know how to approach several government regulatory authorities to acquire the necessary licences and approvals. Although, UNDP conducted this on behalf of the CBOs, this will affect scalability and replicability in the future. According to UNDP team *"The fees are high. Some people's houses were not registered to start with. Some did not pay the fees of registering their houses and this was difficult. Some licences of houses or shops have expired and the most important was government policies. There was no policy waiver. There was processes and we had to follow- the step by step. They did not do any waivers for us. We worked with the administrative unit of the CBOs and they tried to help and remove some of the barriers that we were facing such as fees or support to the CBOs and once we had the licences that was very useful."* The absence of work on policies focusing on the informal sector and the promotion of SMEs (through tax deduction, waiving of fees and other policies) is another challenge to the improvement of the local economic development.

For other interventions such as the 3x6 modality and skills exchange, many of the project beneficiaries remained within the informal sector due to insufficient attention to the ecosystem for business development by the different projects. As documented by the HC mid-term evaluation in December 2016, the HC interventions, and the attempt at creating businesses there is no results beyond emergency employment. The evaluation cautioned against overstating possible achievements and clearly pointed out that livelihoods interventions without policy

¹⁶ Mitigating the Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis on Host Communities. Mid-Term Review UNDP: December 2016.

review or reform (tax cuts for these types of micro-businesses for example) will not be sustainable. Furthermore, although UNDP adopted an inclusive approach by targeting the most vulnerable Jordanians and Syrian refugees, yet this was not conceptualized taking in consideration the challenges in the ecosystem. Syrian refugees for example are engaged in entrepreneurship activities because of UNDP interventions. However, according to Jordanian laws Syrians cannot own a formalised business. These barriers are not addressed through policy dialogue or advocacy efforts thus limiting the potential for inclusive growth and sustainable livelihoods even for Jordanians who are unable to access the regulatory authorities (due to lack of funds or awareness). The one-size-fits all approach is not effective in promoting sustainable livelihoods. It is important to consider the barriers to employment and to business ownership of vulnerable Jordanians and of Syrian Refugees separately and design adequate strategies to mitigate the barriers facing each target group.

For PLEDJ project the partnership with the Ministry of Interior is an enabling factor for this project and not necessarily for the achievement of the intended goals of the Outcome interventions. According to UNDP staff *“The governor was heavily involved and especially the development department. They were involved in selection and monitoring and evaluation. Some grantees faced problems in acquiring some approvals, but MOI helped a big time and they helped us with monitoring visits.”* Other enabling factors include the strong coordination and collaboration that UNDP teams exerts in managing projects. According to government officials (MOI) one of the enabling factors of that led to the success of PLEDJ is that *“The coordination was strong in PLEDJ we felt that we are one team in this project. I never felt that we are different organisations,”* explained a MOI official interviewed.

In line with the findings of the ADR 2017, the staff turnover of the livelihoods sector within UNDP has been one of the challenges encountered by the programme. Staff turnover is linked to donor interest and commitment to poverty reduction in Jordan. According to UNDP team *“Some staff members get better opportunities elsewhere, the funding was a problem and so when projects ended in 2013 we had Host Community project and then from 2017-2018 the donor interest was reduced and there weren’t enough funds and staff were looking for other opportunities because we have project based staffing.”*

Nonetheless, since 2018 the new policy management enabled the partnership process and the selection of partners. Before that it was a normal procedure that can take 2-3 months, and this was time consuming. From developing a ToR until signing could take time. Now with the new guidance, there are better and more realistic and practical tools to select partners. It is not just about procurement process. *“Now we do not deal with partners as furniture or a small service”* explained UNDP staff. The global focus on creating partnership with implementing partners has been an enabling factor allowing UNDP CO Jordan to forge partnerships and implement interventions through more time-savvy approaches. A second change in policy that has enabled UNDP to achieve its results is the direct granting mechanism *“Now what we do is do a ToRs and criteria and I selected someone else to do the granting process on my behalf. I give the big organisation the grant and they can work with the CBOs directly”* explained UNDP staff.

EQ: Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices to promote productive capacities of small and medium enterprises, to develop knowledge-based economy and social entrepreneurship, to enhance employability and access to decent work, to improve value chains for SMEs and to strengthen access to financing and market instruments?

UNDP CO Jordan was the leading organisations that has introduced the GoJ to the coordination mechanisms to address the Syrian Crisis. This was through support to the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation’s Secretariat for the Jordan Response Platform (JRP). UNDP was one of the key actors introducing and implementing emergency employment modalities (3x6) with a focus on promoting small and medium enterprise and enhancing employability and entrepreneurship. According to the findings of the ADR to which this evaluation agrees Among the most concrete results of UNDP is its contributions to fine-tuning the resilience-based approach and to establishing a planning and coordination platform for the national response to the Syrian crisis. The JRP 2015, developed with contributions from UNDP, represented a shift from a refugee response approach to a resilience-based approach. The 2016–2018 JRP further integrates short-term refugee response with longer-term development response aiming at strengthening local and national resilience capacities.

In terms of implementation of economic opportunities UNDP has worked in a number of priority areas including solid waste management, vocational training, employment and entrepreneurship support. Through the different

economic interventions presented by UNDP, the aim was to introduce the different stakeholders to different models that could be adopted for increasing economic growth. These included demand-driven vocational training; Emergency employment entrepreneurship and micro-businesses. These interventions focused on the humanitarian-development nexus and benefited both Jordanian and Syrian refugees.

In addition to these economic intervention modalities, UNDP has sought to work on local economic development in different governorates through PLEDJ and the decentralization project. UNDP was successful in designing and initiating an MA programme with the Hague Academy and the university of Jordan that would offer a master's degree in Local development and decentralisation. The whole programme is on local economic development and aims to increase awareness and knowledge of the best practices in local economic development.

Through the work in Ajloun and Tafleh UNDP built supported the capacities within the governorates to work with SMEs and develop a model for local economic development. This was more than investing in a business that was already there. The investment in the staff for those working with the CBOs. UNDP connected and worked with the local development units at the governorates levels. They can attract government finances, and this would be a great success for the approaches introduced by UNDP.

In terms of work on value chains activities, UNDP worked with milk producers and milk manufacturers for the development and issuance of a trademark for cheese that is marketed in Jordan and some CBOs are exporting outside Jordan. This presents a second concrete example of how UNDP has managed to introduce new concepts in local economic development to the Jordanian landscape.

EQ: To which extent were cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, rights-based approach, and resilience-building measures understood and pursued in a coherent manner?

Between 2013-2017 UNDP country office did not have a gender strategy. However, a gender mainstreaming strategy was in place. UNDP gender strategy was developed only in 2019. The attention paid to gender equality and women empowerment has increased over the years especially with the hiring of gender focal point. Attention of the livelihoods interventions to gender issues has seen a steady improvement as the focus gradually shifted from considering the number of women vs. men who benefit from interventions to a more systematic focus on involving women at different levels. The livelihoods interventions actively involved women (e.g. SWM activities) and have somehow contributed to women's empowerment (trainings, employment, self-reliant and income generation and not only unemployed housewives anymore, more participation in decision making processes, etc.), **gender as a cross-cutting issue could have been better taken into account** (e.g. needs and priorities of women specifically were not identified, do no harm was not considered through risk analysis to ensure that women would not be subjected to violence as a result of additional resources, etc.).

Not all livelihoods intervention conduct a thorough gender analysis during the design phase to ensure that gender sensitive and inclusive approaches are considered in the implementation strategies of the project. Nonetheless, there is evidence to suggest that the attention to gender equality is increasing. This is facilitated by the presence of donors who are also committed to gender equality. For example, UNDP has successfully designed a GEN 3 project with the support of the Canadian government. The assessment started by understanding the barriers facing women and then proceeded to design interventions addressing these barriers.

On the other hand, the milk production project team explained that they faced difficulties working with women in the rural areas because women's work is not accepted outside the house. "The communities accepted their work eventually because this type of work (milk manufacturing) is suited to women" explained one of the UNDP team members interviewed. Women were not heavily engaged in networking and marketing efforts because going out of the governorates is unacceptable for the community. "There was acceptance because one of the men from the community came with us. The husband of a friend and I took my nephew," explained one of the board members of a CBO engaged in the project.

Anecdotal accounts from the different projects examined as part of this evaluation indicate that although gender and rights-based approaches are considered by UNDP in the different activities, this is not done in a coherent and systematic manner that can yield to actual change in the lives of women. The focus of PLEDJ for example was on creating job opportunities that are well suited for women and that can ensure their access to social insurance and

self-reliance. Another example of how the absence of gender assessments have led to implementation challenges that could have been avoided is the demand driven vocation training. As pointed out by one of the implementing partners of the demand-driven vocational training in Zarqa during this evaluation “*We had 180 females out of 240 participants, but most of the jobs were in Amman and not in Zarqa. Because of distance, transportation and salary scales we had a higher drop-out rate of females than of males.*”

According to UNDP staff, UNDP formulated a gender strategy only in 2019. The implementation and results of this strategy is yet to be seen.

UNDP team at the different levels acknowledged that there has been a gap in the previous work done on gender mainstreaming and rights-based approaches. It was pointed out that up until 2018, capacity to address gender and gender issues had remain limited within the country office as the country office did not even have a gender focal point. However, since 2018 the country office now has Gender Focal Points, a Gender Analyst, and a Women’s Empowerment Programme Officer. These capacities are both located in the Livelihoods Programme (Women’s Empowerment Programme Officer) and in the Central Team supporting gender mainstreaming and quality assurance to all programmes. Both th Gender Analyst and Gender Focal Point are supporting the programmes and the pillars on integrating gender and developing different capacities. UNDP is trying to create linkages between gender equality and principles within the existing objectives beyond how many lives have the programmes changed to how have these lives been changed.

EQ: To which extent were the Outcome activities scaled up to accommodate emerging needs/promising sectors for promoting livelihoods opportunities?

UNDP approach for the livelihoods interventions has been focused on building models and then advocating for the implementation of these models with other partners and with the GOJ. Projects are approached as testing grounds that can form a base for viable economic interventions. However, identified barriers are not addressed which limits the validity of the pilot models. For example, in a recent rapid assessment of Impact of COVID19 on UNDP the majority of UNDP beneficiaries were found to be engaged in informal businesses which impeded them from accessing government business continuity and protection measures or access to finance.

Following the London Conference and the focus on localisation, the approaches of UNDP in developing pilots that can be scaled up by other entities and stakeholders seem to be a valid and coherent approach. However, special attention should also be afforded to addressing the different barriers that has a direct effect on sustainable results. There was a strong need emerging from the London Conference for a focus on changes in labour rights and as such work with the ILO on policy initiatives can have rippling effects. Furthermore, the area-focused approaches recently adopted by UNDP through its Heart of Amman project also integrates different approaches that could also present a model for economic development. “*We set the parameters for ideal economical activities that we would need to see. UNDP introduced the incubators, we maintain that refugees are not just in the North but also in Amman and there are Syrians and other vulnerable groups and we reactivate the social tissue of the city using incubators and start-ups by include people in the activities and not just any economic activity but some that have social and environmental returns,*” explained UNDP staff.

5.3 Efficiency

EQ: To which extent did allocated resources correspond to the needs of the Outcome activities?

The financial resources allocated for the CPD 2013-2017 were adequate and sufficient for the achievement of the Outcome activities. UNDP benefited from a surge in funding opportunities that were a direct result of the Syrian Refugee Crisis. UNDP successfully leveraged resources for both humanitarian and development approaches which contributed to the successful implementation of the outcome activities. The country programme between 2013-2017 was substantially larger than UNDP anticipated during preparation of the CPD and CPAP for 2013–2017. Between 2012 and 2015 the size of the programme in terms of throughput more than doubled, from just over \$5 million to over \$11.5 million annually.¹⁷ In 2013 UNDP developed the project proposal on mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordanian vulnerable host communities, which was funded by the Government of

¹⁷ ADR 2017

Japan. Since then the project has expanded horizontally and vertically and become a multi-donor programme for all host community related interventions. UNDP presence in the affected host communities in the northern regions since 2013 is helping to attract donor funding.¹⁸

However, as donors focus started to shift in 2017-2018 since the London Conference, there seems to be some challenges in resource mobilisation. According to UNDP team *“We focus on providing proposals for call for proposals and this limited the amount of technical and financial resources here in comparison to previous phases. We should not be competing for calls for proposals. Everyone is going towards localisation and so donors are interested in CBOs and CSOs.”* UNDP should be providing technical assistance to the government who are receiving funds from different donors. None of the CBOs and CSOs can support the government. This is UNDP’s niche, and this is where the CO should be working.

UNDP reports in its ROAR 2018 and 2019 acknowledge the inability to meet the livelihoods targets as a result of *“lack of funding, fragmented resource mobilization, one year short implementation cycle and focus of donors on emergency and crises response.”*¹⁹ Moreover this limited the ability to build-in policy and enabling ecosystem or vocational reform interventions for inclusive broad based economic growth in areas of micro and small enterprises, access to finance, access to alternative and export markets and demand driven skills for new graduates and future vocations "skills for the future" that contribute to medium and longer terms economic growth. A way to correct is focus more on private sector partnerships and funding, align to national economic growth stimulation strategies and prepare new concepts with a clear component for enabling inclusive growth ecosystems and regulatory reforms.

In terms of human resources, UNDP has developed a strong coordination system amongst its different portfolios and pillars to increase connection, coordination, and coverage. In addition, at the top management level there are TL meetings and updates take place on projects and synergies are created to promote livelihoods whenever possible. *“We share project proposals and try to ensure input and feedback. There is already a regular coordination mechanism. They need to be improved and each pillar used to work alone but top management is making us work together and this is critical,”* explained UNDP staff. The livelihoods team provides technical assistance and guidance to the different projects on PVE and SWM. This helps create synergies and identify cross-cutting themes where the livelihoods experts can provide guidance and support. According to UNDP staff coordination starts when a new proposal is developed. When proposals are drafted under the environmental component from the beginning of the livelihoods team is involved. Coordination is done at a strategic level as well as through joint interventions (PVE/LV). However, coordination does not go beyond sharing of information and reporting. For example, the livelihoods interventions within the PVE pillar are managed by the livelihoods team and not through a holistic pillar management that can create linkages and reporting on progress of the overall indicators. Asked how livelihoods are contributing to PVE neither PVE nor livelihoods teams could answer this question and admitted to absence of linkages. *“Each one is doing their thing and a more organic linkage could be useful. There is LV team (pillar) and they manage it completely and we share information and some statistics. Each is working on their part. We interact based on need. There is a territoriality. The LV team is the one managing all the LV interventions even the workplan and budget and the reporting there will be sections, and each would be filling theirs. There is strong separation,”* explained the PVE team.

EQ: To which extent were resources efficiently utilized to identify, assess institutional capacity, and select partners appropriate for the scope of work?

As previously discussed, the changes in the policies and approaches to partner selection. Since 2018 the new policy management enabled the partnership process and the selection of partners. Before that it was a normal procedure that can take 2-3 months, and this was time consuming. From developing a ToR until signing could take time. Now with the new guidance, there are better and more realistic and practical tools to select partners. It is not just about procurement process. The global focus on creating partnership with implementing partners has been an enabling factor allowing UNDP CO Jordan to forge partnerships and implement interventions through more time-savvy approaches. A second change in policy is the direct granting mechanism *“Now what we do is do a ToRs and criteria and I selected someone else to do the granting process on my behalf. I give the big organisation the grant and they can work with the CBOs directly”* explained UNDP staff. The approach needs further attention

¹⁸ ADR 2017

¹⁹ ROAR 2018

as it appears to be useful, yet UNDP programme team have explained that this system has not always been effective in achieving results.

As pointed elsewhere in this report, staff turnover, absence of adequate capacity for M&E and gender within the country office also contributed to a reduction in the efficiency and effectiveness of the interventions and the achievements of intended results especially in what concerns gender mainstreaming and rights-based approaches. The evaluation recognises that UNDP CO contributions to livelihoods and the linkages created between livelihoods and other pillars are commendable, yet the current M&E framework does not mirror the efforts and the outcomes of these activities and interventions.

EQ: Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost efficient? How much time, resources and efforts did it take to manage the diversification of the economy outcome? Where are the gaps if any?

The current available data at the time of drafting this report make it almost impossible to answer this evaluation question. This is due to various reasons; UNDP does not have a holistic strategy for economic growth and local economic development. Decisions on which livelihoods model to adopt in each project is left to the discretion of each project and is usually related to the capacities of the implementing partners as opposed to what would work or to a thorough analysis of market dynamics.

Second, UNDP does not systematically collect data on value for money indicators that could help shed light on the cost effectiveness of livelihoods interventions. According to UNDP staff all the livelihoods interventions adopted are “awfully expensive.” According to the livelihoods team UNDP followed an expensive model because livelihoods was not the main objective but was a tool to prevent violent extremism or for improving the environment. “So instead of supporting 3000 through cash for work, we worked with 1000 beneficiaries because we needed to use funds elsewhere for other objectives,” explained UNDP team. Studies from the World Bank indicate that the cost of establishing a business in Jordan is almost USD 4000, whereas the model adopted by UNDP puts this range close to USD 5000. “We are within the employment creation range. Some provide vocational training and cheaper, but we also provide higher quality and design of the action.”

5.4 Impact

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to desired changes over time, consistent with the Resilience Lens, including enhanced delivery of quality services to affected populations through national and local systems, strengthened partnerships with and capacities of national/local service providers, enhanced self-reliance of vulnerable populations and social cohesion/stability among affected communities?

The overarching activities of the livelihood’s component fall within the “emergency” lens. It is thus difficult to speak about long term impact. Nonetheless, each of the projects contributing to the outcome activities have contributed to the desired change overtime especially in terms of short-term impact on improving coping mechanisms of target beneficiaries. Stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation (implementing partners, government, CBOs, beneficiaries) have all reported some level of positive change that has occurred to them and their communities because of the Outcome activities (projects). For example, the King Hussein Foundation explained that the activities carried out by young people in the community as part of the 3x6 interventions has increases young people involvement in the working within their community and increased their social engagement. “When you see them together and understand the context within the community, the self-confidence and sense of responsibility has also increased. We also discovered the potential of the young people. Also, the families said that this is the first time that young people from the community come and help them” explained KHF.

Government officials interviewed described the work on SWM in El-Akaider Landfill as a “success story” where a holistic approach turned an environmental “disaster into an economic opportunity.” This impact of the SWM interventions in terms of upgrading El-Akaider landfill is considered a long term impact. However, the livelihoods impact of that particular project are considered short term.

According to the government the main impact of SWM projects was to improve the management of solid waste and improve the health and environmental issues. "Citizens felt the impact of this project as it creates work opportunities, many municipalities now are asking us to work there to be able to provide some employment and this is an important outcome in our SWM although this is not our area or our responsibility" explained a representative from the Ministry of Local Development. In addition to the obvious improvement in the situation and management of the landfill, the impact was the improved capacities of local partners at the sub-national levels and local CBOs through building the capacity in what concerns management of projects. "Now we see the local partners are reaching out to donors. We still support them but at least they are taking the initiative," explained UNDP teams.

The PLEDJ and decentralisation project helped in creating new and better jobs and better economic opportunities for women and also access to local markets for higher profit margins. The concept of collaboration and sharing of knowledge between local community and surrounding communities increased according to stakeholders interviewed. UNDP staff explained that the project worked on improving business services by creating linkages and networks "we helped them create a network between the small group level and the wider network and connections. This helps them in resilience because of a network of knowledge." Working at the local level for PLEDJ and Milk Production helped increase the capacity of the development departments and local councils. "They had 19 and 17 members in Ajloun and Tafileh and they were engaged to direct some of the activities of the project to local priorities and so it helped improve the local context." All beneficiaries CBOs and individuals and others were receiving training on institutional capacity building. For MOI and the development department were always involved in the trainings. Local council was focusing on the SMEs and they were a platform to manage the beneficiaries and to increase the role of the development department. They understand better implementation approaches and how to work on development issues in general.

The PVE programme through the CCGM helped increase cohesion between Syrian and Jordanian (although the CCGM were not technically part of the livelihoods portfolio). Some of the programmatic support focused on small farmers and sharing farming techniques between Jordanians and the Syrians (who have the know-how) and others who could do partnership on land cultivation and some on productive projects. The skills exchange programme was useful during the life of the project but interviews with beneficiaries during this evaluation indicate that employment of Syrians by Jordanians was not sustainable on the long run. Jordanians who had Syrians working for them, reported an abrupt interruption of this work or cooperation between them, as soon as the UNDP project ended. Syrians worked for Jordanians while getting paid by UNDP. In general, there's a risk that beneficiaries have developed some kind of dependency on funds/UNDP. Thanks to the training, it seems that they know what to do and how to do it, but they either rely on funds to continue because they lack self-confidence or it could be the issue with communication of UNDP and the disappointment of certain. Regardless of the reason, there is a general state of dependency that isn't sustainable.

The other kind of programme in terms of social cohesion (3x6 and CCGM) include community engagement programmes to work collaboratively on solving some of the problems facing the community. The programme worked with a variety CBOs to create a business and employment office, collect CVs and map their community and physical support to connect with businesses and connect with them and try to find them some jobs or connect them within some factories. These things help solve some of the problems within communities and reposition CBOs within the community.

Outcome interventions helped strengthen service delivery at the local level. The local institutions at the beginning of 2012-2013 the municipalities were not ready for development or humanitarian assistance. They did not have preparedness or knowledge on how to deal with a crisis. Some of the departments for social development were not ready. UNDP wanted to increase the readiness of municipalities. Second, the other challenge was that CBOs and CSOs lost their mandates. These CSOs were engaged with children and women and so on. They did not have visible contributions per se but they were focusing on their own mandates but with the Syrian emergency every CSO and CBO wanted to work on where the money is coming from. UNDP focused on institutional capacity, but it was difficult to find real development partners and so a stronger focus was placed in capacity development of municipalities and CSOs. UNDP worked through the local councils in 36 municipalities which ultimately improved the performance of these municipalities and their abilities to manage the crisis and manage future interventions. UNDP was successful in promoting the role of municipalities as an arm for local development. According to government officials interviewed *"local municipalities have become catalysts for development, and UNDP*

supported them in developing development plans. Some of them got funds from the World Bank to implement their development plans.”

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to the local community development, enhance social cohesion, strengthen resilience assets and capacities at individual, community, and institutional level, and strengthen youth and women’s empowerment in the targeted areas?

Social cohesion was enhanced through the interventions of the PVE programme as well as the 3x6 activities. The integration of both Syrian and Jordanian beneficiaries helped strengthen the relations between them and diffuse potential conflicts by engaging them in the same activities to provide services for the community. All beneficiaries, from all projects, appreciated meeting the other beneficiaries. The network created between candidates, whether it was while working together on improving their area through initiatives, or building their projects, meeting each other made a difference on both the personal and professional level. Beneficiaries reported resorting to their peers for issues related to registration and governmental process. There were partnerships formed during the training (for both initiative and projects) and cooperation, despite certain interviews reporting disputes between candidates.

All beneficiaries who part of the initiative project, were delighted to benefit their area, in different manners. All interviewed participating beneficiaries expressed their interest in being part of a new initiative or continuing the one they started. It was an important step for motivation and giving inhabitants, a sense of responsibility for their area(s). This has strengthened social cohesion as intended by the Outcome activities. In 2018 UNDP reported that five social initiatives of the 3x6 approach contributed in creating inclusive infrastructure and services for youth, elderly, women and people with disabilities in partnership with small municipalities in remote areas and border towns that were affected by the Syria crises. The partnership with municipalities, local development units and governorate development units was key to have ownership and build a sense of belonging to vulnerable communities and making sure no one was left behind in social and public services interventions with a strong component for direct community engagement and participation in prioritizing and selecting and implementing these projects.²⁰

In terms of local economic development, it is hard to quantify the impact of the different interventions beyond counting of beneficiaries or knowing how many businesses have continued since they were established. Nonetheless, the different outcome interventions have increased economic exchange at the local level in the targeted governorates. UNDP had several successful interventions in 2018, one of them is the “the establishment of Composting Facility” and its operation during 2018. The project came first as a response to an urgent priority and need for an environmental and health problem (the fresh manure). It also confirmed and promoted the concept of turning the “problem of wastes” into an opportunity, as the final product is being now commercialized and the quality is tested and maintained. The intervention has worked well due to the integrated efforts and the partnerships established from the beginning of the implementation and included Government (Ministry of municipal affairs, Ministry of environment & Ministry of Agriculture), NGOs, CBOs (both engaged in managing the operation and packaging), private sector (engaged in marketing and product testing) and research institutions (engaged in identifying the best methodology). PLEDJ and Dairy Production Projects also helped with local economic development.

The Dairy production project helped establish six work opportunities per CBO engaged. In addition, this project helped improve the overall value chain of milk production. One of the CBOs said in the interview during this evaluation “now we have more people selling their milk to us even in the other projects and more people come to receive services from the CBO and they trust us more. We are a women organisation and not all people are convinced that women should work. This project helped us build trust with the community.” Another CBO explained “Many of the milk producers in our area are selling to us and this helps improve their income. They are far from the village and we make it better for them on the long term.”

According to UNDP staff the achievements for the 2013-2017 was that it focused on improving the role of women in economy in marginalised areas. The Syrian refugee crisis provided an opportunity for UNDP to work in rural areas. Prior to 2013, most donors and development agencies were focusing their work on Amman. With the

²⁰ ROAR 2018

consistent attention paid to rural areas especially in the North of the Kingdom, more attention was afforded to women and women's empowerment. Each of the projects contributing to the Outcome had encompassed a certain focus on women empowerment even if by a mere ensuring an equal number of opportunities are afforded to women. CBOs engaged in diary production created six work opportunities for women per CBO; 180 participants in the demand-driven vocational training out of 240 participants were women. UNDP reports also that the percent of women beneficiaries in the emergency employment models shows that 65% of the available opportunities were for women. This included improved access to finance and saving schemes, small business establishment training and gender equality through employment and micro and small business entrepreneurship packages and better access to markets.²¹

Nonetheless, women economic empowerment and youth engagement (as previously discussed) could benefit from a closer attention to gender mainstreaming and attempts at addressing root causes of inequalities for sustained outcomes. As reported in UNDP ROAR 2019 UNDP's livelihood programmes faced structural challenges that impede effective and efficient participation of women in the labour market. These challenges, such as the harmful social norms, lack of decent transportation system especially in remote areas, absence of affordable proper day-care services among others, put obstacles in front of women to join employability and self-employability skills development programmes and consequently hindering them from entering the labour market.²² To increase the impact UNDP Outcome activities and strengthen the impact on women, these structural barriers need to be addressed systematically through policy dialogue with the government as well as through community awareness and engagement.

EQ: Have any positive or negative long-term effects been produced by the Outcome activities, whether directly or indirectly, intended or unintended?

The livelihoods interventions contributed to enhanced economic opportunities for the target beneficiaries and their families (employment, working days created, establishment of micro-businesses stimulated, cash for work activities, etc.), increased professional skills and capacities (trainings, capacity-building), contributing to improvements at the individual level as well as local community development.

There are many achievements (intended and unintended) by the Outcome activities which include the improvement in services at the local level through an improved SWM system in different areas. The women in Zarqa reported a radical change in their lives during interviews for this evaluation, thanks to the communication training. This aspect was being covered for customer relations, however, women from Zarqa and its surrounding, reported a change in their private communication with family members and children. Many reported solving their anger management issues and feeling better and stronger. Despite the gossips about them, for being women and working, they reported having found courage thanks to the training staff, who increased their self-confidence and gave them the ability to face this societal challenge. The Zarqa team followed-up with beneficiaries, guided them when they were stuck and put them in touch with other projects to support each other. Beneficiaries from other locations complained about the lack of follow-up with them from the project staff, and how much they needed it, except for the Zarqa team who reported how beneficial their follow-up was.

Beneficiaries from Zarqa reported that this was their first experience applying with an organization. Many explained that these areas were like villages and forgotten, and that these areas are the ones that need this project the most. The women focused on the importance of the training and capacity-building for their secluded areas, even more than the funding itself. Interviewed women liked to work and enjoyed financial independence, because of the freedom and equality that it provided them. Certain women reported having an equal say with their husband in decision-making and this is linked to the project and the extra income provided by the women working. As soon as they were given the opportunity, women used all their resources to make things work, even though the COVID-19 lockdown. They developed problem-solving skills because they have the feeling that they can do something.

²¹ ROAR 2018

²² ROAR 2019

The 3x6 modality enabled the engagement of women and young people. According to interviewed stakeholders, UNDP activities enabled young people to respond to the needs of their communities. The 3x6 is based on re-integration through engagement of beneficiaries to serve the community needs and to create perception and behavioural change for young people. This platform changed the view about young people and their role in the community through being engaged in community services and changed the views of older generation in young people.

EQ: To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to the labour market development and stimulation?

The Outcome interventions through the different projects contributed to a stimulation of the local market through the introduction of different livelihoods models. The livelihoods modalities ensured integration of different socio-economic categories and worked both at the national and local levels. UNDP aimed to avoid duplication and to add value to the targeted communities especially between 2013-2015 hence it was believed that the most effective tool was the start-up granting mechanism to establish businesses. “When we go to an area to fund 50 persons and each received 5000 JDs, we inject an amount of money in a municipality and that would have an impact on the existing businesses. We created businesses and employment opportunities and supported existing businesses and their supply chain,” explained UNDP teams. **The work of UNDP during 2013-2017 was not necessarily aiming to contribute to labour market development but it intended and succeeded in working in host communities affected by the Syrian refugee crisis through cash injection to improve the livelihoods for persons and the communities.**

Starting 2015-2016 irrespective of the project and the intervention, capacity building and training were an integral part of the design of livelihoods interventions. Some projects even focused on market dynamics to ensure the development of the sector. For example, the Badia Milk Production project adopted a holistic approach of training, provision of equipment, support in marketing, acquiring licences as well as creating a brand name for the products and attractive packaging. This has resulted in a change in the lives of the project participants as well as in the sector of the production of cheese. It is safe to say that the approach has contributed to a positive change in the simulation of this sector. According to stakeholders of the project prior to implementation all production was home-based and small in terms of quantity “Now we have a higher level of production and we have many employees from the community. We have 6 women. Before we had just 2 women working with us. We have bigger production. And this is especially useful, and it increases the community income.”

However, as previously discussed, the Outcome activities were mostly implemented as “emergency” interventions to mitigate the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis. The implementation modality of the livelihoods interventions since 2013 continued without a specific focus on developing a specific sector or on a comprehensive economic growth approach. Support to an enabling business ecosystem was not considered or implemented. Despite identifying some barriers such as access to finance, registration fees, sustainability and informality, there has not been advocacy and policy work to address these barriers.

UNDP work needs to pay stronger attention on inclusive economic growth and not only on livelihoods. Examples and lessons could be drawn from smaller interventions such as PLEDJ or Badia. As Jordan moves towards a protracted crisis and Syrians are moving from border areas to internal migration. It would be important to focus on rural communities as well as bigger cities such as Zarqa, Irbid and Amman. There is a need to focus on bigger urban centers and address widening inequalities in cities. Livelihoods interventions in general need to focus more on the demand side especially the enabling environment to enable market based (demand) approaches to generate jobs, sustain livelihoods through export development, access to markets, economic recovery of key sectors, investment and strengthen fiscal stability at national and subnational level.

EQ: To which extent the Outcome activities advocated inclusive decent work conditions?

Some activities within the overall Outcome portfolio considered elements of decent work conditions. For example, the newly launched project with the Canadian government focused on women economic empowerment established a flexible work environment and considered the number of working hours of women in the SWM plant. In addition, the design of the sorting facility considered the needs of women. Other projects aimed to increase knowledge about women economic rights by holding information and awareness sessions and using

surveys and asking participants and beneficiaries to indicate knowledge on certain topics and after some activities we also ask them again about these issues. In Karak one of the activities under livelihoods was focusing on mainstreaming women's employment and their rights in the labour market.

Within PLEDJ, the Nour El-Hussein Foundation ran an occupational health and safety training. UNDP did most of trainings especially for businesses in the food processing. Within PLEDJ, there was also a focus on the registration of job creation to ensure the legal requirements were also considered in the work of UNDP. Within the Badia Dairy Production, trainings were provided to ensure that all are abiding by legal requirements including provision of social security for employees. This was also a challenge because the companies worry from the social insurance issues. It was a challenge at the beginning because they did not want to pay.

5.5 Sustainability

EQ: To which extent are the employment opportunities created/provided sustainable, including differences in gender and nationality, if any?

The sustainability of the employment opportunities provided is mixed. As discussed previously, the outcome interventions are varied between the different projects. Some employment opportunities continued after the life of the projects and even during the COVID-19 lock-down in Jordan and others stopped. A survey conducted by UNDP looking at the effects of COVID-19 on businesses supported through UNDP interventions indicated that 15% of businesses (out of 400 businesses) managed to continue to function after COVID-19. In terms of the micro-venture fund, UNDP and Ruwad report that 60% of 150 businesses created continued to function (reports from pre-COVID-19 situation). However, it is important to point out that these businesses are within the informal sector and whether they will be sustainable in the midst of a global pandemic and beyond remains to be seen. Whereas, two of the CBOs engaged in the Dairy Production in the Badia have explained that they have to cut four out of the six job opportunities created as a result of the difficulties in marketing and selling during the COVID-19 lockdown.

Interviewed beneficiaries during this evaluation engaged in different commercial projects suffered from the lockdown of COVID-19, which they're struggling to overcome. None of the interviewed beneficiaries (28) closed their activities due to lockdown, and closed projects had been closed before the lockdown. Some of them took their commercial activities online or used the lockdown to focus on production at home (and sold products at the end of the lockdown). However, those who kept their stores, had to go into debt to continue paying the rent of their shops. They're now working on closing the gap caused by the lockdown, in order to move forward with developing their projects/businesses. In Mafraq, Jordanian men's projects severely suffered from the consequences of the COVID-19 lockdown. The gap that opened led them to borrow money and to be even more in debt. Since the market isn't yet back to normal, these men have suffered a lot. They are back into debts and need support to overcome it and continue their businesses from where they left off.

UNDP ROAR 2018 reports that the percent of Syrian women refugees' participants in livelihoods activities was below target in some rural regions. The report attributes this to the preference of many Syrian women refugees who preferred to establish home-based businesses and freelancing. "A few expressed reservations about working for long hours with the private sector due to lack of day care facilities, affordable and gender friendly transport and single parent households duties since their husbands returned to Syria for economic reasons or were victims of war."²³ Furthermore, and as previously discussed the drop-out rate of women is higher than men in demand-driven vocational training as reported by implementing partner. This is due to the distance between Zarqa and Amman (where most of the opportunities are).

Evidently, the sustainability of women employment and participation in the labour market is greatly affected by structural challenges which include access to finance, customs and traditions related to women's economic participation, lack of day care for children which require closer attention during the remaining implementation period of CPD 2018-2022 and during subsequent programme interventions.

EQ: How has UNDP contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions? EQ: To which extent will the capacity building of Outcome

²³ ROAR 2018

activities sustain some of the results? To which extent are the benefits/results of the Outcome activities sustaining resilience-building achievements?

Capacity-building of beneficiaries (trainings) and partners' and facilities' staff could possibly contribute to maintain some of the results achieved in terms of livelihoods and resilience in the longer-term. All livelihoods interventions encompassed an element of capacity building of local entities and individuals. The capacity building of the CBOs engaged in milk production along with the networking and marketing support is likely to sustain some of the results of this project. According to project stakeholders "The most relevant to us was taking us to the Tafileh and we learned how to make Cheese, and this was extremely useful, and this was theoretical and practical. We exchanged the experiences and we were 10 CBOs and this exchange was useful as we learned the new technicalities. And this was useful to us and we acquire new approaches. Also, how to get licenses and the legal aspects were especially useful. We got the approval of the municipality."

In addition, the CBOs engaged in the project have received a unit with new and modern technology enabling them to increase their production. In addition, small CBOs have created six employment opportunity each (prior to COVID-19) which also supports the sustainability of the activities. The development of a trademark and marketing networks will also support the sustainability of the interventions. According to interviewed CBOs engaged in the milk production project "the most important achievements were the equipment that we managed to get for the production and manufacturing of milk and the licences and the marketing." A second CBO explained that the technical training will increase their abilities "we can check on the quality of the milk and make sure that the milk is good or bad. In the past it was mostly home-based business. Now we know how to use it and which ways to protect it."

The introduction of the concept of incubators in through the PLEDJ project is also likely to sustain some of the results of the Outcome Interventions. According to government officials "The supported projects are still going to the incubators. In addition, the donors now feel that the incubators are important and can work with the different entities. The Nour Hussein is maintaining the sustainability of the incubators."

Beneficiaries interviewed from Amman, Mafrq, Ramtha and Irbid, some of them praised the training, others stated that it didn't add anything new to their already existing knowledge or experience. This reveals an issue in the selection of candidates to receive the training. Nonetheless, they all agreed that the training helped most of the beneficiaries to develop creative ideas, how to turn them into an actual project and budget management, which are cited as the most relevant aspects of the training.

3x6 and CCGM modalities are also contributing to resilience-building results. This is the first time that the young people feel that they are part of their community and they are effective and productive. They worked on different sectors culture, social and health and infrastructure and environment. Some of them created awareness to the families about how to reduce the use of electricity and through community outreach and reduce their consumption. Some of the initiatives focused on water conservation and some were how to use free time for children in a positive way. Some were focusing on health awareness. These initiatives and the engagement of young people can contribute to resilience-building.

EQ: Has follow-up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?

As noted elsewhere in this report, the outcome activities are composed of a different number of projects each with its objectives, implementation methodologies and subsequently potential for sustainability and availability of a clear exit strategy. For example, within the SWM project focusing on El-Ekaider landfill there was a strong component of discussion and engagement with the relevant ministries to ensure sustainability of the landfill on the long run. Likewise, the composting facilities and promotion of the role of women within the factory have also been reviewed and agreed upon by the different stakeholders.

Likewise, Dairy production has benefited from the provision of equipment which should technically allow them a certain level of sustainability. Nonetheless, CBOs interviewed explained that they still need coordination and collaboration with UNDP "we need them and since this project they are always with us and they are part of the project" explained one CBO interviewed. Both CBOs engaged in the Dairy production explained that one of the

key impediments to their sustainability is the absence of a sustained and clean energy source that can make them reduce their electricity bill and increase productivity. “We need more help with the Marketing and so this is one of the biggest issue. Marketing is a problem. We can produce more and there are milk and some people offer us the milk but we can’t take them because of the marketing but we can produce more” explained one of the CBOs.

Within PLEDJ project sustainability and exit strategy was considered during the design and the implementation of the project. As such, they focused on considering sustainability as social, environmental and economic aspects. Supported projects through PLEDJ acquired the necessary approvals from the environmental department to ensure that SWM is well integrated in the SMEs. The project also worked on institutional capacity building and ensure proper financial management along with the Nour El Hussein to ensure the capacity of businesses as institution and their financial sustainability and ensure that they will not lose control of their businesses. The capacity building of the local units and municipalities especially the social department within MOI would ensure a certain level of follow-up to established businesses. The support of the incubators by King Hussein Foundation is also likely to contribute to sustainability and resilience of businesses. According to MOI, resilience will be guaranteed as the different municipalities move slowly towards decentralisation *“The department of local development is working and we are at the end of the decentralisation process and the new one is built on the older one. This is sustainability and the MOI is moving towards the decentralisation and the governorates.”*

VI. Conclusions

The CPD 2013-2017 and 2018-2022 is well suited to the context in Jordan. CPDs were designed in a participatory process taking into considerations the needs, requirements and priorities of the Government of Jordan and the various stakeholders. The country programme documents were designed in times of great fluidity (2013-2017) including an influx of refugees, an unstable regional landscape and with a funding modality that are geared towards humanitarian assistance and less on development or humanitarian-development nexus.

The Outcome interventions and activities corresponded and helped address some of the needs in the target areas and the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries. The provision of support to affected areas such as the El-Ekaider landfill with its subsequent transfer stations, support to waste pickers and the spiralling development of composting facilities all contribute to improving the socio-economic conditions of beneficiaries as well as reducing the impact of the Syrian Crisis on the available resources in Jordan. Following a strong focus on mitigating the impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis, the country programme in the last 3 years or more there has been a more localizing the programme. While it still focuses and works with host communities yet there seems to be a greater attention to local economic development.

The livelihoods interventions of each project were implemented effectively which contributed to the achievement of the expected results of the different projects (trainings/capacity building completed, livelihoods opportunities/employment achieved, new market opportunities, contributed to enhanced economic opportunities and relieved stress on demand on services). Livelihoods related targets were achieved in each project. It is important to point out that there is no one livelihoods / economic development strategy to which each project contributes in a systematic manner. Some interventions focused on Syrian refugees and successfully reached them while others focused on Jordanian host communities, and a third attempted to work with both refugees and host communities. Depending on the selected target group, each individual project was able to reach its targeted population (s) and achieve its expected results.

However, the effectiveness of the interventions was affected by a number of factors such as the absence of a comprehensive livelihoods’ strategy focusing on economic growth in addition to the absence of detailed gender analysis to inform the women’s empowerment and gender equality aspects of the work. The situation was further exacerbated by a weak monitoring and coordination system that focuses more on information sharing, creating synergies and less on collective programme design and implementation. The livelihoods portfolio remained fragmented between the socio-economic pillar, the preventing violent extremism pillar (2013-2017) and the environment and DDR pillar. Linkages between livelihoods interventions and higher objectives such as preventing violent extremism remain unclear and the value added of integrating livelihoods within the PVE pillar remain anecdotal and is not supported by empirical evidence. It is not clear why there are livelihoods interventions within the PVE portfolio. There is no monitoring data focusing on understanding the link between improved livelihoods and resilience to violent extremism. So as far as the evaluation could tell the livelihoods interventions within PVE (which are more 3x6 interventions) appear to support a premises that young people join violent extremist groups

because of lack of livelihoods and engagement within the community (while this is valid logically, , causality within Jordan doesn't seem to have been established as far as available information point out).

The largest portfolio and budget was for 3x6, host communities project and PVE1-4 programs with smaller interventions in the form of area specific or sector specific interventions such as PLEDJ and Badia. These two interventions albeit small in comparison to 3x6 or PVE related livelihoods interventions seem to have a clearer approach. This could be explained due to the fact that they are multi-year projects; are either area specific or sector specific; were preceded by thorough needs assessment and identification of local economic development needs; and have managed to partner with strong partners made them successful (as far as the evaluation could tell). On the other hand, 3x6 approach appear sporadic and does not have a clear strategy (it is not planned interventions based on specific identified needs and it is never a multi-year project because most of the funds for it are emergency funds at best 18 months in duration making sustainability very unlikely because the emergency by definition should not be sustainable). On the other hand, PLEDJ, SWM and Environment interventions (Badia) had clear livelihoods outputs with resilience impact i.e. infrastructure, capacity building, LED and should be further examined for scalability and replication.

UNDP projects have made systematic contributions to increasing the number of work opportunities available to women. However, these have been mostly in sectors that are dominated by women such as food manufacturing. There is a need for mainstreaming gender in all aspects of programme design and implementation. Lessons could be drawn from the recent experience of conducting a gender analysis for a women economic empowerment project at the request of the donor to ensure that the design of the project is aligned to the needs and priorities of women who will be engaged in it. It is also imperative that some of the work of UNDP focuses on addressing some of the structural challenges that are affecting women's abilities to be active in the labour market.

The efficiency of the Outcome activities was positively affected by a surge in donor funding 2013-2017 and negatively by a loss of donor interest 2018-2022. This had an impact on the ability of the CO to meet its targets and retain competent livelihoods staff with the knowledge and skills to work on economic growth agenda. The recent policy directives regarding partnership development and granting mechanism is one of the enabling factors that has increased the time allocated to administering and managing grants which has positively affected the efficiency of the Outcome activities. UNDP is commended by increasing coordination mechanisms between the different pillars and attempting to create synergies between the different interventions. It will be important though to ensure that linkages are well constructed and that a coherent and sound monitoring system is in place to develop necessary empirical evidence that can help advocacy and policy work.

The impact of the livelihood's interventions could be seen at many levels. On the strategic level the engagement and support to the GoJ has created a high level of trust between UNDP CO and the government opening the door for UNDP to work on policy reform should it wish to do so. It is also clear from the feedback from government at the local level that the economic opportunities have strengthened local government as well as businesses and created stimulation in local markets. The activities of 3x6 have helped inject funds into local markets and supported the livelihoods of individuals. Beneficiaries interviewed reported intended and unintended results in the form of improved livelihoods, better communication skills, ability to manage personal problems and high degree of confidence and optimism about the future of their families. Women in particular were very vocal about the impact of engagement with UNDP economic activities in providing them with a voice and ability to have agency within their households.

VII. Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Livelihoods outcomes do not have a holistic framework for local economic development. There needs to be a clear framework or strategy that all projects contribute towards achieving. This could include the scaling up of some models, the introduction of innovation and acceleration labs or other methods that all projects could contribute to in a coherent and systematic fashion.

Recommendation 2: The CPD for 2013-2017 did not include an outcome/outputs specifically targeting Syria refugees' livelihoods/inclusive growth, neither does CPD 2018-2022. The Syrian refugee situation has become a protracted crisis that requires a specific focus by development practitioners. There is a need to realign the objectives and outputs of the CPD to the reality on the ground. This could be done either through an evaluation

or an internal review and update of the CPD document itself. It is important to realign the objectives and outputs and adjust to rapidly changing socio-economic landscape, challenges and national priorities

Recommendation 3: UNDP has taken large strides to increase women economic participation and empowerment. However, these attempts are disjointed and lack a coherent and systematic approach. There is a need to ensure that all projects encompass strong gender analysis at the design stage and the capacity of the different teams are aware of key concepts in gender mainstreaming such as do no harm.

Recommendation 4: UNDP has developed a system for monitoring and evaluation. Further efforts need to be exerted to ensure the development of common indicators and data collection methods to improve data quality and reporting.

Recommendation 5: UNDP has introduced many economic development models to the Jordanian landscape without assessing the value for money of each of the models. There is a need to move beyond the emergency employment schemes into more economic growth and market dynamics. UNDP should focus on rendering technical support to the GOJ on improving the labour market and developing sector strategies or area-based approaches.

Recommendation 6: UNDP has successfully worked on promoting SMEs in Jordan. There is a need to work on the policy reform agenda to ensure the adequate support and access to finance for newly established SMEs. UNDP should focus on creating an enabling environment for businesses by working on legal reform, IT support and software and other key requirements for the development of a sustainable economic growth.

Recommendation 7: Data generated from this evaluation indicate a level of success of smaller projects implemented at the governorate levels such as PLEDJ and the Dairy Production initiatives. It is recommended that the model be studied and replicated through partnership with the government and the private sector in other sectors and in other governorates.

Recommendation 8: MOPICs institutional capacity building for Jordan Response Plan was a positive partnership model developed and supported by UNDP at the onset of the Syrian refugee crisis. To ensure the continued relevance of the interventions the relationship needs to be enhanced considering the protracted nature of Syria crises and multiplicity of challenges facing Jordan.

VIII. Annexes

Annex 1: Final Work Plan and Evaluation Schedule,

Task / Activity	Level effort (nb. of days)	Team members involved	Revised timeline
Inception Phase			
Desk review of qualitative and quantitative secondary data; consultations with UNDP staff	2	NH, AB	By June 25
Preparation of: stakeholder mapping, data collection tools (interview guides and related protocols), refined evaluation methodology, finalized implementation plan	2	NH, AB	
Drafting and submission of Inception Report including the above-mentioned elements	2	NH, AB	
Reception of feedback on the Inception Report and finalization	1	NH, AB	
Final validation of Inception Report	-	-	
Total number of working days – Inception Phase	7		
Data Collection Phase			
Remote interviews (Zoom/Skype/phone) with agreed stakeholders; remote debriefing session (immediately after completion of field data collection)	12	NH – AB	June 28 – July 10
Total number of working days – Data collection phase	12		
Analysis and Reporting Phase			
Field data cleaning and entry; data analysis; development and submission of the Draft Evaluation Report	8	NH, AB	Draft Evaluation Report to be submitted two weeks after the completion of data collection Tentative July 25 th .
Reception of feedback from UNDP	-	NH, AB	
Editing of the Draft Assessment Report and submission of the Final Evaluation Report	3	NH, AB	
Total number of working days – Analysis and Synthesis Phase	11		
Total number of working days	30		

Annex 2: List of Interviewees

Beneficiaries

Number	Gender		Age		Nationality		Place of Residence				
	Male	Female	30 and under	30 and above	Jordanian	Syrian	Amman	Mafraq	Zarqa	Ramthat/Irbid	
1	x		23		x		x				
2		x		43	x		x				
3	x			31	x		x				
4		x		32	x		x				
5		x	29		x			x			
6		x		36	x		x				
7		x	30		x					x	
8		x		40	x					x	
9	x		29		x			x			
10	x		23		x			x			
11		x		36	x				x		
12		x	26		x				x		
13		x	23		x			x			
14		x		44	x			x			
15		x	23		x		x				
16		x	23			x		x			
17	x			32	x				x		
18		x		32	x				x		
19		x		35	x				x		
20		x		38		x	x				
21		x		40		x	x				
22	x		27		x				x		
23	x		23		x				x		
24	x		29		x		x				
25		x		37		x	x				
26		x	23		x				x		
27	x		24		x				x		
28		x		45	x				x		
TOTAL		9	19	14	14	24	4	10	6	10	2

Annex 3: Final Data Collection Tools

Key Informant Interview Guide UNDP Staff

Relevance

What was the process of developing the CPD?

What were the preparatory steps / studies that went into the formulation of the CPD 2013-2017 and 2017-2021?

What methods were used for the assessment of the capacities of implementing partners?

How were LV interventions selected?

How were resilience challenges identified and considered?

How was the selection of LV as a cross cutting theme considered?

(For project specific teams) Why is this particular project relevant to Jordan, UNDP and the beneficiaries?

Effectiveness

What would you say was achieved from the CPD?

(For project specific teams) what do you see as the main achievements of this project?

How were beneficiaries for each project selected?

How were implementing partners selected?

How and in what way were the capacity of implementing partners developed?

(For project specific teams) What was the implementation strategy of the CPD/ project?

(For project specific teams) How did each individual project contribute to the LV outcome?

(For project specific teams) What were the enabling factors? What were the challenges?

(For project specific teams) What UNDP policies or systems support or hinder the achievement of the outcome and the achievement of the LV objectives within projects?

What approaches were developed to engage the GoJ in UNDP LV activities? What was the outcome of this engagement? What steps has the government taken to reform existing systems in line with UNDP approaches?

(For project specific teams) How did UNDP integrate LV in other cross cutting themes such as gender, human rights and resilience?

(For project specific teams) What monitoring systems were in place? how were indicators selected? How effective were they in monitoring and assessing progress? How could they be improved?

(For project specific teams) How is gender and human rights considered in your project?

(For project specific teams) What types of coordination mechanisms exist between the different projects? How effective are they? How can they be improved?

Efficiency

(For UNDP Management) What and how were the percentage allocated from each project for LV interventions? Do you think it was enough? Why/ why not?

How was the LV managed? What types of support were you able to access from UNDP LV lead or officers?

How many LV models did your project adopt? What were they? Which of the LV interventions had a higher value for money? What explains this?

What resource challenges were identified? How were they overcome?

(For UNDP Management) How was monitoring data used to adjust project design?

Impact

What happened as a result of projects' interventions?

How was the quality of services affected as a result of the different interventions?

In what ways were the capacities of local service providers enhanced? What is still required?

How did LV activities impact resilience of local communities? How is that assessed?

How did LV activities affect local councils? Government? NGOs at the national and local level?

Sustainability

(For UNDP Management) What is the exit strategy of the CDP?

How are employment opportunities monitored? What explains their sustainability or lack of? How can this be strengthened?

How did each project consider sustainability and what were the outcomes of this approach?

What types of partnerships have been forged amongst and between the different partners?

What capacity building activities have been carried out with partners? What is likely to continue after the cessation of funding?

Other Key Issues

What would you say are the key lessons learned from this project?

Are there any best practices?

What would be your recommendations for the upcoming CDP and LV interventions?

Key Informant Interview Guide Government partners

Relevance

Tell me about your engagement with UNDP

What is the value of this engagement for the achievement of national priorities?

Are you familiar with UNDP strategies regarding employment? How are they relevant for Jordan?

Effectiveness

Tell me about the project / activity that your department was involved in?

To what extent were you engaged in the design and implementation of the activities?

What type of capacity building activities / engagement events did you participate in? which did you like most and why? Which was most relevant?

What do you think worked best?

What challenges were encountered?

Efficiency

What types of coordination were in place between you and UNDP for the management of this project? Do you think they were sufficient? What would you change about the management?

Do you think that enough time and resources were made available by UNDP for the successful implementation of this project? Why/ why not?

Impact

What happened because of projects' interventions?

How was the quality of services affected because of the different interventions?

In what ways were the capacities of local service providers enhanced? What is still required?

How did LV activities impact resilience of local communities? How is that assessed

How did LV activities affect local councils? Government? NGOs at the national and local level?

Sustainability

What is likely to continue after the end of the project (or end of UNDP support)?

What is likely to stop? Why? What is required to enhance sustainability?

What changes have been introduced by your department to support sustainability of interventions?

Other Key Issues

What would you say are the key lessons learned from this project?

Are there any best practices?

Do you have any recommendations for UNDP in the coming phase?

What are the main sectors that might directly and largely benefit from UNDP projects?

Key Informant Interview Guide Implementing Partners

Relevance

How did you hear about this project and why did you decide to engage with UNDP in it?

How is this project and its components relevant to your community? How is it relevant to Jordan?

Have you worked on similar projects/objectives before?

Are you aware of the up-to-date rules and regulations regarding work permits, refugees' employment, business establishment, etc.

Effectiveness

Tell me about the project / activity that your organisation was involved in?

To what extent were you engaged in the design and implementation of the activities?

What type of capacity building activities / engagement events did you participate in? which did you like most and why? Which was most relevant?

Which LV intervention was most suitable for your community? Why?

What do you think worked best in this project?

What challenges were encountered? How were you able to overcome them?

Efficiency

What types of coordination were in place between you and UNDP for the management of this project? Do you think they were sufficient? What would you change about the management?

Do you think that enough time and resources were made available by UNDP for the successful implementation of this project? Why/ why not?

Impact

What happened because of projects' interventions?

How was the quality of services affected because of the different interventions?

In what ways were the capacities of local service providers enhanced? What is still required?

How did LV activities impact resilience of local communities? How is that assessed

How did LV activities affect local councils? Government? NGOs at the national and local level?

Sustainability

What is likely to continue after the end of the project (or end of UNDP support)?

What is likely to stop? Why? What is required to enhance sustainability?

What changes have been introduced by your organisation to support sustainability of interventions?

How did capacity building activities affect your organisation?

Other Key Issues

What would you say are the key lessons learned from this project?

Are there any best practices?

Do you have any recommendations for UNDP in the coming phase?

Key Informant Interview Guide Donors

Relevance

How is this project aligned with your government / agency's priorities for Jordan?

Effectiveness

How involved were you in the design and implementation of this project?

What would you say worked best? And what were the challenges encountered?

How has UNDP managed to communicate and address these challenges?

How satisfied are you with UNDP management of this project?

What would you change about the management or communication within this project in order for it to be more effective?

Impact

As far as you are aware, what do you think changed as a result of this project?

In regular consultations with government counterparts how does this particular project feature in the relationship with the GoJ?

What could be done to enhance the partnership with UNDP and with the GoJ?

Other Key Issues

What would you say are the key lessons learned from this project?

Are there any best practices?

Do you have any recommendations for UNDP in the coming phase?

Phone Interview Guide: Beneficiaries

Gender	Age	Nationality	Marital Status	Place of residence	Service Received	Place of Origin (For Syrians)	Level of Education

Relevance

How did you hear about this project and why did you decide to engage with it?

How is this project and its components relevant to you and your family? community? How is it relevant to Jordan?

Effectiveness

Tell me about the project / activity that you were involved in?

To what extent were your needs and feedback considered in the design and implementation of the activities?

What type of capacity building activities did you participate in? which did you like most and why? Which was most relevant? Why?

Which LV intervention was most suitable for your situation? Why?

What do you think worked best in this project?

What challenges were encountered? How were you able to overcome them?

Impact

What happened because of projects' interventions?

How was the quality of services affected because of the different interventions?

In what ways were the capacities of local service providers enhanced? What is still required?

How did the activities affect the relationship between Jordanians and Syrians (if at all)?

What coping mechanisms have you adopted since engagement in this project?

(For both men and women) sometimes just getting out of the house can help with the relationship with spouse and children; did this project affect your relationship with your spouse or children? How?

What did you spend the extra income on? (probe education, food, repayment of debts...etc.)

Sustainability

Are you still involved in the economic activity? Why / why not?

How can UNDP make the economic activities continue (if ceased)?

How can your work be enhanced (what do you need to make it grow?)

Do you have any recommendations for UNDP in the coming phase?

Annex 4: Documents Consulted

Annex 5: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions (ToRs)	Specific Questions	Relevant Stakeholders	Evaluability Indicators	Data Collection Methods
<p>Relevance</p>	<p>To which extent were the Outcome activities aligned with the national priorities, plans, strategies as well as emerging priorities/challenges faced the development progress in Jordan e.g. the National Resilience Plan 2014 – 2016 and the Jordan Response Plan 2016-2018?</p> <p>To which extent were the Outcome activities designed properly to address the issues identified in the CPD 2013 - 2017?</p> <p>To what extent did the Outcome objectives remain valid and relevant throughout the implementation phase?</p> <p>To which extent were the activities and outputs consistent with the intended impact/results?</p> <p>On which basis were the targeted governorates/areas selected?</p> <p>To which extent did the Outcome activities, outputs/expected results correspond with the needs and problems of targeted governorate(s)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the process of developing the CPD? • What were the preparatory steps / studies that went into the formulation of the CPD 2013-2017 and 2018-2022? • What methods were used for the assessment of the capacities of implementing partners? • How were LV interventions selected? • How were resilience challenges identified and considered? • How was the selection of LV as a cross cutting theme considered? • How were the targeted governorates/areas chosen? • How were the implementing partners chosen? For each component • Has UNDP conducted any needs assessments on the targeted 	<p>UNDP Management Team</p> <p>UNDP Pillar Leads</p>	<p>Evidence of participatory process of formulation of CDP</p> <p>Evidence of consultation with government/ partners/ donors ...etc.</p> <p>Needs assessments of implementing partners capacities</p> <p>Alignment with government priorities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Informant interviews • Document Review • Context analysis

	<p>To which extent did the Outcome activities consider the pre-existing capacities of the implementing partners?</p> <p>To which extent did the Outcome activities consider broader resilience-building challenges?</p> <p>To which extent did the Outcome activities take into consideration the skills and competencies of targeted group?</p> <p>To which extent did the Outcome activities take into consideration and supply and demand?</p>	sector/area/households ?			
Effectiveness	<p>To which extent did the Outcome activities reach its targeted population(s)?</p> <p>To which extent were the capacities of implementing partners developed regarding knowledge, attitudes and practices on LED?</p> <p>To which extent were the Outcome activities implemented effectively, thereby contributing to the achievement of the expected results and support the diversification of economy, specifically at the local community level?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were beneficiaries for each project selected? • How and in what way were the capacity of implementing partners developed? • What was the implementation strategy of the CPD? • How did each individual project contribute to the LV outcome? • What were the enabling factors? What were the challenges? 	<p>Projects' managers</p> <p>Implementing Partners (CBOs/NGOs)</p> <p>Government Counterparts for each project</p> <p>UNDP M&E officer</p> <p>UNDP Gender Focal Point</p> <p>Project's M&E officers</p>	<p>Training Materials of Implementing Partners</p> <p>Evidence of engagement with government</p> <p>Decrees, policies adopted by GoJ to enhance SMEs</p> <p>Complementarity between projects around LV interventions</p>	<p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Document Review</p>

	<p>To which extent did the monitoring of Outcome activities implementation contribute to learning and accommodated changes throughout the implementation?</p> <p>What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outcome?</p> <p>To which extent did UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints and capabilities affect the implementation of Outcome activities?</p> <p>Has UNDP played a role in introducing the Government to the best global practices to promote productive capacities of small and medium enterprises, to develop knowledge-based economy and social entrepreneurship, to enhance employability and access to decent work, to improve value chains for SMEs and to strengthen access to financing and market instruments?</p> <p>To which extent were cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, rights-based approach, and resilience-building measures understood and pursued in a coherent manner?</p> <p>To which extent were the Outcome activities scaled up to accommodate emerging needs/promising sectors for promoting livelihoods opportunities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What UNDP policies or systems support or hinder the achievement of the outcome and the achievement of the LV objectives within projects? • What approaches were developed to engage the GoJ in UNDP LV activities? What was the outcome of this engagement? What • Has the monitoring process managed by UNDP or/and the implementing partner? • steps has the government taken to reform existing systems in line with UNDP approaches? • How did UNDP integrate LV in other cross cutting themes such as gender, human rights and resilience? • What monitoring systems were in place? how were indicators selected? How effective were they in monitoring and assessing progress? How could they be improved? 	<p>Donors</p>	<p>Evidence of Lessons learned from LV interventions feeding into new project design</p> <p>Sector specific studies conducted and evidence of integration into new CDP and new projects</p>	
--	---	---	---------------	---	--

	To what extent were programme indicators able to measure achievements of the Outcome activities listed above using the Resilience definition as applicable in the NRP/ 3RP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the evaluation or assessment been conclusive to realignment of programs and enhancing cost - benefits impact 			
Efficiency	<p>To which extent did allocated resources correspond to the needs of the Outcome activities?</p> <p>To which extent were resources efficiently utilized to identify, assess institutional capacity, and select partners appropriate for the scope of work?</p> <p>Have the results been achieved at an acceptable cost, compared with alternative approaches with the same objectives? If so, which types of interventions have proved to be more cost efficient?</p> <p>How much time, resources and efforts did it take to manage the diversification of the economy outcome? Where are the gaps if any?</p>	<p>what percentage was allocated from each project for the LV interventions?</p> <p>How was the LV managed within the different projects? Within the CDP?</p> <p>Which of the LV interventions had a higher value for money? What explains this?</p> <p>What resource challenges were identified? How were they overcome?</p> <p>How was monitoring data used to adjust project design and realignment during implementation?</p>	<p>Projects' managers</p> <p>Pillars Leads</p> <p>UNDP Finance officer</p> <p>UNDP Senior Management</p> <p>Government</p>	<p>Project's budget allocations</p> <p>Organigram of LV pillars</p> <p>Organigram of Projects</p> <p>Evidence of cost effectiveness of interventions</p>	<p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Document review</p>
Impact	To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to desired changes over time, consistent with the Resilience Lens, including enhanced delivery of quality services to affected populations through national and local systems, strengthened partnerships with and capacities of national/local service	<p>What happened as a result of projects' interventions?</p> <p>How was the quality of services affected as a result of the different interventions?</p>	<p>Project Officers at the field level</p> <p>Projects' partners (national and local levels)</p>	<p>Change in the quality of services as reported by beneficiaries</p> <p>change in lives of beneficiaries (as reported by them)</p>	<p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Phone Interviews with beneficiaries</p> <p>Reported change from project documents</p>

	<p>providers, enhanced self-reliance of vulnerable populations and social cohesion/stability among affected communities?</p> <p>To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to the local community development, enhance social cohesion, strengthen resilience assets and capacities at individual, community, and institutional level, and strengthen youth and women’s empowerment in the targeted areas?</p> <p>Have any positive or negative long-term effects been produced by the Outcome activities, whether directly or indirectly, intended or unintended?</p> <p>To which extent did the Outcome activities contribute to the labour market development and stimulation?</p> <p>To which extent did the Outcome activities promote innovation and resilient/flexible methods of employment?</p> <p>To which extent the Outcome activities advocated inclusive decent work conditions?</p>	<p>In what ways were the capacities of local service providers enhanced? What is still required?</p> <p>How did LV activities impact resilience of local communities?</p> <p>How did LV activities affect local councils? Government? NGOs at the national and local level?</p> <p>How decent work conditions were integrated in the project?</p>	<p>Government Counterparts</p> <p>Jordanian Youth Jordanian Women</p> <p>Syrian Youth Syrian Women</p>		
Sustainability	<p>To which extent are the employment opportunities created/provided sustainable, including differences in gender and nationality, if any?</p>	<p>What is the exit strategy of the CDP?</p>	<p>UNDP Management</p> <p>LV Lead</p>	<p>Evidence of monitoring mechanisms in place for projects’</p>	<p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Document review</p>

	<p>How has UNDP contributed to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?</p> <p>To which extent will the capacity building of Outcome activities sustain some of the results?</p> <p>Has follow-up support after the end of the Outcome activities been discussed and formalized? Is there a clear exit strategy?</p> <p>To which extent are the benefits/results of the Outcome activities sustaining resilience-building achievements?</p>	<p>How are employment opportunities monitored? What explains their sustainability or lack of? How can this be strengthened?</p> <p>How did each project consider sustainability and what were the outcomes of this approach?</p> <p>What types of partnerships have been forged amongst and between the different partners?</p> <p>What capacity building activities have been carried out with partners? What is likely to continue after the cessation of funding?</p> <p>What are the challenges experienced by newly established businesses?</p>	<p>Government</p> <p>CBOs / NGOs</p> <p>Donors</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>beneficiaries beyond the life of projects</p> <p>Change in approaches adopted by CBOs / NGOs as a result of capacity building</p> <p>Presence of new partnerships established to continue the work of UNDP</p> <p>Donor interest in continuing funding</p>	
--	---	--	---	---	--

Annex 6: Terms of Reference