

UNDP Jordan

FINAL INCEPTION REPORT

External Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNDP Jordan Country Programme 2018-2022

Commissioned by the UNDP CO, Jordan

By: Christian Bugnion de Moreta

Inception report and work plan

18th January 2021

Table of contents

Page

Content

Acronyms and abbreviations.....	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Purpose, scope and objective of the assessment.....	4
3. Audience	4
4. CPD background.....	5
4.1. Country context	9
5. Evaluability	11
6. Approach and methodology	12
7. Risks and limitations	15
8. Evaluation work plan.....	15
9. Key evaluation questions (KEQ) and framework	15
Annexes:	
• TOR	
• Bibliography	
• List of KII to be interviewed	
• KII interview guide	

Acronyms and abbreviations

CO:	Country Office
CPD:	Country Programme Document
DAC :	Development Assistance Committee
EU:	European Union
FGD:	Focus Group Discussion
GoJ:	Government of Jordan
IP:	Implementing Partner
KII:	Key Informant Interview
MOPIC:	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
MSC:	Most Significant Change
MTR:	Mid-Term Review
OECD:	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PSC:	Project Steering Committee
RRF:	Resource and Results Framework
ToC:	Theory of Change
ToR :	Terms of Reference
UNDG:	United Nations Development Group
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG :	United Nations Evaluation Group

1. Introduction

The UNDP Country Office (CO) has hired an independent consultant to undertake the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the UNDP Jordan Country Programme Document (CPD) 2018-2022. This MTR is meant to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contribution to development results at the country level with regard to policy advisory services and implemented programmes, projects and initiatives. In line with UNDP Jordan evaluation plan, this MTR is being conducted to assess the impact of UNDP's development assistance across the major thematic and cross cutting areas of Governance, Sustainable Development and Inclusive Growth. At the same time, the MTR findings and recommendations are meant to inform future CPD programming. This MTR is therefore both summative, giving an objective judgement of the value of the CPD performance, and formative, providing a learning exercise from which senior UNDP management will be able to position itself for the next CPD.

2. Purpose, scope and objective of the assessment

The objective of this evaluation is to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contribution to development results at the country level with regard to policy advisory services and implemented programmes, projects and initiatives.

The MTR must have a sharp focus on the 3 selected UNSDF outcomes to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the current programmes of UNDP, which would be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for the preparation of the new CPD.

The MTR has three specific purposes combining both summative and formative elements:

- 1) To provide a summative evaluation of the performance and results to date,
- 2) To identify good practices and lessons to be carried forward into potential future interventions with similar outcomes
- 3) To provide recommendations, where relevant, on aspects of policy and programming which could be improved to inform the next CPD

The scope of this mid-term evaluation is the implementation period of the Programme Phase since its start on 1 January 2018 until 31st December 2020. The MTR unit of analysis is the CPD, which is composed of a portfolio of interventions described under section 4. hereunder. The evaluation is carried out under the provisions of the UNDP revised evaluation policy of January 2019. It essentially assesses the strategic level to determine the value, performance, improvements and good practices that underpin the CPD implementation and looks to the future to suggest, based on the findings and lessons identified during the MTR process, possible ways to inform UNDP for its next planning and programming cycle.

3. Audience

This mid-term decentralised evaluation is meant to provide evidence of results and accountability to the UNDP and other interested stakeholders, but it is also a learning exercise for the CO. It is undertaken under the oversight of the UNDP Jordan Country Office. The UNDP evaluation manager is the UNDP business development support and reporting specialist, in consultation with the CO Team. Her role is to ensure that the final evaluation remains on track

with its work plan and submits the required deliverables. The audience is primarily the CO, regional bureau and corporate headquarters, but the MTR may also be shared more widely with the government, donors and implementing partners. It is normally publicly available on UNDP's Evaluation Resource Center website (<https://erc.undp.org>).

4. CPD background

The CPD document was distributed on 22 November 2017 and approved at the first regular session between 22-26 January 2018 of the Executive Board of the UNDP, UNFPA and UNOPS, as item 2 of the provisional agenda.¹ It comes at a time of a change in the Administrator, and coincides with a different perspective to development work which is reflected in the different structure and wording of the expected results (or outcomes/progress) in the two different UNDP strategic plans: For the period 2013-2017, UNDP has a vision of helping countries achieve the simultaneous *eradication of poverty and significant reduction of inequalities and exclusion*. It is articulated through the following 7 outcomes: “

- a) Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded;
- b) Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance;
- c) Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services;
- d) Faster progress is achieved in reducing gender inequality and promoting women's empowerment;
- e) Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict, and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change;
- f) Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster setting;
- g) Development debates and actions at all levels prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles”²

For the period 2018-2021, UNDP's strategic plan vision is “to help countries achieve *sustainable development by eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development and building resilience to crises and shocks*”. By 2021, UNDP wants to “catalyse tangible progress on:

- a) Eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, and keeping people out of poverty;
- b) Accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development, especially through innovative solutions that have multiplier effects across the Sustainable Development Goals;
- c) Building resilience to crises and shocks, in order to safeguard development gains”.³

¹ United Nations, Country Programme Document for Jordan (2018-2022), ref. DP/DCP/JOR/3

² UNDP Strategic Plan 2013-2017, p. 3-4

³ UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021, p. 1-2

UNDP's CPD 2018-2022 was developed on the basis of national priorities as identified in Jordan 2025, a National Vision and Strategy, elaborated in 2015 by the Government and consistent with the 2030 Agenda. UNDP's CPD is itself aligned to the United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDF 2018-2022) with three joint outcomes defined as:

1. Institutions in Jordan at national level and local levels are more responsive, inclusive, accountable, transparent, and resilient;
2. People, especially the most excluded and vulnerable, proactively claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities for improved human security and resilience, and
3. Enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the social, economic and political spheres⁴.

Within the CPD, two commitments are found to be examples of good practice: 1) allocation of at least 15% of its programme budget to gender-specific programming and 2) allocation of at least 3 per cent of the programme budget for monitoring and evaluation.⁵

The actual portfolio of programmes and projects amount to USD 62 million for the CPD period, e.g., from 1st January 2018 to end of December 2020⁶, which is divided into 39 different interventions, of which nine under outcome 1, twenty-two under outcome 2, eight under outcome 3. The fact that the Resource and Results Framework of the CPD presents the CPD outcomes in a different order (starting in reverse order) was found to be confusing⁷. Verification with the CO indicated that the numbering is incorrect, but the outcomes remain the same and for UNDP's reporting system the first outcome appears as *JOR Outcome 28 Enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the social, economic and political spheres*, followed by *JOR 29 People, especially the most excluded and vulnerable, proactively claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities for improved human security and resilience*, and by *JOR 30 Institutions in Jordan at national level and local levels are more responsive, inclusive, accountable, transparent, and resilient*. The MTR will therefore use Outcome 1 as JOR 28, Outcome 2 as JOR 29, and Outcome 3 as JOR 30. These outcomes are articulated through the following outputs:

Outcome 1: *Enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the social, economic and political spheres*

- Output 1.1. Civil participation, institutions and electoral/parliamentary processes strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability.
- Output 1.2. National and subnational government effectiveness levels enhanced, and accountability strengthened
- Output 1.3. National and civic capacities strengthened for social cohesion and prevention of violent extremism

Outcome 2: *People, especially the most excluded and vulnerable, proactively claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities for improved human security and resilience*

⁴ UNDP CPD 2018-2022, p. 4 paragraph 9

⁵UNDP CPD 2018-2022, p. 7-8

⁶ This is the amount of the contributions between 1.1.18 and 31.12.20, not the total budget for each intervention considering some are just starting/are about to start.

⁷ UNDP CPD 2018-2022, RRF, pages 9 to 15

- Output 2.1. Employment opportunities and livelihoods strengthened, for stabilization, and return to sustainable development pathways
- Output 2.2. Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote local economic development (LED) and deliver basic services
- Output 2.3. Nature-based solutions developed, financed and applied for sustainable recovery, and improving communities' resilience and living conditions
- Output 2.4. Climate change adaptation and mitigation policies and measures, and DRR plans funded and implemented

Outcome 3: *30 Institutions in Jordan at national level and local levels are more responsive, inclusive, accountable, transparent, and resilient*

- Output 3.1. Capacities developed across the Whole of Government to integrate the 2030 Agenda in development plans and budgets and analyse progress towards the Goals, using innovative and data-driven solutions
- Output 3.2. Policies, plans and partnerships for sustainable development draw upon UNDP thought leadership, knowledge and evidence

The list of interventions that comprise the CPD portfolio is detailed in the table hereafter:

Nr	Project Description	Output Description	Counterpart	Start date	End date	Donor	Contributions US\$ 1.1.2018 to 31.12.20
Outcome 1 (JOR 28): Enhanced opportunities for inclusive engagement of people living in Jordan in the social, economic and political spheres							
1	HEWAR Community Dialogue	HEWAR Community Dialogue for S	Ministry of Local Administration	1-Jan-2019	31-Dec-2020	NORWAY	\$ 291.708,77
2	Rule of Law and the 2030 Agenda Jordan	Rule of Law and the 2030 Agend	Ministry of Justice	31-Jan-2019	31-Dec-2020	UNDP-FUNDING WINDOW	\$ 277.729,73
3	decentralization	Decentralization and Local De	MOI, MOLA	11/06/2017	31/12/2020	EU	\$ 4.122.643,00
4	Prevention Platform For PVE	Prevention Platform For PVE	Office of PM (PVE Unit)	5-Nov-2018	31-Dec-2020	NETHERLAND	\$ 354.233,46
5	PVE & Livelihoods through HDN	Human Security and PVE	Office of PM (PVE Unit)	1-Jan-2019	31-Mar-2021	JAPAN	\$ 3.600.359,41
6	Harnessing Gender Justice into Microfinance for an	women's access to justice digi	Ministry of Justice, Central bank of Jordan, tanmeyah memebtrs	1-Jul-2020	1-Jul-2021	UNDP FW	\$ 325.000,00
7	Network of Local Gov-COVID19	COVID-19 Network of Local Gov	MOLA, MOI	1-Jan-2021	31-Dec-2021	NORWAY	\$ 1.553.990,73
8	Mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisi	PVE & SOCIAL STABILISATION	Office of PM (PVE Unit)	10-Mar-2017	31-Dec-2019	JAPAN	\$ 1.731.320,70
9	Mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisi	PHASE III SOCIAL COHESION PROG	Office of PM (PVE Unit)	13-Mar-2018	31-Dec-2019	JAPAN	\$ 1.138.076,16
Sub-total							\$ 13.395.061,96
Outcome 2 (JOR 29): People, especially the most excluded and vulnerable, proactively claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities for improved human security and resilience							
10	Mainstream Rio Convention into 3 areas	DRR mainstreaming	Civil defense, Ministry of Interior, National Center for Security and Crises Management	1-Jun-2018	31-Dec-2020	JORDAN	\$ 175.502,06
11	PVE & Livelihoods through HDN	Self-Reliance & Inclusion	Ministry of Local Administration (PVE)unit	10-Aug-2020	31-Dec-2021	Italy	\$ 1.806.750,00
12	PVE & Livelihoods through HDN	Human Security and PVE	Office of PM (PVE Unit)	10-Aug-2020	31-Dec-2020	JAPAN	\$ 3.710.359,41
13	PVE & Livelihoods through HDN	PVE & Livelihoods through HDN	Office of PM (PVE Unit), Greater Amman Municipality , MOLA	10-Aug-2020	31-Dec-2020	JAPAN	\$ 4.835.331,16
14	Women Empowerment in SWM	Enhance women resilience	Ministry of Health	1-Apr-2020	31-Dec-2023	AGP FOR UN DEV	\$ 202.000,00
15	Women Empowerment in SWM	COVID-19 WOMEN INITIATIVES	Ministry of Local Administration	1-Apr-2020	31-Dec-2023	CANADA	\$ 156.623,00
16	Fourth National Communication Report and Second Bi	4th Nat. Comm report & 2nd BUR	Ministry of Local Administration	1-Mar-2018	1-Mar-2022	GEF	\$ 870.191,20
17	Property tax knowledge transfer	COVID-19 CRISIS RESPONSE	Ministry of Finance , Ministry of Local Administration, Ministry of Interior	4-May-2020	31-Dec-2020	UNDP FW	\$ 267.500,00
18	Reduction & Elimination of POPs	COVID-19 Triage	Ministry of Health	1-Jan-2018	31-Dec-2022	UNDP	\$ 217.000,00
19	Reduction & Elimination of POPs	Reduction&Elimination of POPs	Ministry of Environment and Ministry	1-Jan-2018	31-Dec-2022	GEF	\$ 5.434.334,68
20	Improve livelihoods of Sheep Owners	Sheep wool	MOE & Badia Restoration Programme	1-Jan-2019	31-Dec-2022	JORDAN	\$ 646.875,94
21	Sustainable Urbanization	Sustainable Urbanization	Greater Amman Municipality	1-Jan-2018	31-Dec-2022	GEF	\$ 2.739.686,55
22	Reduction & Elimination of POPs	Marine Littering	ASEZA	1-Jan-2018	31-Dec-2022	GWC	\$ 110.000,00
23	SWM Development Service	SWM Development Services	Ministry of Local Administration	1-Jun-2019	#####	JORDAN	\$ 1.716.682,55
24	Women Empowerment in SWM	Women Empowerment in SWM	Ministry of Local Administration	1-Apr-2020	31-Dec-2023	CANADA	\$ 4.808.254,38
25	Migratory Soaring Birds II	Migratory Soaring Birds II	Ministry of Environment, Birdlife Internal	1-Jan-2018	31-Dec-2022	GEF	\$ 3.676.469,77
26	MED4EBM	MED4EBM	JEREDS & ASEZA (UNDP only administering the fund)	1-Dec-2019	1-Dec-2022	EU	\$ 3.277.462,96
27	NDC enhancement- climate promise	NDC - climate promise	Ministry of Environment	1-Aug-2020	31-Dec-2021	KUWAIT	\$ 259.200,00
28	Global Water and Ocean Governance Support Programm	Water Governance Support Progr	Ministry Of Water And Irrigation; Ministry of Environment (Regional project)	1-Jan-2019	31-Dec-2023	Swedish int dev	\$ 202.500,00
29	SDG Climate Facility: Climate Action for Human Sec	O3: National & Local Capacity	Ministry Of Water And Irrigation; Ministry of Environment (Regional project)	22-May-2018	31-Dec-2022	SIDA	\$ 12.000,00
30	Mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordan	Syrian refugee Host Community	Ministry of Planning and internatio	1-Mar-2013	31-Dec-2020	UNDP, Jordan, Japan, UN Agencies, Kuwait, Unwomen , WFP, UNOCHA, JORDAN, JAPAN, Kuwait, SWISS AFD, Unilever, UN Foundation	\$ 14.352,97 \$ 246.766,60 \$ 190,20 \$ 397,88 \$ 1.751,08 \$ 322.626,14 \$ 673.876,00 \$ 227.269,44 \$ 4.055,00
31	Mitigating the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordan	Solid Waste Management;	Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Local Administration	1-Apr-2015	31-Dec-2019	CANADA	\$ 6.798.394,00
Sub-total							\$ 43.414.402,97
Outcome 3 (JOR 30): Institutions in Jordan at national level and local levels are more responsive, inclusive, accountable, transparent, and resilient							
32	Tracking SDG data-DOS	Tracking SDG data-DOS	MoPIC, DOS	1-Jul-2019	31-Dec-2020	UNDP	\$ 275.000,00
33	Financing for Delevopment SDG's	Financing for Development SDGs	Private Sector	1-Sep-2018	31 Dec. 2028	UNDP, Canada, UNICEF, KUWAIT	\$ 751.375,00 \$ 138.604,00 \$ 96.934,00 \$ 59.400,00
34	Jordan Parliament & SDGs	Enhance capacities of Parlia	Parliament	1-Oct-2018	31-Mar-2020	UNDP FW	\$ 381.429,45
35	Enabling SDG Financing Ecosystem	SDG Financing_ Component I	MoPIC, MOF	15-Jun-2020	15-Jun-2022	MPTF -JOINT SDG	\$ 420.000,00
36	Enabling SDG Financing Ecosystem	SDG Accelerat_ Component II	MoPIC, MOF	15-Jun-2020	15-Jun-2022	MPTF -JOINT SDG	\$ 200.000,00
37	Property tax knowledge transfer	Plan and implement the Knowled	Ministry of Finance , Ministry of Local Administration	4-May-2020	31-Dec-2020	JORDAN	\$ 1.585.000,39
38	COVID-19 Impact and policy Analysis	COVID-19 SURVEYS ANALYSIS	UN agencies	1-Jan-2021	31/05/2022	UNDP	\$ 350.000,00
39	Jordan-Accelerator Lab	Jordan-Accelerator Lab	UNDP, Partner	1-Apr-2019	31 Dec. 2021	UNDP	\$ 1.164.992,53
Sub-total							\$ 5.422.735,37
Total							\$ 62.232.200,30

In terms of the CO structure to manage and implement the CPD portfolio, the CO has divided the programming into three pillars, each headed by a Team Leader, under the authority of the DRR as Programme Manager:

- 1) Inclusive participation and institutional strengthening Pillar;
- 2) Inclusive Growth and sustainable Livelihoods Pillar;

3) Environment, Climate Change and DDR Pillar.

Furthermore, a Central Team also provides key management functions for the CO programme, including Gender, Innovation, Youth Engagement, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Reporting. A Communication, Partnership and Resources Mobilization team also provide the needed support and management functions, while the Operations team is headed by an Operations Manager reporting to the RR.

4.1. Country context

While the government had established its 2025 vision in 2015, changes in the government also meant changing priorities over the period of the CPD. Firstly, a two-year National Renaissance Plan (Al-Nahda) was presented by the new government for a two-year period (2019-2020) to achieve the “Jordanian Human State”, based on three pillars: “state of law” which aims to ensure the principle of rule of law and enhancing the rights and duties of the Jordanian citizen in real life; “productive state” which aims to unleash the Jordanian human’s potential to achieve a decent living; and the “solidarity state” which aims to safeguard the Jordanian human’s dignity by improving the quality of public services and social protection systems. While this Renaissance Plan has common aspects with three UNSDF outcomes, there are also some differences, in particular the focus on a two-year planning period to achieve objectives, versus a ten-year planning cycle as laid out in Vision 2025. The shift to short-term objectives and quick gains needs to be read together with the increasing social and economic burden of the Syrian refugee crisis, which is trying to mobilise, under the Jordan Response Plan for the Syrian Crisis 2020-2022, a total of US\$ 6.6 billion, of which US\$ 3.8 billion in projects and US\$ 2.8 billion in direct budget support.⁸ This protracted humanitarian crisis entails a shift in priorities as development gains, both social and economic, have eroded in the aftermath of both the 2009 economic crisis and more recently as a result of the continued crisis in Syria and the generous acceptance by the Jordanian government of 1.36 million Syrians on their territory. Within a more constraining financial and economic global context, the competitiveness of the country and its ability to face the additional social and economic costs of the crisis are diminishing.

To further complicate matters, the COVID-19 (C-19) pandemic was declared in March 2020 and affected all countries with diverse measures including lock-down and confinement in order to contain the pandemic. The restrictions to mobility and limitations regarding physical togetherness and contact have further affected all people living in Jordan, with the most vulnerable bearing more importantly the weight of the limitations, and particularly women. To respond as quickly as possible to the new situation caused by the C-19 pandemic, the UN system, under the technical lead of UNDP CO on socio-economic response to COVID-19 and building on the UNDP leadership displayed in developing and implementing the UN socio-economic assessment with the Resident Coordinator and UN partners, elaborated a Socio-Economic Framework for C-19 Response (UN SEF) in July 2020. The government has responded to the pandemic through issuance of 24 defence orders as of December 2020. The UN SEF has identified five strategic pillars for C-19 as described hereunder with a total budget of US\$ 431.2 million:

Pillar 1 Health first: protecting health systems during crisis

Pillar 2 People first: social protection and basic services

⁸ Jordan Response Plan to the Syrian Crisis 2020-2022, p. ii

Pillar 3 Economic response and recovery: protecting jobs, small and medium-sized enterprises, and vulnerable workers in the informal economy

Pillar 4 Macroeconomic response and collaboration

Pillar 5 Social cohesion and community resilience

UNDP CO has the Technical Lead Role in development of the SEF.

Five “accelerators” have been identified to recover better under the UN SEF:

- i) Equity and Inclusiveness to make sure that new and pre-existing vulnerabilities are addressed;
- ii) an integral Gender Focus to guide us in addressing both new and pre-existing gender gaps and structural inequities;
- iii) Digital Transformation that supports innovation and progress in public and social services as well as business and economic initiatives;
- iv) Environmental Sustainability that emphasizes green solutions and technology for a better future; and
- v) Preparedness and Prevention to strengthen systems and processes to efficiently maintain access to health, public and basic services, education, social assistance and business during times of crisis.

It is unclear to what extent these accelerators are being used as entry points by UNDP or the UN system in supporting the 2018-2021 Strategic Plan outcomes and UNSDF 2018-2022 outcomes, or how they are being instrumentalized in the implementation of the different interventions, or even how they fit in UNDP’s six “Signature solutions” which already include some of the so-called “accelerators”⁹.

The current situation is therefore very different than the planning scenario used in the CPD 2018-2022 and the level of complexity for a proactive positioning of UNDP in the country is high. UNDP needs to find the proper balance between the short-term quick-win gains stemming from the C-19 pandemic and the UN SEF which it can help achieve, together with its longer-term development approach to contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), for which it remains both an integrator and a champion.

The most recent documentation shared by UNDP indicates a heightened attention to resilience as a key concept for development programming. This seems to be espoused by the Government of Jordan through the JRP and ahead of the Brussels Conference in 2020, more articulate strategies to give resilience a major role as both connector between humanitarian aid and development but also as a medium to long term developmental process has been readily recognised and is starting to be rolled out. This in turn should also inform the next CPD and UNDP’s approach and positioning. It is also clear based on documentation from the MoPIC that the efforts to address the COVID-19 pandemic (under the UN SEF) are complementary to the efforts from the JRP (from which UNDP is not mobilising resources)¹⁰. Rather than seeing the JRP and UN SEF as competitors, the two have been recognised by the GoJ as complementary interventions which do not overlap current efforts.

In terms of resource allocation and mobilisation, it must be said that as Jordan is a middle-income country, there are more limited resources available from traditional donors and indeed from the UNDP itself, while the highest flux of resources from the international community is

⁹ <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/six-signature-solutions.html>

¹⁰ See bibliographical annex, in particular documents 40 and 41

devoted to mitigating the protracted humanitarian crisis affecting Syrian refugees and migrants living in Jordan. This would seem to indicate the need for a dual resource mobilisation strategy: a) one for the quick-wins necessary linked to both the C-19 pandemic and the need for recovery and stabilisation, and b) one for the longer-term developmental inclusive growth that also requires the support from both the Jordanian government and the private sector. The initial desk review indicates that UNDP has already been establishing some contacts with specific ministries and private sector partners and that certain partnerships may be upscaled or replicated in the future based on the findings that will come from this MTR.

The evolving context, with a number of recurrent changes in the partner ministries and government, with two new Cabinets and four government reshuffles since the CPD started, the C-19 pandemic, and the difficulty to access funding for long-term development when priority is given to short-term gains, requires the UNDP CO to review the perception it receives from partners to position itself in the areas where the CO is able to bring added-value and use its comparative advantage. Globally speaking, this relates to both the work upstream (informing and supporting policy making) and downstream (implementation of catalytic projects that have a potential to be upscaled or replicated).

5. Evaluability

The UNSDF contains a Resource and Results Framework (RRF) with a set of related indicators, which had been used during years 2018-2019. However, in the current context, as indicated by the CO, the main reference document has become the UN SEF.

The indicators for appraising the results under each Pillar are:

Pillar 1 (WHO) 4 indicators:

- 1.1. Number of people accessing non-C-19 essential health services
- 1.2. Number of health facilities that received UN support to maintain essential immunization services since C-19 disruptions
- 1.3. Is the country protecting health services and systems (binomial, Yes or No)
- 1.4. Number of community health workers receiving UN support to maintain essential services since C-19 disruptions

Pillar 2 (UNICEF) 5 indicators:

- 2.1. Number of people reached with critical WASH supplies
- 2.2. Number of children supported with distance/home based learning
- 2.3. Number of primary school children receiving meals or alternatives to meals
- 2.4. Does the country have measures in place to address GBV (binomial, Yes or No)
- 2.5. Number of beneficiaries of social protection schemes and services related to C-19.

Pillar 3 (ILO) 4 indicators:

- 3.1. Is the country reinforcing UN supported employment policies and a regulatory environment conducive to economic recovery and decent work (binomial, Yes or No)

3.2. Number of private sector companies and formal and informal sector workers supported during and after the C-19 pandemic

3.3. Is the country adopting climate and environmentally sensitive fiscal, legislative and monetary stimulus packages for C-19 economic response and recovery (binomial, Yes or No)

3.4. Number of direct beneficiaries of food supply protection regimes that are designed to protect livelihoods by addressing food supply bottlenecks Pillar 4 (UNDP) one indicator:

Socio-economic impact assessments done (binomial, Yes or No)

Pillar 5 (UNDP) three indicators:

5.1. number of organisations benefitting from institutional capacity development,

5.2. number of CBOs capacitated to respond to and mitigate the pandemic and its effects,

5.3. number of social dialogue, advocacy and political engagement spaces.

This MTR contains a strong formative element and analyses a CPD which has been now implemented for 60% of its life cycle, three out of its five years. While some of the expected results may not yet be achieved, the MTR will look at whether the building blocks and processes are in place to enable the CO to achieve its expected objectives (and hence consider prospective evaluation and appreciate inquiry elements for analysis). The MTR will focus its information mostly on qualitative evidence gathered from MTR's respondents' perception and will assess the ToC used to inform the CPD at the time of its design to test its validity.

6. Approach and methodology

This MTR is carried out in line with the UNDP IEO Evaluation Guidelines of January 2019, UNDP guidance on Outcome-level evaluation¹¹, of the UNDP PME Handbook¹², the UNDG Result-Based Management Handbook¹³, UNDG UNDAF Theory of Change Companion Guidance, and following the provisions of the UNDP evaluation policy. The MTR also adheres to the UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation. The approach follows also a "utilization-focused evaluation" approach that is described by M. Q. Patton in his book of the same title¹⁴ that continues to be a good practice reference material for the conduct of evaluations.

The four criteria for undertaking the assessment are mentioned in the ToR and are the standard criteria used for project evaluations: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. The definition of each of the evaluation criteria has been given by the OECD/DAC glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management updated in 2019¹⁵ as follows :

¹¹ UNDP, Outcome-level evaluation, a companion guide to the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and evaluation for development results for programme units and evaluators, December 2011

¹² UNDP, Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, 2009

¹³ UNDG, Results-Based Management Handbook, Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level, October 2011

¹⁴ "Utilization-focused Evaluation", Michael Quinn Patton, 3rd Edition, Sage publications, 1998 also see the link https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/utilization_focused_evaluation

¹⁵ Better Criteria for Better Evaluation, Revised Evaluation Criteria, Definitions and Principles for Use,

“Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results

Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed.”

The MTR will also seek to analyse direct and indirect effects, positive or negative, which have been identified as factors affecting the three UNSDF outcomes, as not enough time has passed to undertake an impact evaluation of development results since the beginning of the CPD. This will be done using an adaptation of the Most Significant Change approach (MSC) to identify key factors contributing to results. At the same time, the logic behind the development of the CPD will be reviewed by assessing the validity of the Theory of Change (ToC) used to inform the CPD. The evaluation will also review the partnership strategy and coordination results from the UNDP CO.

In addition, and to the extent possible and as requested by the CO, the MTR will also analyse the following specific issues:

As mentioned in the background section, the CPD takes place at a time of substantial change and UNDP’s support includes the following five “accelerators” as identified in the UN SEF :

- 1) Application of equity and inclusiveness lenses
- 2) Gender responsive recovery
- 3) Digital transformation
- 4) Environmental sustainability
- 5) Preparedness and prevention

This also means that the MTR will review the different approaches to supporting development work and its relevance and feasibility in light of the current context and looking to the future. Finally, it will also review its assurance and monitoring and evaluation system, that has drawn some recommendations for improvement from past evaluations reviewed under the former CPD.

Tools and methodology

The evaluation will use a mixed-methods approach, but will be essentially qualitative, through the following phases:

1) Documentary review and evaluation planning phase

This phase is based on the review and analysis of the documentation submitted by UNDP CO (included in the bibliographical annex). It has been revised in light of additional information provided on 16th January 2021 by the CO. It is further informed by two virtual meetings with the

OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2019 which completes and updates the traditional OECD/DAC, glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management, Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness series, 2002

UNDP evaluation manager and senior management. The result of this process is the current inception report, which provides the details regarding the evaluation approach, tools, timeframe and key questions, as well as the understanding of the evaluator regarding the work to be performed. Once accepted, the inception report becomes the main reference document for the conduct of the evaluation process.

2) **Remote data collection from Jordan**

As discussed with the UNDP evaluation manager, the main method to collect in-country data will be through virtual **Key Informant Interviews (KII) and/or Focus Groups Discussions (FGD)**. *Interviews will be semi-structured using a questionnaire/interview protocol with key evaluation questions to ensure consistency and comparability.* It will normally take up to 60 minutes and contain open-ended questions as well as subjective appraisals regarding UNDP's performance. A five-point rating-scale will also be used for some key questions in order to provide also quantitative data. However, each rating will be supported by a qualitative explanation justifying the rating. In addition to KII, there may be group interviews or **Focus Group Discussion (FGD)**, when more than one informant is participating in the virtual meeting. These may be longer and last up to 90 minutes, although they will also be using a questionnaire/interview protocol. KII may be held in English, French or Spanish, and interpretation will be required for all other languages for which interviews may be held.

Findings will be triangulated where and when possible (e.g., having confirmation from three different sources) to strengthen the credibility of the evaluation report. Probing (following up on a question's answer) will take place, particularly for those national counterpart interviews from which additional information may be required.

At the end of the data collection phase, the MTR will hold a preliminary debriefing supported by a PowerPoint presentation with the UNDP CO to present the tentative findings, conclusions and recommendations in order to obtain an initial feedback and take into consideration the CO's inputs for the preparation of the draft evaluation report.

3) **Preparation of the draft evaluation report**

Latest three weeks after the presentation of the preliminary findings to the UNDP CO, a **draft evaluation report** will be submitted to the UNDP evaluation manager, who will have two weeks to provide the consolidated comments to the evaluator for the preparation of the final report.

4) **Final evaluation report**

A final evaluation report will be submitted to the UNDP evaluation manager within five working days from the date of receipt of the consolidated comments but in any case, not later than fifteen working days after the receipt of the draft evaluation report. An audit trail will also indicate how the comments and suggestions made on the draft report have been addressed.

Data validation: A clear distinction will also be made between the interpretation of the data (subjective) versus the triangulated findings (objective and factual).

Sampling and data sources: as discussed with the CO, the primary sources of information for the KII/FDG will be the UNDP CO management and programme staff, the main Government counterparts and partners, the main development actors and key donors, as well as the UN and other implementing partners (IP). The list of KII is enclosed as annex to this inception report.

It remains to be decided whether the evaluator will contact government counterparts and IP directly or whether the CO will facilitate the agenda. For UNDP and donors, the evaluator is expected to make his own arrangements. A comprehensive list of 75 KII excluding UNDP CO has been prepared and is the target for this MTR, thereby providing an inclusive analysis of the perception from the various actors regarding the work of the UNDP in Jordan. This will be appraised against the earlier UNDP perception results carried out in 2017 and referenced in the CPD and the more recent UNDP perception survey of 2020. It may be particularly interesting to see any shift in trends regarding where UNDP is seen to have been bringing added value.

KII will be done through semi-structured individual interview process.

7. Risks and limitations

A major limitation is that the evaluation has to be undertaken remotely through virtual means and does not allow the physical presence of the evaluator in Jordan. This limits the level of evidence gathered through observation and from site visits. Another limitation is that some of the KII may be held in Arabic. UNDP CO has indicated it has a dedicated interpreter that will be available for those KII requiring such a service. The initial assessment from the KII respondent list is that 17 KII will require the services of an interpreter.

Availability of government staff given turn-over and staff change may also be a limiting factor. For this reason, the list of 75 KII is quite exhaustive and includes a potential drop-out of 20% of the identified respondents (e.g., targeting 60 KII completed).

Finally, the number of working days for the MTR is on the low side, as the amount of preparation and background analysis is substantial. 30 working days should be allocated in the future for such an exercise.

8. Evaluation work plan

The initial contract was signed on 23rd December 2020 and this inception report is the first deliverable under the contract, elaborated on the basis of the documentary analysis and review detailed above. It is expected that data collection will be finalised by 20th February 2021 and a preliminary findings presentation will be made to the UNDP CO, with the submission of the draft evaluation report latest by 15th March 2021.

9. Key evaluation questions (KEQ) and framework

The key questions to be addressed by the evaluation have been structured along both the main purpose of the evaluation, the ToR and the line of enquiry mentioned above into a set of 19 KEQ.

Table 1

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS	ISSUE	DATA SOURCE & METHODS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
1. Relevance			
1.1. To what extent is the CPD still responding to government and donor priorities at present	relevance	Documentary analysis, KII/FGD with GoJ, UNDP, donors and IP	documentation and interview notes
1.2. Is UNDP's UN SEF response aligned to the country's main priorities?	Responsiveness contextualisation	Documentary analysis, KII/FGD with GoJ, UNDP, donors, IP	documentation, notes from KII
1.3. What potential shifts in CPD are necessary to address current priorities?	Responsiveness, adaptability	Documentary analysis, KII with GoJ, UNDP, donors, UNCT, IP	Documentation, interview notes
1.4. To what extent is the method of delivery aligned to current priorities?	Positioning and partnership strategy	Documentary analysis, KII with GoJ, UNDP, donors, UNCT, IP	Documentation, notes from KII
2. Efficiency			
2.1. Is the CPD programming providing value for money?	Cost-efficiency Return on investment	Documentary analysis, KII with GoJ, UNDP, donors, UNCT, IP	documentation notes from KII financials
2.2. Has the CPD been efficiently managed?	efficiency timeliness	Financial analysis of budget expenditures, delivery rate UNDP KII	Workplan, budget, interview notes
2.3. How strong is the CO's M&E system in providing evidence to inform decision-making?	RBM value and use of M&E as decision-making tool	Documentary analysis and KII with UNDP, donors, GoJ, UNCT, IP	Analysis of the CO M&E and SP/IRRF and review of ToC
2.4. How is UNDP balancing current short-term priorities with its longer-term CPD planning objectives?	Flexibility Positioning Response capacity	Documentary analysis and KII with UNDP, donors, GoJ, UNCT, IP	documentation notes from KII
3. Effectiveness			
3.1. What are the key results of the CPD programme to date? (at policy and project levels separately)	Key results Strengths positioning	Documentary analysis, KII/FGD with UNDP, donors, GoJ, UNCT, IPs	M&E data, evaluations, KII notes
3.2. What unexpected results (direct or indirect effects) did UNDP generate since the CPD was implemented?	Identification of effects (positive or negative)	Documentary analysis, KII/FGD with UNDP, donors, GoJ, UNCT, IPs	documentation notes from KII
3.3. Is there evidence that national institutional capacity development has been enhanced at national level? And at local level?	Capacity development partnerships	Documentary analysis, KII with GoJ central level and governorates and or municipality, UNDP, UNCT, donors, IPs	documentation notes from KII

3.4. Are there any apparent gaps in the CPD programming to address the current challenges?	Learning UNDP positioning	Documentary analysis, KII with UNDP, donors, GoJ, UNCT, IPs	documentation notes from KII
3.5. How can UNDP maximise its potential to achieve CPD results?	Improvement and learning	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders	documentation notes from KII
3.6. To what extent does the CPD ensure tracking of the interventions' coverage and target groups	Targeting and coverage Exclusion Leave no one behind	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders	documentation notes from KII
3.7. Are the five "accelerators" mentioned in the UN SEF adding value to UNDP's contribution to development results?	New approach Partnerships Visibility of results	Documentary analysis, KII with UNDP, donors, GoJ, UNCT, IPs	documentation notes from KII
4. Sustainability			
4.1. What results of UNDP's interventions are likely to be replicated or continued by GoJ institutions? Or by donors?	Ownership commitment scaling	Documentary analysis, KII with GoJ central and local level, UNDP, donors, UNCT, IPs	documentation notes from KII
4.2. Has UNDP established any mechanism to support the GoJ sustain gains in key development areas?	Ownership and commitment Partnership value	Documentary analysis, KII with GoJ central and local level, UNDP, donors, UNCT, IPs	Documentation, notes from KII
4.3. What are the existing opportunities for UNDP to maximise the sustainability of its programming?	Sustainability learning	Documentary analysis, KII with key stakeholders	Documentation, notes from KII
5. Cross cutting themes			
5.1. To what extent was gender mainstreamed within the CPD? Is there any evidence that 15% of the programming budget was allocated to GEN3 projects	Gender, equity, inclusiveness	Documentary analysis, KII with key stakeholders	M&E and financial data, documentation, notes from KII
5.2. To what extent was the Gender Equality Seal successfully implemented?	Gender, equality, inclusiveness	Documentary analysis, KII with key stakeholders	documentation, notes from KII
5.3. To what extent was UNDP successful in the partnerships established?	Strategic positioning Analysis of partnership value	Documentary analysis, KII with stakeholders,	M&E data, documentation, notes from KII

Total: 21 KEQ