



Agreed minutes of the Mid-Term Review of the United Nations Development Programme (2003 – 2007) and Government of Jordan held 29th May, 2005, Amman, Jordan

A. Background

1. After agreement of both the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation and the Jordan Country Office of the United Nations Development Programme, to carry out a review of the programme of work (January 2003 - December 2007), the preparations for the Mid-Term Review of the United Nations Development Programme and Government of Jordan Cooperation Programme, began in January 2005. The Mid Term Review (MTR) aimed at identifying the strengths and areas of improvement. The terms of reference for the MTR are attached to these minutes as Annex One.
2. The preliminary work of MTR included a desk review of the programme and project implementation, preparation of Background Papers of the programmes three thematic areas: Governance, Environment and Poverty Reduction, case studies of six projects, two from each thematic area, and preparation of a draft MTR Report. The work was carried out by a joint Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) team (see Annex Two)
3. The analysis of the programme has focussed on issues of relevance to national as well as UNDP priorities, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, paying particular attention to: delivery, quality, mainstreaming of cross cutting issues (including gender, youth, ICT for Development, and Human Rights) and outcomes and impact.
4. The Draft MTR Report was the basis for the one day stakeholder review meeting held in Amman on 29th May, 2005. The Meeting was attended by representatives of MOPIC, UNDP, representatives of Ministries, other Government institutions and Non-Government Organisations implementing projects within the programme, project managers and project staff. The list of participants is attached as Annex Three and the Agenda of the review meeting as Annex Four.
5. The purpose of the review meeting was to present the findings of the Review Team to the concerned parties, to discuss the issues raised by the Review Team, and make recommendations to H.E. the Minister of Planning and International Cooperation and the

UNDP Resident Representative on actions to be taken to improve the programme and its constituent projects' management and formulation.

B. Findings of the Review Team

Programme Relevance

6. UNDP's programme focus on alleviating poverty, enhancing governance and promoting a sustainable environment was found to be in line with the national priorities of the Government of Jordan and consistent with the CCA/UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/United Nations Development Assistance Framework). However, the broad scope of each theme and wide range of areas of work can distract from working systematically towards achieving the stated programmatic outcomes. As such, shifting towards a more programmatic approach (that is guided by achieving outcomes in each theme) will consolidate efforts, enhance focus in working approach, help prioritise action and maximise value and impact of UNDP's contribution in Jordan.

Programme Effectiveness

7. The project implementation strategies' level of effectiveness is affected by the staffing set up and project management. The different types of contract for project staff influence their commitment, loyalty, motivation and more importantly accountability for the project; the type of institutional commitment by the implementing agency also makes a difference. It was also found that mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues such as human rights and gender could be improved from the design stage of projects through to implementation and reporting.

8. The roles and responsibilities of UNDP, MoPIC and implementing agencies, as well as the steering and technical committees, are not clear to all partners and are sometimes under-utilised. The lack of clarity as regards the roles and responsibilities as well as relations between the managerial structures, affects the ability to follow-up on the projects and expedite progress.

9. Communication systems (content and frequency of communications) between UNDP programme staff and project managers as well as between project managers and MoPIC are not always clear from the outset of each project and therefore different stakeholders are not always given adequate opportunity to participate at both the design and implementation stage of the project.

11. Quality measures within project management and implementation are not consistent across projects. Programmatic quality varies from one project to the other partially due to the unclear quality standards upheld and partially due to the different set ups of the projects.

12. Monitoring and evaluation does not occur in a systematic manner, as monitoring requirements are inconsistent among projects. The scope and quality of reporting also varies from one project to the other. However, there was consistent under-reporting on the qualitative results of projects, which the current report structure does not facilitate. In the absence of mechanisms to manage late submission of reports, they are often delayed, which makes it difficult to monitor the level of achievement, or the challenges being encountered, within a project.

Programme Efficiency

13. Efficiency across projects is affected by the different systems of contract for project managers. This creates inconsistency in the reporting and accountability structure. Occasionally, project managers' preoccupation with other delegated tasks from the implementing agency delays progress on work plans and thus delivery.

14. Delays in delivery on projects are partly attributable to slow and lengthy procedures within the government system and /or UNDP. Occasionally there is also an insufficient understanding within one party's organization of the procedures required by the other.

Programme Sustainability

15. Sustainability of projects is managed differently in each case. Some have a clear sustainability strategy while others do not show consideration and commitment for sustainability from the early design stages of the project.

C. Recommendations and Agreed Actions

Based on the findings of the Review Team and the deliberations of the participants in the Mid-Term Review Meeting of the 29th May, the following recommendations were made:

- Establish common understanding, among project partners, of the roles and responsibilities of UNDP, MOPIC, implementing agency and project management (project managers, steering committee and technical committee) to ensure clarity of relations and individual accountability.
- Manage delays in project implementation more effectively.
- Create a more enabling working environment for project managers and project staff.
- Enhance programme design and development process by adopting a more outcome oriented planning framework (i.e. results based planning).
- Clarify and generate commitment (when possible) to ensure sustainability of outcome/ impact of projects.
- Enhance mainstreaming efforts of cross cutting issues into programmes and projects.
- Improve the quality of monitoring and evaluation system including reporting scope and frequency.

To address the recommendations made by the MTR, it was agreed by the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation and UNDP to take action as detailed in plan of action annexed (Annex 5).

Signatures


Ms. Suhair Al Ali
Minister of Planning and
International Cooperation



Ms. Christine McNab
UNDP Resident Representative

Date: 

Date: 

List of Annexes

1. **Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference**
2. **Membership of Mid Term Review Team**
3. **List of Participants at Review Meeting of May 29,2005**
4. **Agenda of Review Meeting (May 29,2005)**
5. **Plan of Action for undertaking MTR recommendations**