



International
Labour
Organization

unicef 
for every child

► Evaluation Office



i-eval Discovery



ILO and UNICEF Joint Midterm Independent Project Evaluation of “Towards an inclusive national social protection system and accelerating decent job opportunities for Syrians and vulnerable Jordanians” in Jordan

ILO DC/SYMBOL: JOR/20/01/EUR

Type of Evaluation: Joint

Evaluation timing: Mid-term

Evaluation nature: Independent

Project countries: Jordan

P&B Outcome(s): Outcome 3: Economic, social and environmental transformations for decent work for all, Outcome 5: Skills and lifelong learning to facilitate access to and transitions in the labour market

SDG(s): [SDGs 1, 5, 8, 10, 11

Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 24 October 2023

Date when evaluation was approved by EVAL: 20 November 2023

ILO Administrative Office: RO-Arab States

ILO Technical Office(s): DWT-Beirut; NC-Amman;

Joint evaluation agencies: UNICEF

Project duration: October 2020 – December 2024

Donor and budget: EU MADAD Trust – US\$ 15,730,337

Name of consultant(s): Nabil Najjar (lead), Dr Raghda Butros, Anas Salous

Name of Evaluation Manager: Hiba Al-Rifai (ILO), Gabrielle Tremblay (UNICEF)

Evaluation Office oversight: Naomi Asukai

Evaluation budget: US\$ 19,400.00 (EUR 14,116,138)

Key Words:

02 Social policy, social protection and social security; 06 Education and training; 13 Labour and employment; 14 Population, race relations and migration

02.03.01 Social protection; 02.12.2 Scope and coverage of social security; 06.04 Education and training programmes; 13.01.3 Employment; 13.02.3 Job placement; 14.09.2 International migration

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Acronyms | 2 |
| 2. Executive Summary | 4 |
| 3. Project Background | 12 |
| 3.1. Country framing and context..... | 12 |
| 3.2. Project History | 12 |
| 3.3. Project outcomes | 13 |
| 4. Evaluation Background..... | 14 |
| 5. Criteria and Questions..... | 15 |
| 6. Methodology | 17 |
| 7. Main findings..... | 19 |
| 7.1. Relevance..... | 19 |
| 7.2. Coherence | 25 |
| 7.3. Effectiveness..... | 27 |
| 7.4. Efficiency..... | 33 |
| 7.5. Impact..... | 36 |
| 7.6. Sustainability..... | 39 |
| 8. Conclusions..... | 41 |
| 9. Lessons learned and emerging good practices | 46 |
| 10. Recommendations..... | 49 |
| 11. Appendices | 52 |
| 11.1. Bibliography | 52 |
| 11.2. List of stakeholders consulted | 53 |
| 11.3. Evaluation questions matrix..... | 55 |
| 11.4. Lessons learned and good practice tables | 70 |
| 11.5. Terms of reference | 75 |

1. ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|--|
| CGE | Computable General Equilibrium |
| EMV | Economic Modernisation Vision |
| FGD | Focus group discussion(s) |
| GFJTU | General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions |
| GoJ | Government of Jordan |
| GTS | Graduation Tracking System |
| ILO | International Labour Organisation |
| ISU | Implementation Support Unit |
| KII | Key Informant Interviews |
| MADAD | The EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis |
| MIS | Management Information System/s |
| MoL | Ministry of Labour |
| MoPIC | Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation |
| MoSD | Ministry of Social Development |
| NAF | National Aid Fund |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| NSPS | National Social Protection Strategy |
| PSEA | UNICEEF Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Function |
| SSC | Social Security Corporation |
| ToT | Training of Trainers |
| TVET | Technical and Vocational Education and Training |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commission for Refugees |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children’s Fund |

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT | |
|--|---|
| Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure | <p>For decades, Jordan's labour market has faced significant challenges related to sluggish economic growth, and unequal access to employment. Whilst recent steps have been taken, and numerous strategies and reforms have been introduced, culminating in the Economic Modernisation Vision published in June 2022, inclusion gaps remain. Jordan continues to maintain an unemployment rate of 22.8%.¹</p> <p>Inclusion gaps have persisted for women, youth, and refugees. Youth were particularly affected by unemployment, with youth unemployment almost double the rate of the total population.² Further impacting the situation has been the impact of the influx of refugees living in Jordan. Jordan's geographical location has led it to become the third most populous country in the region in terms of hosting Syrian refugees.</p> <p>This EU-funded joint ILO-UNICEF programme was implemented in response to recent progress made towards developing a social protection system for Jordan, in light of recent developments, and the development of a National Social Protection Strategy. The programme proposed three main outcomes to address these systemic issues, in alignment with both ILO and UNICEF country documents, as well as national government strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhanced coordination, integrated planning, and monitoring for government wide efforts in the social protection and employment sector. Outputs delivered serve to strengthen mechanisms for coordinated implementation of national employment and social protection interventions in the context of the NSPS. 2. Strengthened national systems/mechanisms to enhance access to labour market, decent work and employment based social protection schemes. Outputs delivered serve to provide support towards effective and cost-efficient implementation and realisation of access to employment (work permits), enhanced capacity for the implementation of mechanisms to ensure increasingly decent work (labour inspection) and access to social security expanded to workers in the informal economy. 3. Vulnerable Jordanians and Syrians transition from cash assistance to sustainable jobs. |
| Present situation of the project | <p>The EU-funded programme, delivered jointly by ILO and UNICEF, commenced in October 2020, with an initial completion date of October 2023. It seeks to deliver the three outcomes listed above, working across Jordan at both a government and policy level, and a field level.</p> <p>Due to delays in implementation, a no-cost extension was requested in April of 2023, and approved in June 2023, which extends the duration until December 2024. The extension also revised the outcomes and deliverables, most notably proposing significant amendments to Outcome 3, and the deletion of Outcome 2.1.</p> |
| Purpose, scope and usage of the evaluation | <p>This joint mid-term evaluation was commissioned by ILO and UNICEF and looked to assess the M&E framework for the programme, as well as its coherence, resilience, and ability to monitor, adapt to, and measure change. also It also sought to understand and contextualise the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, foreseen impact, and sustainability of the programme, in line with UN Evaluation norms, through a series of questions set out below and in the Evaluation Matrix included in the annexes of this report.</p> <p>This mid-term evaluation commenced in October 2022, and was postponed for three months due to the no-cost extension request. It considered the period from the commencement of the programme, until 31 May 2023, and reviewed all aspects of the programme, in line with both OECD/DAC criteria, and the ILO criteria set out below. It adopted a geographically and gender-balanced approach. It is expected that both ILO and UNICEF will benefit directly, and in equal measure, from this evaluation. Other users include the engaged Ministries, such as the Ministry of Social Development, and the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, employers, workers associations, and implementing partners such as the National Aid Fund, and Social Security Corporation.</p> |

¹ Department of Statistics, Q1 2022

² Ibid

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Finally, the evaluation will also be of benefit to the donor, the European Commission; DG Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations, as well as wider stakeholders including UNHCR and the World Bank.</p> |
| <p>Methodology of evaluation</p> | <p>The participatory mid-term evaluation adopted a formative approach and utilised mixed methods which included both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments, including extensive desk research of over 20 programme documents, policy analysis, 24 key informant interviews with ILO and UNICEF staff, tripartite constituents, and technical specialists, two focus group discussions with programme participants and one FGD with counsellors, and a workshop with programme staff from both ILO and UNICEF, which validated initial assumptions and provided opportunities to explore key elements of the programme in more detail.</p> <p>The evaluation had a specific focus on gender, which was incorporated into the evaluation questions, and considered in both the desk review and field elements of the evaluation.</p> <p>The evaluation had a number of limitations, including the no-cost extension which took place during the initial evaluation period, resulting in a three-month postponement, the lack of participants in Outcome 3 who had progressed to date, and the changes to that component, resulting in a lower overall number of FGD participants than had been anticipated, and the short time period for interviews, which was mitigated through the well-attended workshop.</p> |
| <p>MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</p> | <p>Relevance findings (qns 1-7)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The programme has a very high degree of relevance, according with both ILO and UNICEF priorities and country strategies, as well as national government strategies including the NSPS and the Economic Modernisation Vision. The programme also demonstrates a strong connection to the UNSDGs. 2. The rationale from the perspective of both ILO and UNICEF is clearly defined in inception documents, as well as annual reports. 3. A flexible approach to programme activities in response to the Covid-19 pandemic was adopted from the outset, with the Standard Joint Programme Document allowing for revisions as required. 4. The needs of participants are well understood, and the programme has delivered valuable and needed support around system strengthening and utilise important tools to advance evidence-based policy making. In light of the need for more information on beneficiary needs, UNICEF also suggested and subsequently commissioned a diagnostic study to understand their challenges with youth. 5. The aims and outcomes are clearly defined and accord well with both Agency and national strategic priorities. 6. The Results Framework is comprehensive, and includes each output, whilst providing a series of indicators, a baseline and target, and verification sources for each component of the programme. 7. Whilst significant progress has been made in delivering gender-centric outcomes, some relevance challenges persist around the mainstreaming of gender through ensuring that the graduation component is both accessible and relevant for female beneficiaries. <p>Relevance conclusions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It can be concluded that, across all three programme Outcomes, a high degree of relevance is noted, in that activities and outputs align strongly with ILO and UNICEF country strategies, programmes, and priorities. 2. A strong degree of relevance is noted at government level, with the programme aligning with major national strategies, although the introduction of new strategies, such as the Economic Modernisation Vision, necessitates the updating of the NSPS to ensure continued alignment. 3. Programme activities have the support of tripartite stakeholders, including the relevant Ministries (MoSD, MoPIC, MoL), agencies (NAF, SSC), as well as partners such as GFJTU and JCI, as evidenced through review of programme documents and interviews with relevant stakeholders. |

4. The importance of gender mainstreaming was noted, however a gender-specific approach was not incorporated into the programme's Theory of Change or central to its activities. Gender relevance and outcomes beneficial to gender mainstreaming were noted, though these were not necessarily targeted by design.

Coherence findings (qns 8-10)

8. Staff from both agencies report a close working relationship, and an understanding and acceptance of the division of responsibility. Approaches were complimentary, as ILO focused on working-age participants, whilst UNICEF worked only with youth up to the age of 25.
9. There appears to be less coherence when it comes to the interplay between the three distinct Outcomes, especially the relationship between Outcome 3 and the wider programme, and staff and stakeholders reported not being fully aware or briefed on activities outside of the Outcome on which they work.
10. There is an effective level of communication between in-country staff and technical specialists, although again, it was noted that technical staff, like staff in Jordan, were not fully aware of programme activities outside of their speciality areas.
11. Whilst clear in its scope, the coherence of Outcome One and Two is challenged by the multitude of relevant stakeholders, working with ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR, the donor, and three relevant Ministries. The multitude of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the NSPS, with over 21 institutions involved, leads to coherence and efficiency challenges, and has resulted in delays to activities. The introduction of the two programme committees has helped address this challenge.

Coherence conclusions

5. There is a strong degree of linkage, and acceptance of joint-ownership between ILO and UNICEF, with clear divisions of roles and responsibilities, and regular communication.
6. There does, however, remain a lack of coherence between Outcomes, as staff and stakeholders reported not being fully aware of activities outside of their own scope of work.
7. The introduction of the two new Steering Committees has helped to address these coherence challenges and resulted in a more streamlined approach to programme management and implementation.
8. Communication between project staff and regional teams has been effective, but regional staff also reported not being fully aware of project activities outside of those in which they have direct involvement.

Effectiveness findings (qns 11-14)

12. The programme is not specifically relevant to social dialogue or labour standards, although contributions were noted around improved dialogue around NSPS implementation, as well as work with employers around social insurance models.
13. Outcomes One and Two have demonstrated a strong degree of effectiveness, exemplified by the implementation and institutionalisation of the ISU within the MoSD, the Transform training, and the statistical bulletin, among other successes.
14. The success of the ISU has been recognised by both staff, and Ministry stakeholders, who reported that the unit has delivered significantly improved technical capacity, and has provided advice and support to the 21 institutions involved in implementing the NSPS.
15. The programme has introduced a new package of training for Ministry staff and focal points which builds on the existing UN Transform training package.
16. It has delivered against UNICEF Social Protection and Policy priorities, and successes include the role of the ISU, the commitment to developing tools for evidence-based policy, such as the annual social protection reflection report, shock responsive social protection component, social protection public expenditure review, NSPS dashboard and wider support of the NSPS.
17. On Outcome Three, lessons were learned around the need to provide assurance around income security, to stop people losing cash assistance whilst going through

training, and to break the cycle of informal work, and programme adjustments were put forward to address these concerns.

18. The removal of Outcome 2.1, related to work permits for Syrian refugees, has created a gap between outputs, and the brief of the donor whose focus is on Syrian refugee relief. This gap must subsequently be addressed through programmatic adjustments. More emphasis needs to be placed on meeting the specific needs of Jordanian women, and Syrian men and women, rather than relying only on a trickle-down effect.

Effectiveness conclusions

9. Programme activities have directly contributed to strengthened institutions and improved capacity, providing direct support for the implementation of the NSPS, as well as other useful tools such as Transform training and the shock responsive social protection component.
10. The effectiveness of Outcome Three in its revised form cannot be fully assessed for effectiveness, as the component has undergone a major redesign as part of the no-cost extension, the results of which cannot yet be seen.
11. A coherent and technically sound approach to gender mainstreaming is lacking, with interviewees from both Agencies and stakeholders commenting that the programme was not designed to be gender-centric, with a more holistic approach being adopted.
12. The continued effectiveness of the programme from the perspective of its impact on Syrian refugees, has been diminished by the deletion of Outcome 2.1, though this is partially mitigated by successes in other areas.

Efficiency findings (qns 15-19)

19. Staff working on all outcomes expressed concern that the programme was being delivered in siloes, and the introduction of the steering committees goes some way towards addressing this challenge.
20. With over 20 different institutions involved in the NSPS, actioning and embedding it remains a challenge. This has led to delays, and has resulted in the need for an extension of the duration of this phase, as expressed in the no-cost extension request.
21. Coordination between Agencies has been efficient, although stakeholder expressed concerns around delays in receiving approval for funds, and the levels of micromanagement. External challenges such as the uncertainty of the future of the Ministry of Labour have further delayed progress.
22. The programme has encountered delays which have necessitated a no-cost extension, which has extended the duration of the programme to December 2024. Work on Outcomes 1 and 2 has progressed well, although delays were noted especially when dealing with Ministries.
23. The restructuring of the programme, including the deletion of Outcome 2.1, has resulted in a redistribution of financial resources, alongside a significant restructure of Outcome 3, which makes addressing efficiency at this point challenging.

Efficiency conclusions

13. Programme resources have been effectively utilized, and coordination between ILO and UNICEF has been efficient, however a major efficiency concern centres on the siloing of Outcomes, which as addressed under coherence, is impacting levels of collegiate working, although this has been mitigated through the establishment of the steering committees.
14. External uncertainty, staff churn and uncertainty around the no-cost extension all contributed to efficiency challenges.
15. The establishment and functionality of the Steering Committee has addressed some of these communication challenges, and will be helpful in surmounting these challenges in future, and these committees should be supported and institutionalized for the remainder of the programme.
16. The engagement of GTFU has somewhat improved efficiency by providing a needed layer of hierarchical support and direction to field staff.
17. On Outcome 3, the resource efficiency and distribution has been somewhat efficient, however it was reported by both ISU staff, and stakeholders including NAF, that levels

of bureaucracy and complicated procedures for low-cost expenditures have slowed down implementation.

Impact findings (qns 20-23)

24. The Transform training package on social protection, currently in use in 40 countries, has been translated and adapted into Arabic for the first time and this resource can now be used in support of social protection programmes across the MENA region.
25. With the update of the NSPS Jordan will become the only country in the region to have developed and updated an NSPS in the last six years, and furthermore, the ISU case study has been presented to the Lebanese MoSD as an example of how an NSPS can be implemented. This is a key example of how the work done by this programme, with input from UNICEF, can create a tangible and lasting impact, both in Jordan, and in the wider region.
26. The impact of Outcome Three can be measured, through both the number of female graduates under Outcome Three, and the extent to which the intervention delivered lasting, dignified livelihood opportunities for those women, either as heads of households, or as secondary earners.

Impact conclusions

18. The programme has the potential to deliver a significant positive impact in Jordan through the effective implementation of the NSPS, which will have direct benefits at both a nationwide level, and a gender-specific level.
19. The introduction of the data dashboard and statistical bulletin has brought about a more data-driven and transparent approach to data publication, and more evidence-led decision-making. There is scope for this data-driven and transparent approach to act as a case study for the region, which would further broaden the impact of the Madad programme.
20. The UN Transform training package which has been translated into Arabic can be seen as an investment in a resource which can be rolled-out in other parts of the region and would demonstrate a long-term and sustained impact both within and outside of Jordan.
21. In Outcome 3, gender mainstreaming was more prominently defined, and the use of female outreach officers who are known and trusted in the community has been helpful in breaking down barriers. This is also extended to the work under Outcomes 2 and 3, around creating enabling environments for women to work, engaging with employers to break down transportation, childcare, and accessibility challenges.
22. If the programme has empowered women to move away from cash assistance, supported them in developing their skillsets, and matched them with viable job opportunities which lead to sustainable and dignified employment, then the impact of the programme can be considered a success.

Sustainability findings (qns 24-28)

27. Work around the NSPS is likely to be sustainable, as Ministry support, and effective training measures, have been put in place. MoSD has already institutionalised the ISU by placing it within the Office of the Secretary General, and this, coupled with moves to update the NSPS to run until 2030, stand the programme in good stead in this regard.³
28. The training package for Ministry staff can be of considerable long-term value, but it is essential to ensure that the knowledge and learning it imparts are institutionalised effectively.
29. The statistical bulletin is already providing gender-disaggregated data on gender which is useful reference material for both policy-makers and implementing partners.
30. The exit strategy related to the graduation component remains immature, but steps are being taken, and ILO has recently formalized an Implementation Agreement with NAF, aimed at providing training and employment opportunities for NAF beneficiaries.

³ Note: During the validation workshop for this evaluation, it was reported that in the period of time since the evaluation was drafted, the ISU had been moved from the Office of the Secretary General, and is now housed under the Policy Directorate. This has led to fears that its role and impact could be diminished. Whilst this took place outside of the time period stated for this evaluation, it is important that this development, and the associated concern, is noted.

Sustainability conclusions

23. The programme has considered the sustainability challenge through the lens of how institutions, capacity, and training can become sustainable resources, but the extent to which this can be realized is dependent on future funding arrangements.
24. The relevance of the NSPS should be kept under consideration as new government policies and strategies have been, and will continue to be introduced, which could result in the NSPS becoming outdated.
25. The delivery of the statistical bulletins within implementing partners has set a precedent which helps ensure they are continued post-completion, but concerns remain that knowledge imparted through these tools, and the Transform training could be lost if training recipients left the Ministries.
26. Outcome Three presents a significant sustainability challenge, in so far as the graduation framework remains dependent on Madad funding, and without a commitment to future funding, this delivery framework is hard to futureproof.

Conclusions on cross-cutting issues

On **gender**, whilst the programme presents a clear gender-based objective in programme documents, this has not been fully realised in its activities. Whilst Outcomes One and Two centre on policy responses, implementing the NSPS, and providing technically sound data and training, these are assets of general benefit, as opposed to gender-specific targeted interventions. Data has been disaggregated, but the programme, especially post-restructure, centres around the theory that sound and robust practices, processes, and policies, will deliver benefit for all citizens, including women.

Alongside these activities, the delivery of a social protection public expenditure review, which is equity-based and addresses gender concerns, the MoSD M&E framework which disaggregates data to reflect the impact on women and girls, and the shock-responsive social protection component, with a specific brief on gender-responsive social protection, demonstrate more gender-focused outcomes with the potential to deliver a tangible impact.

Whilst this concept has merit, the programme still lacks sufficiently-developed, targeted, gender-specific approaches which deliver tangible impact in this area. Ongoing work with NAF around ensuring women are prioritised in assistance programmes is also meritorious, but must be followed through.

Outcome Three can in theory deliver a more substantive, gender focused, interventions by meetings its targets around participant gender ratios. Given the programme has undergone a substantial restructure, it is far too early to determine whether this can or will be achieved, but the team must ensure a continued focus on ensuring women are mainstreamed throughout the process.

On **tripartite issues**, the programme involves a multitude of stakeholders, with 21 institutions involved in delivering the NSPS, and engaged in Outcomes Two and Three, including NAF, SSC, GFJTU, employers and others. Three Ministries also play prominent roles in implementation.

Challenges were noted around engagement with stakeholders, and delays arising from both internal and external factors, however the introduction of the Higher Coordinating Committee, as well as the Madad Project Steering Committee, have helped to streamline this approach. Further work should be implemented to institutionalise these bodies for the remainder of the duration, and the focus should centre on tackling sustainability challenges and ensuring future funding for both the ISU, and the graduation component.

On **International Labour Standards**, the programme's focus on delivering structural and systemic improvements to social protection and social insurance under Outcomes One and Two, alongside with its efforts to transition people from cash assistance into decent work means that the design aligns with ILO mandates and priorities around labour standards at both an in-country and regional level.

On **environmental sustainability**, this has not been considered as a major, facet of the programme and is not the focus on activities or outputs, and therefore has not been a consideration in this evaluation.

On **capacity development**, this has been integral to the success under Outcomes One, where the introduction of the ISU, coupled with improved data publishing and reporting

frameworks, has led to a significant uplift in the Ministry of Social Development's capacity to address social protection issues. The ISU has also had a positive impact on the wider stakeholder network, and the ability of partners to implement the NSPS.

The training through the Transform programme has also delivered an uplift in awareness and skills at a Ministry level, and especially for key focal points, and this knowledge must be retained and institutionalised through the recommendations set out below.

A capacity dividend has also been reported by GFJTU who have found the data gathered through beneficiary profiling under Outcome Three to be useful from both a geographical and a sectoral perspective, helping inform their approaches to other projects. The skills developed by career counsellors who are now working under GFJTU has also been noted.

On **refugee response**, to align with donor requirements and to compensate for the deletion of Outcome 2.1 related to work permits, a more concerted and coordinated focus on refugee response is essential, starting with providing much needed reassurance that refugees who participate in the activities of Outcome 3 will not risk losing cash assistance. Closer working with UNHCR, which has now begun to take place, can help ensure that the challenges faced by this outcome to date are mitigated.

| LESSONS LEARNED, GOOD PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS | |
|--|---|
| MAIN LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES | <p>LESSONS LEARNED</p> <p>24. Programme outcomes need to be both manageable and evaluable, and from the outset, staffing and resourcing capacity should be aligned to expectations. Not to do so risks situations such as that seen in this programme, where significant revisions, and a no-cost extension are required.</p> <p>25. When working on projects which target the most economically or socially vulnerable members of society, a higher level of consideration for their financial, physical, and psychological limitations is required.</p> <p>26. Working with vulnerable segments of the population, often with limited education and who may suffer from stress and trauma related to poverty and conflict requires a level of communication and transparency that is nuanced and specific to their needs and abilities.</p> <p>27. With a joint programme between two UN Agencies, and with 21 stakeholders, the communication challenges should not be underestimated, and strong communications procedures in the form of steering committees should be introduced and empowered from the outset.</p> <p>GOOD PRACTICES</p> <p>28. An impressive level of alignment with both ILO and UNICEF country programmes and ambitions, as well as with major national government strategies, which creates strong delivery foundations.</p> <p>29. The ISU has provided valuable technical capacity support at a ministry level, and this expertise can be further institutionalised.</p> <p>30. Translating, adapting, and rolling-out UN Transform training in Arabic for the first time, creating a valuable resource which can be replicated and deployed in other countries in the region.</p> |
| MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS | <p>Relevance</p> <p>Recommendation 1: Ensure that the National Social Protection Strategy is updated to align with national strategic priorities. (Linked to finding 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extend the period of the NSPS until 2030, - Ensure it aligns with the Economic Modernisation Vision - Ensure that training and job opportunities provided under Outcome 3 accord with the key priority growth areas set out in the EMV - Ensure that the impact on females at both a policy and implementation level accords with the gender ambitions in the EMV. <p>Recommendation 2: Ensure a more proactive and clarified focus on gender mainstreaming across all three outcomes, utilising the in-house capacity of ILO staff working on gender, as</p> |

well as UNICEF resources, to critically assess and plan the gender impact of programme activities. (Linked to findings 7 and 8).

Coherence

Recommendation 3: Improve and enhance cooperation and collaboration between ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR, donor, and Ministries through further strengthening and empowering the Higher Coordination Committee, and the MADAD Steering Committee, by ensuring regular meetings, coordinated follow-up actions, and clear division of roles, and maintaining a focus on gender-specific outcomes. (Linked to findings 10, 11, and 12).

Recommendation 4: Work more closely with the EU Madad Fund team to ensure the donor is adequately represented in programme activities, and that visibility is increased.

Effectiveness

Recommendation 5: Provide essential clarity to potential participants in Outcome 3, to ensure that fears around loss of cash assistance are allayed, through production of written materials and amendments to the content awareness sessions, with a specific focus on clarity for female participants. (Linked to findings 13, 17, and 18).

Recommendation 6: Deliver iterative improvements to the graduation framework in light of key findings. (Linked to findings 18 and 21).

- Engage counselors on the ground more fully in the process of identifying job opportunities and matching them with potential graduates
- Conduct a geographically based study utilizing data gathered in the profiling stage to deepen understanding of educational levels and available skillsets.

Recommendation 7: Develop a clearer and more transparent process when engaging potential graduates, with higher levels of clarity, remove the home-based project option from the profiling questionnaire, and ensure steps are taken to provide female participants with reassurance and awareness of the additional support they can be afforded, such as transport and childcare. (Linked to findings 13, 17, and 18).

Efficiency

Recommendation 8: Deliver improvements to the Graduation Tracking System, and the data dashboard, to ensure further disaggregation of data by gender and refugee status, to enable more adequate monitoring. (Linked to findings 20, 21, and 22).

Impact

Recommendation 9: Institutionalise knowledge imparted through Transform training, to ensure knowledge is retained within Ministries, through standardised and consistent training of trainers, and consider how the Transform training package, now translated and adapted into Arabic, can be deployed in other countries in the region, to amplify the long-term impact of the programme. (Linked to finding 23).

Sustainability

Recommendation 10: Take appropriate action to further institutionalise and ensure sustainability of the Implementation Support Unit within the Ministry of Social Development, by agreeing future funding arrangements to secure its longevity. (Linked to findings 28, and 30).

3. PROJECT BACKGROUND

3.1. COUNTRY FRAMING AND CONTEXT

For decades, Jordan's labour market has faced significant challenges related to sluggish economic growth, and unequal access to employment. Whilst recent steps have been taken, and numerous strategies and reforms have been introduced, culminating in the Economic Modernisation Vision published in June 2022, inclusion gaps remain. Jordan continues to maintain an unemployment rate of 22.8%.⁴

Inclusion gaps have persisted for women, youth, and refugees. Youth were particularly affected by unemployment, with youth unemployment almost double the rate of the total population, at 41.5 per cent in the second quarter of 2022. Over half of the young female labour force (50.6 per cent) was unemployed, compared with a 39.6 per cent unemployment rate among young men.⁵ This has compounded the longstanding economic challenges, and exacerbated social and environmental issues. Pressure on housing, education, healthcare services, infrastructure, electricity and energy, water, and other natural resources has been long-standing, and further exacerbated by the onset, and continued impact, of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Further impacting the situation has been the impact of the influx of refugees living in Jordan. Jordan's geographical location has led it to become the third most populous country in the region in terms of hosting Syrian refugees. As per the official data, in 2023, Jordan hosted around 654,000 Syrian refugees registered under the UNHCR's mandate⁶, however, the total number of Syrians is estimated at around 1.3 million, when taking the unregistered Syrian refugees into account.⁷ That same year, Jordan's population was estimated at 11.06 million, with registered Syrian refugees comprising a 6.1% share of Jordan's entire population. This rate is even higher when considering unregistered refugees, with Syrian's comprising approximately 11.8% of the country's population, taking a major toll on the country's economy, infrastructure, and social landscape.

The government of Jordan is cognisant of these challenges, and has made great strides towards mitigating and adapting to these issues, however this overall country context must be kept under consideration when contextualising and evaluating the activities, impact, and sustainability of the programme and its activities.

3.2. PROJECT HISTORY

In recent decades, Jordan has progressed in developing its social protection system. At present, the different social protection programmes implemented can be categorised as social assistance, social insurance, labour market interventions, the fiscal subsidy system and food security/nutrition programmes. Several amendments of the Social Security Law over the past decade have helped to expand coverage. Social security is obligatory for all working entities, and in 2014, Jordan was the first country in the Middle East to ratify the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102) (ILO, 2020b).

In 2019, the Jordanian Government embarked on a process of developing a new National Social Protection Strategy - NSPS (2019-2025) under the leadership of the Ministry of Planning and International Corporation (MoPIC) and the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD) with technical support from UNICEF at that time. The strategy represents a recent effort towards the formulation of a comprehensive national policy for social protection, providing an overarching framework for the sector to maximize synergies and ensure effective integrated approaches by considering the following areas of the SP system: social assistance, social services, social insurance, and labour market policies.

This programme was implemented in response to recent progress made towards developing a social protection system for Jordan, in light of recent developments, and steps towards the formulation of a comprehensive national policy for social protection. This EU-funded joint ILO-UNICEF programme seeks to support the implementation of the NSPS, and to contribute to the development of a sustainable social protection system, in policy as well as institutional set-up, with strengthened links between social protection and employment for both Jordanian and refugee populations and enhanced outreach into the informal sector.

⁴ Department of Statistics, Q1 2022.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ UNHCR, 'UNHCR in Jordan'.

⁷ ACAPS, 'Country Analysis Jordan'.

The programme is jointly implemented by ILO and UNICEF, with ILO designated as the 'leading organisation', with UNICEF as a 'partner organisation'. The programme is funded by the EU Madad Fund, also known as the EU Regional Trust Fund, which was established in 2014, in response to the Syrian refugee crisis. The total funding envelope is EUR 14,116,138, and at the time of publication of the 2022 Annual Report, a total of EUR 7,322,169 had been provided to the programme to date. The programme was scheduled to commence in October 2020, and run until September 2023, though as set out below, a programme extension until December 2024 has since been granted.

The programme operates across Jordan, with the policy components listed under outcomes one and two being centralised largely at government level, and the pool of participants for outcome three drawn from seven governorates, including Irbid, Mafrqa, Jerash, Amman, Zarqa, Karak, and Tafileh.

In the delivery of this programme, ILO and UNICEF work with a number of partners and stakeholders, the most prominent of which are government ministries including the Ministry of Labour (MoL), the Ministry of Planning and international Cooperation (MoPIC), and the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD). The programme has also engaged with the National Aid Fund (NAF), the Social Security Corporation (SSC), and the General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions (GFJTU).

3.3. PROJECT OUTCOMES

The programme seeks to achieve three main outcomes, specifically:

1. Enhanced coordination, integrated planning, and monitoring for government wide efforts in the social protection and employment sector. Outputs delivered serve to strengthen mechanisms for coordinated implementation of national employment and social protection interventions in the context of the NSPS.
2. Strengthened national systems/mechanisms to enhance access to labour market, decent work and employment based social protection schemes. Outputs delivered serve to provide support towards effective and cost-efficient implementation and realisation of access to employment (work permits), enhanced capacity for the implementation of mechanisms to ensure increasingly decent work (labour inspection) and access to social security expanded to workers in the informal economy.
3. Vulnerable Jordanians and Syrians transition from cash assistance to sustainable jobs.

No-cost extension

ILO and UNICEF requested a no-cost extension to the programme in April 2023, which was approved during the course of this evaluation, and which extends the duration of this programme from October 2023, until 31 December 2024, extending the total duration to 51 months. This extension request also revised elements of the scope of the programme, most notably through the removal of Outcome 2.1 and significant changes to outcome three, but with additional amendments to the scope of outcomes one and two.

These programme amendments, as set out in the request for extension, include:

Outcome one - limited changes, specifically focused on system strengthening, evidence-based policy making and capacity building': the project shall continue to provide support for better institutionalisation of social protection in Jordan, and will build the capacities of government officials working in different institutions. To deliver this, capacity building, guidance, and mentoring are key to the implementation plan, to enhance and build government capacity to institutionalise the work initiated by this project, and to secure its continuity and sustainability.

Outcome two - streamlining of activities to redirect funding towards Outcome three: the project is proposing that ILO will provide technical assistance to MoL to review and analyse the existing laws, regulations, instructions and procedures related to organizing the labour market in Jordan, including issuance mechanisms for work permits for non-Jordanians, in order to ensure compliance with international labour standards and best practices.

It also includes support for the technical departments at MoL with all consultation support needed to review/develop new policies and work procedures for MOL in order to increase transparency and improve the process. This includes the regulation of the labour market for non-Jordanians. Finally, it seeks to build institutional

capacity for MoL and other stakeholders on the application of the new policies and procedures, especially those related to regulating the labour market for non-Jordanian workers.

In delivering these ambitions, the extension deletes Outcome 2.1, related to the issuance of work permits, in its entirety.

Outcome three - more substantive changes related to improving the performance of the graduation component, focusing on on-the-job training, and delivering a diagnostic study: During the no-cost extension period, the project is proposing to:

- Continue the implementation of phase two of the graduation program, by launching the different training/employment schemes that have been identified, for the prospective graduates who expressed interest and willingness from the first phase. The project will first implement the on-the-job training and employment scheme, alongside vocational training, soft skills training, and work-based learning. Continue the profiling and selection process for the new beneficiaries of NAF and UNHCR for the employment programs.
- Conduct a diagnostic study for the graduation programme interventions conducted thus far to understand and identify recommendations for improvements that should be made to future work
- Complete the hosting the graduation tracking system (GTS) at NAF, to manage the graduation program and ensure there are no overlaps and duplication across similar programmes.

The extension request also includes a proposed change to the duration of the project, with the end date pushed back fifteen months, from October 1, 2023, to December 31, 2024.

In light of this, both this inception report, and the overall framework for this evaluation have been slightly restructured to ensure the mid-term evaluation adapts to the changes to the project, and focuses more on forward-looking recommendations for improvement, and opportunities for learning.

4. EVALUATION BACKGROUND

This mid-term evaluation was borne out of ILO and UNICEF's joint commitment to transparency, learning and accountability, with evaluation being seen as an integral part of the implementation of cooperation-led projects such as this one. This is set out in both the ILO Evaluation Policy⁸, and the Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF.⁹

Given the fact that the no-cost extension was requested after this evaluation was commissioned, the purpose of the evaluation has shifted during its life cycle. After consultation with ILO and UNICEF teams, it was decided that the mid-term evaluation would take on a different, more forward-looking approach. It was formative in nature, taking place during what the consulting team saw as a reflection point for this programme, at a time when an extension has been requested, and the scope of programme activities have changed slightly. As such, the evaluation was designed to inform and improve the implementation and performance of the programme during the remainder of its cycle, and in light of these proposed changes.

The mid-term evaluation was designed in line with the OECD-DAC criteria, and assessed the overall framework for the programme, as well as its relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, foreseen impact, and sustainability, in line with UN Evaluation norms.

The evaluation considered the period from the commencement of the programme in October 2020, until 31 May 2023, and considered all aspects of the programme, in line with both OECD/DAC criteria, and ILO criteria. It adopted a geographically and gender-balanced approach.

The geographic scope of the evaluation aligned with that of the programme itself, with prospective participants situated across Jordan, and the importance of equality, gender, and inclusion were at the core of this mid-term evaluation and were reflected in the evaluation questions.

The users of the mid-term evaluation include both ILO and UNICEF, who will benefit directly, and in equal measure, from its findings. Other users could include the engaged Ministries, such as MoSD, MoPIC, and MoL, employers, workers associations, and implementing partners such as the National Aid Fund, and Social Security Corporation. Finally, the evaluation will also be of benefit to the programme donor, the European Commission;

⁸ ILO, *Evaluation Policy*, passim.

⁹ UNICEF, *Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF*, passim.

DG Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations, as well as wider stakeholders including UNHCR and the World Bank.

The mid-term evaluation commenced in November 2022, and was paused in February 2023, in light of the no-cost extension request. Evaluation activities resumed in April 2023, and a new desk review was conducted at this time. Key informant interviews took place in May and June, with focus group discussions following in mid-June. A learning workshop with ILO and UNICEF staff was conducted in late-June, following which the evaluation report was drafted and submitted.

5. CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The mid-term evaluation followed the UN Evaluation Standards and Norms, using the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, namely relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability, around which the following questions were approved by the ILO and UNICEF evaluation teams during the inception phase of the programme.

Relevance

1. How well did the project approach fit in context of the on-going challenges in Jordan, specifically in relation to UNHCR's work with Syrian refugees in the country? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed, and has the new project design been responsive to these challenges? To what extent was gender mainstreamed?
2. To what extent are the project's objectives aligned with the national strategies and priorities, framework of the ILO Decent Work Country Project of Jordan (2018-2022), the ILO's Project and Budget (P&B) 2020-2021, UNICEF's Social Protection framework, UNSDCF (2018-2022) and the SDGs? To what extent did the project's objectives respond to the priorities of the donor (EU) in Jordan, specifically with regard to EU Partnership Priorities, the EU MIP, and the EU Madad Trust Fund?
3. To what extent did the project provide a timely and relevant response to constituents' needs and priorities including those related to the COVID-19 context, and with a focus on gender mainstreaming?
4. Are the needs of beneficiaries fully understood and have the revisions to the project, specifically around Outcome Three, been responsive to their needs and the challenges encountered to date?
5. Has the situation been properly analysed? Does the project document contain satisfactory immediate objectives / project outcomes, a strategy and a Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?
6. What is the extent of logical correlations between the objective, outcomes, and outputs, in relation to the revised project scope put forward as part of the request for extension? Are the set indicators logical with specified baseline and targets? Can data be gender disaggregated? Are monitoring and evaluation activities adequately planned?
7. To what extent has the new project design considered: specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context? As well as concerns relating to inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS, and social dialogue?

Coherence

8. To what extent was the division of responsibility between ILO and UNICEF clarified in project documents, has this been adhered to, and has the new project design assisted in streamlining this relationship?
9. To what extent have ILO and UNICEF adopted a joint ownership of the project, and worked together towards joint outcomes rather than in silos?
10. To what extent has communication between the project's teams, the regional office and the responsible technical department at headquarters been effective, and how can the new project design further enhance this?

Effectiveness

11. How have the outputs and outcomes contributed to ILO's mainstreamed strategies including gender equality, social dialogue, and labour standards?
12. To what extent has the project contributed to UNICEF's Social Protection and Policy priorities?
13. What positive or negative unintended outcomes can be identified, specifically related to gender mainstreaming, or in relation to the specific locations in which the project was implemented?
14. Has the project fostered ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue in articulating, implementing, and sustaining coherent response strategies to mitigate the effects of the pandemic on the world of work?

Efficiency

15. To what extent have resources been utilized efficiently to reach the project's objectives?
16. To what extent have the coordination efforts between ILO and UNICEF been efficient?
17. To what extent has the coordination with the national implementing partners been efficient, specifically with regards to MoSD? And other national stakeholders like NAF, DoS and SSC?
18. To what extent has the project been on track in terms of timely achieving the assigned milestones?
19. To what extent has the project leveraged new or repurposed existing financial resources to mitigate COVID-19 effects in a balanced manner?

Impact

20. Does the project, especially post-redesign, have the potential to extend knowledge across the Arab region and other countries putting Jordan in a leading position and how can this be maximised during its implementation?
21. How can the proposed or envisioned impacts of the project post-redesign be measured, especially with regard to female beneficiaries, and how can they be amplified in future phases?
22. How will the project contribute to social cohesion in the communities between Jordanians and Syrians post-completion, particularly in relation to gender mainstreaming and in relation to specific implementation locations?
23. How has the support of UNICEF to date managed to pave the way towards more inclusion of non-Jordanians, and for females in particular, within the national social protection system? Can the project contribute to the economic self-reliance of refugees and vulnerable local population in Jordan?

Sustainability

24. Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable- in terms of the social protection sector in Jordan?
25. To what extent has the project prepared a sustainable exit strategy to depart from donor-supported cash assistance for Syrian refugees?
26. How will the implemented work be institutionalized and used by the government institutions to enhance future work on SP?
27. Will the implementing partners be able to retain the work after the end of the project?
28. What measures have been taken to ensure that the key components of the project are sustainable beyond the life of the project? Are they sufficient?

In addition to these initial questions, a series of supplementary sub-questions have been developed by the evaluation team in response to the amendment to the project scope, and these are set out below, and in the Matrix in the Appendices.

On Relevance:

- a. To what extent have the revisions to the project further aligned its outcomes to major national government strategies which have been announced since its inception, such as the Economic Modernisation Vision?
- b. To what extent does this synergise with a move from cash assistance to employment?
- c. To what extent do the project activities ensure a focus on gender mainstreaming?
- d. What are the actions taken to ensure that NSPS remains relevant and aligned to national priorities?

On **Coherence:**

e. To what extent did the revisions to the project scope and implementation deliver better engagement and cooperation between implementing partners and the relevant Government Ministries (MoSD, MoL, MoPIC)?

On **Effectiveness:**

f. How can the amendments to the methodology and targets for outcome three, such as the reduction in total beneficiaries from 4,200 to 2,500, and the shift towards on-the-job training over on-campus training, help improve delivery against the desired outcomes?

g. To what extent gender balance has been/will be maintained throughout implementation?

On **Efficiency:**

h. What are the key challenges in terms of efficiency, most particularly concerning the engagement with other stakeholders?

On **Sustainability:**

i. What steps can be taken to ensure that the collection and publication of data mainstreamed gender is consistent, and how can it support policy-making and knowledge retention post-project completion?

j. To what extent has the project contributed to shift perceptions around graduation?

k. To what extent is it likely that the model and the benefits will continue post-completion of this programme?

6. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation adopted a mixed-method approach, utilising both quantitative data collection methods, in the form of desk-based research, alongside qualitative tools including interviews, focus group discussions, and a staff workshop. It engaged with programme leadership and staff, implementing agencies, relevant ministries, and participants. Data collection methods were varied, to allow for holistic data collection and effective validation. The data collection methods deployed included:

1. Desk review of:

- Cooperation agreement
- Financial report and auditors' reports
- Quarterly and annual reports
- Budgets
- Memoranda of understanding
- Existing research into social protection processes in Jordan, as relevant
- No-Cost Extension Request Justification and associated documents
- Graduation Strategy Framework
- Operational Manual for Graduation Approach
- Relevant National Strategies including the EMV and NSPS

2. Key informant interviews with:

- Programme staff (ILO and UNICEF)
- Programme management (ILO and UNICEF)
- Programme technical specialists and backstoppers
- Representatives from relevant Ministries
- Representatives from NAF, SSC, and GFJTU
- Staff within the Implementation Support Unit (ISU)
- Representatives of the donor agency

3. Focus group discussions with:

- Programme participants from Irbid and Mafraq
- Career counsellors working with prospective graduates

4. Learning workshop, with staff and management from ILO and UNICEF

A full list of document reviewed is set out Annexe 11.1 (Bibliography).

Participants for KIIs were selected due to their proximity to the programme, practical experience of working on the programme with either ILO or UNICEF, or as representatives of Ministries or other stakeholders. Efforts were taken to ensure a gender-balanced pool of informants, with exactly 50% of KII participants being female. FGDs were conducted with both Jordanian and Syrian participants, to ensure that a complete perspective was achieved, and a gender-balanced approach was adopted, to ensure at least 50% of participants were female. This was exceeded, with 66% of participants being female. The FGD with career counsellors was also designed to be gender balanced, and six of the thirteen participants were female.

Additionally efforts were made to include both Syrian and Jordanian participants in FGDs, and this was achieved through holding one FGD for Jordanian participants, and a second FGD specifically for Syrian participants.

A full list of individuals who were interviewed, and the breakdown of FGD participants, is set out in Annexe 11.2 (List of Stakeholders Consulted).

Data analysis

The data collected was analysed through a number of methods. Qualitative analysis of data gathered through KIIs and FGDs helped to better understand the lived experience of participants, staff, and stakeholders, noting their challenges, perceived benefits of participation, and overall perception. Stakeholder analysis, through KIIs and desk review, plotted the various activities of relevant stakeholders, and their perceptions towards the programme, to determine how their support can be maximised for the remainder of the programme.

Comparative analysis was used to compare and contrast the lived experiences of participants, and their perceptions, as disaggregated by gender, refugee status, and geography. This was also relevant when comparing the experiences of wider stakeholders, and validating findings. Finally, situational analysis through desk review, informed the evaluation team on the wider socio-economic trends in Jordan, and whether these have the potential to impact delivery during the remainder of the programme duration.

A workshop, with 12 ILO and UNICEF staff in attendance, was held after the fieldwork had concluded, and was used to present initial findings, and gather feedback on assumptions. The workshop was a valuable opportunity to test and validate these assumptions, gather new and more recent information where required, and invite feedback and challenge on the findings of the mid-term evaluation, which in turn informed conclusions and recommendations.

Triangulation of data took place through investigator triangulation with the presence of a three-person evaluation team, all participating in the data review, data analysis, and in interviews and focus groups. Engaging multiple stakeholders, including counsellors, programme partners, the GFJTU, programme participants, representatives of Ministries, and staff, allowed the team to arrive at conclusions drawn from multiple data gathering sources including FGDs, KII, and desk review. Conclusions were reached through comparative analysis of data collected from different sources and assumptions validated through KIIs with key stakeholders and through a joint ILO-UNICEF staff workshop.

Evaluation norms and standards

The mid-term evaluation adhered to all applicable UNEG ethical norms and standards, the ILO Documents for Project Evaluators and Quality Checklists, and UNICEF procedure on ethical standards as prescribed in the relevant key guiding documents. The evaluation complied with the principles of the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2017), as well as the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection, and Analysis. These considerations were outlined in the Inception Report and approved by programme evaluation staff.

A mixed-gender evaluation team was deployed in the field, and ethical standards were maintained throughout. The team respected local cultures, beliefs, and customs during fieldwork. The principles set out in the UNICEF Procedure were upheld, and the privacy of participants was maintained, alongside confidentiality and the

principle of informed consent. Practical guidance on ensuring gender-balanced and ethical approaches to fieldwork were supplied to all members of the evaluation team.

Limitations

Whilst the data collection for this assignment was robust and comprehensive, some challenges were encountered throughout the process. Due to the introduction of the no-cost extension, and significant changes to Outcome Three, related to graduation from cash assistance to work, the progress of participants through the graduation process had been slowed, and as such, beneficiaries had not been engaged by the programme for over twelve months. This reduced both the number of prospective graduates who could participate in FGDs, and also the value of these FGDs, as their experiences were no longer fully relevant to the revised programme. As such, the number of FGDs conducted was reduced, in agreement with the project team, from seven as proposed in the initial inception report of January 2023, to two.

The evaluation team also wishes to put on record that a desk review was conducted, involving quarterly and annual reports, project documents, and inception reports, prior to the no-cost extension. Given the very recent and significant changes to large segments of the programme, including the deletion of Outcome 2.1, and the overhaul of Outcome 3, less emphasis has been placed on the desk review in the writing of this report. Instead, these changes, and subsequent revisions to the scope of the mid-term evaluation, have driven the evaluation team to place a greater emphasis on qualitative tools, including interviews, FGDs, and staff workshops, in order to gather the most recent information, which has yet to be reflected in standard reporting tools.

The evaluation team also notes that, due to the need to reschedule and repeat interviews, and the short window for conducting interviews, a small handful of Agency staff were unable to schedule interview within the available time period. This was mitigated through excellent attendance at the staff workshop, wherein all required staff were present, as set out in Annexe 2 (section 11.2) of this report.

7. MAIN FINDINGS

Herein the main findings of the report are presented. Findings have been grouped according to evaluation criteria, and in each case, the section begins with an introduction to the criteria, then the main findings are presented, followed by each evaluation question, and subsequent answers.

7.1. RELEVANCE

Within the context and new scope of this programme post-extension request, relevance looks at the extent to which the objectives are further aligned with sub-regional, national and local priorities and needs, the constituents' priorities and needs, and the donor's priorities for the country, taking into consideration national plans and strategies, alongside the strategic priorities of ILO and UNICEF in Jordan. It also considers the extent to which programme revisions can improve levels of interest and engagement with participants within Outcome Three through ensuring the service provided is aligned with their needs.

Main Findings

1. The programme has a very high degree of relevance, according with both ILO and UNICEF priorities and country strategies, as well as national government strategies including the NSPS and the Economic Modernisation Vision. The programme also demonstrates a strong connection to the UNSDGs.
2. The rationale from the perspective of both ILO and UNICEF is clearly defined in inception documents, as well as annual reports.
3. A flexible approach to programme activities in response to the Covid-19 pandemic was adopted from the outset, with the Standard Joint Programme Document allowing for revisions as required.
4. The needs of participants are well understood, and the programme has delivered valuable and needed support around system strengthening and utilise important tools to advance evidence-based policy making. In light of the need for more information on beneficiary needs, UNICEF also suggested and subsequently commissioned a diagnostic study to understand their challenges with youth.
5. The aims and outcomes are clearly defined and accord well with both Agency and national strategic priorities.
6. The Results Framework is comprehensive, and includes each output, whilst providing a series of indicators, a baseline and target, and verification sources for each component of the programme.
7. Whilst significant progress has been made in delivering gender-centric outcomes, some relevance challenges persist around the mainstreaming of gender through ensuring that the graduation component is both accessible and relevant for female beneficiaries.

Within this section the report also addresses the validity of the amended design of the programme post-extension, specifically the extent to which the extension design, logic, strategies and other elements are and remain valid vis-à-vis the challenges the programme seeks to address, and the needs of its prospective participants.

1. How well did the project approach fit in context of the on-going challenges in Jordan, specifically in relation to UNHCR's work with Syrian refugees in the country? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed, and has the new project design been responsive to these challenges? To what extent was gender mainstreamed?

The programme is designed in a manner which is responsive to the challenges facing Jordan, specifically with regards to refugee response and integration, sluggish economic growth and low employment rates, and efforts to mainstream gender within national policy as well as the labour market. Efforts to support the transition of Syrian refugees from cash assistance to labour align with national strategies, however the deletion of Outcome 2.1 related to the issuance of work permits has somewhat diminished the refugee-specific focus of the programme, as noted by both the programme team and the donor.

The Government of Jordan (GoJ) is also focused on tackling the refugee challenge through a number of measures. In 2016, the Jordan Compact was introduced, where the Government agreed to the issuance of 200,000 work permits for Syrian refugees in specified sectors, alongside additional educational and training commitments. Since July 2021, Syrian refugees in Jordan have been able to attain work permits in sectors open to non-Jordanians, allowing them access to employment in services and sales, skilled agriculture, forestry, and fishery work, plant and machine work, and in basic industries.¹⁰ This has allowed Syrians to seek employment far beyond the sectors which had typically accounted for the majority of their employment, namely agriculture, construction, and manufacturing.

The initial scope of Outcome 2 (specifically under Outcome 2.1) included a significant commitment to delivering work permits for Syrian refugees in Jordan, helping unlock access to the labour market and facilitate access to decent work, which is a central pillar of both the UNHCR vision, and the scope of the donor fund, being itself a refugee-focused fund.

The programme was designed to be responsive to the challenges identified through seeking to facilitate a transition from cash assistance to dignified work for both Jordanians and Syrians, as well as supporting Ministries

¹⁰ UNHCR, 'Jordan issues record number of work permits to Syrian refugees'.

with implementing the National Social Protection Strategy, in support of national ambitions. Subsequent changes to the scope of work as part of the no-cost extension have removed Outcome 2.1, specifically related to the issuance of work permits, and this has called into questions around how this Outcome can continue to be justified as aligned with donor priorities, as well as the clearly identified need to support Syrians into employment.

Gender challenges were noted, specifically around lower levels of female employment, as well as the importance of the social protection agenda for women, although this was not always reflected through direct interventions targeting this demographic. This is elaborated further throughout the report.

2. To what extent are the project's objectives aligned with the national strategies and priorities, framework of the ILO Decent Work Country Project of Jordan (2018-2022), the ILO's Project and Budget (P&B) 2020-2021, UNICEF's Social Protection framework, UNSDCF (2018-2022) and the SDGs? To what extent did the project's objectives respond to the priorities of the donor (EU) in Jordan, specifically with regard to EU Partnership Priorities, the EU MIP, and the EU Madad Trust Fund?

The programme rationale from the perspective of ILO is clearly defined in inception documents, as well as annual reports. The programme accords with ILO Country Programme Outcome JOR105, which refers to *'improving existing programmes to extend social security coverage through the progressive establishment of a national Social Protection Floor'*.

The programme also correlates directly with the ILO Decent Work Country Programme (2018-22), which has three priorities, namely job creation for social cohesion, decent working conditions for all, and capacity building of social partners. Outcomes One and Two directly target both working conditions (through policies introduced under Outcome 2.2), as well as capacity building for social partners, as evidenced by work done with MoSD, MoL, GFJTU, and NAF. The most prominent examples of this are the introduction of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), and the Transform training package, both of which are highlighted throughout this report. The ILO Programme and Budget priorities for 2020-21 are also addressed, with a specific focus on Outcome 1 (influential and inclusive social dialogue), Outcome 3 (transitions for full, productive, and freely chosen employment and decent work for all), Outcome 5 (skills and lifelong learning), Outcome 6 (gender equality), Outcome 7 (protection at work for all), and Outcome 8 (comprehensive and sustainable social protection).

The same is true for UNICEF, insofar as there is direct alignment between this programme, and UNICEF Country Programme Outcomes, which call for *'utilising evidence-based, inclusive, integrated social policies, and enhanced social protection services and socioeconomic opportunities'*.¹¹ The programme also aligns with the UNICEF Social Protection Framework, which aims to *'address economic and social vulnerability to give every child an equal chance'*.¹² It does this through its work on both the National Social Protection Strategy, and through supporting the transition towards dignified and sustainable livelihoods for both Jordanians and Syrians.

There is also strong alignment between the programme and SDGs 1 (ending poverty and implementing social protection systems), 8 (promoting sustained, inclusive, and sustainable growth, with decent work for all), 10 (adopting policies which achieve greater equality), and 5 (gender equality).

The programme also largely accords with the aims of the donor organisation, the EU Regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian crisis, known as the 'Madad fund'. The fund was established in response to the Syrian refugee crisis and seeks to address the critical needs of Syrian refugees, as well as their host communities. The programme accords with these ambitions in broad terms, through its efforts to support transitions from cash assistance to jobs for both Syrians and Jordanians, alongside wider policy support, although it should be noted that, in some areas, a lack of distinct refugee focus and the removal of Outcome 2.1 (specifically related to the issuance of work permits for Syrian refugees) have weakened this connection.

Furthermore, the programme is well aligned with the UNSDCF. The UN Cooperation Framework for Jordan (2023-2027) sets out a series of priorities around which this programme aligns, including priority one (inclusive green growth and decent work) and priority 2 (social protection and quality basic services). It also relates to Outcome 1 (enhanced inclusive, gender-responsive and green growth in Jordan), as well as Outcome 2 (enhanced access to quality social services, protection, and self-reliance).¹³

¹¹ UNICEF, *Country Programme Document: Jordan*, 17.

¹² UNICEF, *Global Social Protection Programme Framework*, 2.

¹³ UN, *The United Nations' Cooperation Framework in Jordan 2023-27*, 1.

One consistent theme across all programme outcomes is the lack of visibility for the donor, a concern which was raised during KIs. There was a fear that the programme was presented and perceived as an ILO-UNICEF venture, as opposed to a Madad venture, and steps can be taken to remedy this, as set out in the recommendations.

3. To what extent did the project provide a timely and relevant response to constituents' needs and priorities including those related to the COVID-19 context, and with a focus on gender mainstreaming?

The programme has been adaptive and engaged to the needs of tripartite constituents around Outcomes 1 and 2, however the need for restructuring of Outcome 3 have meant that constituent concerns in that area have not been realised or addressed to date. The pandemic did not adversely impact the gender mainstreaming ambitions of this programme.

A flexible approach to programme activities in response to the Covid-19 pandemic was adopted from the outset, with the Standard Joint Programme Document allowing for revisions as required, by stating that *'The tentative activity plan below will be revised during the inception period taking into account necessary adaptation to COVID and post-COVID crisis context'*.¹⁴

The Graduation Framework associated with Outcome 3 does make reference to the impact of Covid-19, and the subsequent response, highlighting how government initiatives and interventions sought to deliver job security and wage protection, and cites the *'uncertainty amid the protracted Covid-19 crisis'* as a risk to programme implementation, but without further clarification.¹⁵ The Standard Joint Programme Document also makes reference to government interventions related to the pandemic, and the subsequent impact on the labour market.

It called on the programme to *'consider the impact of Covid-19 crises on the economy and social protection'* through delivering sectoral analysis, reviewing private sector coping mechanisms and reviewing the social protection system.¹⁶ This work resulted in the need for the development of the Shock-Responsive Social Protection System within the NSPS, which the programme has successfully delivered.

4. Are the needs of beneficiaries fully understood and have the revisions to the project, specifically around Outcome Three, been responsive to their needs and the challenges encountered to date?

The needs of participants are well understood. Outcomes 1 and 2 have delivered valuable support around system strengthening and utilise important tools to advance evidence-based policy making such as the SRSP and the public expenditure review, alongside the introduction of the ISU and Transform training, and, on Outcome 3, revisions to the programme have tackled key barriers to participation, as set out below.

In light of the need for more information on beneficiary needs, UNICEF also suggested and subsequently commissioned a diagnostic study to understand their challenges with youth aged 18-24 entering the labour market, as opposed to staying in the informal sector, with a view towards developing a baseline and a solid evidence base, and the results of this study will allow for more effective targeting, but also and importantly, better monitoring of outcomes against targets.

5. Has the situation been properly analysed? Do the project document contain satisfactory immediate objectives / project outcomes, a strategy and a Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?

The programme aims and outcomes are clearly defined, and accord well with both Agency and national strategic priorities. The need for an effective NSPS has been identified and recorded in programme documents dating back to the Standard Joint Programme Document, and Inception Report, and the challenges around employment, and subsequent need for the graduation process is well articulated in the Graduation Framework.

The Results Framework for the programme is comprehensive, encompassing each programme output, and providing a series of indicators, a baseline and target, and verification sources and means for each. The targets within are ambitious, but well substantiated through comprehensive provision of baseline information. A series of short and long-term targets are set out, which accord with the Programme Work Plan, which did set in place a

¹⁴ Standard Joint Programme Document, 37.

¹⁵ ILO and UNICEF, *Graduating from Cash Assistance: The Graduation Framework of the EU MADAD Programme in Jordan*, 34.

¹⁶ Standard Joint Programme Document. p.34.

pathway towards the delivery of all programme outputs by the end of the initial three-year programme duration. Whilst these targets have not all been met for reasons explored throughout this report, the delivery strategy was, at the time of programme inception, comprehensive. It should be noted that the Theory of Change itself is not explicitly mentioned in the programme Inception Reports, results framework, or the Standard Joint Programme Document, calling into question the extent to which a coherent and robust Theory of Change was applied to this programme, or at least, articulated in its entirety.

6. What is the extent of logical correlations between the objective, outcomes, and outputs, in relation to the revised project scope put forward as part of the request for extension? Are the set indicators logical with specified baseline and targets? Can data be gender disaggregated? Are monitoring and evaluation activities adequately planned?

There is logic behind the connection between outputs and outcomes, and indicators set out in the programme documents are logical, with clear baselines in place. Baseline data was collected and established during the programme start-up phase, and a baseline study was conducted. A risk register was also compiled, which accurately reflects overall levels of programme risk.

Programme outputs are clearly connected to the overarching themes of each programme outcome, and the indicators proposed reflect an accurate method of gauging success against each output. Indicators themselves range from high-level measures, such as the number of Syrians and Jordanians with social protection and the number of job opportunities promoted, to more specific measures for particular programme strands, such as the creation of an inter-governmental technical committee, the implementation of the ISU, a coordination roadmap for the NSPS, and the delivery of the social protection public expenditure review and shock-responsive social protection system.

Gender-specific targets are set out for six outputs, related to the number of graduation beneficiaries, the number of women to whom job opportunities are promoted, work permit issuance, and the number of female officials at partner institutions who have been trained. Policy-centred objectives, such as the development of the case management system, numbers of policy proposals, and the work of the ISU, among others, lack a distinct focus on gender encapsulated within the results framework.¹⁷ This sets the tone for future comments in this report around the absence of gender-specific programming in some programme areas.

Monitoring and evaluation activities have been adequately planned, and include quarterly information notes, annual narrative, and financial reporting. To date, these documents have been submitted promptly, and have been reviewed by the evaluation team, and found to be comprehensive and accurate. Alongside this mid-term evaluation, a final evaluation is expected at the time of the programme's conclusion.¹⁸

7. To what extent has the new project design considered: specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context? As well as concerns relating to inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS, and social dialogue?

Whilst there is a theoretical focus on key cross-cutting themes such as gender mainstreaming, this does not always translate into outputs, and more must be done to retain a gender-centric perspective in programme implementation. This applies across all outcomes. Similarly, a refugee-centric lens is required for both policy-based and implementation-led actions to ensure that the specific needs of refugee communities are met.

That said, some programme activities sought to ensure that gender issues are highlighted. Examples include the manner in which data on the social protection public expenditure review is disaggregated by gender, and how an equity lens is applied, which focuses on vulnerable groups including women, and people with disabilities. Furthermore, the shock responsive social protection deliverable includes a policy brief on gender responsive social protection.

Gender-disaggregated data on Outcome 3 participants is also available, as is gender-disaggregated data published in statistical bulletins. GFJTU is now adopting a more data-centric approach to identifying and matching participants as a result of this approach.

¹⁷ *Programme Results Framework*

¹⁸ *Project Inception Report*, 28.

Input from UNICEF's gender specialist also provided valuable insight into why gender mainstreaming ambitions were not necessarily reflected in programme outcomes, by recognising the programme design and measurement framework limitations and the impact this had on the extent to which gender equality objectives had been addressed. These questions about the extent to which gender was mainstreamed in project design, and the issue around the extent to which gender mainstreaming was seen as a programme priority was also addressed by the donor representative, who articulated that, for the EU, this was not perceived as a gender project, but rather a refugee response project, and the focus on gender from an evaluability perspective could be seen as overstated in terms of priority. It should be noted that, at its core, this was not a gender-centric project, and therefore it is reasonable to assume that such priorities were not centralised in its design or implementation.

A. To what extent have the revisions to the project further aligned its outcomes to major national government strategies which have been announced since its inception, such as the Economic Modernisation Vision?

The principles of Outcome One, related to enhancing coordination, planning, and monitoring within the GoJ for the social protection and employment sectors, and strengthening the implementation of the NSPS, is highly relevant. It accords with both national strategies, and the In-Country programme documents for ILO and UNICEF, and it has the support of the relevant Ministries.

The programme focus on gender also aligns with the priorities of GoJ around increasing and improving female economic involvement and empowerment. The GoJ has a commitment to close the gender equality gap by 2030, by improving national legislation to align with international commitments, and accelerating national plans and strategies to align with the UN SDGs, including SDG 5¹⁹. In support of this, the budget for the Jordan National Commission for Women has been increased, and the ambitions of this programme around mainstreaming gender through policy improvements, as well as in its practical focus through Outcome Three, accords with these ambitions. This level of alignment has been acknowledged by MoPIC who stated that the programme is highly relevant to Jordanian national strategies, and the Ministry itself does not accept projects unless they meet national standards and contribute to inclusion for women and minorities. This affirmation further justifies the relevance of the programme.

It should be noted that, since the programme was designed, new Government-led national strategies have been adopted, most notable and relevant amongst which is the Economic Modernisation Vision (EMV), the publication of which post-dated that of the NSPS. As such, it is important that the programme works to ensure alignment between existing activities and this new strategy, so that any future updates to the NSPS accord with the EMV.

B. To what extent has this synergised with a move from cash assistance to employment?

The scope of Outcome Three, related to graduating participants off cash assistance and into decent work, is again fully aligned with both the strategies of the implementing Agencies, and that of the GoJ, and also brings a specific focus on gender and refugee issues, as stated above, and the needs of refugees, in a manner which was partially absent in other aspects of the programme. If successful, it would help address the stark youth employment challenges facing the country, of which GoJ is cognisant, and would also support wider skills development programmes.

C. To what extent do the project activities ensure a focus on gender mainstreaming?

Outcomes One and Two, relating to strengthening the NSPS, strengthening national systems and mechanisms to enhance access to the labour market, decent work, and employment-based social protection schemes, and finding linkages between social protection and employment, are relevant in their scope, again aligning with both ILO and UNICEF In-Country documents, and other core government strategies. That said, these are policy-driven outcome, seeking to strengthen and institutionalise national systems. As such, both staff and stakeholders felt that a broad approach was preferable to one which made policy exemptions or specific measures for women, or for those of refugee status. The belief, and the principle behind this component, especially post-restructure, is that strong foundations and effective processes will deliver a tangible benefit for all who use these services, and that this necessarily delivers a benefit for women and refugees, alongside the wider population.

¹⁹ UN Women, 'Jordan pledges to align national laws with international commitments and expand support to women and girls'.

Interviews with SSC staff further validate this, in that they felt strongly that the programme complemented national strategies, as well as their own general policies and social protection recommendations, working to support citizens, and designed in a manner which actively fights poverty for both Jordanians and Syrians.

Specific activities have also delivered a gender-focused output, such as the social protection public expenditure review, which disaggregates data by gender, alongside utilising an equity-based lens which considers both women, and those of refugee status. The shock-responsive social protection deliverable also considers a policy brief related to gender-responsive social protection.

On Outcome 3, inclusivity, and the mainstreaming of women and those of refugee status has clearly been considered within this component, as the programme itself is designed to be inclusive. It aims for 50% of participants to be Syrian refugees, with the same ratio applied to females. It also focused on matching Syrians with jobs in open sectors, such as retail, sales, agriculture, construction, and hospitality. Agreements were in place with industrial zones and development zones to facilitate this. Some relevance challenges persist around the mainstreaming of women, and specifically the relevance of jobs offered to women, for whom childcare and transportation burdens, as well as societal limitations, make graduation challenging, and in some cases irrelevant, given the lack of support available for flexible or home-based projects.

D. What are the actions taken to ensure that NSPS remains relevant and aligned to national priorities?

Initial dialogue between the programme team and the Ministry for Social Development is currently underway with a view towards extending the NSPS until 2030, which would provide a key opportunity to both strengthen its longevity, and also ensure continued alignment with key national strategies including the EMV.

This has been acknowledged by programme staff who confirmed that discussions were underway to update and refresh the NSPS, extending its scope to 2030, and this would be an ideal opportunity to reassess where further alignment could be delivered. The EMV itself is built on two pillars, the 'Economic Growth Pillar', and the 'Quality of Life Pillar', and this programme can effectively align with both, as set out in the recommendations of this report. Since that workshop, staff have met with the Minister of Social Development to further discuss alignment between the NSPS and the EMV Quality of Life Pillar.

7.2. COHERENCE

Coherence seeks to capture linkages between outcomes and national priorities, coherence, especially within the context of a joint evaluation between ILO and UNICEF, partnership dynamics between agencies and implementing partners and complexity, in addition to synergies with national initiatives and with other donor-supported projects.

8. Staff from both agencies report a close working relationship, and an understanding and acceptance of the division of responsibility. Approaches were complimentary, as ILO focused on working-age participants, whilst UNICEF worked only with youth up to the age of 25.
9. There appears to be less coherence when it comes to the interplay between the three distinct Outcomes, especially the relationship between Outcome 3 and the wider programme, and staff and stakeholders reported not being fully aware or briefed on activities outside of the Outcome on which they work.
10. There is an effective level of communication between in-country staff and technical specialists, although again, it was noted that technical staff, like staff in Jordan, were not fully aware of programme activities outside of their speciality areas.
11. Whilst clear in its scope, the coherence of Outcome One and Two is challenged by the multitude of relevant stakeholders, working with ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR, the donor, and three relevant Ministries. The multitude of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the NSPS, with over 21 institutions involved, leads to coherence and efficiency challenges, and has resulted in delays to activities. The introduction of the two programme committees has helped address this challenge.

8. To what extent was the division of responsibility between ILO and UNICEF clarified in project documents, has this been adhered to, and has the new project design assisted in streamlining this relationship?

The relationship between both implementing agencies has been positive, and a good degree of alignment has been noted throughout the programme, and reflected in this report. It is important to draw attention to the division of roles between ILO and UNICEF with regards to this programme. Staff from both agencies report a close working relationship, and an understanding and acceptance of the division of responsibility. ILO lead on the decent work portfolio whilst UNICEF are working to design and develop a shock-responsive social protection system for Jordan. Both Agencies had a strong track record of working together, having done so in Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, and Iraq.

Approaches were complimentary, as ILO focused on working age adults, whilst UNICEF worked only with youth (defined as under 25). Good levels of harmony were reported across both partners, and communication was steady and improving iteratively. Both Agencies agreed that the donor has been engaged and responsive in their relationship with the programme, and accepted that elements of it were pioneering, and therefore came with increased risk.

The coherence of Outcome Three, both pre, and post-restructure, presents a unique challenge insofar as, whilst Outcomes One and Two are policy-driven, Outcome Three is an implementation exercise on the ground. It operates with a different set of key staff and a different range of stakeholders, and this results in the need for additional effort to ensure its team, outputs, and reporting are well aligned with the rest of the programme, to avoid siloing.

9. To what extent have ILO and UNICEF adopted a joint ownership of the project, and worked together towards joint outcomes rather than in silos?

There appears to be less coherence when it comes to the interplay between the three distinct Outcomes, and staff and stakeholders reported not being fully aware or briefed on activities outside of the Outcome on which they work. Despite awareness on the overall programme and wider activities, the complexity and multilayered cooperation and bureaucratic needs and heavy workloads risk a lack of complete awareness and full coordination. This has led to a perception that the programme is 'siloed', and this is especially true for Outcome 3, as it focuses on implementation on the ground, whilst the other two are more centred around policy design and government structure. Staff expressed this concern explicitly, and feared that, because that component was perceived to be 'struggling', it risked giving the impression that the whole programme was struggling, and this could result in reduced focus and reprioritisation of the social protection workstreams.

Joint communication and ownership of the programme is well demonstrated at all points; however an awareness gap has been perceived amongst staff working in different elements, and a risk of 'siloing' of outcomes has been noted. The introduction of two steering committees has mitigated this, and these mechanisms must be supported.

10. To what extent has communication between the project's teams, the regional office and the responsible technical department at headquarters been effective, and how can the new project design further enhance this?

There is an effective level of communication between in-country staff, and the ILO regional office in Beirut, with good awareness and reporting mechanisms in place, and effective technical support being provided to programme outcomes. ILO and UNICEF technical staff were interviewed as part of this mid-term evaluation, and reported good levels of understanding and engagement in the outcomes most directly linked to their portfolios. Technical and supervisory staff based at the ILO regional office in Beirut demonstrated good levels of general awareness of the programme, however, in the same manner as staff in Jordan, expressed that they were not fully aware of programme activities outside of their speciality areas. The evaluation team were unable to speak to staff at the UNICEF regional office to clarify whether the same applied in that case.

E. To what extent did the revisions to the project scope and implementation deliver better engagement and cooperation between implementing partners and the relevant Government Ministries (MoSD, MoL, MoPIC)?

Whilst clear in its scope, the coherence of Outcome One and Two is challenged by the multitude of relevant stakeholders, working with ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR, the donor, and three relevant Ministries. Alignment and decision-making have been a noted challenge, and one which has slowed progress, but this has been in large part addressed through the creation of the NSPS National Steering Committee (also known as the Higher

Coordination Committee), comprised of Ministry representatives and Agency staff, which seeks to deliver improved coordination and reporting mechanisms, and help break down barriers to implementation.

The creation of a further Madad Steering Committee also serves to mitigate some of the internal communication risks which have been identified. These two steering groups are helping to deliver meaningful stakeholder engagement, and strengthening collaboration between partners. Their introduction has also resulted in a more structured reporting and monitoring mechanism.

Coherence challenges were also noted around Outcome 3, most notably that the career counsellors did not feel engaged or consulted during the initial design or restructuring. This has led to a degree of disenfranchisement amongst the team, compounded by concerns around a lack of long-term job security, as contracts have shifted to GFJTU, for whom they now report.²⁰

These challenges also extend to NAF, who reported a degree of dissatisfaction about the progress of the programme, as delays in delivery have left them feeling as though their credibility with participants has been adversely affected. Procurement challenges have also impacted the performance, and complicated reporting standards and mechanisms have led to further delays. Steps towards finalising the proposed new agreement between NAF and the ILO, and the subsequent signing of the implementation agreement with NAF in June 2023, will help to alleviate these challenges by providing certainty and clarity around funding and roles and responsibilities.

7.3. EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness studies the extent to which the programme is on track to deliver on its outcomes to date, specifically with regard to gender mainstreaming, whether it is currently delivering on time and budget based on existing plans, and whether the stated activities have given due regard to gender equality. It also seeks to gauge progress against existing targets, and specifically those which have not changed as part of the requested no-cost extension. Where the no-cost extension has applied significant change to the structure or goals of the programme, it is important to understand how these changes can improve effectiveness, that is to say, how they support the team in implementing the programme in a manner which can deliver its stated outcomes by December 2024.

²⁰ Since the time of writing, project staff have reported that consultants contracted by GFTJU were offered the opportunity to become formal staff members, with social security and health insurance coverage, although they instead chose to continue on service contracts due to the higher salary.

Main Findings

12. The programme is not specifically relevant to social dialogue or labour standards, although contributions were noted around improved dialogue around NSPS implementation, as well as work with employers around social insurance models.
13. Outcomes One and Two have demonstrated a strong degree of effectiveness, exemplified by the implementation and institutionalisation of the ISU within the MoSD, the Transform training, and the statistical bulletin, among other successes.
14. The success of the ISU has been recognised by both staff, and Ministry stakeholders, who reported that the unit has delivered significantly improved technical capacity, and has provided advice and support to the 21 institutions involved in implementing the NSPS.
15. The programme has introduced a new package of training for Ministry staff and focal points which builds on the existing UN Transform training package.
16. It has delivered against UNICEF Social Protection and Policy priorities, and successes include the role of the ISU, the commitment to developing tools for evidence-based policy, such as the annual social protection reflection report, shock responsive social protection component, social protection public expenditure review, NSPS dashboard and wider support of the NSPS.
17. On Outcome Three, lessons were learned around the need to provide assurance around income security, to stop people losing cash assistance whilst going through training, and to break the cycle of informal work, and programme adjustments were put forward to address these concerns.
18. The removal of Outcome 2.1, related to work permits for Syrian refugees, has created a gap between outputs, and the brief of the donor whose focus is on Syrian refugee relief. This gap must subsequently be addressed through programmatic adjustments.
19. More emphasis needs to be placed on meeting the specific needs of Jordanian women, and Syrian men and women, rather than relying only on a trickle-down effect.

In the context of this programme, effectiveness is judged differently for each component. For Outcome One, the ambitions are clear and largely unchanged through the no-cost extension, and so progress can be adequately judged. Outcome Two is more challenging, insofar as a significant component (Outcome 2.1) was deleted in its entirety, and the impact of that decision has yet to be seen, given its recency. As such, discussions on effectiveness will centre around Outcome 2.2 in its current form. For Outcome Three, the design has been radically altered, which makes a protracted discussion around the shortcomings of the previous design redundant. Therefore the evaluation team chose to look more carefully at what lessons had been learned and how these had been applied to ensure effectiveness of the remaining period of the programme.

11. How have the outputs and outcomes contributed to ILO's mainstreamed strategies including gender equality, social dialogue, and labour standards?

The programme has made a significant contribution against its stated aims, and whilst some progress has been made to deliver a gender-mainstreamed approach, including the public expenditure review, the shock-responsive social protection system, the disaggregation of gender data in statistical bulletins, and the commitment to 50% participants in the graduation process, some shortcomings were noted in this area, specifically around the absence of gender-disaggregated targets in the programme's Results Framework, as discussed below. The programme is not specifically relevant to social dialogue or labour standards, although contributions were noted around improved dialogue around NSPS implementation, as well as work with employers around social insurance models.

The success of the ISU has been recognised by both staff, and Ministry stakeholders, who reported that the unit has delivered significantly improved technical capacity, and has provided advice and support to the 21 institutions involved in implementing the NSPS. It has introduced new standardised processes for reporting on the NSPS, and helps coordinate Ministry, donor, and NGO activity to prevent duplication of efforts.

This progress was further supported by the development of an updated Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) model, which has enabled improved analysis of the economic impact of proposed policies. This tool has now

been handed over to the Government, and serves to support both the ISU, as well as the policy activities conducted under Outcome Two.

The programme has introduced a new package of training for Ministry staff and focal points which builds on the existing UN Transform training package, and which, if implemented successfully, has the potential to embed key themes and policy approaches at a senior government level, at a time when social protection remains an emerging concept in Jordan. This also includes a ToT component, which has the potential to support sustainability of the skill acquisition and retention over time. The statistical bulletin provided gender-disaggregated data on gender which was useful reference material for decision-makers, and this was underpinned by the presence of ILO staff working on gender in Jordan who provided recommendations. That said, ILO gender specialists could have additional input in ensuring that these findings are interpreted and embedded across the programme.

Other examples of effective implementation include efforts to strengthen the overall regulatory framework to formalise in-work social protection, and extend social security to more people. To help inform this approach, the team have commissioned diagnostic and analytical studies into key economic sectors, including emerging themes such as platform work, to build the knowledge required to effect policy change.

12. To what extent has the project contributed to UNICEF's Social Protection and Policy priorities?

Core UNICEF priorities around Social Protection and Policy include evidence generation, promotion of transformative social protection, promotion of disability-inclusive social protection systems, enhanced shock responsiveness, supporting nascent social protection systems, working with government and partners, provision of technical support, and promotion of a case management approach.²¹

Here, the programme has been highly relevant, with the role of the ISU, the commitment to developing tools for evidence-based policy (Annual social protection reflection report, shock responsive social protection component, social protection public expenditure review) and wider support of the NSPS forming a key success story. Likewise, work around the rollout of the Transform training package has made a valued contribution in this area.

A number of workstreams have already begun to demonstrate successful implementation, most notable amongst which is the establishment of the ISU, housed in the Ministry of Social Development. The ISU consists of staff from MoSD, as well as external consultants, and is supervised by the Minister, and the Secretary General.²² It is backed by a strong staff, an effective monitoring framework and KPI matrix, and standardised processes.

In addition, work under Outcome One has supported the MoSD Law, worked on developing mapping of the MoSD MIS, supported the development of an M&E framework for MoSD and developed the CGE model. Work is also underway on a social protection public expenditure review, and a shock-responsive social protection component

This is accompanied by a commitment to more effective data gathering and a more transparent approach to publication, which has resulted in the issuance of the statistical bulletin, supported by the ISU, which represents a new approach to gathering and disseminating social protection data and statistics. It is the first of its kind regionally, and provides important data backstopping for evidence-led decision making. This approach offers a new opportunity to shape the policy narrative in new ways, and if it effectively encourages an integration in thinking and delivery around social assistance and social insurance, it can help bridge the gap between the work of SSC, and NAF, and in doing so, move Jordan one step further towards universal coverage.

13. What positive or negative unintended outcomes can be identified, specifically related to gender mainstreaming, or in relation to the specific locations in which the project was implemented?

²¹ UNICEF, 'Social Protection', *passim*.

²² Note: During the validation workshop for this evaluation, it was reported that, in the period of time since the evaluation was drafted, the ISU had been moved from the Office of the Secretary General, and is now housed under the Policy Directorate. This has led to fears that its role and impact could be diminished. Whilst this took place outside of the time period stated for this evaluation, it is important that this development, and the associated concern, is noted.

Unintended outcomes related to Outcome Three were noted, as barriers to participation were identified during implementation which had not been fully understood or anticipated during the design phase. These included a realization that the programme as initially designed had amplified fears that participants could lose their cash assistance if they enrolled on the programme, and awareness that, for many prospective beneficiaries, the loss of income from informal labour which would be incurred if they participated in full-time training made participation unviable. These challenges have been theoretically addressed as part of the restructure, through incorporating on-the-job training options, and a commitment to provide clarity around the impact on cash assistance wherever possible, although the impact of these revisions cannot yet be assessed.

14. Has the project fostered ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue in articulating, implementing, and sustaining coherent response strategies to mitigate the effects of the pandemic on the world of work?

The objectives of the programme were not directly pandemic-related, and programme activities had resumed as planned, without specific pandemic-driven changes to implementation. That said, the pandemic reinforced the necessity of an effective national social protection strategy, which led to renewed focus on the core aims of this programme. To that end, the 21 stakeholders associated with the implementation of the NSPS, including ministries, employer representatives, and wider stakeholders, engaged constructively on its implementation, and the introduction of the steering committees further supported the active involvement and dialogue across all parties.

Improvements to social dialogue in a wider sense, though not directly related to the pandemic, were also observed around activities related to Outcome 3, and the principle behind the restructure is coherent, with engagement and active involvement from Ministries, UNHCR, and employee representatives in the form of GFJTU, and it is hoped that this new approach will help expedite this. Challenges persist around a lack of compatibility between the programme, and home-based or flexible working, which is one of the major emerging sectors post-pandemic.

F. How can the amendments to the methodology and targets for outcome three, such as the reduction in total beneficiaries from 4,200 to 2,500, and the shift towards on-the-job training over on-campus training, help improve delivery against the desired outcomes?

The effectiveness of Outcome Three is a challenging one to quantify, as the component has undergone a major redesign as part of the no-cost extension. Prior to this, a major challenge was noted in that, over the duration to date, the speed at which prospective participants are progressed from the initial profiling stage, to the job matching stage, has been too slow. The critical issue with Outcome Three is that to date, work with potential graduates has not moved beyond the initial profiling stage, which started two years ago.

In moving from profiling to the training and employment segment of the programme, the team are aware that challenges still lie ahead. These challenges are well-summarised in the 2022 Annual Report, which states that *'these factors include the high prevalence of informal employment among the targeted segments who receive cash assistance, the absence of guaranteed financial incentives when transitioning to formal employment, concerns about losing a steady cash transfer that is often supplemented with income from informal sources, and limited access to affordable and safe transportation'*.

The evaluation team had similar experiences when interviewing potential graduates who had completed the profiling phase, who reported that, whilst their initial experiences around first interviews were positive, and that many were eager for work, the fear of losing cash assistance, and the inability of the programme to guarantee or provide assurance that they would not be left without income was stark. For Jordanians, both the potential graduates and the counselors who profiled them stated that there was no clear written guarantee of the continuation of welfare for the 12-month duration which the programme promises, making it much harder for potential graduates to approach a new training or job opportunity confidently. Additionally, and most notably in the North of Jordan and in major urban areas, the younger profiled potential graduates were mainly community college or university graduates seeking skilled labor in their fields, which does not match with the programme's focus on low-skilled minimum wage employment. For those Jordanians seeking low-skilled labor, they pointed to competition by Syrians as a main obstacle to job retention since Syrians are willing to accept lower pay and accept less optimal working conditions.

Syrian participants also expressed that the lack of written confirmation that joining the programme would not result in the loss of UNHCR benefits, made them wary of seeking formal employment. Additionally, Syrians commented on the fact that even if they were to gain formal employment, there were no guarantees for future job sustainability since any disagreement with the employer would lead to immediate job loss since they lack the social clout to protect or defend themselves against employer abuse and have to accept sub-optimal working conditions as a result.

Another issue of confusion for Syrians in particular (and for Jordanians also), was the fact that one of the first questions in the questionnaire they were being asked to complete by counselor was whether the potential graduates wanted to start a home-business, and the majority of Syrians especially and many Jordanians, especially women, chose this option and are now anticipating support for home businesses, when in fact, this option is not part of the programme's plans or strategies. As such, expectations have been set, especially among Syrians, which cannot be fulfilled by the programme.

The team were cognizant of these risks, and took necessary steps to revise the design of this component through the no-cost extension process. Whilst it is too early to judge whether these adjustments will result in tangible improvements to the effectiveness of the programme, the logic behind them is sound. The proposed shift away from campus-based training, and into on-the-job training will reduce the lag time between cash assistance and work-based income, meaning people can begin earning from their work as soon as they commence the programme, which should come as some reassurance to prospective participants.

The evaluation team noted a significant gap between perception and reality with regards to the concerns of participants, and the aforementioned fears around the loss of their cash assistance payments must be addressed. The staff workshop revealed that the team are currently producing a series of literature, including leaflets for prospective participants, and it is important that this literature acknowledges these concerns, and addresses them through providing reassurance that participation will not leave participants in financial distress. However, it should be noted that written materials may not be the most effective way to reach many of the potential graduates, especially those of them who are seeking low-skilled employment since they are not all necessarily fully literate. This is especially true of the Syrians.

On a more technical note, and as stated by the counselors in the field, the questionnaire they are being asked to complete is not well-designed or as relevant to the population at hand as could otherwise be. Some of the flaws in design include:

1. The presence of the home-based project element which misdirects potential graduates.
2. The lack of nuanced or specific skillsets within the drop-down menu for skills, leaving the counselor to choose the closest option, which is not always representative, and with no option to manually add in a skill that is lacking in the drop-down menu.
3. Two questions on income levels of potential graduates and on the availability of jobs matching the skills of the interviewee, which are highly subjective and would skew any attempt at comparison between respondents.

On a wider note, the lack of parallel process of profiling and job-identification, coupled with prompt placement has caused delays and affected the credibility of the programme. Participants reported waiting months, and in some cases years, and have yet to progress even to the phase of the job-counseling session, and this impacts their desire to engage in the programme, and duplicates effort, as many profiles now need updating two years after submission. This has eroded the effectiveness of the programme, and should be addressed through a simultaneous approach to identifying, profiling, and matching, to ensure prompt transition.

Further complicating this is the fact that counselors face job insecurity, with their contracts ending in September of 2023 with no clarity as to whether they will be renewed. The counselor continue to profile potential graduates, with some having reached their targets, while others continuing to do so, however, and apart from being asked in May of 2023 to begin matching candidates to immediately available jobs, they are not privy to the arch of the programme even with regards to Outcome Three, leaving them feeling disenfranchised and unable to put their skills to good use

G. To what extent gender balance has been/will be maintained throughout implementation?

The issue of gender remains significant in judging the effectiveness of both Outcomes One and Two, and gender mainstreaming in a policy context is challenging, as policy, as described by both staff and stakeholders, must be objective and wide-ranging, without necessarily targeting one subgroup. However, the principle of a rising tide lifting all ships is key, and by improving structures, processes, policy, and instruments, benefits may be realised for all, and a strengthened and expanded sector will provide more support for women alongside men. The same applies in a refugee context, and these enhanced structures will benefit Syrians, as well as Jordanians, and thus a policy structure without a target sub-group can still deliver in line with the mandate of this programme, and the Madad Fund.

The outcome of this approach remains to be seen however and more emphasis needs to be placed on the meeting the specific needs of Jordanian women, and Syrian men and women, rather than relying only on a trickle-down effect. These needs include policy-making around child-care and transportation needs for all women and a clearer policy on cash-assistance and its sustainability for Syrians.

The evaluation team sought to gain a clearer picture around the extent to which the programme can adequately track outcomes related to women and Syrians, to identify where monitoring tools could be introduced and improved. The response from both agency and ISU staff was that the introduction of the new data dashboard, delayed due to Covid, and expected later this year, would provide much needed clarity in these areas.

Gender challenges were also noted around Outcome 3, which seeks to ensure that 50% of participants in the graduation programme are female. This gender challenge further tested the effectiveness of this component, with female participants noting that childcare needs, transportation challenges, logistics and cultural barriers remained in place, which curtailed their ability to work or accessing training. However, those women who managed to overcome these barriers and are eager to work lamented the fact that they were profiled months ago and have yet to hear back with any opportunities for either training or work. Counselors who attempted to curb some of these challenges through working out a transportation agreement with employers, but were curtailed by procurement challenges in finalizing such agreements.

In addition, the team has given due consideration to the specific needs of female participants, and is working with employers to create more conducive workplace environments which encourage female participation and inclusion. Proposing new measures such as supporting participants with public transport services, and working with employers to offer workplace creches are two examples of initiatives which, if successful, can further drive female participation.

Further findings related to effectiveness

Whilst not specifically related to any of the evaluation questions initially put forward, the following represents important learning, related to Outcome Three, which the evaluation team felt was worthy of inclusion.

Outcome Three targets some of the most economically vulnerable members of society - both Jordanians and Syrians - those receiving cash assistance and those on social welfare. Moreover, the programme targets second tier potential earners in the family for Jordanians and specifically women, and includes a wider age range than most livelihood projects, thus further increasing vulnerability criteria of participants (or potential graduates). Many of those targeted for profiling also lack basic education levels, especially among Syrians. Among Jordanians, many of the younger potential graduates have higher education levels, especially in urban settings, making the targeted population a diverse and non-homogenous group that requires different approaches to job linkages. Among Syrians, the population has undergone significant trauma, which is another factor that needs to be considered.

Given these levels of vulnerability, it is important that the following comments are considered by the programme team:

1. Working with vulnerable members of society requires higher levels of consideration in terms of respect for financial, physical and psychological limitations, and the delays noted between application, screening, and progressing through the graduation programme, have resulted in raised expectations, followed by frustration, and a loss of trust.
2. Working with vulnerable segments of the population, often with limited education and who may suffer from stress and trauma related to poverty and conflict requires a level of communication and transparency

that is nuanced and specific to their needs and abilities. Whilst counsellors did their best to communicate with graduates and are aware of the need to communicate clearly and effectively, the design of the programme and delays within it, coupled with a lack of specifically relevant and effective communication tools that explain the programme, and specifically the potential loss of welfare and cash assistance that may ensue, has made their jobs harder. A lack of clarity and attention to the specific needs of potential graduates can lead to a sense of alienation or lack of trust that has the potential hinder the programme's progress. The targeted population has a range of abilities and needs (age, educational, gender-based, refugee status, urban vs. rural etc.) requiring a targeted approach when it comes to profiling approach and job identification and placement in the future. This was not taken sufficiently into account in programme design.

7.4. EFFICIENCY

Herein, the evaluation team considered the efficient implementation of programme to date, and whether an efficient use of financial, material, and human resources has been deployed thus far.

Main Findings

20. Staff working on all outcomes expressed concern that the programme was being delivered in siloes, and the introduction of the steering committees goes some way towards addressing this challenge.
21. With over 20 different institutions involved in the NSPS, actioning and embedding it remains a challenge. This has led to delays, and has resulted in the need for an extension of the duration of this phase, as expressed in the no-cost extension request.
22. Coordination between Agencies has been efficient, although stakeholder expressed concerns around delays in receiving approval for funds, and the levels of micromanagement. External challenges such as the uncertainty of the future of the Ministry of Labour have further delayed progress.
23. The programme has encountered delays which have necessitated a no-cost extension, which has extended the duration of the programme to December 2024. Work on Outcomes 1 and 2 has progressed well, although delays were noted especially when dealing with Ministries.
24. The restructuring of the programme, including the deletion of Outcome 2.1, has resulted in a redistribution of financial resources, alongside a significant restructure of Outcome 3, which makes addressing efficiency at this point challenging.

15. To what extent have resources been utilized efficiently to reach the project's objectives?

This question is challenging to answer due to the no-cost extension and extensive restructuring of some programme components. Whilst some programme Outcomes remain on track, others have been fully redesigned. Therefore, whilst costs have not increased, efficiency challenges have been noted. This is most prominent under Outcome 3, where the reduction in participant targets has increased the cost-per-beneficiary significantly, which has resulted in efficiency concerns from the donor.

A programme of this size and scale, working across three distinct outcomes, and with a myriad of different stakeholders, will always pose efficiency risks around effective coordination, funding arrangements, and implementation. Agencies and the donor all acknowledge that the programme is highly ambitious and expensive, both in scope and design, and this has resulted in some of these challenges are evident in this programme. Programme staff working on all outcomes expressed concern that the programme was being delivered in siloes, and that more needed to be done to address this. The introduction of the steering committees goes some way towards addressing this challenge.

In attempt to manage these operational challenges, as well as the effectiveness challenges mentioned, the no-cost extension proposed a reduction in the target number of participants from 4,200 to 2,500. Whilst this move has been welcomed by programme staff, and is seen as more attainable, some members of staff still question the extent to which this target is realistic, with some classifying it as 'impossible'. Similarly, the target put forward for 3% to be people with disabilities was questioned by technical specialists, who felt that, without the required infrastructure at a national level, and in workplaces, to support them as labour market entrants, this target was

unfeasible. The reduction has also led to an increase in the unit cost per beneficiary, which has led to value for money concerns to be expressed by the donor, although the programme team confirm that the overall cost-per-beneficiary stands at USD 1,500, well below the USD 10,000 level of the RYSE project, and in line with similar World Bank-funded interventions.

16. To what extent have the coordination efforts been between ILO and UNICEF been efficient?

Coordination between Agencies has been efficient, although stakeholder expressed concerns around delays in receiving approval for programme funds, and the levels of micromanagement associated with the programme.

Building on the recent ROM Evaluation conducted by the EU, the donor expressed a satisfaction that most of the points for improvement and recommendations suggested in that study had since been taken on and included in the no-cost extension document.

17. To what extent has the coordination with the national implementing partners been efficient, specifically with regards to MoSD? And other national stakeholders like NAF, DoS and SSC?

A programme with a budget of over EUR 14million, across three distinct Outcomes has the potential to face a number of efficiency challenges, though this risk was acknowledged and accepted by Agencies and the donor.

Working with 21 stakeholders on the implementation of the NSPS will always pose efficiency challenges, and delays were noted, however the introduction of the Higher Coordinating Committee, as well as the Madad Project Steering Committee have helped expedite the programme, and overcome existing barriers.

Whilst the programme has delivered well against Outcome One targets to date, some efficiency challenges were noted, most notably in the manner in which the programme engages with its stakeholders. With over 20 different institutions involved in the NSPS, actioning and embedding it remains a challenge. This has led to delays, and has resulted in the need for an extension of the duration of this phase, as expressed in the no-cost extension request.

Staff of the ISU have, however, expressed frustration at the bureaucratic nature of processes which they believe stymie the efficiency of their work. This includes delays in even modest requests for funds to cover meeting costs and more significantly significant delays in the hiring of a third staff member to work on communications. This position was approved and yet many months later and despite the recruitment process being launched, has yet to be hired.

Some of these roadblocks are attributable to external challenges, notably the changing structures and personnel at government ministries, with frequent churn of relevant staff slowing down implementation. This was further compounded by the uncertainty over the future of the Ministry of Labour itself, which was for a period of time, scheduled to be closed, and its services merged with other Ministries. This proposal has since been unwound, however the uncertainty it yielded has necessarily caused implementation delays, which cannot be attributed to programme staff.

Some efficiency challenges were also related to staffing challenges. Hiring processes for staff including a communications officer have been challenging, and this resulted in the unit functioning for up to a year without key personnel. This has resulted in some staff feeling overworked, and subsequently needing to restructure their workloads, thus slowing down the progress of the unit. A more coherent and robust recruitment process would serve to alleviate this. The programme annual report of 2022 provides further grounding for this, by noting that *'capacity gaps at MoSD pose a challenge in facilitating the work of the ISU to operationalise the NSPS'*.²³

This necessitates the need for enhanced coordination, to ensure that the programme can continue to deliver despite external challenges, to which end the new National Steering Committee will add significant value, in helping prevent duplication of efforts, strengthen collaboration, and reduce some of the inter-actor tension which has been alluded to throughout this report.

18. To what extent has the project been on track in terms of timely achieving the assigned milestones?

²³ Annual Progress Report 2022, 6.

The programme has encountered delays which have necessitated a no-cost extension, which has extended the duration of the programme to December 2024. Work on Outcomes 1 and 2 has progressed well, although delays were noted especially when dealing with Ministries. Outcome 3 has been fully delayed, and has been restructured as a result of these challenges. The introduction of the two steering committees will play a positive role in addressing these challenges in future.

Another important point to bear in mind at this stage is the levels of monitoring and evaluation attached to this programme. Annual Reports and log frames are supported by Quarterly Information Notes, which provide a timely update for both stakeholders, and the donor, and these have been delivered on time to date, although a delay to the publication of the first annual report was noted. Work plans and budgets are clear, detailed, and well-presented, which makes tracking delivery against programme outcomes, monitoring, and risk identification easier and more efficient.

The Annual Report of 2022 does provide an honest depiction of the challenges which the programme faced, addressing them in both the Summary Outcomes, and the Summary Outputs sections, drawing attention to delayed or postponed components, and making clear the reasons for those delays.

As Outcome 3 has been restructured through the no-cost extension, it is too early to judge the efficiency of the revised model, however there are lessons to be learned from the previous iteration which can inform the future implementation of the programme.

That said, Outcome 3 has also seen significant improvements to its efficiency, driven by the Graduation Tracking System (GTS), which has proved to be a successful introduction. Challenges persist around its interface and usability, which can be improved, but the overall impact of its introduction has been a positive one.

Here, it should be noted that the restructuring of Outcome 3 as part of the no-cost extension is, in and of itself, a good example of how the project monitored performance, identified a clear shortfall in the form of low levels of uptake and trepidation around participation, commissioned diagnostics, and adapted the project approach to address and mitigate the barriers to participation.

It was reported by both ISU staff and stakeholders, that levels of bureaucracy and complicated procedures for low-cost expenditures have slowed down implementation. Additionally, micro-management and a lack of responsiveness to questions and concerns from field staff have further impacted efficiency levels. This complaint about over-management and overly complex procedures for requesting funding were also echoed by the ISU, whose staff highlighted the fact that the process of requesting expenditure for programme activities is both long and complicated, which adds additional effort, and results in frustration.

At the counselor level and on the management level, the counselors concur that being under the umbrella of GFTU has made their work situations considerably more productive and efficient since they now have active involvement and direction from their management. However, the counselors feel they could do a lot more with their time and skills since they are all ILO-trained and have been working on their respective fields for four to five years each. Utilizing their skills and time more efficiently by engaging more directly in the job-matching and identification phase of the programme would be advisable and would also further justify their sizable remuneration packages.

Efficiency challenges also extend to programme implementation, and the long duration of the profiling phase of the programme has suffered delays throughout its life cycle, which has resulted in the need for its significant redesign. Part of this challenge centres on the fact that programme management has changed several times, with different stakeholders being responsible for the profiling and matching elements of the programme. This responsibility for implementation has now fallen to GFJTU, and this change has been widely reported as beneficial in improving the efficiency of programme delivery, and the quality of profiling being conducted.

This arrangement with GFJTU has been in place since April 2023, and now includes the provision of work placements for participants who do not require training, expediting the process. Despite this progress, and the obvious high regard in which GFJTU and their work is held, they reported difficulties in communication, as well as delays in receiving payments which have slowed down their ability to deliver on time.

These responsiveness challenges were also reported by NAF, who stated that delays in agreeing and facilitating the required fund transfers to NAF have also resulted in implementation delays. The complex relationship

between NAF and ILO has also led to delays in receiving relevant data from NAF, which in turn has slowed down the matching efforts.

19. To what extent has the project leveraged new or repurposed existing financial resources to mitigate COVID-19 effects in a balanced manner?

A further efficiency challenge for this outcome centres on staffing and resourcing, as, when the no-cost extension was submitted, and Outcome 2.1 was deleted, the overall funding package for this component was reduced. Technical specialists have subsequently been repurposed, and to date, clarity is still lacking around how that expertise and capacity can be replaced.

The programme has, through the restructure, allocated more financing for Outcome 3, through deleting Outcome 2.1 entirely. This will help support the meeting of new and lowered targets for Outcome 3. These changes were driven by programme performance and design challenges, as opposed to the impact of the pandemic.

H. What are the key challenges in terms of efficiency, most particularly concerning the engagement with other stakeholders?

This challenging interplay between Ministries and implementing agencies has also impacted Outcomes One and Two to some extent. There is a political reality to bear in mind around how data is presented by government, what message it sends, and how it is perceived, and communication and balance are needed, which the National Steering Committee can provide. This challenge can be addressed through introducing a standardised form and template, wherein content is agreed in advance, and both parties commit to publication before figures are announced, meaning that data can be shared transparently, without the data itself impacting whether or not it can be published.

The establishment and functionality of the Steering Committee will be helpful in surmounting these challenges, and this report recommends that this Committee is further institutionalised to help circumnavigate this and other efficiency and cohesion challenges.

7.5. IMPACT

Assessing impact in a mid-term evaluation is preliminary, as the programme has yet to conclude, and the long-term impact is as yet unknown. What can be assessed is the positive and negative changes and effects have been noted to date at both a national level, and with regard to the progress of participants through the process, alongside the extent to which this can be continued or improved throughout the remainder of the programme. Lessons can be learned which can maximise the output and significance of programme impact for its remaining lifetime.

Main Findings

25. The Transform training package on social protection, currently in use in 40 countries, has been translated and adapted into Arabic for the first time and this resource can now be used in support of social protection programmes across the MENA region.
26. With the update of the NSPS Jordan will become the only country in the region to have developed and updated an NSPS in the last six years, and furthermore, the ISU case study has been presented to the Lebanese MoSD as an example of how an NSPS can be implemented. This is a key example of how the work done by this programme, with input from UNICEF, can create a tangible and lasting impact, both in Jordan, and in the wider region.
27. The impact of Outcome Three can be measured, through both the number of female graduates under Outcome Three, and the extent to which the intervention delivered lasting, dignified livelihood opportunities for those women, either as heads of households, or as secondary earners.

20. Does the project, especially post-redesign, have the potential to extend knowledge across the Arab region and other countries putting Jordan in a leading position and how can this be maximised during its implementation?

There is significant potential for this to occur. The Transform training package on social protection, currently in use in 40 countries, has been translated into Arabic for the first time for this programme, and this resource can now be used in support of social protection programmes across the MENA region.

The introduction of the statistical bulletin has led to a more data-driven and transparent approach to data publication, and more evidence-led thinking, and this should be fostered and encouraged. The statistical bulletin, and the successful integration of the ISU within MoSD are also good examples of the replicable impact of the programme. Furthermore, the ISU case study has been presented to the Lebanese MoSD as an example of how an NSPS can be implemented, in a manner which could be replicated in Lebanon. The development of a shock responsive social protection component and integrating it into the updated NSPS will make Jordan a leading example in the region.

There is scope for this data-driven and transparent approach to act as a case study for the region, around how evidence-led social protection programming can be rolled out in other countries in the MENA region. This idea that the programme can be seen as a regional trailblazer is further solidified by the fact that, in order for it to be delivered to Ministry focal points, the UN Transform training package has been translated into Arabic. This investment has created a resource which can be delivered in other Arabic-speaking countries, and this investment typifies the potential long-term and sustained impact which this programme can have at both a local and regional level.

It is important for programme staff and stakeholders to consider how the knowledge delivered through the training package can be institutionalised, as opposed to being held by only those who have received the training. To do so would mitigate the risks that the impact of the training would be lost if participants were to subsequently change roles or leave the Ministries. Therefore, a ToT approach could be beneficial, wherein training could be packaged and provided to Ministry staff internally, and on a periodic basis, without the need for continued Agency involvement. This has already been trialled under Outcome 1, where ToT activities for Master Trainers were conducted in Q4 of 2022.

21. How can the proposed or envisioned impacts of the project post-redesign be measured, especially with regard to female beneficiaries, and how can they be amplified in future phases?

The overall impact of each outcome can be measured through a number of methods. For Outcomes One and Two, the institutionalisation and continued operation of the ISU post-completion of the programme is a key indicator of impact, as would be renewal or updating of the NSPS, and continued publication of statistical bulletins. Continued use, or wider rollout of the Transform training programme can also deliver tangible impact both in Jordan and on a regional level. For Outcome Three, its impact can be defined by the overall number of participants who transitioned from cash assistance to employment, and the longevity of their tenure in employment.

The impact of the programme, specifically in related to female beneficiaries can be measured, through both the number of female graduates under Outcome Three, and the extent to which the intervention delivered lasting, dignified livelihood opportunities for those women, either as heads of households, or as secondary earners. If the programme has empowered women to move away from cash assistance, supported them in developing their skillsets, and matched them with viable job opportunities which lead to sustainable and dignified employment, then the impact of the programme can be considered a success.

Due to implementation delays, and the restructure as part of the no-cost extension, it is too early to determine how many female participants will benefit from this programme, however this should become clear as the restructured programme resumes implementation.

The impact itself will first be felt at the outreach phase, and the use of female outreach officers who are known and trusted in the community was essential, as they provided reassurance to both participants and their families, and provided awareness session which addressed cultural concerns, helping improve access to the programme for women, and thus delivering impact not just on the direct participants, but also on the wider community. Addressing these challenges will be key to maximising the impact of the programme for females.

Specific gender mainstreaming benefits were noted by other partners, whose support will be required to further amplify these benefits in future phases. SSC emphasised that they see the organisation as a pioneer for gender inclusion, and their programmes were designed to target female participants, especially mothers. As such, they chose to engage in programmes which supported this ambition. Furthermore, UNICEF reported that they engaged with both SSC and NAF, seeking to ensure the prioritisation of women when setting out vulnerability criteria, ensuring an adequate weighting for female applicants. They also lobbied NAF to ensure that transfers of funds could be made to women as well as men, to help deliver financial autonomy. Efforts such as this, which help shift both perceptions and narrative, have the potential to amplify the impact of the programme itself, and leave a lasting impact in the communities in which it works.

22. How will the project contribute to social cohesion in the communities between Jordanians and Syrians post-completion, particularly in relation to gender mainstreaming and in relation to specific implementation locations?

The programme has potential to contribute to social cohesion through empowering both Jordanians and Syrians to graduate from cash assistance to work, and through providing stronger social protection infrastructure. For the former to occur, the programme must take steps to provide prospective refugee participants with reassurance that they will not lose cash assistance if they participate in the programme, as this is a major barrier to engagement.

Some immediate positive impacts around Outcome 3 are evident, in that the programme has already contributed to the building of experience and capacity for GFJTU staff, who reported that, whilst *'impact is hard to measure since there are no results on the ground at this stage, data gathered on geographical skillsets of interviewees is promising'*. Viewed through the lens of data collection and disaggregation, the programme can equip stakeholders with a more holistic and complete perspective of both geographic need, and associated opportunities for trained individuals.

Further alignment with national strategies can further increase the impact of this component of the programme. Specifically, aligning the training and job opportunities provided with key growth sectors identified in the EMV. This would ensure that the programme component accords even further with core national priorities, and also further serves participants by aligning the training they receive with the key growth sectors set out in the Vision, futureproofing their employment prospects, and enabling them to access well-paid, skilled labour.

The situation around Syrian refugees is more complex. The prevalence of closed sectors will inevitably result in an outcomes gap when compared to Jordanians, due to reduced opportunities, and limitations on the areas in which they work. Even in open sectors, they needed to get work permits, compete against Jordanians, face exploitation, and risk working below the minimum wage. These structural issues were challenges for the ILO, and whilst UNICEF provided training in these areas, there was a perception that the onus was on ILO to tackle these barriers. This was echoed by technical specialists who felt that, given the baseline for Syrian refugees was far lower than that of Jordanians, the programme was far less likely to help refugees reach a point of financial security at the required pace, which is likely to result in worse overall outcomes for Syrians when compared to Jordanians.

23. How has the support of UNICEF to date managed to pave the way towards more inclusion of non-Jordanians, and for females in particular, within the national social protection system? Can the project contribute to the economic self-reliance of refugees and vulnerable local population in Jordan?

Despite the programme having yet to conclude, the impact of work contributed under Outcome One is already evident, and the work undertaken by UNICEF related to the shock-responsive protection deliverable, as well as the social protection public expenditure review both have the potential to improve access to social protection for non-Jordanians, as well as for women.

On the work done by the programme more widely, stakeholders reported that the introduction of the ISU, and its institutionalisation within the Office of the Secretary General at MoSD²⁴ has led to significant strengthening of the ability of the Ministry and stakeholders to deliver on the NSPS, and in doing so, improve inclusion within the

²⁴ Note: During the validation workshop for this evaluation, it was reported that in the period of time since the evaluation was drafted, the ISU had been moved from the Office of the Secretary General, and is now housed under the Policy Directorate. This has led to fears that its role and impact could be diminished. Whilst this took place outside of the time period stated for this evaluation, it is important that this development, and the associated concern, is noted.

national social protection system. Representatives of both MoSD and MoPIC confirmed the importance of this move, emphasising that the programme has played a significant role in establishing a credible unit within MoSD, which can follow up on the NSPS and provide relevant teams with training, technology, and M&E tools, all of which can be leveraged in support of these ambitions, and can create a lasting impact in this space.

With the update of the NSPS Jordan will become the only country in the region to have developed and updated an NSPS in the last six years, and furthermore, the ISU case study has been presented to the Lebanese MoSD as an example of how an NSPS can be implemented, in a manner which could be replicated in Lebanon. The development of a shock responsive social protection component and integrating it into the updated NSPS can also make Jordan a leading example in the region. This is a key example of how the work done by this programme, with input from UNICEF, can create a tangible and lasting impact, both in Jordan, and in the wider region.

7.6. SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability seeks to critically assess the extent to which adequate capacity building of social partners has taken place or been planned, to ensure mechanisms are in place to sustain activities beyond the conclusion of the programme, and whether the existing results are likely to be maintained beyond programme completion.

Main Findings

28. Work around the NSPS is likely to be sustainable, as Ministry support, and effective training measures, have been put in place. MoSD has already institutionalised the ISU by placing it within the Office of the Secretary General, and this, coupled with moves to update the NSPS to run until 2030, stand the programme in good stead in this regard.
29. The training package for Ministry staff can be of considerable long-term value, but it is essential to ensure that the knowledge and learning it imparts are institutionalised effectively.
30. The statistical bulletin is already providing gender-disaggregated data on gender which is useful reference material for both policy-makers and implementing partners.
31. The exit strategy related to the graduation component remains immature, but steps are being taken, and ILO has recently formalized an Implementation Agreement with NAF, aimed at providing training and employment opportunities for NAF beneficiaries.

24. Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable- in terms of the social protection sector in Jordan?

Work around the NSPS is likely to be sustainable, as Ministry support, and effective training measures, have been put in place. Stakeholders including Ministries are cognisant of the benefits of the ISU and other interventions, and are committed to supporting them.

Given the policy-focused nature of this outcome, it is important to ensure that the work done remains aligned with the priorities of the EU Madad Fund, specifically related to refugee response, and that this remains distinct from the improvement of systems at an overall level, without targeted approaches. Whilst the programme philosophy that system strengthening and improvements have an indirect positive impact on all users, including refugees, a more specific package of interventions would be meritorious.

25. To what extent has the project prepared a sustainable exit strategy to depart from donor-supported cash assistance for Syrian refugees?

The exit strategy related to the graduation component remains immature, and the restructure, with the revised approach to the entire graduation approach, has made evaluating the sustainability of this element challenging. Sustainability through the lens of the participants can be quantified through the skills they gain and the jobs they engage in, and incentives to ensure job retention can help in this regard, but the model itself remains dependent on donor funding in order to be continued.

The programme has successfully considered sustainability through the lens of how institutions, capacity, and training can become sustainable resources, however, as with several donor-driven programmes, sustainability depends in large part on the extent to which future funding arrangements can be secured for the continuation of the graduation model, to support future cohorts through the process. Across all three outcomes, this need to

deliver future funding to enable the activities and benefits instigated by the programme to continue post-completion. These challenges, and the specific areas where future funding is required are outlined below.

Sustainability concerns were echoed by both technical and field staff, stakeholders, and the donor, all of whom felt that longevity issues were apparent. From the donor perspective, lasting impact and sustainable programmes were a priority, but one which had not been addressed by Agency or Ministry staff, a theme which is explored at length in this section.

26/27. How will the implemented work be institutionalized and used by the government institutions to enhance future work on SP? Will the implementing partners be able to retain the work after the end of the project?

MoSD has already institutionalised the ISU by placing it within the Office of the Secretary General²⁵, and this, coupled with moves to update the NSPS to run until 2030, stand the programme in good stead in this regard. Continued relevance must be ensured by further aligning NSPS to the EMV and other national strategies.

This can begin with ensuring that the NSPS is updated to ensure continued alignment with the EMV and other critical national strategies, as to do so will ensure its continued relevance, and allow for further integration of social protection and labour markets, aligning with both the theory of change for this programme, and the strategic priorities of the government.

There is also a need to secure the sustainability of the ISU, and secure the funding for staff retention in the ISU post-completion of the programme, to allow this unit to continue to function, and support the implementation and updating of the NSPS. This will require a commitment from the Ministry to take on these costs, or the involvement of the EU or other donors to provide future funding.

This continues to be a major challenge for the programme, as future funding for the ISU, as well as the statistical bulletin, will be required to ensure continued support for the NSPS. Steps have been taken to institutionalise the ISU within MoSD, but a commitment to future funding is required to ensure its sustainability. Staff and stakeholders also expressed significant sustainability concerns around other programme outcomes, as set out below.

Leaving behind these tools, systems, and capacities within MoSD will allow the Ministry to continue to convene the NSPS, acting as a strategic successor to the programme, and this sense of ownership will be key to the longevity of the strategy.

28. What measures have been taken to ensure that the key components of the project are sustainable beyond the life of the project? Are they sufficient?

The programme presents tangible opportunities to deliver a sustained impact, most notably through the training, but as with Outcome One, the longevity of these interventions depends on whether elements such as training and technical support can be continued post-completion, and who can meet that requirement, as well as how the knowledge imparted, and structures built can be retained.

The training package for Ministry staff can be of considerable long-term value, but it is essential to ensure that the knowledge and learning it imparts are institutionalised effectively, creating institutional knowledge which can survive in the event that trained staff move on from the ministries.

For Outcome Two, potential alignment with the complimentary Estidama+ programme is a major sustainability factor, as the fund now received money from three international partners. SSC anchored and housed the programme, and they were in conversation around the future funding they could put into the scheme.

The background work and analysis that the Madad programme contributed also provided sustainability to the wider agenda. The programme had opened dialogue for new policy discussion around the links between social protection and insurance. If SSC and NAF can be brought together to discuss better linkages between the systems, this would be a real triumph for the programme and its sustainability.

²⁵ Note: During the validation workshop for this evaluation, it was reported that in the period of time since the evaluation was drafted, the ISU had been moved from the Office of the Secretary General, and is now housed under the Policy Directorate. This has led to fears that its role and impact could be diminished. Whilst this took place outside of the time period stated for this evaluation, it is important that this development, and the associated concern, is noted.

I. What steps can be taken to ensure that the collection and publication of data mainstreamed gender is consistent, and how can it support policy-making and knowledge retention post-project completion?

The statistical bulletin is already providing gender-disaggregated data on gender which is useful reference material for both policy-makers and implementing partners, and this can be supported through ensuring continued funding and support for the ISU, and the agreement of a consistent template for publication, currently under discussion, which will limit human error, deliver more consistent reporting of key data and metrics, and ensure a continued focus on gender throughout future data reporting.

J/K. To what extent has the project contributed to shift perceptions around graduation? To what extent is it likely that the model and the benefits will continue post-completion of this programme

Outcome Three presents a significant sustainability challenge, in so far as the graduation framework remains dependent on Madad funding, and without a commitment to future funding, this delivery framework is hard to futureproof. This lack of financial sustainability is causing concern amongst counsellors, who fear that the programme and its benefits may dissipate without a commitment to future funding to guarantee its longevity.

Sustainability can be measured through the lens of the future prospects of the programme participants, as the skills and training they will receive if the programme is implemented as planned will stand them in better stead for securing decent and dignified work in future. Even this remains reliant on a degree of future support, and counsellors believe that an additional twelve months of counselling, coupled with incentives for remaining in employment, are required to ensure that the transition from cash assistance to work is sustained.

These financial challenges are, in some ways, already taking effect prior to the completion of the programme, as counsellors are currently working on lump-sum contracts which are due to end in September 2023. This has created additional uncertainty and lowered morale levels due to a lack of job security.

In response to the challenge, ILO has recently formalized an Implementation Agreement with NAF, aimed at providing training and employment opportunities for NAF beneficiaries. This strategic approach is designed to support NAF in developing internal capacity, allowing them to independently manage, supervise, and implement the graduation approach in the future.

In addition to this, ILO is planning to organise a workshop focused on adapting the graduation methodology to the Jordanian context and addressing sustainability challenges. Staff have also presented MoSD and NAF with proposals for the use of a graduation mobile application, which could serve as a powerful tool for ensuring the programme's sustainability. Whilst still in early stages, and requiring a feasibility study, this is one step which could support future programme sustainability.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Herein we list the conclusions of this evaluation, considering the six OECD-DAC criteria, as well as the crosscutting themes, and how they relate to the three programme Outcomes.

Relevance

It can be concluded that, across all three programme Outcomes, a high degree of relevance is noted, in that activities and outputs align strongly with ILO and UNICEF country strategies, programmes, and priorities. Programme activities and outputs align strongly with ILO and UNICEF country strategies, including the ILO Decent Work Programme, and the UNICEF Country Programme Outcomes. The programme also accords with the UN SDGs 1, 5, 8, and 10.

A strong degree of relevance is noted at government level, with the programme aligning with major national strategies, although the introduction of new strategies, such as the Economic Modernisation Vision, necessitates the updating of the NSPS to ensure continued alignment.

Programme activities have the support of tripartite stakeholders, including the relevant Ministries (MoSD, MoPIC, MoL), agencies (NAF, SSC), as well as partners such as GFJTU, as evidenced through review of programme documents and interviews with relevant stakeholders.

The programme also has the support of the donor, albeit the relevance of the programme as it relates to the Madad Fund's focus on Syrian refugee response, has been diminished slightly through the deletion of Outcome 2.1.

The importance of gender mainstreaming was noted, however a gender-specific approach was not incorporated into the programme's Theory of Change or central to its activities. Gender relevance and outcomes beneficial to gender mainstreaming were noted, though these were not necessarily targeted by design.

Coherence

The programme is compatible with other interventions in Jordan, with specific linkages noted with the ILO and UNICEF Country strategies, as well as global policies and ambitions, including the UNSDGs. There is also a strong degree of coherence and compatibility against national government strategies, including the EMV,

There is a strong degree of linkage between ILO and UNICEF, with clear divisions of roles and responsibilities, complimentary approaches, and regular communication. There is, however, a lack of coherence between the three programme Outcomes, as staff and stakeholder reported not being fully aware of activities outside of their own scope of work. Communication between project staff and regional teams has been effective, but regional staff also reported not being fully aware of project activities outside of those in which they have direct involvement. This can be addressed to ensure a more collaborative and collegiate environment which more effectively captures linkages between different programme activities.

The multitude of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the NSPS, with over 21 institutions involved, leads to coherence and efficiency challenges, and has resulted in delays to programme activities. The introduction of the two new Steering Committees has helped to address these coherence challenges and resulted in a more streamlined approach to programme management and implementation.

Specific coherence challenges were noted around Outcome 3. Career counsellors were not fully engaged or consulted during the programme restructure, and this has led to disenfranchisement amongst the team, compounded by concerns around a lack of long-term job security. Similarly, the delays in agreeing a new contract with NAF have left them feeling as though their credibility with participants has been adversely affected.

Effectiveness

Programme activities have directly contributed to strengthened institutions and improved capacity, providing direct support for the implementation of the NSPS, as well as other useful tools such as Transform training and the shock responsive social protection component. The strong degree of effectiveness is exemplified by the implementation and 42standardized42ization of the ISU within the MoSD. Its success has been recognised by both programme staff, and Ministry stakeholders, who reported that the unit has delivered significantly improved technical capacity, better coordination, and new 42standardized processes. The level of success witnessed under Outcome One can also be evidenced by the fact that only very modest changes in scope for this outcome were proposed in the no-cost extension.

The Transform training package, translated and adapted into Arabic, can deliver real benefit to Ministry staff, and can also now be rolled out in other countries in the region. The publication of the statistical bulletin, as well as high levels of Ministry engagement also point to success in this area.

Outcome 3 had clearly not been effective to date, which has resulted in a significant restructuring. Having learned lessons around the need to provide assurance around income security, to stop people losing cash assistance whilst going through training, and to break the cycle of informal work, programme adjustments were put forward to address these concerns. The shift to on-the-job training, coupled with an incentive package, and closer working with GFJTU should result in a more effective programme which delivers outcomes for participants. The effectiveness of Outcome Three in its revised form cannot be fully assessed for effectiveness, as the component has undergone a major redesign as part of the no-cost extension, the results of which cannot yet be seen.

A coherent and technically sound approach to gender mainstreaming is lacking, with interviewees from both Agencies and stakeholders commenting that the programme was not designed to be gender-centric, with a more holistic approach being adopted. The approach of implementing sound and robust structures and processes for the benefit of all citizens, and by extension, females and those of refugee status, is valid, however this does not meet the gender-specific criteria on which this programme was designed, and more must be done to deliver tangible outcomes for women in particular.

The continued effectiveness of the programme from the perspective of its impact on Syrian refugees, has been diminished by the deletion of Outcome 2.1, though this is partially mitigated by successes in other areas.

Similarly, the deletion of Outcome 2.1, related to work permits for Syrian refugees, has created a gap between programme outputs, and the brief of the donor whose focus is on Syrian refugee relief. This gap must subsequently be addressed through programmatic adjustments. Outcome 3 presents a more tangible gender target through aiming for 50% female participants in the graduation process, although it is too early to tell whether this target can be met in light of the restructuring.

Efficiency

A programme with a budget of over EUR 14million, across three distinct Outcomes has the potential to face a number of efficiency challenges, though this risk was acknowledged and accepted by Agencies and the donor. A major efficiency concern centres on the siloing of programme Outcomes, which as addressed under coherence, is impacting levels of collegiate working. This is specifically attributable to Outcome 3, which centres on implementation over policy. The introduction of the steering committees goes some way towards addressing this challenge, but more must be done to connect the programme internally as well as externally.

Programme resources have been effectively utilized, and coordination between ILO and UNICEF has been efficient, however a major efficiency concern centres on the siloing of Outcomes, which as addressed under coherence, is impacting levels of collegiate working, although this has been mitigated through the establishment of the steering committees.

Programme monitoring and reporting is consistent, with Annual and Quarterly Reports, a log frame, work plans, and budgets clearly defined and able to be tracked.

External challenges, such as uncertainty around the potential deletion of the Ministry of Labour, staff churn and uncertainty around the no-cost extension all contributed to efficiency challenges. Delays in filling posts, both internally, and such as that of the communication officer at ISU, have created work backlogs and led to further efficiency challenges.

External uncertainty, staff churn and uncertainty around the no-cost extension all contributed to efficiency challenges. This challenging interplay between Ministries and implementing agencies has also impacted Outcomes One and Two to some extent. The establishment and functionality of the Steering Committee will be helpful in surmounting these challenges. The engagement of GTFU has somewhat improved the efficiency of the programme by providing a needed layer of hierarchical support and direction to field staff.

On Outcome 3, the resource efficiency and distribution has been somewhat efficient, however it was reported by both ISU staff, and stakeholders including NAF, that levels of bureaucracy and complicated procedures for low-cost expenditures have slowed down implementation. Additionally, micro-management and a lack of responsiveness to questions and concerns from field staff have further impacted efficiency levels. Furthermore, field staff and counselors have not had their time or skills sufficiently utilized or invested and they themselves are asking for more involvement and additional layers of tasks within the programme.

The reduction in participation targets for Outcome 3 as part of the no-cost extension has also raised additional questions at a donor level around value for money, insofar as with participant numbers falling, and costs remaining the same, the net cost per participant has increased dramatically. Programme staff would note in response that the current cost per beneficiary of USD 1,500 remains lower than the costs associated with the similar RYSE programme, which stand at approximately USD 10,000. The cost per beneficiary remains similar to

that of the National Employment Programme, delivered by the Ministry of Labour and financed by the World Bank.²⁶

Impact

The programme has the potential to deliver a significant positive impact in Jordan through the effective implementation of the NSPS, which will have direct benefits at both a nationwide level, and a gender-specific level.

Despite the programme having yet to conclude, the impact of work contributed under Outcome One is already beginning to show with stakeholders clear in stating that the introduction of the ISU has led to significant capacity improvement and has made the Ministry and stakeholders better able to deliver on the NSPS.

The introduction of the data dashboard and statistical bulletin has brought about a more data-driven and transparent approach to data publication, and more evidence-led decision-making. There is scope for this data-driven and transparent approach to act as a case study for the region, which would further broaden the impact of the Madad programme.

With the update of the NSPS Jordan will become the only country in the region to have developed and updated an NSPS in the last six years, and furthermore, the ISU case study has been presented to the Lebanese MoSD as an example of how an NSPS can be implemented. This is a key example of how the work done by this programme, with input from UNICEF, can create a tangible and lasting impact, both in Jordan, and in the wider region.

The UN Transform training package which has been translated into Arabic can be seen as an investment in a resource which can be rolled-out in other parts of the region and would demonstrate a long-term and sustained impact both within and outside of Jordan.

The impact of Outcome Three can be measured, through both the number of female graduates under Outcome Three, and the extent to which the intervention delivered lasting, dignified livelihood opportunities for those women, either as heads of households, or as secondary earners.

If the programme has empowered women to move away from cash assistance, supported them in developing their skillsets, and matched them with viable job opportunities which lead to sustainable and dignified employment, then the impact of the programme can be considered a success.

Sustainability

The programme has considered the sustainability challenge through the lens of how institutions, capacity, and training can become sustainable resources, but the extent to which this can be realized is dependent on future funding arrangements. These sustainability concerns are understood and were echoed by Agency staff, stakeholders, and Ministry representatives, as well as the donor.

Whilst the programme is well aligned to national priorities, the national policy landscape continues to evolve, and new strategies, including the EMV, have been adopted in the period since this programme commenced. As such, sustainability will also depend on the extent to which both the programme and its outputs, notably the NSPS, continue to remain aligned to new and emerging government strategies. This, coupled with further institutionalisation of the ISU and a Ministerial or donor-led funding commitment to retain the team, will help secure the sustainability of this work strand.

The process of delivering statistical bulletins within the Ministry has helped to deliver data clarity and transparency, but concerns persist that knowledge imparted through the Transform training could be lost if training recipients left the Ministries, and this could be allayed through adopting a ToT approach to retain institutional knowledge.

The graduation framework remains dependent on Madad funding, and without a commitment to future funding, this delivery framework is hard to futureproof. Funds will be required to cover staff costs of career counsellors, and field staff, and these will need to be met to ensure continued engagement and ongoing support for

²⁶ Figures provided by ILO and UNICEF project staff in written feedback.

participants, as well as the establishment of a sustainable framework to support future cohorts through a similar scheme.

Cross-cutting issues

On **gender**, whilst the programme presents a clear gender-based objective in programme documents, this has not been fully realised in its activities. Whilst Outcomes One and Two centre on policy responses, implementing the NSPS, and providing technically sound data and training, these are assets of general benefit, as opposed to gender-specific targeted interventions. Data has been disaggregated, but the programme, especially post-restructure, centres around the theory that sound and robust practices, processes, and policies, will deliver benefit for all citizens, including women.

Alongside these activities, the delivery of a social protection public expenditure review, which is equity-based and addresses gender concerns, the MoSD M&E framework which disaggregates data to reflect the impact on women and girls, and the shock-responsive social protection component, with a specific brief on gender-responsive social protection, demonstrate more gender-focused outcomes with the potential to deliver a tangible impact.

Whilst this concept has merit, more targeted, gender-specific approaches are needed to deliver tangible impact in this area, and building on ongoing work around engaging employers to deliver more female-friendly and gender-accessible working environments, providing support with childcare and transportation, and tackling societal barriers is a good starting point. Ongoing work with NAF around ensuring women are prioritised in assistance programmes is also meritorious, but must be followed through.

Outcome Three can in theory deliver a more substantive, gender focused, interventions by meetings its targets around participant gender ratios. Given the programme has undergone a substantial restructure, it is far too early to determine whether this can or will be achieved, but the programme team must ensure a continued focus on ensuring women are mainstreamed throughout the process.

On **tripartite issues**, the programme involves a multitude of stakeholders, with 21 institutions involved in delivering the NSPS, and several others involved in Outcomes Two and Three, including NAF, SSC, GFJTU, employers and others. Three Ministries also play prominent roles in programme implementation.

Challenges were noted around engagement with stakeholders, and delays arising from both internal and external factors, however the introduction of the Higher Coordinating Committee, as well as the Madad Programme Steering Committee, have helped to streamline this approach. Further work should be implemented to institutionalise these bodies for the remainder of programme, and the focus should centre on tackling sustainability challenges and ensuring future funding for both the ISU, and the graduation component.

On **International Labour Standards**, the programme's focus on delivering structural and systemic improvements to social protection and social insurance under Outcomes One and Two, alongside with its efforts to transition people from cash assistance into decent work means that the programme design aligns with ILO mandates and priorities around labour standards at both an in-country and regional level.

On **environmental sustainability**, this has not been considered as a major factor in this programme, and is not the focus on programme activities or outputs, and therefore has not been a consideration in this evaluation.

On **capacity development**, this has been integral to the success under Outcomes One, where the introduction of the ISU, coupled with improved data publishing and reporting frameworks, has led to a significant uplift in the Ministry of Social Development's capacity to address social protection issues. The ISU has also had a positive impact on the wider stakeholder network, and the ability of partners to implement the NSPS.

The training through the Transform programme has also delivered an uplift in awareness and skills at a Ministry level, and especially for key focal points, and this knowledge must be retained and institutionalised through the recommendations set out below.

A capacity dividend has also been reported by GFJTU who have found the data gathered through beneficiary profiling under Outcome Three to be useful from both a geographical and a sectoral perspective, helping inform their approaches to other programmes. The skills developed by career counsellors who are now working under GFJTU has also been noted.

On **refugee response**, to align with donor requirements and to compensate for the deletion of Outcome 2.1 related to work permits, a more concerted and coordinated focus on refugee response is essential, starting with providing much needed reassurance that refugees who participate in the activities of Outcome 3 will not risk losing cash assistance. Closer working with UNHCR, which has now begun to take place, can help ensure that the challenges faced by this programme outcome to date are mitigated.

9. LESSONS LEARNED AND EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES

This is a multifaceted programme with three distinct Outcomes, which has undergone structural changes as part of the no-cost extension. Throughout the evaluation, a series of key lessons have emerged, which are documented below.

1. The programme so far has previously been impacted by a **lack of effective, consistent, and structured communication** between implementing partners and tripartite constituents. This was due to a number of factors, including the presence of over 20 stakeholders all involved in the implementation of the NSPS, external factors such as uncertainty around the future of the Ministry of Labour, and challenges related to staff recruitment and retention. A coherent internal communication strategy was not embedded in the programme from the outset, which compounded these challenges. The team has reacted accordingly, and the introduction of the two steering committees has largely addressed this shortcoming. The lesson learned is that **communications structures between programme partners should be introduced at the outset of a programme of this size and scale.** (Linked to findings 19, 20, and 21).
2. **The outcomes initially put in place for this programme were overly ambitious in places**, and this has resulted in the need for the no-cost extension. On reflection, the programme set a target for the number of participants in the graduation component which was going to be challenging to reach, even in favourable circumstances, and the impact of delays, and the need to restructure the approach, necessitated a reduction in the total number of beneficiaries. The lesson to be learned is to ensure that outcomes are manageable and evaluable, and that staffing and resourcing capacity is aligned to expectations. (Linked to finding 12).
3. Working with vulnerable members of society requires **higher levels of consideration in terms of respect for financial, physical and psychological limitations.** Asking people to come long distances to fill out a profile that they believe will lead to some financial benefit then disappearing for many months or even years adds unnecessarily to their vulnerability and stress. Working with populations that have limited education and who suffer from stress and trauma related to poverty and war requires **a level of communication and transparency that is nuanced and specific to their needs and abilities.** While the counsellors did their best to communicate, the design of the programmes and delays within it, coupled with a lack of relevant communication tools that explain the opportunity to participants, have alienated potential graduates. (Linked to findings 17 and 18).
4. Whilst the programme did consider gender from the outset, and in the design of the programme, **specific programme outcomes still lack a distinct focus on gender-centric interventions**, and whilst some distinct outputs are gender-disaggregated, a key lesson is that, when designing programmes with a gender focus, **key outputs must be designed with a gender-driven outcome in mind.** Whilst it is understood that this programme was not conceived or initially designed as a gender project, it is important to ensure that the design of ILO projects nevertheless represents a connection to the key crosscutting issues which it advocates, and which have been considered during this evaluation. To do so will improve both the impact of the programme, and its evaluability within the ILO Evaluation Guidelines. (Linked to finding 8).

The programme did also present a significant number of significant good practices which emerged from both the initial design, and the revisions. These include:

1. An impressive level of **alignment with both ILO and UNICEF country programmes and ambitions**, as well as with major national government strategies, was identified, and this creates strong delivery foundations. For a programme of this size and scope, with a budget of over USD 15 million, ensuring a clear division of responsibilities, with strong overall coordination is key, and this has been well demonstrated throughout its implementation. (Linked to findings 1 and 2).
2. The introduction of **much needed technical capacity at a ministry level** through the ISU is commendable, and the prospect of further institutionalising this expertise is key to ensuring that the NSPS can be implemented effectively, revised and extended as required, and continue to remain aligned with key national priorities. It also plays an important role in providing stakeholders and implementing agencies with technical support to ensure the NSPS is enacted effectively. (Linked to findings 14 and 15).
3. **Translating and rolling-out UN Transform training in Arabic for the first time** has created a valuable resource which can be replicated and deployed in other countries in the region. This represents not only a tangible impact and sustainability dividend for the programme, but also key good practice in terms of setting

regional precedents, and developing and localising an important tool which can be replicated in other Arabic-speaking countries (Linked to finding 23).

Full case studies outlining the most important lessons learned, and good practices are provided in Annex 11.5 of this report.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions listed above, the following chapter presents the key recommendations of this mid-term evaluation, for the benefit of ILO and UNICEF, as well as for technical and implementing partners. Recommendations are categorised by priority, resource intensity, and timing, with short-term recommendations actionable immediately, mid-term recommendations actionable within a one-year implementation period, and long-term recommendations requiring adjustments to programme operations, and subsequently expected to take longer to implement, up to two years before the conclusion of the programme.

Recommendation 1: Ensure that the National Social Protection Strategy is updated to align with national strategic priorities. (Linked to finding 1).

- Extend the period of the NSPS until 2030,
- Ensure it aligns with the Economic Modernisation Vision
- Ensure that training and job opportunities provided under Outcome 3 accord with the key priority growth areas set out in the EMV
- Ensure that the impact on females at both a policy and implementation level accords with the gender ambitions in the EMV.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management Implementation Support Unit | High | Medium | Mid-term |

Recommendation 2: Ensure a more proactive and clarified focus on gender mainstreaming across all three outcomes, utilising the in-house capacity of ILO staff working on gender, as well as UNICEF resources, to critically assess and plan the gender impact of programme activities.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management | High | Low | Long-term |

Coherence

Recommendation 3: Improve and enhance cooperation and collaboration between ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR, donor, and Ministries through further strengthening and empowering the Higher Coordination Committee, and the MADAD Steering Committee, by ensuring regular meetings, coordinated follow-up actions, and clear division of roles, and maintaining a focus on gender-specific outcomes.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|---|----------|----------|------------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management Implementation Support Unit Tripartite Constituents | High | Low | Short-term |

Recommendation 4: Work more closely with the EU Madad Fund team to ensure the donor is adequately represented in programme activities, and that visibility is increased.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management Donor | Medium | Low | Long-term |

Effectiveness

Recommendation 5: Provide essential clarity to potential participants in Outcome 3, to ensure that fears around loss of cash assistance are allayed, through production of written materials and amendments to the content awareness sessions, with a specific focus on clarity for female participants. (Linked to findings 13, 17, and 18).

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|---|----------|----------|------------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management Field staff Tripartite Constituents | High | Low | Short-term |

Recommendation 6: Deliver iterative improvements to the graduation framework in light of key findings. (Linked to findings 18 and 21).

- Engage counselors on the ground more fully in the process of identifying job opportunities and matching them with potential graduates
- Conduct a geographically based study utilizing data gathered in the profiling stage to deepen understanding of educational levels and available skillsets.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|--|----------|----------|------------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management Tripartite Constituents | High | High | Short-term |

Recommendation 7: Develop a clearer and more transparent process when engaging potential graduates, with higher levels of clarity, remove the home-based project option from the profiling questionnaire, and ensure steps are taken to provide female participants with reassurance and awareness of the additional support they can be afforded, such as transport and childcare.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|---|----------|----------|------------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management | High | Low | Short-term |

Efficiency

Recommendation 8: Deliver improvements to the Graduation Tracking System, and the data dashboard, to ensure further disaggregation of data by gender and refugee status, to enable more adequate monitoring.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management Tripartite Constituents | Medium | High | Mid-term |

Impact

Recommendation 9: Institutionalise knowledge imparted through Transform training, to ensure knowledge is retained within Ministries, through standardised and consistent training of trainers, and consider how the Transform training package, now translated and adapted into Arabic, can be deployed in other countries in the region, to amplify the long-term impact of the programme.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| Implementation Support Unit Tripartite Constituents | High | Low | Mid-term |

Sustainability

Recommendation 10: Take appropriate action to further institutionalise and ensure the sustainability of the Implementation Support Unit within the Ministry of Social Development, by agreeing future funding arrangements to secure its longevity.

| Addressed to | Priority | Resource | Timing |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|
| ILO Project Management UNICEF Project Management Implementation Support Unit Tripartite Constituents | High | High | Long-term |

11. APPENDICES

11.1. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACAPS. 2023. *Country Analysis Jordan*. [Available at: <https://www.acaps.org/en/countries/jordan>].
- Government of Jordan. 2022. *Economic Modernisation Vision*. Amman: GOJ.
- International Labour Organisation. 2018. *Decent Work Country Programme: The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, 2018-22*. Geneva: ILO.
- International Labour Organisation. 2020. *Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2020-21*. Geneva: ILO.
- International Labour Organisation. 2017. *ILO Evaluation Policy*. Geneva: ILO.
- UN Women. 'Jordan pledges to align national laws with international commitments and expand support to women and girls'. *UN Women Website*. [Available at: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/get-involved/step-it-up/commitments/jordan>].
- UNHCR. 2023. *UNHCR in Jordan*. [Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/jo/who-we-are#:~:text=Syria's%20ongoing%20war%2C%20with%206.6,registered%20with%20UNHCR%20in%20Jordan*].
- UNHCR. 2022. 'Jordan issues record number of work permits to Syrian refugees'. *UNHCR Website*. [Available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/uk/news/news-releases/jordan-issues-record-number-work-permits-syrian-refugees>].
- UNICEF. 2023. 'Social Protection', *UNICEF Website*. [Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/social-policy/social-protection>]
- UNICEF. 2019. *Country Programme Document, Jordan*. Amman: UNICEF.
- UNICEF. 2019. *UNICEF's Global Social Protection Programme Framework*. New York: UNICEF.
- UNICEF. 2018. *Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF*. New York: UNICEF.
- United Nations Jordan. 2023. *The United Nations' Cooperation Framework in Jordan 2023-27: Results framework at outcome level and outcome descriptions*. Amman: UN Jordan.

In addition to these external sources, the following programme documents were consulted:

- Annual Progress Report
- Programme Inception Report
- Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- Programme Overview entitled: *Graduating from Cash Assistance: The Graduation Framework of the EU MADAD Programme in Jordan*
- Programme Quarterly Information Notes from September 2021 - March 2022
- Programme Work Plans
- Project Factsheet
- Project Results Framework
- Revised Standard Joint Programme Document

11.2.LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

| NAME | ORG | DESIGNATION | EMAIL | INTERVIEW MODE |
|---|-----------------|--|-------|---------------------|
| ILO Staff | | | | |
| Qais Qatamin | ILO | Chief Technical Advisor and ILO Representative in Jordan (Officer in Charge) | | Online interview |
| Markku Malkamaki | ILO | Social Protection Technical Specialist | | |
| Rana Al-Ansari | ILO | National Project Coordinator | | |
| Kishore Singh Kumar | ILO | Senior Skills Specialist | | |
| Khaled Al-Qudah | ILO | National Project officer | | |
| Lina Alkrimeen | ILO | Monitoring and Reporting Officer | | |
| Luca Pellerano | ILO | Social Protection Regional Specialist | | |
| UNICEF Staff | | | | |
| Abdulrehman Al-Baroudi | UNICEF | Youth and Adolescents Development Specialist | | Online interview |
| Sara Rizzo | UNICEF | Adolescent Development Officer | | |
| Shairose Mawji | UNICEF | Head of Programme | | |
| Ministry and Government Agency Representatives | | | | |
| Mays Abdeen | MoSD / ISU | Head Of ISU | | In-person interview |
| Sara Eteibe | | Senior Coordinator | | |
| Katia Mdanat | | M&E Specialist | | |
| Sakher Badareen | MoPIC | Head of Social Studies Unit | | |
| Jannet al-Tayeb | SSC | Director of Research Department | | |
| Mohammed Khreis | SSC | | | |
| Ibraheem Izreqat | NAF | Director of NAF's Training Directorate | | |
| Jameela Abbadi | NAF | Head of the Department of Training and Employment | | |
| Ayman Dabba'a | NAF | | | |
| Malek Maaitah | GFJTU | Planning & Development Lead | | |
| Omar Qadi | GFJTU | Zarqa Office career counsellor | | |
| Donor agency | | | | |
| Ilona de Zamaroczy | | | | |
| Additional Interviewees | | | | |
| Layan El Khatib | Genesis | Consultant | | Online interview |
| Ahmad Khawaldeh | Employment Unit | Consultant | | In-person interview |
| Participants in ILO-UNICEF visioning workshop | | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--|--------------------|
| Abdulrehman Al-Baroudi | UNICEF | | In-person workshop |
| Nayef Al-Khawaldeh | UNICEF | | |
| Maya Hammad | UNICEF | | |
| Sara Rizzo | UNICEF | | |
| Gabrielle Tremblay | UNICEF | | |
| Shatha Al Aqaileh | | | |
| Khaled Al-Qudah | ILO | | |
| Sameh Al-Ajlouni | ILO | | |
| Rana Al-Ansari | ILO | | |
| Qais Qatamin | ILO | | |
| Lina Alkrimeen | ILO | | |
| Rozan Qaqish | ILO | | |

Focus Group Discussions

| LOCATION | ATTENDEES | MALES | FEMALES |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Mafrq | Beneficiaries | 4 | 8 |
| Irbid | Beneficiaries | 4 | 8 |
| GFJTU Premises | Counsellors | 7 | 6 |

11.3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX

To deliver on the requirements of the evaluation, the following evaluation matrix was used. This document includes the questions posed in the ToR, amended where necessary, alongside a series of additional sub-questions included to address cross-cutting themes such as gender, and provide further clarity where needed.

| EVALUATION QUESTIONS | INDICATORS | DATA SOURCES | DATA COLLECTION METHODS | STAKEHOLDERS/ INFORMANTS | ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Relevance | | | | | |
| <p>1. How well did the project approach fit in context of the on-going challenges in Jordan, specifically in relation to UNHCR's work with Syrian refugees in the country? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed, and has the new project design been responsive to these challenges? To what extent was gender mainstreamed?</p> <p>2. To what extent are the project's objectives aligned with the national strategies and priorities, framework of the ILO Decent Work Country Project of Jordan (2018-2022), the ILO's Project and Budget (P&B) 2020-2021, UNICEF's Social Protection framework, UNSDCF (2018-2022) and the SDGs? To what extent did the project's objectives respond to the priorities of the donor (EU) in Jordan, specifically with regard to EU Partnership</p> | <p>Alignment with local and national priorities and needs;</p> <p>Coherence with ILO and UNICEF strategic priorities and implementation frameworks;</p> <p>Evidence of engagement and coordination with UNHCR around aligned approaches to financial support and social protection for Syrian refugees in Jordan.</p> <p>Adherence to SDG targets and indicators</p> <p>Evidence of coherence with Ministerial priorities and programmes;</p> <p>Understanding of, and reflection of, the needs of beneficiaries;</p> <p>Evidence of human rights and gender mainstreaming in the inception and implementation of the project;</p> | <p>Project documents Needs assessment ILO and UNICEF country frameworks Stakeholder perceptions Project staff perceptions Project extension request and proposed revisions</p> | <p>Desk review and analysis of project documents Policy analysis Interviews Focus groups</p> | <p>ILO project team UNICEF project team Ministry of Social Development (ISU) Regional Office for the Arab States Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation GFJTU Donor Beneficiaries Career counsellors</p> | <p>Identification and comparison with ministerial plans and policies, alongside key guiding documents for ILO and UNICEF, with initial hypotheses drawn from the desk review and validated through interviews. Using focus groups with beneficiaries and career counsellors to understand the experience of participants</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Priorities, the EU MIP, and the EU Madad Trust Fund?</p> <p>3. To what extent did the project provide a timely and relevant response to constituents' needs and priorities including those related to the COVID-19 context, and with a focus on gender mainstreaming?</p> <p>4. Are the needs of beneficiaries fully understood and have the revisions to the project, specifically around Outcome Three, been responsive to their needs and the challenges encountered to date?</p> <p>5. Has the situation been properly analysed? Does the project document contain satisfactory immediate objectives / project outcomes, a strategy and a Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?</p> <p>6. What is the extent of logical correlations between the objective, outcomes, and outputs, in relation to the revised project scope put forward as part of the request for extension? Are the set indicators logical with specified baseline and targets? Can data be gender disaggregated? Are monitoring and evaluation</p> | <p>The existence of a detailed needs assessment (primary or secondary evidence-led) conducted by UNICEF, ILO or by funding or implementing partners;</p> <p>Evidence of systematic use of findings from the needs assessment in the design and implementation of the programme;</p> <p>The extent to which beneficiaries and stakeholders were consulted in relation to programme design and activities.</p> <p>Evidence of understanding of EU (donor) priorities, and references to EU Partnership Priorities, MIP, and Madad Trust in project design and revision.</p> <p>A clear understanding of national strategic priorities shown in the proposed project redesign, with reference to linkages and demonstrated efforts to align project activities with these goals.</p> | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| <p>activities adequately planned?</p> <p>7. To what extent has the new project design considered: specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context? As well as concerns relating to inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS, and social dialogue?</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Sub-questions</p> <p>1.a. To what extent do the needs of Syrian refugees differ from those of Jordanians within the context of the NSPS? How were these distinctions considered and addressed through programming?</p> <p>1.b. How have the revisions to the project further aligned its outcomes to major national government strategies which have been announced since its inception, such as the Economic Modernisation Vision?</p> <p>1.c. How can this synergise with a move from cash assistance to employment, and how can project activities ensure a focus on gender mainstreaming?</p> <p>1.d. To what extent the project activities ensure a focus on gender mainstreaming?</p> | <p>Disaggregation of the needs of beneficiaries by gender, and consideration of gender-specific and non discrimination challenges during the design stage;</p> <p>Evidence that the revised project documents and extension request demonstrate awareness of the relevant elements of the EMV, and how the project synergises with these goals.</p> <p>Demonstration of an understanding of the existing service provision landscape;</p> <p>Demonstration that education and awareness activities were delivered in a participatory manner, with engaging, shareable, and understandable content, which was adopted and shared.</p> <p>A clear indication in project documents around how the NSPS is responsive to the needs of women,</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>Evidence of specific focus on gender issues at the inception and implementation phases of the project</p> <p>Evidence of alignment with national priorities, referenced throughout inception and reporting documents</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>1.e. What are the actions taken to ensure that NSPS remains relevant and aligned to national priorities?</p> | <p>and how data related to female engagement and gender parity will be captured and presented.</p> <p>A sustainability plan related to the NSPS to ensure it is updated and aligned, and a clear plan for the future ownership and implementation of the NSPS.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Additional sub-questions related to validity of design</p> <p>1.c. Has the situation been properly analysed? Does the project document contain satisfactory immediate objectives / project outcomes, a strategy or Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?</p> <p>1.d. What is the extent of logical correlations between the objective, outcomes, and outputs? Are the set indicators logical with specified baseline and targets? Can data be gender disaggregated? Are monitoring and evaluation activities adequately planned?</p> <p>1.e. To what extent did the project design consider: specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context? As well as concerns relating to inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS, and social dialogue?</p> | <p>Engagement with relevant ministries and other implementing agencies;</p> <p>Demonstration of an understanding of the existing service provision landscape;</p> <p>Comparison of baselines and targets/KPIs against needs assessment to ensure effective programme design, and evidence of gender mainstreaming. Clear definition of project outcomes and outputs, with effective performance monitoring metrics to ensure delivery against overall targets.</p> <p>Evidence that situational analysis and theory of change were considered within the needs assessment for the project;</p> <p>Internal coordination and interplay between ILO and UNICEF projects and interventions;</p> <p>Demonstration of use of economies of scale to reduce duplication;</p> <p>Evidence that this was considered within the needs assessment;</p> | <p>Project documents Needs assessment Policy documents MoU Stakeholder perceptions Project staff perceptions Project extension request and proposed revisions</p> | <p>Desk review and analysis of project documents Policy analysis Interviews Focus group discussions</p> | <p>ILO project team UNICEF project team Regional Office representatives Ministry representatives Implementing partners Project beneficiaries Donor</p> | <p>Analysis of theory of change Analysis of quarterly and annual reporting Understanding the involvement of wider stakeholders in project design and development Assessing iterative improvements to the project</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>Clear understanding of underlying gender related barriers;</p> <p>Demonstration of project analysis, evolution, and adaptation within annual reports;</p> <p>Evidence of KPIs and milestones embedded during project design and reflected in reporting;</p> <p>Specific consideration of the need to disaggregate and analyse data by gender, refugee status and other non-discrimination concerns, and appropriately designed data collection tools which reflected that;</p> <p>Clear short, medium and long-term measures including desired gender equality outcomes;</p> <p>Clear understanding of the environment and sustainability considerations, and mainstreamed monitoring throughout the delivery of the project.</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

2. Coherence

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>8. To what extent was the division of responsibility between ILO and UNICEF clarified in project documents, has this been adhered to, and has the new project design assisted in streamlining this relationship?</p> <p>9. To what extent have ILO and UNICEF adopted a joint ownership of the project, and</p> | <p>Evidence of clear MoUs between delivery partners, Ministries, the donor and other stakeholders, with clear differentiation in roles and responsibilities, and further clarity on this demonstrated in revised project documents;</p> <p>Evidence of ongoing communication and updates for all partners at key intervals</p> | <p>Project documents Needs assessment Policy documents MoU Stakeholder perceptions Project staff perceptions Project extension request and proposed revisions</p> | <p>Desk review and analysis of project documents Policy analysis Interviews</p> | <p>ILO project team UNICEF project team Regional Office representatives Ministry representatives Implementing partners Donor</p> | <p>Correlation of feedback from ILO, UNICEF, partners, and ministries, which reflects shared vision and understanding, supported by regular and concise communication.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <p>worked together towards joint outcomes rather than in silos?</p> <p>10. To what extent has communication between the project's teams, the regional office and the responsible technical department at headquarters been effective, and how can the new project design further enhance this?</p> | <p>Effective updates on performance against key targets and milestones, broken down by implementing partner, and referenced in quarterly and annual reporting;</p> <p>Clear disaggregation of objectives and outcomes, with clear identification of responsible bodies and delivery leads, reflected in reporting, and referenced throughout.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Sub-questions</p> <p>2.a. The project consists of numerous stakeholders at a government and agency level. How was coherence and communication between these agencies overseen and streamlined?</p> <p>2.b. Has the project received adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?</p> <p>2.c. How has the shift towards a focus on training and awareness-raising, with focal points in government ministries and other stakeholders, helped deliver a more coherent, joined-up approach to policy-making and implementation?</p> <p>2.d. To what extent did the revisions to the project scope and implementation deliver better engagement and cooperation</p> | <p>Evidence of a communication strategy, and clear division of responsibility and dialogue between stakeholders;</p> <p>Clear evidence of gender being central to both policy, and activity, evidenced by output;</p> <p>A clear consideration, and strategy for improved government and stakeholder engagement, evident in revised project documents.</p> | As above | As above | As above | As above |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| between implementing partners and the relevant Government Ministries (MoSD, MoL, MoPIC)? | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

3. Effectiveness

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>11. How have the outputs and outcomes contributed to ILO's mainstreamed strategies including gender equality, social dialogue, and labour standards?</p> <p>12. To what extent has the project contributed to UNICEF's Social Protection and Policy priorities?</p> <p>13. What positive or negative unintended outcomes can be identified, specifically related to gender mainstreaming, or in relation to the specific locations in which the project was implemented?</p> <p>14. Has the project fostered ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue in articulating, implementing, and sustaining coherent response strategies to mitigate the effects of the pandemic on the world of work?</p> | <p>Degree of completion of outputs planned in the M&E Framework against indicators; Evidence that completed outputs contributed to planned outcomes;</p> <p>Evidence of clear gender equality outcomes beyond access and reach (outputs);</p> <p>Evidence of correlation between project goals and both ILO gender equality, social dialogue, and labour standards, and UNICEF Social Protection and Policy priorities.</p> <p>The number of project beneficiaries mirrors the targets set out at the project inception;</p> <p>Positive feedback from key government and community stakeholders which attests to the effectiveness of the programme;</p> <p>Annual reports demonstrating incremental growth in the number of beneficiaries, and adaptations to the approach;</p> <p>Demonstrative proof that programme activities were targeted towards the most vulnerable demographics, in hard-to-reach communities;</p> | <p>Project documents Needs assessment ILO and UNICEF country frameworks ILO gender equality, social dialogue, and labour standards UNICEF Social Protection and Policy priorities. Stakeholder perceptions Project staff perceptions Opinions of beneficiaries, disaggregated by gender and refugee status</p> | <p>Desk review and analysis of project documents Policy analysis Interviews Focus group discussions</p> | <p>ILO project team UNICEF project team Regional Office representatives Ministry representatives Implementing partners Project beneficiaries Donor</p> | <p>Comparison of delivery against plans Discerning material and tangible benefits and delivery to date Understanding of attrition rates amongst beneficiaries moving between project phases, disaggregated by gender Awareness and participation levels amongst stakeholders</p> |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|----------|----------|--|
| | <p>Evidence that the project reacted to the key needs borne out of the needs assessment;</p> <p>Proof of specific focus on gender elements aligned to analysis of barriers (ToC);</p> <p>Demonstration that education and awareness activities were delivered in a participatory manner, with engaging, shareable, and understandable content, which was adopted and shared.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Sub-questions: 3.a. Have all relevant set targets, outputs, and outcomes (considering the time frame) been achieved according to plan?</p> <p>3.b. How have the outputs and outcomes contributed to ILO's and UNICEF's mainstreamed strategies including gender equality, social dialogue, and labour standards?</p> <p>3.c. What positive or negative unintended outcomes can be identified?</p> <p>3.d. Does the project foster ILO and UNICEF constituents' active involvement through social dialogue in articulating, implementing and sustaining coherent response strategies to mitigate the effects of the pandemic on the world of work? Furthermore, is the project working towards supporting the</p> | <p>Effective reporting at quarterly and annual bases which reflect the successes to date, and challenges encountered including potential backlash as related to marginalised populations;</p> <p>Demonstrable examples of application of lessons learned to inform and improve future project activity including 'what is working' and 'not working'; Evidence that completed outputs contributed to planned outcomes;</p> <p>Evidence of the existence, and performance management of the media and communications strategy.</p> <p>Justification for how and why targets were revised down, and a clear strategy for meeting these targets, specifically related to the number of graduates from cash assistance to work.</p> | As above | As above | As above | <p>Adequate documentation of iterative improvements to project design, implementation, and internal and external communication, as well as an updated register of risks and mitigations, which considers the impact of Covid-19 alongside other unforeseen challenges.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>effective transition for beneficiaries away from cash assistance and into work?</p> <p>3.e To what extent can the ambition to strengthen the national SP system for children be achieved. How has the project contributed directly to this to date, and how is progress connected to specific activities?</p> <p>3.f. What are the good practices and lessons learned from the project that can be applied in the next period?</p> <p>3.g. What were the main challenges identified? How were these different from the risk assumptions? What were the mitigation steps taken?</p> <p>3.h. What are the challenges, lessons learned and the recommendations regarding the cross-cutting issues of gender equality, social dialogue, and environmental sustainability?</p> <p>3.i. With regards to the media and communication strategy aimed at the public and beneficiaries, how long has this campaign been running, and has the digital platform been established and if so, what are the components and how has it been received?</p> <p>3.j. How will the ILO/UNICEF commitment to the NSPS help</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>reduce the disparity and improve access to social protection for marginalised/discriminated groups, and how was gender mainstreamed during the project inception?</p> <p>3.k. How can the amendments to the methodology and targets for outcome three, such as the reduction in total beneficiaries from 4,200 to 2,500, and the shift towards on-the-job training over on-campus training, help improve delivery against the desired outcomes?</p> <p>3.l. To what extent gender balance has been/will be maintained throughout implementation?</p> | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|

4. Efficiency

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>15. To what extent have resources been utilized efficiently to reach the project's objectives?</p> <p>16. To what extent have the coordination efforts been between ILO and UNICEF been efficient?</p> <p>17. To what extent has the coordination with the national implementing partners been efficient, specifically with regards to MoSD? And other national stakeholders like NAF, DoS and SSC?</p> | <p>Evidence that ILO and UNICEF received the planned resources at the foreseen level;</p> <p>Evidence that the project was delivered in accordance with pre-planned budgets, and that the planned amount of funding was earmarked and spent on programme activities which provided support for beneficiaries;</p> <p>Evidence that project implementation was delivered in a financially-efficient manner;</p> <p>Demonstration of the ability to react, and reassess the programme</p> | <p>Project documents MoU Annual and multiyear budgets Annual reports Stakeholder perceptions Project staff perceptions Project extension request and proposed revisions</p> | <p>Desk review and analysis of project documents Policy analysis Interviews Focus group discussions</p> | <p>ILO project team UNICEF project team Regional Office representatives Implementing partners</p> | <p>Analysis of budget management, forecasting, and monitoring, confirming efficiency and accuracy of reporting, and identification of good practice, as well as any issues</p> |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|----------|--|
| <p>18. To what extent has the project been on track in terms of timely achieving the assigned milestones?</p> <p>19. To what extent has the project leveraged new or repurposed existing financial resources to mitigate COVID-19 effects in a balanced manner?</p> | <p>priorities in response to changing needs and demands particularly in the context of COVID;</p> <p>Evidence of the impact of cost inflation on the overall budget;</p> <p>That annual reports and budgets are reflective of appropriate levels of M&E oversight, ensuring that annual budgets matched expectations;</p> <p>Adherence to any existing mitigation or risk management strategies;</p> <p>Effective use of any contingency budget available;</p> <p>Evidence of due consideration of the future of the project, and the need to ensure continued and timely delivery particularly in the context of COVID;</p> <p>Clear communication of changes to programme delivery with partners and the donor.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Sub-questions</p> <p>4.a. How can the significant drop-out rates for prospective beneficiaries noted between phases one and two of the project be explained, and if necessary, remedied?</p> <p>4.b. What factors have contributed to any project delays?</p> | <p>Dialogue or exit interviews with participants.</p> <p>Risk management register and evidence of project adaptability.</p> <p>Evidence of monitoring and performance management related to stakeholder outreach and engagement, and a coordinated communication plan which is adhered to.</p> | As above | As above | As above | <p>Review of data collected on participants who left the programme, and understanding decision-making behind it.</p> <p>Contrasting of changing scenarios with subsequent changes in project implementation.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>4.c. How could these factors be mitigated in the upcoming phase?</p> <p>4.d. How will the revisions to the project scope and implementation deliver better engagement and cooperation between implementing partners and the relevant Government Ministries (MoSD, MoL, MoPIC), with whom engagement has not always been efficient to date?</p> <p>4.e. What are the key challenges in terms of efficiency, most particularly concerning the engagement with other stakeholders?</p> | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

5. Impact

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>20. Does the project, especially post-redesign, have the potential to extend knowledge across the Arab region and other countries putting Jordan in a leading position and how can this be maximised during its implementation?</p> <p>21. How can the proposed or envisioned impacts of the project post-redesign be measured, especially with regard to female beneficiaries, and how can they be amplified in future phases?</p> | <p>Existence of regional mapping or other efforts to understand the situation in neighbouring countries, as compared to Jordan;</p> <p>Effective communications tools, knowledge management resources (e.g., regional offices) to raise awareness, map and share best practice, across to neighbouring countries;</p> <p>Existence of an impact assessment, and the existence of effective tools through which impact can be monitored;</p> <p>Adherence to impact monitoring plans and effective communication of the outcomes;</p> | <p>Project documents Needs assessment Stakeholder perceptions Project staff perceptions Beneficiary perceptions Project extension request and proposed revisions</p> | <p>Desk review and analysis of project documents Interviews Focus group discussions</p> | <p>ILO project team UNICEF project team Regional Office representatives Ministry representatives Implementing partners Project beneficiaries Donor</p> | <p>Identification of results and outcomes to date, and delivery against timeframes and targets,</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| <p>22. How will the project contribute to social cohesion in the communities between Jordanians and Syrians post-completion, particularly in relation to gender mainstreaming and in relation to specific implementation locations?</p> | <p>Clear impact measures available aligned to the project's Theory of Change and Results Framework;</p> <p>Effective community communications and engagement delivered at key intervals and reflected in reporting;</p> | | | | |
| <p>23. How has the support of UNICEF to date managed to pave the way towards more inclusion of non-Jordanians, and for females in particular, within the national social protection system? Can project contribute to the economic self-reliance of refugees and vulnerable local population in Jordan?</p> | <p>An understanding of the behavioural and perception change which was sought, and how this was measured at different stages;</p> <p>Demonstration that beneficiary surveys were designed to capture these sentiments, and that the perceptions of beneficiaries and communities were tracked throughout the project to date;</p> <p>Existence of case studies or best practice narratives which have arisen throughout the project, to demonstrate its success;</p> <p>Demonstration, through project documents and interviews, of UNICEF's commitment to, and methodical approach, to addressing inclusion gaps amongst females and non-Jordanians.</p> | | | | |
| 6. Sustainability | | | | | |
| <p>24. Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable- in terms of the social protection sector in Jordan?</p> | <p>Evidence of due consideration of sustainability issues within project design, inception and implementation;</p> | <p>Project documents Needs assessment Stakeholder perceptions Project staff perceptions</p> | <p>Desk review and analysis of project documents Interviews Focus group discussions</p> | <p>ILO project team UNICEF project team Regional Office representatives Ministry representatives</p> | <p>Analysis and understanding of the proposed exit strategy, and assessment of long-term impact related to policy change, the implementation of the NSPS, and the lived</p> |
| <p>25. To what extent has the project prepared a sustainable exit strategy to</p> | <p>An understanding of how the benefits of the project could be extended, reviewed, or</p> | <p>Beneficiary perceptions</p> | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------|--|---|
| <p>depart from donor-supported cash assistance for Syrian refugees?</p> <p>26. How will the implemented work be institutionalized and used by the government institutions to enhance future work on SP?</p> <p>27. Will the implementing partners be able to retain the work after the end of the project?</p> <p>28. What measures have been taken to ensure that the key components of the project are sustainable beyond the life of the project? Are they sufficient?</p> | <p>reincorporated into future programming in a post-covid environment;</p> <p>Commitment and engagement with Ministries and other relevant implementing agencies to ensure project findings are mainstreamed into strategies and policies as required;</p> <p>An understanding of the proposed exit strategy, transition, and the division of responsibilities and labour post-project completion.</p> <p>Demonstration of consideration around future ownership and implementation of the NSPS, and any graduation frameworks introduced by the project.</p> | <p>Project extension request and proposed revisions</p> | | <p>Implementing partners Project beneficiaries Donor</p> | <p>experience of beneficiaries, alongside a commitment from Ministries and implementing partners to continue their involvement in the subject matter.</p> |
| <p>Sub-questions:</p> <p>6.a. Has due consideration been given to the transition period for this project, and the future division of responsibilities post-completion?</p> <p>6.b. How will government ownership over the project be fostered and continued post-project completion. More work will doubtless be needed and what assurances are in place that this agenda will be carried forward?</p> <p>6.c. How have steps taken to improve the collection and publication of data supported</p> | <p>Detailed exit strategy developed or under consideration, and engagement with ministries and implementing partners.</p> <p>An effective data collection and dissemination strategy with monitoring tools in place to ensure this is delivered.</p> <p>A study or analysis around how the proposed graduation mechanism will be sustained and expanded post-completion of the project.</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>As above</p> | <p>Analysis of planned or existing exit strategy documentation, alongside clear understanding from partners around future roles and responsibilities.</p> |

policy-making and knowledge retention post-project completion, and is this data disaggregated in a manner which delivers good quality data related to gender mainstreaming?

6.d. Additionally, how will the project support a shift in perception around graduation, allowing more stakeholders to perceive it as an 'industry' which requires structure and investment, and ensuring the model can continue post-completion of this programme.

6.e. What steps can be taken to ensure that the collection and publication of data mainstreamed gender is consistent, and how can it support policy-making and knowledge retention post-project completion?

6.f. To what extent has the project contributed to shift perceptions around graduation?

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

11.4.LESSONS LEARNED TABLES

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Towards an inclusive national social protection system and accelerating decent job opportunities for Syrians and vulnerable Jordanians

Project TC/SYMBOL:

Name of Evaluator: Nabil Najjar

Date: August 2023

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation, linked to coherence and efficiency. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

| LL Element | Text |
|--|--|
| Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task) | <p>The lesson to be learned is that, for a project of this size, and with over 20 different stakeholders, clear lines of communication with tripartite constituents, in the form of project steering committees, should be established from the outset.</p> <p>This project is composed of three distinct outcomes, with separate objectives, resources, and staffing. The initial targets set were unable to be met in the designated timeframe, which resulted in the need for a no-cost extension, and revisions to the project scope. It is important to ensure that the project is delivered in a collaborative manner, which avoids siloes between ILO and UNICEF, or between staff working on different outcomes.</p> <p>The introduction of the Higher Coordination Committee, and the Madad Project Steering Committee has improved communication between Agencies, stakeholder, and staff, and this should be enhanced over the remainder of the programme.</p> <p>This opinion was expressed by project staff, stakeholders, and the donor, and validated through KIIs, and discussion in the staff workshop.</p> |
| Context and any related preconditions | <p>With a joint project between two UN Agencies and 21 stakeholders, communication challenges should not have been underestimated. Procedures are now in place to address them, and these should be supported so as to streamline activities and avoid delays.</p> |
| Targeted users / Beneficiaries | <p>ILO project staff UNICEF project staff Field staff Tripartite constituents</p> |
| Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors | <p>The negative lesson is that a multi-level, high-budget project with several work strands has the potential to result in communication and coherence challenges which cause delays, and can undermine relationships if not addressed.</p> |
| Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors | <p>The introduction of formal mechanisms to support improved project communication and coordination, such as the Steering Committees have begun to address these challenges. This demonstrates an acknowledgement of a challenge and a response to address it.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation) | Staffing, design, and implementation issues were all identified, and addressed through the introduction of new procedures. |
|---|--|

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Towards an inclusive national social protection system and accelerating decent job opportunities for Syrians and vulnerable Jordanians

Project TC/SYMBOL:

Name of Evaluator: Nabil Najjar

Date: August 2023

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation, linked to effectiveness. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

| LL Element | Text |
|--|--|
| Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task) | <p>The lesson to be learned is that, when working on projects which target the most economically or socially vulnerable members of society, a higher level of consideration for their financial, physical, and psychological limitations is required.</p> <p>Outcome Three targets some of the most economically vulnerable members of society - both Jordanians and Syrians - those receiving cash assistance and those on social welfare. Moreover, the project targets second tier potential earners in the family for Jordanians and specifically women, and includes a wider age range than most livelihood projects, thus further increasing vulnerability criteria of participants (or potential graduates). Many of those targeted for profiling also lack basic education levels, especially among Syrians. Among Jordanians, many of the younger potential graduates have higher education levels, especially in urban settings, making the targeted population a diverse and non-homogenous group that requires different approaches to job linkages. Among Syrians, the population has undergone significant trauma, which is another factor that needs to be considered.</p> <p>Given these levels of vulnerability, the lessons learned are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working with vulnerable members of society requires higher levels of consideration in terms of respect for financial, physical and psychological limitations. Asking people to come long distances to fill out a profile that they believe will lead to some financial benefit then disappearing for many months or even years adds unnecessarily to their vulnerability and stress. 2. Working with vulnerable segments of the population, often with limited education and who may suffer from stress and trauma related to poverty and conflict requires a level of communication and transparency that is nuanced and specific to their needs and abilities. The counselors did their best to communicate with graduates and are aware of the need to communicate clearly and effectively. However, the design of the project and delays within it, coupled with a lack of specifically relevant and effective communication tools that explain the project, and specifically the potential loss of welfare and cash assistance that may ensue, has made their jobs harder. A lack of clarity and attention to the specific needs of potential graduates can lead to a sense of alienation or lack of trust that has the potential hinder the project's progress. The targeted population has a range of abilities and needs (age, educational, gender-based, refugee status, urban vs. rural etc.) requiring a targeted approach when it comes to profiling approach and job identification and placement in the future. This was not taken sufficiently into account in project design. <p>This finding was derived from desk review, KIIs, and FGDs with both programme participants and career counsellors, and validated through the staff workshop.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Context and any related preconditions | Involving field staff, who have direct experience with the potential graduates/beneficiaries on the ground in the design of communication strategies and approaches and specific strategies for profiling and matching for specific populations as well as equipping them with needed training and communication materials would be beneficial to the project. |
| Targeted users / Beneficiaries | Potential graduates/Beneficiaries ILO project staff UNICEF project staff Field staff Tripartite constituents |
| Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors | The challenge has arisen due to the delays encountered by potential graduates, who have waited for such a long period of time to progress through the project, and have raised their expectations. This makes realigning these expectations, and clarifying misconceptions, more challenging than had it been done from the beginning. |
| Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors | The presence of the field staff on the ground and their engagement directly with potential graduates/beneficiaries and their knowledge of their specific needs/profiles as well as their previous ILO training and experience in their locales is a positive issue that can be further invested in. |
| ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation) | Project design and implementation should be much more participatory, and should engage field staff to gain lessons from their experience on the ground. Potential beneficiaries should also be involved in project design to help identify issues with design and implementation. Not to do so risks the need for restructuring mid-way through the project, once those challenges are encountered. |

11.5. GOOD PRACTICE TABLES

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Towards an inclusive national social protection system and accelerating decent job opportunities for Syrians and vulnerable Jordanians

Project TC/SYMBOL:

Name of Evaluator: Nabil Najjar

Date: August 2023

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation, linked to impact. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

| GP Element | Text |
|---|---|
| Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.) | <p>The translation and adaptation of the Transform training package (A UN social protection training package) into Arabic, was done to provide technical training to senior staff and focal points at government Ministries, and is now being expanded to include a ToT component to ensure sustainability.</p> <p>This training, already being rolled out by UN Agencies in 40 countries, has been translated into Arabic for the first time and this represents an investment in a resource which can now be used in other Arabic-speaking countries. This makes it an asset which can deliver an impact in the wider MENA region, further expanding the impact of the project.</p> |
| Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability | <p>For this training to be effectively rolled-out in other countries and scenarios, two factors must first be judged:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The national social protection landscape must be mature 2. Buy-in from relevant government Ministries, and a willingness to engage in the programme is required |
| Establish a clear cause-effect relationship | <p>If a government is cognisant of the need for effective social protection systems, and relevant Ministry figures are eager to engage in Transform training to improve internal and external packages, then the effect of implementing the training programme will be improved awareness and capacity to deliver improved social protection structures and policies in that country. ToT will also provide sustainability by ensuring that institutional knowledge is retained.</p> |
| Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries | <p>Target beneficiaries include key staff and focal points, as well as policymakers, within Ministries with a responsibility for both labour and social protection. In a Jordanian context, this includes MoSD, MoL, and MoPIC, as well as agencies including NAF and SSC.</p> |
| Potential for replication and by whom | <p>ILO and UNICEF Regional Offices, and in-country teams in Arabic-speaking countries where social protection is a policy or programmatic focus.</p> |
| Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework) | <p>This aligns with the ILO's Decent Work Programme, as well as UN SDGs, especially SDG 1 - No Poverty - and its goal to <i>'implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable'</i>.</p> |

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Towards an inclusive national social protection system and accelerating decent job opportunities for Syrians and vulnerable Jordanians

Project TC/SYMBOL:

Name of Evaluator: Nabil Najjar

Date: August 2023

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation, linked to effectiveness and impact. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

| GP Element | Text |
|---|---|
| Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.) | The establishment and successful integration of the Implementation Support Unit into the Ministry of Social Development has been regarded by project staff, stakeholders, and partners, as a successful intervention. The ISU now has Ministerial support and is housed within the Office of the Secretary General. This represents a major achievement against project outcomes, as well as a replicable model for effectively integrating expert technical staff within a Ministry through a joint government-agency model. |
| Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability | For a specialist technical unit to be embedded in a government agency, two factors must first be judged: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Funding for the longevity of the unit must be secured 2. Buy-in from relevant government Ministries, and a willingness to engage and accept intervention is required |
| Establish a clear cause-effect relationship | If a Ministry is aware of the challenge it faces, and it is willing to receive support and meaningful input on how it is addressed, then introducing technical specialists, underpinned by UN Agency expertise, to work in support of political ambitions by providing technical understanding and assurance will deliver significant improvements to policy-making and implementation. |
| Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries | Target beneficiaries include Ministry stakeholders and focal points, as well as UN Country and Regional Offices who will lead on funding and coordination. |
| Potential for replication and by whom | ILO and UNICEF Regional Offices, and key Ministry focal points. |
| Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework) | This links directly with the UNICEF Country Programme Outcomes, which call for <i>'utilising evidence-based, inclusive, integrated social policies, and enhanced social protection services and socioeconomic opportunities'</i> . ²⁷ |

²⁷ UNICEF Country Programme Outcome

11.6. TERMS OF REFERENCE



Terms of Reference (ToR) for the ILO and UNICEF Joint Midterm Independent Project Evaluation of “Towards an inclusive national social protection system and accelerating decent job opportunities for Syrians and vulnerable Jordanians” in Jordan

| I. Key Facts | |
|---|---|
| DC Symbol: | JOR/20/01/EUR |
| Country: | Jordan |
| Project titles: | “Towards an inclusive national social protection system and accelerating decent job opportunities for Syrians and vulnerable Jordanians” |
| Duration: | 36 months - (2020 - 2023) |
| Start Date: | October 2020 |
| End Date: | September 2023 |
| ILO Administrative unit: | Regional Office for the Arab States (ROAS) |
| ILO Technical Backstopping Unit: | DWT-Beirut; NC-Amman; |
| Collaborating ILO Units: | SKILLS; SOCPRO; EMPLOYMENT; RO-Arab States; |
| Evaluation requirements: | Independent Midterm Evaluation |
| Donor: | European Commission, DG for Neighborhood and Enlargement Negotiations |
| Budget: | 15,730,337 USD |
| Evaluation Manager | Hiba Al Rifai and Aladdin AlQubati |

II. Background

Jordan’s geographical location made it the third country in the Region in terms of hosting Syria refugee influx since 2011. As per the official data, in 2021, Jordan hosted around 672,952 Syrian refugees registered under the UNHCR’s mandate. However, the total number of Syrians is estimated at around 1.3 million, when taking the unregistered Syrian refugees into account²⁸. That same year, Jordan’s population was estimated at approximately 11.06 million, with registered Syrian refugees comprising a 6.1 percent share of Jordan’s entire

²⁸ [Syrian refugees | ACAPS](#)

population. This rate is even higher when considering unregistered refugees, with Syrian's comprising an approximate 11.8 percent of the country's population, taking a major toll on the country's economy, infrastructure, and social landscape.

1. According to Jordan's Department of Statistics, in 2010, prior to the Syrian conflict, Jordan had a labour market participation rate of 63.5 percent among men and 14.7 percent among women. Unemployment rates stood at 12.5 percent of the Jordanian labour force, with a higher average for females and youth, at 21.7 percent and 28.1 percent respectively.
2. Based on recent data, in 2019 15.7 percent of Jordanians were living below the national poverty line, compared to 14.4 percent in 2010, as the pressure of the Syria crisis, and deteriorating economic conditions translated into increased poverty.
3. Over the past decades, Jordan has progressed in developing its social protection system. At present, the different social protection programmes implemented can be categorised as social assistance, social insurance, labour market interventions, the fiscal subsidy system and food security/nutrition programmes. Several amendments of the Social Security Law over the past decade helped to expand coverage. Social security is obligatory for all working entities, and in 2014, Jordan was the first country in the Middle East to ratify the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102) (ILO, 2020b).
4. In 2019, the Jordanian Government embarked on a process of developing a new National Social Protection Strategy - NSPS (2019-2025) under the leadership of the Ministry of Planning & International Corporation (MoPIC) and the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD) with technical support from UNICEF at that time. The strategy represents a recent effort towards the formulation of a comprehensive national policy for social protection, providing an overarching framework for the sector to maximize synergies and ensure effective integrated approaches by considering the following areas of the SP system: social assistance, social services, social insurance, and labour market policies.
5. The NSPS aimed at a decent life for all Jordanians and is organized around three pillars:

Pillar 1; Opportunities - decent work and social security, focuses on opportunities for families to be economically self-reliant through the labour market.

Pillar 2; Empowerment - social services, focuses on the empowerment of the population through affordable education and health care as well as social services that support people with special needs.

Pillar 3: Dignity - social assistance, focuses on targeted social assistance for the poor to maintain dignity. Within this pillar falls as well, the Takaful programme launched in May 2019, which seeks to expand the National Aid Fund (NAF) cash assistance provided to Jordanians and to provide complimentary services to the most vulnerable families nationwide (on energy, transportation, health insurance, and school feeding).

6. This ILO-UNICEF Joint Programme serves to support the operationalization and implementation of the Jordanian National Social Protection Strategy (2019-2025), with a view to contribute to the achievement of a sustainable social protection system, in policy as well as institutional set-up, with strengthened links between social protection and employment for both Jordanian and refugee populations and enhanced outreach into the informal sector. Based on long-standing relations with the Jordanian government and other partners, lessons learned and extensive experience of both ILO and UNICEF in the area of social protection and employment promotion for youth as well as adults, women as well as men, Jordanian host communities as well as refugees, the project serves to achieve three outcomes:

Outcome 1: Enhanced coordination, integrated planning and monitoring for government wide efforts in the social protection and employment sector. Outputs delivered serve to strengthen mechanisms for coordinated implementation of national employment and social protection interventions in the context of the NSPS.

Outcome 2: Strengthened national systems/mechanisms to enhance access to labour market, decent work and employment based social protection schemes. Outputs delivered serve to provide support towards effective and cost-efficient implementation and realisation of access to employment (work permits), enhanced capacity for the implementation of mechanisms to ensure increasingly decent work (labour inspection) and access to social security expanded to workers in the informal economy.

Outcome 3: Vulnerable Jordanians and Syrians transition from cash assistance to sustainable jobs.

Outputs are directed towards the design and implementation of a graduation mechanism to support the transition of vulnerable people on cash assistance (provided by NAF and UNHCR) to employment, by providing a systematic and tailored package of services, delivered primarily by ILO and UNICEF service centres.

7. The project is aligned with the Jordan 2025 National Vision and Strategy, government priorities, executive development program, and sectoral strategies and goals for the social development, health, education, labour, and other related sectors
8. In addition, the Action will also contribute to:
 - o The HRD Strategy, and specifically the following objective: "By 2025, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant technical and vocational skills for employment, decent jobs, and entrepreneurship."
 - o The 2018-2022 Economic and Growth Plan objective under the Labour sector - Restructuring and organizing technical and vocational education and training (TVET), by proposing and institutionalizing new forms of training, including On the Job learning and Apprenticeship.
 - o The National Employment Charter, and specifically the parts related to the graduation of NAF beneficiaries to sustainable jobs.
 - o The Jordan Response Plan
 - o National Youth Strategy
9. Alignment with UN Strategic Development Framework in Jordan

The Project matches the United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDF) 2018-2022 commitments to support economic growth, job creation and quality service delivery in Jordan. Additionally, the 2018-2022 UNSDCF gives particular priority to serving youth, women and the most vulnerable, through strengthened institutions, empowerment and increased opportunities. This project will directly support the three interconnected outcomes. In particular, it will work with the NAF, SSC and MOSD, among others, to increase linkages in the area of social protection and employment, thereby enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of national systems. It will equally work at the local level to strengthen knowledge of social protection entitlements, and contribute to a culture of social protection, particularly among youth, women and persons with disabilities. Enhanced knowledge of rights is also a key objective of Jordan's Vision 2025. Enhanced and targeted employment services will also facilitate greater work opportunities that cater to a variety of abilities and needs.

10. The project will contribute to the following **ILO's P&B Outcomes (2020-21)**:
 - Outcome 3: Economic, social and environmental transformations for decent work for all, but also to some extent to
 - Outcome 5: Skills and lifelong learning to facilitate access to and transitions in the labour market
11. In Jordan, the project will contribute to corresponding Country Programme Outcome (CPO) *JOR105: Improved existing programmes to extend social security coverage through the progressive establishment of a national Social Protection Floor (SPF)*.
12. Under the **ILO 2018-2022 Decent Work Country Programme for Jordan**, agreed with the tripartite constituents, the project will contribute to;
Priority 1: Employment creation contributes to economic and social stability and

Priority 2: Decent working conditions for all create a level playing field for male and female Jordanians, refugees and migrants, and more specifically Outcome 2.3: Sustainable and adequate social protection coverage is extended for all in need and contributes to formalizing the informal economy.
13. The Joint Programme is led by the ILO (Lead Implementing Agency and Administrative Agent for financial management) and implemented in partnership with UNICEF. The project is headed by the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) for the ILO's Programme of Support to the Crisis Response and receives technical and programmatic backstopping from the ILO Regional Office of Arab States on periodical basis.

III. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

1. Evaluation Background and Purpose

ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of development cooperation projects. Provisions are made in all projects in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and based on the nature of the project and the specific requirements agreed upon at the time of the project design and during the project as

per established procedures. The Regional Evaluation Officer (REO) at the ILO ROAS supports the evaluation function for all ILO projects.

Evaluation in UNICEF serves interrelated purposes in support of the organization's mandate. It supports learning and decision-making, which in turn support better results for children. Evaluation also helps to hold UNICEF accountable for contributing to results for children, or for not doing so. The evaluation function supports the development of national evaluation capacity, undertaken in collaboration with Member States and entities of the United Nations system, which should enhance the provision of timely evidence at the country level on the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals and the fulfilment of the rights of all children.

According to the project documents, a midterm independent evaluation is due. The evaluation will be used to assess the M&E framework of the project, its coherence, its robustness, and its ability to monitor and measure change. Furthermore, it will provide analysis according to OECD criteria at country level and will examine the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, potential impact and sustainability of the projects. This evaluation will also identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design, strategy, and implementation as well as lessons learned, best practices and recommendations. It will also touch upon cross cutting issues such as gender equality, disability, social dialogue, environmental sustainability, international standards, and covid-19 in terms of challenges and opportunities for tackling the most vulnerable segments in line with guidelines and protocols set by EVAL/ILO. The findings of the evaluation will be used to feed into the M&E framework of the project and the project's implementation.

The evaluation will comply with the ILO and UNICEF evaluation policies including the protocols and guidelines set by EVAL/ILO²⁹³⁰ and UNICEF Procedure on Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis³¹³², which are based on the OECD DAC and United Nations Evaluation Norms and Standards and the UNEG ethical guidelines.

2. Scope

The evaluation will assess the project duration covering October 2020- April 2022. It will look at the project outputs and outcomes. The evaluation will take into consideration the project duration, existing resources and political, security and environmental constraints. It will also look into the link between the project's objectives and the ILO's P&B strategy, DWCP in Jordan, UNICEF's framework for Social Protection, and the UNSDF in Jordan.

The evaluation will take place from July 2022 until October 2022 through online/field work to collect information from different stakeholders. If the situation allows the evaluator is expected to travel to the field during data collection. The evaluation will cover areas where the project implementation took place (Amman, Mafrq, Zarqaa, Irbid, Jerash, Karak and Tafileh). The evaluation will integrate gender equality, inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS and social dialogue, and Covid-19 as crosscutting concerns throughout its methodology and deliverables, including the final report. This is based on EVAL's protocols on crosscutting issues including the one on covid-19.

3. Clients of Evaluation

The primary clients of this evaluation are ILO Project Team, ILO Amman Office, ILO ROAS, UNICEF, European Commission, DG for Neighborhood and Enlargement Negotiations, Ministry of Social Development (MoSD) and mainly the Implementation Support unit (ISU) for the NSPS, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, National Aid Fund (NAF), The Social Security Corporation (SSC), Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Health, Department of Statistics, Ministry of Education, Jordanian construction contractors' association (JCCA), General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions (GFJTU), Labour directorates (in the field), National employment and

²⁹ Protocol on collecting evaluative evidence on covid-19 https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_757541/lang-en/index.htm

³⁰ Guidance Note 3.1: Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746716.pdf

³¹ <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/documents/unicef-procedure-ethical-standards-research-evaluation-data-collection-and-analysis>

³² - Revised Evaluation Policy of UNICEF:

[https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/1411/file/Revised%20Policy%202018%20\(Interactive\).pdf](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/media/1411/file/Revised%20Policy%202018%20(Interactive).pdf)

training company (NET), Private sector represented by Jordan Chamber of Industry (JCI) and Jordan Chamber of Commerce (JCC), Vocational Training Corporation training centers, private sector training providers, Civil Society Organizations active in the field of Social Protection, UNHCR as well as the World Bank. Secondary users include other project stakeholders and units that may indirectly benefit from the knowledge generated by the evaluation.

IV. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation utilises the standard ILO framework and follows its major criteria while integrating gender equality 30as a cross cutting issue throughout the evaluation questions:

- **Relevance and strategic fit** - the extent to which the objectives are aligned with sub-regional, national and local priorities and needs, the constituents' priorities and needs, and the donor's priorities for the country;
- **Validity of design** - the extent to which the project design, logic, strategy and elements are/remain valid vis-à-vis problems and needs;
- **Efficiency** - the productivity of the project implementation process taken as a measure of the extent to which the outputs achieved are derived from an efficient use of financial, material and human resources, including re-purposing in the mitigation of Covid-19 impacts;
- **Effectiveness** - the extent to which the project can be said to have contributed to the project objectives and more concretely whether the stated outputs have been produced satisfactorily with gender equality, including in the Covid-19 context; in addition to building synergies with national initiatives and with other donor-supported projects;
- **Impact** - positive and negative changes and effects caused by the project at the national level, i.e. the impact with social partners, government entities, beneficiaries, etc.; special attention should be given to secondary job effects, which are expected to occur in economic infrastructure like agricultural roads, markets or irrigation.
- **Effectiveness of management arrangements** - the extent of efficient operational arrangements that supported the timely, efficient, and effective delivery of the project
- **Sustainability** - the extent to which adequate capacity building of social partners has taken place to ensure mechanisms are in place to sustain activities and whether the existing results are likely to be maintained beyond project completion, in the case of infrastructure this refers concretely to whether operation and maintenance agreements are actually being implemented; the extent to which the knowledge developed throughout the project (research papers, progress reports, manuals and other tools) can still be utilised after the end of the project to inform policies and practitioners,

1. **Relevance and strategic fit:**

- How well did the project approach fit in context of the on-going challenges in Jordan? Were the problems and needs adequately analysed? Was gender prioritized?
- How well were the project's objectives aligned with the national strategies and priorities, framework of the ILO Decent Work Country Project of Jordan (2018-2022), the ILO's Project and Budget (P&B) 2020-2021, UNICEF's Social Protection framework, UNSDCF (2018-2022) and the SDGs?
- How did the project's objectives respond to the priorities of the donor (EU) in Jordan?
- To what extent did the project provide a timely and relevant response to constituents' needs and priorities including those related to the COVID-19 context?

2. **Validity of design:**

- Has the situation been properly analysed? Does the project document contain satisfactory immediate objectives / project outcomes, a strategy or Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?
- What is the extent of logical correlations between the objective, outcomes, and outputs? Are the set indicators logical with specified baseline and targets? Can data be gender disaggregated? Are monitoring and evaluation activities adequately planned?

- To what extent did the project design consider: specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context? As well as concerns relating to inclusion of people with disabilities, environmental sustainability, ILS, and social dialogue?

3. Efficiency:

- Have resources been utilized efficiently to reach the project's objectives?
- How efficient has the coordination efforts been between ILO and UNICEF?
- How efficient has the coordination with the national implementing partners been, mainly MoSD? And other national stakeholders like NAF, DoS and SSC?
- To what extent has the project been on track in terms of timely achieving the assigned milestones? If not, what factors contributed to the delays? How could they be mitigated in the upcoming phase?
- To what extent has the project leveraged new or repurposed existing financial resources to mitigate COVID-19 effects in a balanced manner?

4. Effectiveness:

- Have all set targets, outputs, and outcomes (considering the time frame) been achieved according to plan?
- How have the outputs and outcomes contributed to ILO's and UNICEF's mainstreamed strategies including gender equality, social dialogue, and labour standards?
- What positive or negative unintended outcomes can be identified?
- Has the project fostered ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue in articulating, implementing and sustaining coherent response strategies to mitigate the effects of the pandemic on the world of work?

5. Impact orientation:

- Was the project able to extend knowledge across the Arab region and other countries putting Jordan in a leading position?
- What are the impacts that can be associated with the intervention?
- Has the project contributed to social cohesion in the communities between Jordanians and Syrians?
- How has the support of UNICEF so far managed to pave the way towards more inclusion of non-Jordanians within the national social protection system? Did the project contribute to the economic self-reliance of refugees and vulnerable local population in Jordan?

6. Sustainability:

- Are the results achieved by the project so far likely to be sustainable- in terms of the social protection sector in Jordan?
- How will the implemented work be institutionalized and used by the government institutions to enhance future work on SP?
- Will the implementing partners be able to retain the work after the end of the project ?
- What measures have been taken to ensure that the key components of the project are sustainable beyond the life of the project? Are they sufficient?

7. Effectiveness of management arrangements:

- What was the division of work tasks within the project's teams and between ILO and UNICEF?
- How effective was the communication between the project's teams, the regional office and the responsible technical department at headquarters? Has the project received adequate technical and administrative support/response from the ILO backstopping units?
- How have stakeholders, particularly women, been involved in project's implementation?

- To what extent has the project management been participatory and has the participation contributed towards achievement of the project objectives?

8. Challenges, Lessons learned and Specific Recommendations:

- What are the good practices and lessons learned from the project that can be applied in the next period?
- What were the main challenges identified? How were these different from the risk assumptions? What were the mitigation steps taken?
- What are the recommendations for future similar projects?
- What are the challenges, lessons learned and the recommendations regarding the cross-cutting issues of gender equality, social dialogue, and environmental sustainability?

V. Methodology

1. The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. Any changes to the methodology should be discussed with and approved by the evaluation manager.

2. This evaluation will follow a mixed method approach relying on available quantitative data and primary qualitative data collected through interviews and group interviews.

3. This evaluation will utilize all available quantitative and qualitative data from progress reports to monitoring studies and database. The information will be analysed in light of the main thematic questions and results will be integrated with the data from the primary collection.

4. The primary data collection will mainly focus on a qualitative approach investigating the perceptions and inputs of the different stakeholders that had some form of interface with the project. Triangulation of data will also be done using both the secondary and the primary data collected. **The analysis** will follow a thematic examination of the main evaluation areas as guided by the evaluation questions. A list of stakeholders will be prepared and provided by the project team. Depending on the number and nature of stakeholders, the number of group interviews and individual KIIs to be conducted will be identified. Gender will be mainstreamed throughout the methodology from data collection to data analysis. Where appropriate, the methodology will ensure equal representation of women and men throughout data collection and provide separate group meetings as relevant. The evaluation will follow the ILO EVAL Guidelines on integrating gender equality³⁰. The specific evaluation methodology will be provided in the inception report prepared by the evaluation team and approved by the Evaluation Manager. **Tool:** The interview guide will be developed in light of the evaluation themes and main questions as well as the type of stakeholders. **Sample:** The study sample should be reflective of all relevant stakeholders taking into consideration the scope of the project and its evaluation as well as data saturation. All analysed data should be disaggregated by sex. The results shall address the crosscutting issues described above (including Covid-1929).

VI. Work Assignments and Main Deliverables

Work Assignments:

1. Internal briefing by the project team(s):

The evaluator will have an initial consultation with the ILO and UNICEF relevant staff. The objective of the consultation is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the priority assessment questions, available data sources and data collection instruments and an outline of the final assessment report. The following topics will be covered: status of logistical arrangements, project's backgrounds and materials, key evaluation questions and priorities, outline of the inception and final report.

- Preparation of the inception report
- Report to be shared with Evaluation manager for comments
- Report to be shared with key stakeholders for comments
- Inception report revised and interviews to begin

2. Desk Review:

The evaluator will review project's background materials before conducting any interviews.

These include:

- Project documents (Logic Framework, Theory of change...)
- Baseline reports and related data (if available)
- Monitoring reports conducted during the project
- Progress and status reports, extensions and budget revisions
- Previous phase or related evaluation reports of the project (if available)
- Other studies and research undertaken by the project
- Project beneficiary documentation
- Strategic documents (e.g., DWCP, Government's strategic plan)

3. Individual Interviews and/or group interviews:

Following the initial briefing, the desk review and the inception report, the evaluator will have meetings with constituents/stakeholders.

Individual or group interviews will be conducted with the following:

- a) ILO and UNICEF staff/consultants that are involved in the project
- b) EU States representatives;
- c) Interviews with constituents and other stakeholders as relevant: Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), National Aid Fund (NAF), The Social Security Corporation (SSC), Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Health, MOPIC, Department of Statistics, Jordanian construction contractors' association (JCCA), General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions (GFJTU), Labour directorates (in the field), National employment and training company (NET), Private sector represented by Jordan Chamber of Industry (JCI) and Jordan Chamber of Commerce (JCC), Vocational Training Corporation training centers, and private sector training providers.

4. Presentation

Upon completion of the missions, the evaluator will provide a presentation to the stakeholders on the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

5. Evaluation Management

The evaluator will report to the Evaluation managers at ILO and UNICEF. The Evaluation Managers will be the ILO M&E Officer at ROAS and UNICEF's M&E Officer who will be the first points of contact for the consultant as well as the project team for any technical and methodological matters related to this evaluation. All communications with regard to this evaluation must be marked to the evaluation managers. The project team will provide administrative and logistical support for the interviews.

The Main Deliverables:

- Deliverable 1: Inception Report
- Deliverable 2: Draft evaluation report
- Deliverable 3: PowerPoint Presentation (PPP)
- Deliverable 4: Draft 2 evaluation report
- Deliverable 5: Comments log of how all comments were considered and taken on board by the evaluation team or not and why not.
- Deliverable 6: Final evaluation report with executive summary (report will be considered final after review by EVAL. Comments will have to be integrated).

1. Inception Report

The evaluator will draft an Inception Report, which should describe, provide reflection and fine-tuning of the following issues:

- a. Project background
- b. Purpose, scope and beneficiaries of the evaluation
- c. Evaluation criteria and questions
- d. Methodology and instruments
- e. Main deliverables

- f. Management arrangements and work plan

2. Final Report

The final version of the report will follow the below format and:

1. Title page
2. Table of Contents, including List of Appendices, Tables
3. List of Acronyms or Abbreviations
4. Executive Summary with methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations
5. Background and Project Description
6. Purpose of Evaluation
7. Evaluation Methodology and Evaluation Questions
8. Clearly identified findings along OECD/DAC criteria, substantiated with evidence
9. Key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
10. Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations that are linked to findings (identifying which stakeholders are responsible, priority of recommendations, and timeframe)
11. Lessons Learned per ILO template
12. Potential good practices per ILO template
13. Annexes (list of interviews, TORs, lessons learned and best practices in ILO EVAL templates, list of documents consulted, etc.) Annex: Different phases' log frames with results status, by phase.

The quality of the report will be assessed against the relevant EVAL Checklists. The deliverables will be submitted in the English language and structured according to the templates provided by the ILO.

VII. Management Arrangements and Work plan

1. Roles And Responsibilities

- a. *The External Evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (ToR). He/she will:*
- Review the ToR and prepare questions/ clarifications or suggestions of refinements to assessment questions during the inception phase
 - Review project background materials (e.g., project document, progress reports, etc.);
 - Prepare an inception report including a matrix of evaluation questions, workplan and stakeholders to be covered;
 - Develop and implement the evaluation methodology (i.e., conduct interviews, review documents, etc.) to answer the evaluation questions;
 - Conduct online/ field research, interviews, as appropriate, and collect information according to the suggested format;
 - Prepare an initial draft of the evaluation report with input from ILO specialists and constituents/stakeholders;
 - Conduct a presentation on the findings, conclusions and recommendation of the evaluation to stakeholders;
 - Prepare the final report based on the ILO, donor and stakeholders' feedback obtained on the draft report.
 - Attend to other deliverables as per the TOR
- b. *The ILO and UNICEF Evaluation Managers are responsible for:*
- Drafting the ToR;
 - Finalizing the ToR with input from colleagues;
 - Hiring the consultant;
 - Providing the consultant with the project background materials;
 - Assisting in the implementation of the evaluation methodology, as appropriate
 - Reviewing the initial draft report, circulating it for comments and providing consolidated feedback to the External Evaluators (for the inception report and the final report);
 - Reviewing the final draft of the report;
 - Disseminating the final report to all the stakeholders;
 - Coordinating follow-up as necessary.
- c. *The ILO REO³³:*

³³ The REO is also the Evaluation Manager.

- Providing support to the planning of the evaluation;
- Approving selection of the evaluation consultant and final versions of the TOR;
- Reviewing the draft and final evaluation report and submitting it to EVAL;
- Disseminating the report as appropriate.

d. *The ILO and UNICEF Project Coordinators are responsible for:*

- Reviewing the draft TOR and providing input, as necessary;
- Providing project background materials, including studies, analytical papers, progress reports, tools, publications produced, and any relevant background notes;
- Providing a list of stakeholders;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the inception report;
- Participating in the preparatory briefing prior to the evaluation missions;
- Scheduling all meetings and interviews for the missions;
- Ensuring necessary logistical arrangements for the missions;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the initial draft report;
- Participating in the debriefing on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations;
- Making sure appropriate follow-up action is taken

2. Duration of Contract and Timeline for Delivery

The collaboration between ILO and the Consultant is expected to start in August 2022 and last until October 2022 with an estimate of 33 working days.

3. Evaluation Timeframe TO BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND AGREED

| Tasks | Number of Working days |
|---|------------------------|
| Kick-off meeting | 1 |
| Desk review of documents related to the project | 4 |
| Drafting Inception report | 4 |
| Interviews | 10 |
| Drafting report | 8 |
| Developing Second Draft and comments log | 3 |
| Present findings, lessons learned and recommendations to stakeholders | 1 |
| Integration of comments and finalization of the report | 2 |
| Total Number of Working Days | 33 |

4. Supervision

The evaluator will work under the direct supervision of the Evaluation Manager. The evaluator will be required to provide continuous updates on the progress of work and revert to the ILO with any challenges or bottlenecks for support. Coordination and follow-up with the evaluator will take place through e-mail or Teams or any other digital communication mean.

VIII. Legal and Ethical Matters

- ❖ This independent evaluation will comply with ILO evaluation guidelines and UN Norms and Standards.
- ❖ These ToRs will be accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluation "Code of conduct for evaluation in the ILO" (See attached documents).
- ❖ UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed throughout the independent evaluation.
- ❖ The consultant will not have any links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

IX. Requirements and How to Apply

1. Requirements

The evaluator(s)/evaluation team should have:

- An advanced degree in social sciences;
- Proven expertise on evaluation methods, labour markets, conflict issues and the ILO approach;
- Extensive experience in the evaluation of development interventions;
- Expertise in the Labour-intensive modality, job creation projects, capacity building and skills development and other relevant subject matter;
- An understanding of the ILO's tripartite culture;
- Knowledge of Jordan, and the regional context;
- Full command of the English language (spoken and written) will be required.
- Command of the Arabic language would be an advantage.

The final selection of the evaluator will be approved by the Regional Evaluation Focal Point in the ILO ROAS.

2. How to Apply:

Please submit the following:

- An Up-to-date CV highlighting relevant experience
- An evaluation report from previous experience that was implemented and prepared by the applicant
- Financial proposal specifying daily rate based on the above-mentioned number of working days.
- This is open for international and national consultants. In case the applicant does not speak Arabic, and s/he has a preference for a national support in Jordan, please enclose her/his CV with a brief description of her/his responsibilities, number of estimated working days requiring her/his service and daily professional fee in US\$. If not provided, ILO will recruit a national support separately (if deemed necessary).

Please send an application and relevant questions via email to the following contacts:

To: Ms. Hiba Al Rifai, ILO Monitoring & Evaluation Officer <alrifai@ilo.org> ; Mr. Aladdin AlQubati, UNICEF Monitoring & Evaluation Officer <aal-qubati@unicef.org>

Cc: Mr. Hideyuki Tsuruoka, Regional Monitoring & Evaluation Officer <tsuruoka@ilo.org>

Deadline to submit applications is August 21, 2022.