



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation  
Office

## Cluster Evaluation of Employment Intensive Infrastructure Programmes (EIIPs) in Jordan and Lebanon

### Quick Facts

**Countries:** Jordan, Lebanon  
**Cluster Evaluation:** January 2020  
**Evaluation Mode:** Independent  
**Administrative Office:** ROAS  
**Technical Office:**  
**Evaluation Manager:** Nathalie Bavitch  
**Evaluation Consultant(s):** Kirit Vaidya  
**Project Code:** JOR/16/01/MUL;  
JOR/17/08/DEU; JOR/18/05/DEU;  
LBN/16/03/DEU; LBN/18/01/DEU  
**Donor(s) & Budget:** Germany / BMZ through  
KfW, USD 68,838,287  
**Keywords:** Cluster evaluation, Jordan,  
Lebanon, Syrian crisis, refugees, unemployment,  
employment intensive projects, livelihood support

### Background & Context

#### Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

*The Employment Intensive Infrastructure Programmes (EIIPs) in Jordan and Lebanon funded by Germany / BMZ through KfW are responses to the humanitarian crisis following the Syrian civil war which began in 2011. A consequence of the civil war has been the large number of Syrians who have sought refuge in the two countries, causing economic and social*

*pressures and distress for the displaced Syrians and the two host countries and communities in them which have received high numbers of displaced Syrians. The amount committed by BMZ / KfW to the EIIPs is €60,945,000 (about USD68,838,287). The EIIPs combine the twin objectives of providing decent work for Syrian refugees and vulnerable host community members and the creation, improvement or maintenance of local infrastructure assets.*

*The following four broad common objectives and related indicators of outputs have been distilled from programme documents to form the basis of the evaluation:*

- (a) Short-term decent employment creation with requirements for balance between refugee and host community participation and inclusion (per cent of women and disabled persons participating).*
- (b) Improvement or preservation of infrastructure and other public assets including municipal and environmental.*
- (c) Strengthened institutional and technical capacities and policy influencing for extending the employment intensive approach beyond the EIIPs.*
- (d) Employability and livelihood improvement for participants beyond short-term programme employment.*

#### Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

*This is an independent cluster evaluation of the EIIPs being implemented in phases. Operations*

on Phase II in Jordan (JP-II) and Phase I+II in Lebanon (LP-I+II) were due to be completed in December 2019. LP-I+II has been extended to September 2020 and the remaining phases (JP-III and JP-IV in Jordan and LP-III in Lebanon) are continuing into 2020. The advantages of the cluster evaluation are: (a) the lessons from the comparison of the phases within and between the countries, and (b) the efficiency gains of a single evaluation over separate evaluations of phases. For clarity and consistency, the two EIIPs are referred to as “programmes” which operate in “phases”. The works executed in the programmes and phases are referred to as projects.

The TOR for the evaluation list the following issues: (a) how well are the programmes performing in achieving their objectives and whether they can improve their performance from mutual learning; (b) how well are they using outside links, including the UNDP collaboration in Lebanon; (c) what are the implications of short planned phases combined with the delays; (d) benefits to participants of short-term employment and whether longer periods of employment would improve longer term livelihood prospects; (e) how effectiveness are the programmes in achieving the inclusion of women, and (f) how sustainable will be the assets created by the programmes and the LRBT approach when the interventions end.

### Methodology of evaluation

The methodology adopted is qualitative comparative appraisal supported by quantitative indicators. Multiple sources of evidence used in the evaluation include: (a) a desk review of documents; (b) information on the operation and performance of the two EIIPs from programme records; (c) interviews of a total of over 100 persons, and (d) visits to 12 project locations between the two countries. The standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria form the basis of the evaluation.

### Relevance and strategic fit

Lebanon and Jordan are nations with the highest and second highest number of refugees per head of population respectively. Both refugees and vulnerable members of the host populations face hardships because of the distressed labour market conditions. There are also pressures on public services and need for improvement of the infrastructure. The EIIPs in the two countries have relevance in these circumstances since they combine the twin objectives of: (a) providing decent work for Syrian refugees and vulnerable host community members, and (b) the improvement or preservation of assets. The governments of Jordan and Lebanon prepared national crisis response plans and sought external assistance to support them. Germany / BMZ is one of the donors providing assistance to the two countries through KfW as a part of its global mission to support forcibly displaced people through cash for work (CfW). A complementary feature of ILO’s EIIP approach is for the employment generated to be decent which aligns with the principles of BMZ / KfW. There was sound logic in ILO partnering UNDP in the EIIP in Lebanon since UNDP has experience of supporting communities with high proportions of Syrian refugees since 2013 through its Lebanon Host Communities Support Programme (LHSP). The partnership was expected to enable rapid selection of suitable projects.

There is a difference between the governments of Jordan and Lebanon on the relative importance of unskilled employment generation and asset creation. In Lebanon there is stronger preference for asset creation for the host communities than for unskilled employment generation, while in Jordan there is stronger insistence on Jordanians taking an equal share of EIIP employment. Both the governments’ ambivalence on the Syrian refugee influx and lack of capacity to deal with work permits leaves the status of Syrian workers on the EIIPs and in the labour markets

*ambiguous in both the countries. While the BMZ / KfW mission and the EIIP approach have strong relevance and strategic fit to respond to the refugee crisis, the stakeholders' different priorities have implications for the design and implementation of the programmes, which in turn have implications for efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.*

#### *Validity of design*

*The structures of the programme teams are appropriate for their management and operations to meet the programme objectives of meeting the decent employment creation objective and quality of the works. Training of contractors and the staff of national partners and supervision, monitoring and support for project implementation are built into the design of both EIIPs. Since the wage rates in the two countries are higher than in the countries in which the EIIP approach is cost effective when compared with equipment operation, it is important that contractors "buy into" and comply with the EIIP approach.*

*An area of concern in both countries is short planned phases, which combined with long and unpredictable project selection and approval processes, leads to reduced time for implementation or phase extensions. The main differences in design between the two programmes are:*

- Different national partners during phases in Jordan. The same two national partners (Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA) and Ministry of Labour (MoL)) in both phases.*
- A mix of working through contractors and direct labour varying between phases in Jordan. All projects implemented by contractors in Lebanon.*
- Very high labour intensities (80 per cent) stipulated for municipal works in Jordan. In Lebanon labour intensities stipulated enable the programme to fulfil the twin roles of employment generation and asset creation.*

- A transparent and open process of balloting to select workers from applicants for municipal works through direct labour in Jordan. Not all contractors in Jordan and Lebanon employ transparent and open recruitment approaches.*
- In Jordan wages are paid electronically directly to the workers. The payment is managed by the EIIP team. In Lebanon workers are paid in cash on sites by contractors with EIIP staff supervising.*
- In Jordan the safeguard officer is supported by safeguards inspectors. In Lebanon the Social Safeguards Officers (SSOs) are technically qualified and combine the safeguard and technical oversight roles.*
- In Jordan EIIP is the sole responsibility of the ILO. In Lebanon the EIIP is a collaboration between the ILO and UNDP.*

#### *Efficiency*

*Both JP-II and LP-I+II have met their employment generation (worker days) and asset creation targets within the available budgets. In Jordan on JP-II the minimum 10 per cent target for women's participation was exceeded and the target for participation of persons with disabilities (PwD) was met. In Lebanon on LP-I+II the women's participation target was nearly met but there was no target in Lebanon for minimum PwD participation. In both countries there are higher minimum targets for the participation of women and initiatives to increase women's participation in later phases (JP-IV and LP-III). The 40 day jobs targets, introduced by the donor after the programmes started, proved to be overambitious in both countries because of the practicalities of keeping the employment period at 40 days for some project types and for contractor operations. The spectrum of labour intensities achieved are acceptable as long as the activities are concerned with productive work in asset creation or maintenance.*

*The programmes in both countries did not benefit from any significant cost sharing synergies. This*



was particularly disappointing in the ILO / UNDP collaboration in Lebanon in which the envisaged sharing of functions such as procurement and rapid selection of suitable projects based on UNDP's local knowledge and presence did not materialise. There have been other wider synergy benefits of two forms in the two countries: (a) dissemination of the employment intensive approach and related good practice (e.g. developing the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for CfWs in Jordan and "Employment Intensive Projects Guidelines" in Lebanon), and (b) support to other employment intensive projects. In Jordan the high labour intensity targets and municipal community works focus in JP-III and JP-IV limit the asset creation potential of the programme.

One of the most important wider benefits of inclusion of women on the two EIIPs, is their empowerment and either new entry or better reward and treatment in the labour market. In the workers' survey in Jordan, 70 per cent of women stated that they were not employed before working on the EIIP. In interviews at sites, women appreciated the wage rate being the same as for men and their treatment at work. The workers' survey document for Lebanon did not contain information from women's responses separately.

#### *Effectiveness*

Both programmes have performed well on meeting the employment generation targets with inclusion conditions as noted under "Efficiency". The targets on asset creation and maintenance have also been achieved within the available budget. On institutional and capacity development, they have overachieved on training numbers, though some of the training was needed for effective operation of works. The target on policy influencing, preparing the "Guidelines" document and having it adopted as policy has also been met in Lebanon. On work permits both programmes have performed their parts but full achievement (on timely issuing of work permits in Jordan and approval and issuance of special work permits in Lebanon) is not within their

control. Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and private insurance (the latter in Lebanon) are in place as elements of decent work conditions.

On the higher level objective and impact, improved livelihoods and contribution to peace and conflict prevention, the short term impact on household incomes and evidence of reduced tensions from working together are positive. Some of the main issues adversely affecting effectiveness are:

- Short planned phases combined with delays imposed by regulatory and administrative processes.
- Sub-optimal project selection process in Lebanon, partly because of the role of the Project Management Committee (PMC) and partly because of delays in producing the "long list" of suitable projects.
- The challenge of small scale municipal works and the associated high labour intensity target in Jordan.

#### *Impact*

There is positive short-term contribution on the livelihood support and social stability objectives. The longer term impact would be through changes in policy and their improved implementation. Relevant policy aspects are improvements on work permits and a pro-employment strategy incorporating the role of employment intensive infrastructure works. Improved assets also have long-term impacts but their nature and magnitude depend on the types of assets created and their sustainability through maintenance. There are also indirect and induced impacts arising from the expenditure on projects. The indirect impacts arising from the inputs purchased for the EIIP have been estimated by a study of selected LP-I+II projects to add 18 per cent to the direct employment generated. There are no studies of the induced employment impact but a high proportion of the wages of locally recruited participants have economic and employment impacts in project localities.

*An issue which needs investigation is whether participants working longer would accumulate sufficient earnings to invest in training, assets or enterprise and improve their longer term livelihood prospects. There is insufficient analysis of evidence to support this proposition.*

#### *Effectiveness of management arrangements*

*The management systems, including M&E, have evolved into sound systems in both the countries. The evaluation has identified a number of areas in which there would be benefit from mutual learning which are summarised below under lessons to be learned and recommendations. An issue of concern raised by the donor is the share of programme overhead costs in the budget in Lebanon. Contributory factors are the form of the ILO / UNDP collaboration in which implementation of some projects and the related budget are transferred to UNDP with no cost saving synergies from the collaboration.*

*The roles and responsibilities between the programmes and government ministries are clear but there are concerns with respect to the manner in which they function. In Jordan the JORISS process for approval of all international aid causes delays. In Lebanon, the requirement for approval of projects by the PMC delays and constrains the selection of projects.*

*Communication effectiveness between the programmes, the ILO Regional Office and the technical department (EMP/INVEST) continue to be effective. ILO ROAS and ILO Headquarters have been sensitive to the concerns of the donor about programme overheads and have reduced them from the standard 13 per cent to 10 per cent.*

#### *Sustainability*

*The two dimensions of sustainability are preservation of improved assets and improved livelihood of participants. Maintenance of improved assets requires: (a) sufficient financial provision; (b) development of capabilities, and (c) institutional arrangements and incentives to operationalise the maintenance arrangements. In*

*Lebanon, for each ILO implemented project, there is a final inspection and project handover document which includes an undertaking by the municipality to provide sufficient funds and maintain the asset and meet any operating expenses. In Jordan MPWH has adopted performance based management contracts introduced by EIIP for road maintenance under JP-II and has established routine maintenance teams for highways. Whether MPWH has the resources to operate on the same scale in Irbid and Mafrag as the EIIP in JP-II is not known. Such adoption with adequate resources is the key to achieving sustainability.*

*The issue of sustainability of livelihoods is a major challenge which requires external links to support the livelihood improvement strategies of participants post-EIIP employment. Tracer studies of participants who have worked for varying lengths on EIIP projects would provide insights on whether employment of longer duration on the EIIPs would improve longer term livelihood prospects.*

## **Recommendations**

### **Main recommendations and follow-up**

- 1. Future phases to be of 2 to 2.5 years with a 6 month overlap between phases to better plan over 2 annual cycles and to prepare and absorb delays (Stakeholders roles - donor as the key decision maker, ILO ROAS and EIIP teams to make the case.) (Jordan and Lebanon EIIPs)*
- 2. Prepare strategy papers to review sector and project type scope to widen portfolio to include a range of asset creation and maintenance activities and influence policy. (Stakeholder roles - EIIP teams responsible, ILO ROAS and EMP/INVEST to advise and support.) (Jordan and Lebanon EIIPs)*
- 3. Standardise project proposal and results matrix format and content. (Stakeholder roles - EIIP teams jointly responsible, ILO ROAS and EMP/INVEST to advise and support. (Jordan and Lebanon EIIPs)*

4. *Develop low-cost integrated management information systems (MIS) for the teams to share the data for monitoring and reporting externally. (Stakeholder roles - EIIP teams jointly to develop the MIS but to adapt for use separately on each EIIP, ILO ROAS and EMP/INVEST to advise and support.) (Jordan and Lebanon EIIPs)*
5. *Conduct tracer studies of participants (high and low number of days of EIIP employment) to assess the potential of longer-term livelihood improvement through longer EIIP employment (Stakeholder roles - EIIP teams' responsibility, ILO ROAS and EMP/INVEST to advise and support.) (Jordan and Lebanon EIIPs)*
6. *ILO to review with the donor the rationale for the high labour intensities stipulations in Jordan and make the case for the same labour intensity stipulation as in Lebanon. (Stakeholder roles - donor as the key decision maker, the EIIP team and ILO ROAS to make the case.) (Jordan EIIP)*
7. *Explore feasibility of competition between municipalities to put forward projects to improve the quality of projects and incorporate commitment to maintenance in the selection process. (Stakeholder roles - EIIP teams' responsibility, ILO ROAS and EMP/INVEST to advice and support. Engagement with relevant parts of the government and local administrations as potential partners.) (Jordan and Lebanon EIIPs)*
8. *Modify PMC's role in project selection to set the criteria for selection and to leave the project selection to the EIIP team based on technical, project value and geographical distribution criteria (Stakeholder roles - joint decision of the government, donor, ILO ROAS and EIIP team.) (Lebanon EIIP)*
9. *Develop an alternative to the current ILO / UNDP collaboration form for the EIIP. The decision to not retain the form of collaboration has been taken for future phases since the evaluation mission. (Stakeholder roles - joint decision of the donor and ILO ROAS.) (Lebanon EIIP)*