

# **Jordan**

## **Mid-Term Evaluation**

**Thematic window: Environment and Climate Change**

**Programme Title: Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan's MDG Achievements**

**Author:** Jean-Joseph Bellamy, Consultant

## Prologue

The current mid-term evaluation report is part of the efforts being implemented by the Millennium Development Goal Secretariat (MDG-F), as part of its monitoring and evaluation strategy, to promote learning and to improve the quality of the 128 joint programs in 8 development thematic windows according to the basic evaluation criteria inherent to evaluation; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The aforementioned mid-term evaluations have been carried out amidst the backdrop of an institutional context that is both rich and varied, and where several UN organizations, working hand in hand with governmental agencies and civil society, cooperate in an attempt to achieve priority development objectives at the local, regional, and national levels. Thus the mid-term evaluations have been conducted in line with the principles outlined in the Evaluation network of the Development Assistant Committee (DAC) - as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In this respect, the evaluation process included a reference group comprising the main stakeholders involved in the joint programme, who were active participants in decisions making during all stages of the evaluation; design, implementation, dissemination and improvement phase.

The analysis contained in the mid-term evaluation focuses on the joint program at its mid-term point of implementation- approximately 18 months after it was launched. Bearing in mind the limited time period for implementation of the programs (3 years at most), the mid-term evaluations have been devised to serve as short-term evaluation exercises. This has limited the scope and depth of the evaluation in comparison to a more standard evaluation exercise that would take much longer time and resources to be conducted. Yet it is clearly focusing on the utility and use of the evaluation as a learning tool to improve the joint programs and widely disseminating lessons learnt.

This exercise is both a first opportunity to constitute an independent 'snapshot' of progress made and the challenges posed by initiatives of this nature as regards the 3 objectives being pursued by the MDG-F; the change in living conditions for the various populations vis-à-vis the Millennium Development Goals, the improved quality in terms of assistance provided in line with the terms and conditions outlined by the Declaration of Paris as well as progress made regarding the reform of the United Nations system following the "Delivering as One" initiative.

As a direct result of such mid-term evaluation processes, plans aimed at improving each joint program have been drafted and as such, the recommendations contained in the report have now become specific initiatives, seeking to improve upon implementation of all joint programs evaluated, which are closely monitored by the MDG-F Secretariat.

Conscious of the individual and collective efforts deployed to successfully perform this mid-term evaluation, we would like to thank all partners involved and to dedicate this current document to all those who have contributed to the drafting of the same and who have helped it become a reality (members of the reference group, the teams comprising the governmental agencies, the joint program team, consultants, beneficiaries, local authorities, the team from the Secretariat as well as a wide range of institutions and individuals from the public and private sectors). Once again, our heartfelt thanks.

The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views of the MDG-F Secretariat.

Adan Ruiz Villalba Evaluation Advisor

MDG-F Secretariat

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F  
*“Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s  
MDG Achievements”*

**Final**

**Mid-Term Evaluation Report**

Submitted by  
Jean-Joseph Bellamy

December 23, 2010

8 Thiessen Crescent  
Kanata, Ontario  
K2L 2M3 Canada  
Tel: (613) 254-8455 E-mail: [JJ@Bellamy.net](mailto:JJ@Bellamy.net)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<b>V</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>VI</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. CONTEXT OF THE JORDAN JOINT PROGRAMME</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>2</b>
3.1. OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION .....	2
3.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION.....	3
3.3. EVALUATION USERS .....	4
3.4. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....	4
3.4.1. Overall Approach.....	4
3.4.2. Roles and Responsibilities.....	5
3.4.3. Evaluation Instruments.....	5
<b>4. EVALUATION FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1. RELEVANCE OF THE JORDAN JOINT PROGRAMME .....	6
4.1.1. Towards Development Objectives of Jordan.....	6
4.1.2. Towards Implementation of MDGs in Jordan.....	11
4.1.3. Towards UN Objectives in Jordan .....	12
4.1.4. Alignment with MDG-F Goals and Principles.....	13
4.1.5. Towards Needs of Stakeholders.....	15
4.1.6. Synergies with Related Initiatives in Jordan .....	15
4.1.7. Internal Programme Concept/Design.....	17
4.2. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE JORDAN JOINT PROGRAMME.....	19
4.2.1. Achievements of Programme’s Expected Outcomes.....	19
4.2.2. Contribution to Capacity Development.....	24
4.2.3. Additional Programme Achievements .....	25
4.2.4. Risks and Assumptions / Risk Mitigation Management.....	26
4.3. EFFICIENCY OF THE JORDAN JOINT PROGRAMME.....	27
4.3.1. Joint Programme Management Approach.....	27
4.3.2. Financial Management.....	30
4.3.3. Fund Leveraging / Co-financing .....	32
4.3.4. Quality of Technical Assistance / Use of National Capacity.....	33
4.3.5. Country Ownership / Stakeholder Participation .....	34
4.3.6. Monitoring Approach and Progress Reporting.....	34
4.4. POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE JORDAN JOINT PROGRAMME.....	36
4.4.1. Potential to Achieve the Programme’s Strategies.....	36
4.4.2. Contribution to the Implementation of MDGs in Jordan .....	37
4.4.3. Potential Impacts on Local Environment and Socio-Economic Issues.....	37
4.5. SUSTAINABILITY AND REPLICABILITY OF THE JORDAN JOINT PROGRAMME .....	38
4.5.1. Sustainability of Results Achieved.....	38
4.5.2. Enabling Environment: Policy, Legislation and Institutions.....	39
4.5.3. Replication and Scaling-up .....	40
<b>5. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>41</b>

<b>6. LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>7. RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b> .....	<b>49</b>
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORS).....	49
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX .....	60
ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED.....	68
ANNEX 4: DISCUSSION GUIDE.....	72
ANNEX 5: EVALUATION MISSION AGENDA.....	74
ANNEX 6: LIST OF PEOPLE MET .....	75
ANNEX 7: JOINT PROGRAMME EXPECTED RESULTS AND PLANNED ACTIVITIES .....	78

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Joint Programme Logic Model.....	18
Table 2: List of Jordan Joint Programme Achievements.....	21
Table 3: List of Identified Risks and Mitigation .....	26
Table 4: Output and Activity Responsibilities per UN Agency.....	28
Table 5: Utilization of 1 <sup>st</sup> MDG-F Transfer by UN Agency.....	31
Table 6: Status of MDG-F Funds Utilization by UN Agency.....	32
Table 7: Status of Co-financing funds .....	33
Table 8: List of Counterpart Organizations and Others Partners .....	34
Table 9: List of Performance Indicators to Monitor the JP .....	35
Table 10: Proposed List of Performance Indicators to Monitor the JP.....	46

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AA	Administrative Agent
AECI	Spanish Cooperation Agency
ASPnet	Associated Schools Project Network
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CEHA	Center for Environmental Health Activities
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DWQ	Drinking Water Quality
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FTR	Fund Transfer Request
GDI	Gender Development Index
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOJ	Government Of Jordan
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation Agency
HDI	Human Development Index
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development
IHP	International Hydrological Programme
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRCWEE	International Research Center for Water, Environment and Energy
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
JES	Jordan Environment Society
JP	Joint Programme
MCC	Millennium Challenge Account
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDG-F	Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund
MDTF	Multi Donor Trust Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOA	Ministry Of Agriculture
MOEd	Ministry Of Education
MOE	Ministry Of Environment
MOH	Ministry Of Health
MOPIC	Ministry Of Planning and International Cooperation
MOWI	Ministry Of Water and Irrigation
MTE	Medium Term Evaluation
NCARE	National Centre for Agricultural Research and Extension
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NES	National Environmental Strategy
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NSC	National Steering Committee
PAP	Public Action for Water, Energy and Environment Project
PMC	Programme Management Committee
PMO	Prime Minister Office
RBM	Results Based Management
RC	Resident Coordinator (UN)
RFP	Request For Proposal
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound
TOR	Terms of Reference

UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollar
WAJ	Water Authority of Jordan
WANI	Water and Nature Initiative
WGF	Water Governance Facility
WHO	World Health Organization
WSP	Water Safety Plan
WWDR	World Water Development Report
ZRB	Zarqa River Basin

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by Mr. Jean-Joseph Bellamy, Senior Evaluator ([JJ@Bellamy.net](mailto:JJ@Bellamy.net)). Mr. Bellamy would like to express its gratitude and appreciation to all stakeholders he interviewed. Their contributions were most appreciated, and facts and opinions they shared played a critical part in this evaluation.

Mr. Bellamy would also like to extend special thanks to the MDG-F Secretariat and especially the Joint Programme Management Team in Amman who supplied key information and key contacts. A special thank you to Dr. Munjed Al-Sharif, Joint Programme Coordinator and Ms. Marta Lanzoni, UN-RC Assistant, who contributed greatly to the organization of the two-week fact-findings mission in Jordan.

## DISCLAIMER

*This report is the work of an independent consultant and does not necessarily represent the views, or policy, or intentions of the United Nations Agencies.*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) is an initiative funded by the Government of Spain and implemented by UN agencies to support countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication. The Fund operates through UN teams in each country and uses a joint programme mode of intervention that is divided into eight thematic windows corresponding to the eight MDGs. It has currently a total of 128 joint programmes approved in 49 countries.

The Environment and Climate Change thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service provision at the national and local levels, as well as increasing access to new funding mechanisms and expanding the ability to adapt to climate change. This window includes 17 joint programmes that mostly seek to contribute to three types of result: (a) mainstream the environment, natural resource management and actions against climate change in all public policy; (b) improve national capacities to plan and implement concrete actions in favor of the environment; and (c) assess and improve national capacities to adapt to climate change.

The “*Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements*” Joint Programme (JP) is the only joint programmes (window) funded by MDG-F for Jordan. It started in February 2009 and will terminate in February 2012. It has a total budget of USD 4.13M, including USD 4M from the MDG-F and USD 126,667 from UNDP and other partners. It is implemented by four UN Agencies, five main National Partners and several other stakeholders.

The strategy of the JP is to enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change by addressing Jordan’s long-term adaptation needs. It seeks to develop Jordan’s key government and civil society counterparts’ capacity to adapt to climate change threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security under the conditions of severe water scarcity that is expected to be compounded by climate change. The strategy is being implemented through a set of two outcomes:

- *Outcome 1:* Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change;
- *Outcome 2:* Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions;

This mid-term evaluation (MTE) was initiated by the MDG-F Secretariat. Its objectives are to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the JP activities in relation to the stated objectives so far and to generate knowledge including the identification of best practices and lessons learned as well as conclusions and recommendations to improve the implementation of the programme for the remaining period of implementation.

The findings presented in this report are based on a desk review of project documents and on interviews with key programme informants and programme staffs including a two-week mission to Jordan. The methodology included the development of an evaluation matrix to guide the entire data gathering and analysis process. The findings were triangulated with the use of multiple sources of information when possible and the evaluation report is structured around the GEF five evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results/Impacts and Sustainability.

### ***The Main Findings of this Mid-Term Evaluation are:***

The JP is very relevant for Jordan; particularly to support Jordan to establish its climate change adaptation agenda. Water scarcity is a major challenge for Jordan’s development and it is impacted negatively by climate change; both are a threat to human health, food security and overall productivity. However, the review noted that climate change was not mentioned in the National Agenda that is guiding the development agenda in Jordan and

in the “Water for Life” strategy, the main national policy instrument for water management in Jordan. Nevertheless, the focus of the National Agenda is on the development/strengthening of policies, legislation and institutions related to the overall objective of the National Agenda, including water and environment in general; and the water strategy identified the fact that climate change risks were not sufficiently taken into account in sectoral policies and investment frameworks. Consequently, the JP provides resources for the government of Jordan to develop its capacity to address and mainstream climate change adaptation into the national development agenda. From a UN perspective, the JP is well aligned with the UNDAF 2008-2012 and also the implementation of MDGs in Jordan. This is an ambitious programme aiming at many different intervention areas related to climate change. It may look somewhat “piecemeal” but it also reflects national priorities and address national needs. All activities are part of several government of Jordan climate change adaptation programmes.

After more than a year of implementation, the progress made by the JP is so far limited. The review confirms what was noted by the MDG-F Secretariat when they commented the 2010 Bi-annual report. However, despite that the JP is still behind schedule, it is finally implemented at full speed with a good participation of key stakeholders. The delivery of several assignments currently underway should change this assessment in the coming 6-9 months. Currently the JP has an implementation team in place; has a fully developed work plan; has a participatory process in place with the involvement of key stakeholders through task forces to validate the implementation process; has a JP management committee chaired by the Secretary General of the MOWI to oversee the implementation of the programme; and more importantly has several assignments currently underway. Nevertheless, the JP is about capacity development in climate change adaptation; however, no capacity development approach or strategies were explicitly stated in the joint programme document and the review indicates that the approach to develop the needed capacities needs to be strengthened; particularly in order to maximize the long-term sustainability of JP achievements. In term of achievements, it was also noted that the JP is having an impact on establishing a national agenda on climate change in Jordan. Already several unforeseen organizational developments such as the current development of an inter-ministerial committee on climate change have been observed during the mission for this review.

From a management perspective, it is a complex programme to coordinate and manage. It involves 4 UN agencies and 6 main counterpart organizations. The management aspects are well addressed in the programme document with the UN management modalities - including fund management - and overall management arrangements. Roles and responsibilities are clearly identified with a management structure that includes a small JP unit based at MOWI, a PMC and a NSC. According to the financial information reviewed, the JP utilized 27% (\$1.1M) of its MDG-F budget (\$4M) versus an elapsed time of 36% when considering the start-up delay. Disbursements should accelerate in the period September 2010 to June 2011 and it is anticipated that the budget should be entirely disbursed by the end of the programme; including a time extension of 5-6 months. However, it was found that the management of the programme is too activity-based as opposed to be more results-based (RBM); preventing a greater focus on what the programme needs to achieve (vision) as opposed to what activities need to be delivered. Finally, a monitoring framework with 29 indicators is used to monitor the programme. However, the monitoring process is not fulfilling its intent; information contained in the few progress reports does not provide a good “picture” of the reality on the ground. This information gap is partly due to the nature of these indicators and the way information is reported; it reports mostly activities as opposed to progress made toward the achievements of expected results.

Despite that it is too early to assess the potential for the JP to achieve its overall strategy, activities underway and its pioneer role should contribute to the enhancement of the capacity to adapt to climate change in Jordan. This contribution will be achieved through the identification and implementation of adaptation measures to climate change in order to mitigate impacts on water availability, health and food productivity. The potential for long-term impacts of the JP is also confirmed by some unforeseen positive developments such as current negotiations to set up an inter-ministerial committee on climate change and the creation of a climate change and environment unit at MOWI. The JP will also contribute to the implementation of MDGs in Jordan by responding directly to some recommendations made by a MDG assessment conducted in 2004.

Finally, despite a weak sustainability strategy stated in the JP document, JP achievements should be sustainable in the long-term. The implementation approach is conducive for ensuring this long-term sustainability: first, most activities that are supported by the JP are responding to national needs; second, the involvement of stakeholders throughout the implementation process encourages the ownership of the process by stakeholders; and, third, achievements are to be institutionalized within the policy framework or the procedures of organizations. However, it is important that sustainability be emphasized during the implementation of the JP – throughout its remaining period - and “go the extra mile” for institutionalizing achievements and scaling up results issued from demonstrations.

***Few Lessons were Identified:***

- The quality of the implementation of this type of development programme depends a lot on the quality of the design/formulation of these programmes. Strong design phase leads often to better country ownership, better stakeholder participation and better long-term sustainability.
- A joint programme document should be approved when it is completely finalized.
- There is a need to better align management modalities among UN agencies involved into a joint programme under the “One UN” concept for an effective implementation. However, the harmonization of rules and procedures needs to be done at the UN agency headquarter level.
- A joint programme needs a defined inception phase at start up to review design elements, engage stakeholders and document possible changes to the programme strategy, management arrangements, monitoring framework and participation of stakeholders.

***Recommendations for the Remaining Period of the Programme:***

1. It is recommended that the JP implementation team requests a second transfer as soon as possible to avoid a slowdown of the current implementation pace;
2. It is recommended to monitor closely the implementation of all activities under outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.3 that are implemented by WHO over the next 6 to 9 months and address any slippage immediately;
3. It is recommended to develop with relevant stakeholders a “roadmap” for implementing WSPs throughout Jordan;
4. It is recommended to plan a time extension of 5-6 months minimum to complete the JP and ensure that achievements are sustainable and replicated;
5. It is recommended to make indicators included in the monitoring framework gender sensitive and to explore possibilities to mainstream gender approaches in activities where possible;
6. It is recommended to emphasize capacity development throughout the implementation of JP activities, in order to maximize the development of the climate change adaptation capacity of key stakeholders;
7. It is recommended that the JP implementation team constantly emphasizes the involvement of key stakeholders; particularly those whom should become the logical custodians of JP achievements;
8. It is recommended to discuss the formalization of roles and responsibilities for JP focal points with relevant ministries in order to maximize the effectiveness of their intervention;
9. It is recommended to develop a sustainability strategy, emphasizing institutionalization and scaling-up of results throughout the remaining implementation period;
10. It is recommended to create a UN Thematic Group on climate change and environment with the involvement of national stakeholders;
11. It is recommended to create a Working Group inclusive of all stakeholders in the ZRB to oversee the implementation of activities – including decision-making - under output 2.4;
12. It is recommended to work in close collaboration with IUCN; particularly for activities to be implemented in the ZRB;
13. It is recommended to organize high-level seminar(s) targeting Minister level participants to raise awareness of climate change impacts on water resources, food productivity and health protection as well as adaptation measures to be implemented;

14. It is recommended to collaborate with the team that is producing the 3rd National Communication to the UNFCCC in order to integrate current findings from the JP;
15. It is recommended to review the list of performance indicators to monitor the progress of the JP (*a first attempt at reviewing these indicators is proposed in the report*).

***Recommendations for the MDG-F initiative:***

16. It is recommended to strengthen the formulation stage for these joint programmes; including stronger guidelines to review the context of the JP, national priorities, existing barriers and rationale for the programme;
17. It is recommended to the MDG-F Secretariat to institute an inception phase when starting up these joint programmes, including an inception report to finalize and document this initial phase of implementation;
18. It is recommended to introduce gender as a crosscutting theme to be applied in all joint programmes into guidelines produced by the MDG-F Secretariat such as the “*Implementation Guidelines for MDG-F Joint Programmes*” and the “*MDG-F TOR for Thematic Window on Environment and Climate Change*”;
19. It is recommended to streamline the template for the bi-annual monitoring report;
20. It is recommended to review the management modalities among UN agencies and explore how these modalities could be better aligned among UN agencies.

*(Executive Summary translated in Arabic by Dr. Munjed Al-Sharif)*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1. In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €28 million, with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. An additional pledge of €90 million was made by Spain on 24 September 2008 towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

2. The MDG-F operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 49 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs.

3. The Environment and Climate Change thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service provision at the national and local levels, as well as increasing access to new funding mechanisms and expanding the ability to adapt to climate change. This window includes 17 joint programmes worldwide that encompass a wide range of subjects and expected results.

4. This report presents the findings of the independent mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the joint programme “*Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements*” that is funded by the MDG-F. The MTE was conducted by a Senior Evaluator - Mr. Jean-Joseph Bellamy ([JJ@Bellamy.net](mailto:JJ@Bellamy.net)) - on behalf of the MDG-F Secretariat during the period September-November 2010 (see *Terms of Reference in Annex 1*). It comprised four phases: inception, mission, analysis and writing draft/final report.

5. This mid-term evaluation report includes seven sections. Chapter 2 presents the context of the joint programme; chapter 3 briefly describes the objective, scope, methodology, evaluation users and limitations of the evaluation; chapter 4 presents the findings of the evaluation. Conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations are presented in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 respectively and relevant annexes are found at the back end of the report.

## 2. CONTEXT OF THE JORDAN JOINT PROGRAMME

6. The “*Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements*” Joint Programme (JP)<sup>1</sup> started in February 2009 and will terminate in February 2012. It is the only joint programmes (window) funded by MDG-F for Jordan. It has a total budget of USD 4.13M, including USD 4M from the MDG-F and USD 126,667 from UNDP (USD 105,000) and other partners. It is implemented by four UN Agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNESCO and WHO), five main National Partners (Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Environment) and several other stakeholders such as IUCN (international NGO) and a water supply company.

7. Over the last twenty years, Jordan made good strategic advances towards the achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) including the reduction of poverty rates, the increase of adult literacy rate, infant mortality rate, access to water and access to sanitation. The country is on track to meet its MDG targets by 2015. However, these achievements are compromised by several threats including a high population fertility, water scarcity, severe land degradation, income poverty, inefficient production and regional conflicts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this report “JP” will be used to refer to the MDG-F joint programme “*Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements*”.

8. The rationale of this joint programme is to address water scarcity and related threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security induced by climate change as key to sustain Jordan’s human development achievements and growth. The strategy of the joint programme is to enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change by addressing Jordan’s long-term adaptation needs. The joint programme seeks to develop Jordan’s key government and civil society counterparts’ capacity to adapt to climate change threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security under the conditions of severe water scarcity that is expected to be compounded by climate change.

9. The strategy of this joint programme is being implemented through a set of two outcomes and six outputs:
- **Outcome 1:** Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change;
    - *Output 1.1:* National drinking water quality management system at central and periphery level is strengthened
    - *Output 1.2:* Sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection is provided to all citizens
  - **Outcome 2:** Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions;
    - *Output 2.1:* Rural sector adaptive capacity for climate variability and change is improved as well as the urban-rural linkage in water resources management and allocation developed.
    - *Output 2.2:* National institutional and community capacity in integrated water resources management is improved.
    - *Output 2.3:* Adaptation measures, by health sector and other sectors, to protect health from climate change are institutionalized.
    - *Output 2.4:* Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened.

### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION

#### 3.1. Objective of the Evaluation

10. The objective of this mid-term evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the JP activities in relation to the stated objectives so far and to generate knowledge including the identification of best practices and lessons learned. Its specific objectives are to:

- a. Discover the programme’s design quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the Millennium Development Goals, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
- b. Understand how the joint programme operates and assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the One UN framework.
- c. Identify the programme’s degree of effectiveness among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the Environment and Climate Change thematic window, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

11. This mid-term evaluation will generate conclusions and recommendations to improve the implementation of the programme during its remaining period of implementation, as well as generating knowledge and identify best practices.

### **3.2. Scope of the Evaluation**

12. The unit of analysis or object of study for this mid-term evaluation is the joint programme “*Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements*”, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that are detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation. The evaluation assessed the planned, ongoing, or completed joint programme interventions to determine its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. It is part of the body of knowledge constituted by the M&E function of the MDG-F at the joint programme level. This level is the first level of information of the MDG-F information structure that comprises four levels: (a) joint programme level, (b) partner country level, (c) thematic window level and finally (d) overall MDGF level.

13. The evaluation process generated information to address the evaluation questions identified at the outset of this mid-term evaluation. The evaluation questions provided in the TORs were compiled and expanded in an evaluation matrix (see Annex 2). This matrix includes a comprehensive list of evaluation questions and provides overall directions for the evaluation (see Section 3.4.3).

14. A particular emphasis was put on the current programme results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed at which the programme is proceeding. The Evaluator reviewed the programme monitoring framework that was developed at the design stage, including the review of the set of indicators to monitor the programme progress.

15. More specifically, the evaluation assessed the four levels of the programme:

#### ***Design level***

16. The assessment reviewed the relevance of the programme design. The extent to which the objectives of the joint programme are consistent with the needs and interest of the partners and end-users, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of partners and donors.

17. The evaluation looked at the ownership of the programme design by considering the national social actors’ effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions and to what extent the JP objectives reflect the national and regional plans and programmes, the identified needs (environmental and human) and the operational context of national policies.

#### ***Process level***

18. The Evaluator evaluated the efficiency of the overall joint programme’s management model. He assessed the extent to which resources/inputs have been turned into results, the coordination among participating agencies and with the Jordanian government and civil society and how the programme has been monitored.

19. He also assessed the ownership of the process, including to what extent the target population and the participants have taken ownership of the programme and its achievements and if the counterpart resources have been mobilized.

#### ***Results level***

20. The evaluation assessed the effectiveness of the programme in meeting its expected outcomes and objectives and also in contributing to the MDGs at the local and national levels; including putting environmental problems on the country’s policy agenda. A particular emphasis was on the implementation timeline to assess if all expected results will be achieved at programme end. Success stories or best practices were identified.

21. The sustainability of programme achievements were also assessed to explore the probability that programme achievements will continue in the long run. The Evaluator evaluated the conditions in place at the local and national levels to ensure the long term impacts of the joint programme and possibly identify governance measures to improve the long term sustainability of the programme achievements.

### **Country level**

22. At the country level, the Evaluator identified lessons learned and best practices that can be transferred to other programmes or countries. It also looked into the contributions of the joint programme to the United Nations reform (“One UN”), assess how the principles of aid effectiveness (Paris Declaration) were integrated into the evaluated Joint Programme (JP) and the contribution of the JP towards the implementation of the MDGs in Jordan and more generally towards the public policy framework of Jordan.

## **3.3. Evaluation Users**

23. This MTE was initiated by the MDG-F Secretariat. The audience for this evaluation are the programme implementation team, the Programme Management Committee (PMC), the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Secretariat of the Fund. The evaluation provides these managers with complete and convincing evidence in determining the progress of the programme and – based on programme achievements - in providing conclusions and recommendations for the remaining implementation period of the programme. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

## **3.4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

24. The evaluation methodology used for this MTE promoted a shared understanding of environmental management procedures and priorities. The findings were triangulated through the concept of “*multiple lines of evidence*” using several evaluation tools and gathering information from different types of stakeholders and different levels of management.

### **3.4.1. Overall Approach**

25. This MTE was conducted in accordance with the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy designed for the MDG-F<sup>2</sup>. The function to monitor and evaluate the MDG-F was provided in the agreement between the government of Spain and UNDP and states that “*monitoring and evaluation of project activities shall be undertaken in accordance with established rules and procedures of UN Agencies, and determined by the Steering Committee, subject to the respective regulations, rules, policies and procedures of the UN Agencies*”. The evaluation was also conducted according to the provisions stated in the Joint Programme document; including the reporting structure of the JP and the programme monitoring framework with its list of indicators, their baseline values and targets at the end of the JP.

26. The Evaluator developed and used tools in accordance with the M&E strategy to ensure an effective programme evaluation. The evaluation provides evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful and it is easily understood by programme partners and applicable to the remaining period of programme duration. The evaluation was conducted and the findings were structured around the five internationally accepted evaluation criteria set out by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development:

- *Relevance* relates to an overall assessment of whether the JP is in keeping with its design and in addressing identified key priorities.
- *Effectiveness* is a measure of the extent to which formally agreed expected programme results (outcomes) have been achieved, or can be expected to be achieved.
- *Efficiency* is a measure of the productivity of the JP intervention process, i.e. to what degree the outcomes achieved derive from efficient use of financial, human and material resources. In principle, it means comparing outcomes and outputs against inputs.
- *Impacts* are the long-term results of the JP and include both positive and negative consequences,

---

<sup>2</sup> MDG-F, *Monitoring and Evaluation System – Learning to Improve – Making Evidence Work for Development*

whether these are foreseen and expected, or not.

- *Sustainability* is an indication of whether the outcomes (end of programme results) and the positive impacts (long term results) are likely to continue after the JP ends.

27. In addition to the guiding principles described in the M&E strategy, the Evaluator also applied the following methodological principles to conduct the evaluation: (i) Participatory Consultancy; (ii) Applied Knowledge: the Evaluator’s working knowledge of evaluation theories and approaches and its particular expertise in environmental issues were applied to this mandate; (iii) Results-Based Management; (iv) Validity of information: multiple measures and sources sought out to ensure that the results are accurate and valid; (v) Integrity; and (vi) Respect and anonymity: All participants had the right to provide information in confidence.

28. Finally, the Evaluator carried out the MTE according to the ethical guidelines and code of conduct established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)<sup>3</sup>. The Evaluator conducted evaluation activities, which were independent, impartial and rigorous. The MTE clearly contributes to learning and accountability and the Evaluator has personal and professional integrity and is guided by propriety in the conduct of its business.

### **3.4.2. Roles and Responsibilities**

29. The Evaluator reported to the Portfolio Manager who is responsible for managing the execution of the MTE. She had three main functions: to facilitate the work of the Evaluator, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (Evaluator and reference group in Jordan), and to review the deliverables that were produced

30. In addition, this MTE involved the MDG-F Secretariat, the Programme Management Office of the joint programme in Amman and the Programme Management Committee (PMC). In order to oversee the MTE, an Evaluation Reference Group was created by the PMC. It includes the permanent members of the PMC and one representative from each of these organizations: Jordan Environment Society (JES), International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Miyahuna<sup>4</sup>. The role of this group extends to all phases of the evaluation and it includes:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
- Providing input on the evaluation planning documents (work plan and communication, dissemination and improvement plan).
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
- Facilitating the evaluation team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

### **3.4.3. Evaluation Instruments**

31. To conduct this MTE the Evaluator used the following evaluation instruments:

*Evaluation Matrix:* As part of the inception phase, the Evaluator developed an evaluation matrix (see Annex 2) based on the evaluation scope presented in the TOR, the JP document and the review of other key programme documents. This matrix is structured along the five evaluation criteria and includes a comprehensive list of evaluation questions. It provided overall directions for the

<sup>3</sup> More details on the ethic in evaluation can be found in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines at <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

<sup>4</sup> A water company responsible for water management in Amman.

evaluation, was used as a basis for interviewing people and reviewing programme documents and provided a basis for structuring the evaluation report. This matrix was assembled with an overview of the programme, the evaluation scope and the proposed methodology to complete the inception report.

**Documentation Review:** It was conducted in Canada and in Jordan by the Evaluator. In addition to being a main source of information, this documentation was used as preparation for the mission of the Evaluator. A list of documents was provided to the Evaluator prior to the mission to Jordan. Additionally, the Evaluator searched other relevant documents through the web and contacts during the field mission (*see Annex 3*).

**Discussion Guide:** A discussion guide was developed to solicit information from stakeholders (*see Annex 4*). This guide assembles key questions from the evaluation matrix. Its main use was to guide the Evaluator through balanced and unbiased interviews as well as a tool to briefly review the collect of information during the field mission.

**Mission Agenda:** An agenda for the 10 working day mission to Jordan was developed during the inception phase. The process included the selection of stakeholders to meet/interview and ensure that they represent all stakeholders of the JP. Then, in collaboration with the MDG-F Team in Jordan, meetings were planned prior to the mission. The objective was to have a well-organized and planned mission to ensure a broad scan of stakeholders’ views during the time allocated to the mission (*see Annex 5*).

**Meetings/Interviews:** stakeholders were interviewed. Semi-structured interviews were conducted using the discussion guide and adapted to each meeting. All meetings were conducted in person with some follow up using emails when needed. Confidentiality was guaranteed to the participants and the findings are incorporated in this final report (*see Annex 6*).

**Field Visit:** Few field site visits were conducted during the mission of the Evaluator in Jordan. It ensured that the Evaluator had direct primary sources of information from the field and programme end-users.

## 4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

32. This section presents the findings of this MTE, which are based on a desk review of project documents and on interviews with key programme informants and programme staffs. As described in Section 3.4.1 they are structured around the internationally recognized five major evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impacts and Sustainability.

### 4.1. Relevance of the Jordan Joint Programme

33. Jordan suffers from a severe water scarcity problem and it is now one of the four driest countries in the world. Jordan’s remarkable development achievements are under threat due to the crippling water scarcity, which is expected to be aggravated by climate change. The scarcity of water in Jordan is the single most important constraint to the country growth and development as water is not only considered a factor for food production but a very crucial factor of health, survival and social and economical development. This section discusses the relevance of the JP within this context; as well as against its original design.

#### 4.1.1. Towards Development Objectives of Jordan

34. The sustainability of human development in Jordan is dependant on the availability of secure, adequate and clean energy sources. However this development is threatened by the decline in both the quantity and quality of water resources and the degradation in the quality and availability of arable land due to urbanization and poor land-use policies. To address these challenges, the Government of Jordan developed a National Agenda that is

an action plan for achieving sustainable development through a programme of reforms in prevailing policies and practices.

35. Additionally, the government of Jordan has devised a comprehensive set of water resources management strategy, policies, and legislation; and massive expenditures were expended over the last decade with support from international partners to enhance water resources availability and manage water demand.

### **National Agenda**

36. The National Agenda “stands as a unique, holistic and inclusive approach that aims primarily to improve the quality of life for Jordanians, build a strong economy, guarantee basic freedoms and human rights and strengthen democracy and cultural and political pluralism”. It was developed under the leadership of King Abdullah and under the oversight of a National Agenda Steering Committee that was created by a Royal Decree on February 9, 2005; it covers the period 2006-2015. The chief objective of this National Agenda is to improve the quality of life of Jordanians through the creation of income-generating opportunities, the improvement of standards of living, and the guarantee of social welfare.

37. The National Agenda is to be implemented through three consecutive phases: Phase I (2007-2012): *Employment Opportunities for All*; Phase II (2013-2017): *Upgrade and Strengthen the Industrial Base*; and Phase III (2018- onward): *World Class Competitor in the Knowledge Economy*. Furthermore, the National Agenda was developed around eight themes: (i) Political Development and Inclusion; (ii) Justice and Legislation; (iii) Investment Development; (iv) Financial Services and Fiscal Reform; (v) Employment Support and Vocational Training; (vi) Social Welfare; (vii) Education, Higher Education, Scientific Research and Innovation; and (viii) Infrastructure Upgrade.

38. The latter theme – the Infrastructure Upgrade Theme - is a central pillar supporting socioeconomic development in Jordan. It advocates environmentally sustainable economic development, a matter of increasing concern given the fast rate of degradation of Jordan’s natural resources. The theme includes water, Energy, ICT, Postal Services and Transportation sectors as well as Environment Sustainability.

39. Regarding the water sector, the National Agenda sets a host of initiatives that must be implemented in order to redress the current water situation; it includes:

- Develop water supply and new resources, exploit unconventional resources, and enforce the Kingdom’s water rights according to international agreements related to water sharing within a framework of regional cooperation.
- Improve efficiency of water distribution networks to decrease operational costs and non-revenue water.
- Restructure tariffs and progressively reduce subsidies.
- Develop and upgrade wastewater treatment facilities by using state-of-the art technology and re-use treated water for agriculture and industry.
- Encourage involvement of the private sector in developing the water sector and creating investment-friendly environment.

Total water demand is estimated at 1,525 mcm/year (2005), compared to an actual supply of 941 mcm/year, for an annual water deficit of some 584 mcm/year.

*Water Master Plan, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, GTZ*

40. Concerning environmental sustainability, Jordan is facing challenges related to legislative and regulatory frameworks, waste management, air pollution, combat of desertification, natural reserves and land use and the protection of the Dead Sea and the Red Sea. The National Agenda is addressing these concerns through several initiatives in the following areas:

- Regulatory and institutional framework including related legislation
- Waste management
- Air pollution

- Natural resources and land use

41. The National Agenda is the development agenda of Jordan with a strong focus on socio-economic development. Environmental sustainability is mostly addressed through investments in infrastructure; including in the water sector a crucial sector of strategic importance where water scarcity may impede socio-economic growth. It is also noted that climate change was not mentioned at all in the National Agenda. Nevertheless, one focus of this agenda is on the development/strengthening of policies, legislation and institutions related to the overall objective of the National Agenda, including water and environment in general.

### ***Water for Life – Jordan’s Water Strategy (2008-2022)***

42. The “Water for Life” strategy was published early 2009. It is the main policy instrument for water management in Jordan and it is fully endorsed by the government and under the responsibility of the Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MOWI). The rationale for this strategy is clear for all Jordanians. Despite government efforts in managing the limited water resources and its persistent search for alternative supplies, the available water resources per capita are falling as a result of population growth. The annual per capita water availability has declined from 3,600 m<sup>3</sup>/year in the year 1946 to 145 m<sup>3</sup>/year in the year 2008; this is far below the international water poverty line of 500 m<sup>3</sup>/year. According to the National Strategy and Action Plan to Combat Desertification (2006), this availability may fall to about 95 m<sup>3</sup>/year by 2025; potentially putting Jordan in the category of absolute water shortage countries.

*"Our Water situation forms a strategic challenge that cannot be ignored. We have to balance between drinking water needs and industrial and irrigation water requirements. Drinking water remains the most essential and the highest priority issue".*  
H.M. King Abdullah II, November 7, 1999

43. The strategy was developed after the start of the JP, nevertheless, it is currently the main instrument to improve the management of the water cycle in Jordan. The strategy looks at all aspects of the water cycle from rainfall to collection, treatment and discharge. The strategy has three pillars: (i) an effective water demand management; (ii) an efficient water supply operations; and, (iii) a well developed institutional reform. The vision of this strategy includes:

- Adequate, safe and secure drinking water supply ;
- Greater understanding and more effective management of groundwater and surface water;
- Healthy aquatic ecosystems;
- A sustainable use of water resources, and implemented fair, affordable and cost reflective water charges;
- Adaptation to increased population growth and economic development across the water sector and water users.

### ***Key Objectives of the “Water for Life” strategy:***

- The deficit between Supply from Demand in 2007 was 565 MCM; the projected deficit between Supply from Demand in 2022 is estimated at 284 MCM;
- The water resources of 2007 were 867 MCM and should be developed to 1,632 MCM by 2022;
- The Dissi water conveyance is operational by 2013;
- The Red Dead conveyance is operational by 2022;
- Treated wastewater effluent must be fully utilized by 2022;
- Extraction from groundwater should be drastically reduced.

44. In order to achieve this vision, the strategy describes the main lines of action as follows:

- An efficient and effective institutional reform;
- A drastic reduction in the exploitation of the groundwater;
- Efficient use of water resources;
- Implementation of the Dissi water conveyance and the Red Dead conveyance projects;
- Irrigated agriculture in the highlands will need to be capped and regulated and the by-laws will need to be reinforced;
- Appropriate water tariffs and incentives will be introduced in order to promote water efficiency in irrigation and higher economic returns for irrigated agricultural products.

45. The strategy is then developed into 6 main sections and each section has a set of goals for 2022 with related recommended actions. Relevant to the JP are few goals presented in the water strategy:

1. Water Demand by 2022:

- Irrigated agriculture in the highlands will need to be capped and regulated and the by-laws will need to be reinforced
  - Jordanians are well aware of water scarcity and the importance of conserving and
  - protecting our limited water resources
  - Viable options to reduce water demand within each sector are readily available
2. Water Supply by 2022:
- Uninterrupted safe and secure drinking water supply achieved including continuous flow in Amman, Zarqa, Irbid, and Aqaba
  - Drinking water resources are protected from pollution
  - Surface water is efficiently stored and utilized
  - Treated wastewater effluent is efficiently and cost-effectively used.
  - Groundwater management plans to ensure safe yield are operational.
  - The concept of utilizing greywater and rainwater is fully embedded in the codes and requirements of buildings
  - Our shared water rights are protected
3. Institutional Reform by 2022:
- Water law is enacted and enforced
  - Strong policy development and water resource planning strategies and capabilities forged
  - Governance functions and operational functions are separated
  - Staff are trained, number of staff is optimized, conflicts of interests are eliminated, and a dynamic working environment is created that is responsive to the needs of the sector
4. Irrigation Water by 2022:
- Efficient bulk water distribution as well as efficient on-farm irrigation systems are established
  - All treated wastewater generated will be used for activities that demonstrate the highest financial and social return including irrigation and other non-potable uses
  - Alternative technologies such as rainwater harvesting for enhancing irrigation water supply will be promoted
5. Wastewater by 2022:
- Public health and the environment, in particular groundwater aquifers, are protected from contaminated wastewater in the areas surrounding wastewater treatment plants
  - Treated wastewater is used for activities that provide the highest return to the economy. For irrigation use in the Jordan Valley and in the Highlands, a comprehensive risk management system is in place
  - The quality of treated wastewater from all municipal and industrial wastewater treatment plants meets national standards and is monitored regularly
6. Alternative Water Resources by 2022:
- Treated wastewater will be used for the activity that provides the highest social and economic return and standards for use in agriculture will be introduced and reinforced
  - Rainwater harvesting is encouraged and promoted

46. It is a comprehensive water policy to address one of the biggest challenge for the development of Jordan. However, it is noted that it does not address the impact of climate change on water resources. Climate change is hardly mentioned in the strategy and it confirms one of the main barriers to be addressed by the JP that is “*climate change risks were not sufficiently taken into account in sectoral policies and investment frameworks*”. Considering the concept of the JP, it is totally relevant in the context of this water strategy.

***Jordan’s Second National Communication to the UNFCCC (2009)***

47. Jordan produced its second national communication to the UNFCCC in 2009. It emphasized how serious and urgent the challenges face by Jordan in the water sector are and where water resources are expected to

decrease based on suggested scenarios. It reiterates the scientific evidence of the IPCC and shows the dynamics of Jordan’s greenhouse emissions and where direct mitigation measures should be implemented. The vulnerability and adaptation sections define Jordan’s priorities in linking adaptation to national policies for sustainable development; one identified barrier to be addressed by the JP.

48. At the heart of Jordanian climate change mitigation measures lies the issue of energy. The National Energy Strategy 2008-2020 identifies a target of 10% of renewable energy by the year 2020, which is a ten-fold increase from the share of 1% in 2007. The success of Jordan’s mitigation portfolio will highly depend on a smooth system of technical and financial support to deploy the best available technologies in sectors such as energy, transport and waste management, in particular.

49. On the adaptation front, Jordan is facing a severe challenge in water scarcity to be magnified by the impacts of climate change. In a harsh natural environment with limited surface water and heavy demand on groundwater, and lack of adequate financial resources for desalination, Jordan is at the front line in the regional fight for innovative solutions to water scarcity problems. The scarcity of water in Jordan is the single most important constraint to the country growth and development as water is not only considered a factor for food production but a very crucial factor of health, survival and social and economical development. Based on findings from several studies, adaptation measures were suggested; they include:

***Agriculture Sector:***

- Improvement of water use efficiency
- Implementation of conservation agriculture
- Implementation of water harvesting
- Supervised irrigation with treated wastewater
- Community based management of rangeland resources
- Use of crop varieties with appropriate vernalization

***Water Sector:***

Adaptation measures are suggested in the following areas:

- Demand management
- Surface water development
- Groundwater protection
- Non-conventional water resources development
- Brackish water
- Water quality and the environment
- Water resources monitoring system
- Domestic wastewater
- Industrial wastewater
- Measures to improve system efficiency
- Watershed management
- Urban water use
- Water quality and environmental protection
- Flood control
- Research programs

50. This second communication does not mention the JP; however, it says that Jordan was undergoing a comprehensive assessment and planning process to enhance the adaptive capacity of the water sector to the potential impacts of climate change. This is noted as a close objective to the JP and the JP contributes to some of the above suggested adaptation measures such as use of crop varieties more adapted to water scarcity, water demand management, measures to improve water system efficiency, etc..

51. Finally, this communication is concluded with a chapter reviewing problems, constraints and needs. Regarding vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, an initial list of problems, constraints and needs is presented but also with the suggestion to further develop this list into a comprehensive multi-sectoral “National Adaptation Action Plan” through the participation and engagement of relevant institutions and stakeholders including ministries of environment, water, agriculture and health.

### ***National Environmental Strategy (NES) and National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP)***

52. The NES was prepared in 1992 with the support of IUCN and USAID as a first step in Jordan to confront environmental problems. The NES is a “catalogue” of all environmental pressures and problems and contains over 400 specific recommendations; however, no priorities were set in the strategy. Actions were grouped into five strategic directions:

- Construct a legal framework for environmental management
- Strengthen institutions working for environmental protection and conservation
- Focus on cross-sectoral priorities such as water resources management and population expansion
- Improve management of protected areas
- Foster public environmental and conservation education

53. The NEAP was produced in 1996 and provides a comprehensive assessment of environmental problems and opportunities in Jordan. It also includes a prioritized and phased plan of action for addressing the identified environmental issues. The NEAP identified 41 priority environmental needs, which included four cross-sectoral environmental management capacity building needs and 37 sectoral environmental actions. A further 19 priorities were recommended for immediate implementation; including the enforcement of regulations in the water sector and the need for restructuring the water sector.

54. In summary, the JP is very relevant in the context of the development objectives of Jordan. Water scarcity is a major challenge for Jordan’s development and it is impacted negatively by climate change. It is a threat to human health, food security and overall productivity. However, the review of the National Agenda and the “Water for Life” strategy indicates that climate change has not been sufficiently integrated into national policies, which is a barrier that the JP is addressing. It is confirmed by the Government Implementation Plan 2010 that is the instrument for implementing the National Agenda. This plan includes 7 strategic initiatives including #5- *Feeding and Fuelling Growth and Security through Infrastructure Mega Projects*. Under this initiative 2 key priority programmes are related to the JP: *Contributing to the Achievement of Sustainable Water Security in the Kingdom* and *Increasing Jordan’s Capabilities in Achieving Food Security*. It is mentioned as a target to “continue the implementation of 3 pioneering projects to rehabilitate the Zarqa river”, which it can be assumed that the JP is one of them; however, no mention of climate change in the entire plan. This analysis reinforces the relevance of the JP in Jordan by enhancing the capacity to adapt to climate change and in the medium term to introduce climate change in national priorities.

#### ***4.1.2. Towards Implementation of MDGs in Jordan***

55. Jordan is one of the smallest and poorest economies in the Middle East. According to the National Agenda, 14 percent of Jordanians live below the poverty line. The country suffers from structural unemployment as the economy fails to absorb the annual inflow of new job seekers. Moreover, Jordan’s active-to-total population ratio is one of the lowest in the world, with an average of four non-active individuals depending on a single worker; 38% of the population is below 15 years of age. According to the National Agenda, “with the current population growth rate and the economic status-quo, unemployment rates could well exceed 20 percent and could account for over half a million unemployed in the coming ten to fifteen years”. Nevertheless, Jordan’s HDI was 0.77 in 2009 and ranked 96<sup>th</sup> in the world; a respectable position particularly when considering its lower GDP per capita (107<sup>th</sup>) as compared to other Arab and similar countries.

56. Within the context of these major challenges, including the limited water resources, Jordan committed to implementing the obligations of the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This commitment was confirmed by His Majesty King Abdullah II’s speech at the World Summit of the UN General Assembly in New York, on 16 September 2005. In 2004, Jordan produced a progress report stating the progress made to achieve the main targets set globally. From this assessment, two MDGs were identified as more difficult to be achieved by 2015; Goal 3 – *Promote gender equality and empowerment of women* and Goal 7 – *Ensure environmental sustainability*. Regarding the latter, it has three targets:

- Target 7a: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources
- Target 7c: Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water
- Target 7d: Have achieved by 2020 a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

57. The 2004 assessment indicates that the target 7c is already achieved and that the progress for the other two is good. Moreover, it is assessed that the capacity exists for progressing toward the MDGs targets and it was estimated that Jordan should have achieved those targets (7a and 7d) as well by 2015. However, the sustainability of water supplies is, in the long run, a serious problem for Jordan. The assessment concludes with a review of the challenges for the implementation of the MDGs as well as a set of 21 recommendations. Among these recommendations, three are related to the JP:

- Establish policies in the agricultural, industrial and transport sectors, urban planning, biodiversity as well as energy consumption and renewable energy resources, accessibility of water, sewage networks and treatment facilities and integrated solid waste management
- Improve the efficiency of water use in the municipal, industrial and agricultural sectors through the reduction of unaccounted for water
- Adopt a national policy to manage water resources, monitor usage, rehabilitate infrastructure and adopt sound treatment technologies.

58. A first glance at the MDGs indicates that the contribution of the JP towards the MDGs targets is somewhat limited. The most relevant target for the JP is the target 7c and it is already achieved in Jordan. However, considering the water scarcity issue in Jordan, a closer look at the assessment done in 2004 indicates that the JP is contributing to some of the recommendations; particularly the ones presented above and related to water management.

59. Nevertheless, it is also noted that climate change is not really included in the MDGs framework and as a result not taken into account in the 2004 assessment of progress toward the MDGs in Jordan. As per the discussion above, this lack of focus on climate change reinforces the relevance of the JP as a pioneer programme to enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change and to introduce climate change in national priorities in the near future.

#### **4.1.3. Towards UN Objectives in Jordan**

60. The UN country team with the active participation of its partners with government, civil society, private sector and lender/donor community conducted a Common Country Assessment (CCA) for Jordan, which was published in 2006. Its aim was to facilitate the harmonization and integration of the UN programme in Jordan (where a dozen agencies are represented at various levels) and provide the basis for the development of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The National Agenda served as a reference point throughout the process.

61. Based on the review of several environmental areas including water resources management, the CCA identified key environmental and natural resources challenges, which includes:

- Develop an integrated approach to water resource management;
- Enhance adoption of supply measures for surface water, such as surface and sub-surface storage, evaporation reduction, eliminating and controlling seepage losses, and protection of water quality, and develop and expand the use of new non-conventional water resources;
- Properly control groundwater abstractions and reduce abstraction to within a safe yield of the aquifers, and protect the quality of surface and groundwater resources from degradation associated with pollution and over-abstraction;
- Support national efforts aimed at rehabilitating environmental priority areas and “hot spots”, such as

the Zarqa River Basin (ZRB), phosphate mining sites and landfill areas.

62. These challenges formed the basis for the UNDAF 2008-2012 programme, which includes three outcomes to be achieved by 2012:

- Quality of and equitable access to social services and income generating opportunities are enhanced with focus on poor and vulnerable groups,
- Good governance mechanisms and practices established towards poverty reduction, protection of human rights and gender equality in accordance with the Millennium Declaration, and
- Sustainable management of natural resources and the environment

63. The latter outcome is further broken down into four outputs:

- National institutional and community capacities strengthened for more sustainable management of water resources
- Environmental policies aligned to global conventions & national implementation capacities enhanced
- Enhanced capacities for safer management of hazardous waste
- Environmentally-sustainable industrial and transport policies, standards & processes introduced

64. The JP clearly contributes to the third outcome of the UNDAF 2008-2012 that is “*Sustainable management of natural resources and the environment*” and particularly to two related outputs:

- National institutional and community capacities strengthened for more sustainable management of water resources:* The UN system supports the development and implementation of integrated water resource approaches. It includes the finalization of a national vision and related implementation plans, as well as the building up of required operational and managerial capacities in integrated water resource management including waste water reuse. Another key result is the design of an integrated plan for the Zarqa River Basin where groundwater abstraction, the resulting salt intrusion and water contamination levels (from industrial and agricultural pollutants), have often reached unsustainable levels. Water safety plans will be implemented, ensuring drinking water quality and securing a healthier life for the population.
- Environmental policies aligned to global conventions & national implementation capacities enhanced:* The UN system is to assist Jordan in establishing a database for monitoring health issues associated with climate change, assessing potential health impacts, and providing technical support for adaptation measures. It contributes towards prioritizing and designing specific initiatives to assist identified vulnerable groups to adapt to climate change.

65. Finally, on the contrary to other national strategies and programmes, it is noted that the UNDAF 2008-2012 takes into consideration climate change adaptation in its programming framework. Under the second outcome focusing on environmental policies, climate change adaptation to be streamlined in national action plans in ways that protect the vulnerable groups is one output out of five under this outcome. The UN system is to assist the establishment of a database for monitoring health issues associated with climate change, assess potential health impacts, and provide technical support for adaptation measures. It will also contribute towards prioritizing and designing specific initiatives to assist identified vulnerable groups to adapt to climate change. However, this is just a beginning with a relatively small investment and much more focus on climate change would be needed in the future.

#### **4.1.4. Alignment with MDG-F Goals and Principles**

66. The JP is well aligned with the MDG-F goals and principles. As presented in the previous Sections, the JP addresses national priorities identified by national partners and UN agencies; it seeks to coordinate the work of UN agencies with national partners; and support the implementation of innovative activities with the potential for replication and scaling-up. It is also well aligned with the objectives of the MDG-F environment and climate

change window.

67. The Government of Spain decided to establish the MDG Achievement Fund (MDG-F) as a mechanism to expand the institutional partnership within UN Agencies. This decision was done within the context of the Spanish Master Plan for International Cooperation (2005-2008) that was outlining Spain’s policy, advocacy and financial priorities in support of the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The aims of the MDG-F has been to accelerate progress towards the attainment of the MDGs in select countries by:

- Supporting policies and programmes that promise significant and measurable impact on select MDGs;
- Financing the testing and/or scaling-up of successful models;
- Catalyzing innovations in development practice; and
- Adopting mechanisms that improve the quality of aid as foreseen in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

68. The activities of the Fund and the way in which the country-level interventions are designed are guided by several principles:

- Support programmes anchored in national priorities, in line with the Paris Declaration;
- Ensure the sustainability of its investments;
- Apply the highest standards in quality of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation within a management framework oriented towards results and accountability;
- Consolidate inter-agency planning and management systems at the country level;
- Minimize transaction costs associated with administering the Fund.

69. The MDG-F supports innovative actions - within the framework of the MDGs and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness - with the potential for wide replication and high-impact in select countries<sup>5</sup> and sectors. As a result, the approach and decisions of the MDG-F are informed by the imperatives of ensuring national and local ownership of supported activities, aligned with national policies and procedures, coordinated with other donors, be results-oriented and with mutual accountability.

70. The MDG-F has been implemented through the UN development system and finance, supporting collaborative UN activities that leverage the value-added of the UN in the sector and country concerned; particularly where the UN's collective strength is harnessed in order to address multi-dimensional development challenges. The MDG-F supports joint programmes in eight thematic areas including: children, food security and nutrition; gender equality and women's empowerment; environment and climate change; youth, employment and migration; democratic economic governance; development and the private sector; conflict prevention and peace building; and culture and development.

71. The objective of the environment and climate change thematic window is to support initiatives to reduce poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service delivery at the national and local level, increase access to new financing mechanisms and enhance capacity to adapt to climate change. This support has been provided through four priority areas:

- Mainstreaming environmental issues in national and sub-national policy, planning and investment frameworks;
- Improving local management of environmental resources and service delivery;
- Expanding access to environmental finance;
- Enhancing capacity to adapt to climate change.

72. The JP is well aligned with the terms of reference of this window; particularly with the latter priority area presented above. The JP strategy is to enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change by addressing Jordan’s

---

5 The MDG-F is implemented in 49 countries from five regions around the world.

long-term adaptation needs. It seeks to develop Jordan’s key government and civil society counterparts’ capacity to adapt to climate change threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security under the conditions of severe water scarcity that is expected to be compounded by climate change.

#### **4.1.5. Towards Needs of Stakeholders**

73. The JP is relevant for stakeholders that are involved in addressing climate change adaptation needs in Jordan; it includes key government and civil society counterparts. The objective of the JP is a response to national priorities, seeking to address three main barriers identified during the formulation of this JP; there are:

- Climate change risks were not sufficiently taken into account in sectoral policies and investment frameworks;
- Existing climate information, knowledge and tools were not directly relevant for supporting adaptation decisions and actions; and
- Weak national capacity to develop sectoral adaptation responses.

74. All key Jordanians partners are involved in the implementation of the JP; it is an inclusive process. Furthermore, the various meetings with stakeholders during the mission of the Evaluator in Jordan, indicates a strong and growing interest and involvement of these stakeholders in the JP. Four main ministries (water and irrigation; health; agriculture; and environment) are involved as well as few other governmental agencies such as the National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE). The academic sector is well represented and provides a good backstopping mechanism for skills and knowledge for the implementation of the JP. Finally, an initial meeting in Zarqa (Oct. 7, 2010) to meet potential local partners for implementing JP’s activities related to the ZRB, demonstrated interests and willingness of these partners to participate in the implementation of the JP in the ZRB.

75. As it is discussed in Section 4.1.1 above, climate change has not been really mainstreamed yet in national policies and programmes in Jordan. Furthermore, the overall capacity of organizations to address climate change is limited. This context makes the JP very relevant for Jordan. In itself it has a pioneer role to introduce climate change adaptation as a new thematic area to be dealt with by the government. The JP provides a platform for all key stakeholders to come together and figure out how to address climate change adaptation in Jordan. By responding to these national priorities, the JP is addressing the needs of stakeholders.

76. Finally, the concept of the JP brings together a broad range of national and international organizations making it possible to leverage a broad range of comparative advantages, which should contribute to the effectiveness of the JP and the long-term impact and sustainability.

#### **4.1.6. Synergies with Related Initiatives in Jordan**

77. Water scarcity is a well-known national issue in Jordan that needs more and more attention as the years are passing by. Large investments have been made in the water sector to ensure the supply of water to Jordanians. Bilateral agencies have supported initiatives in the water sector for decades; including large investments by USAID and GTZ. The UN agencies are also much involved in the water sector in Jordan. WHO has been partnered with the government of Jordan on such matter for many years under a regional initiative and the same is true with UNESCO, FAO and UNDP. The JP includes UN partners with a wealth of information and best practices on the water sector and it is coordinated with other related initiatives such as the Zarqa Rehabilitation project implemented by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) and funded by the Spanish Cooperation Agency (AECI).

78. In June 2009, Jordan signed a grant agreement of \$13.34M with the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), an independent US foreign aid agency that is helping lead the fight against global poverty, to undertake technical, social and environmental feasibility studies for a large water sector programme with the focus on

water supply and sanitation (wastewater management) and concentrated in the Zarqa Governorate. The implementation of this programme should start mid-2011 with an overall budget of \$275M. It will be implemented by the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), a limited liability company owned by the government of Jordan and a programme management unit is based at the Prime Minister Office (PMO)<sup>6</sup>. The programme will include several projects and will be implemented over a 5-year period. It includes a “soft” component that will focus at the household and community levels to raise awareness on maintaining water infrastructure and behavioral change of water consumption.

79. The UN partners are also linking the JP with global initiatives, benefitting from best practices, lessons learned and multitude tools and guidelines. It includes:

- *UNESCO/IHP*: International Hydrological Programme (IHP) is UNESCO's international scientific cooperative programme in water research, water resources management, education and capacity-building, and the only broadly-based science programme of the UN system in this area. Its primary objectives are to act as a vehicle through which Member States, cooperating professional and scientific organizations and individual experts can upgrade their knowledge of the water cycle, thereby increasing their capacity to better manage and develop their water resources; to develop techniques, methodologies and approaches to better define hydrological phenomena; to improve water management, locally and globally; to act as a catalyst to stimulate cooperation and dialogue in water science and management; to assess the sustainable development of vulnerable water resources; and to serve as a platform for increasing awareness of global water issues. An IHP committee was established in Jordan in 1992 under the umbrella of the MOWI. It has currently 19 members representing 15 different organizations related to water issues.
- *WHO – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene*: WHO works on aspects of water, sanitation and hygiene where the health burden is high, where interventions could make a major difference and where the present state of knowledge is poor. The aim is to reduce water-and-waste related diseases and the optimization of the health benefits of sustainable water and waste management. The WHO programme in Jordan is implemented through the regional WHO-Center for Environmental Health Activities (CEHA) that is based in Amman and has been the region’s environmental health center of excellence for the Eastern Mediterranean region – including supporting and advising the upgrading of the water quality management system in Jordan - since its conception 25 years ago (1985).
- *WHO - Protecting health from climate change*: In order to protect health from Climate Change, the Regional Committee, in its 55th Session (2008), has adopted a Resolution and endorsed a regional framework of action to enhance the health sector’s resilience in all 22 Member States. Within this context, the regional office of WHO-CEHA has been providing countries with capacity building and technical support towards steering the region’s response to climate change in terms of vulnerability assessment, adaptation modalities and mitigation schemes.
- *Water Governance Facility (WGF)*: The WGF is based at the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI). It is a programme that has been developed by UNDP and SIWI and it is funded by UNDP and Sida. The WGF supports developing countries on a demand basis to strengthen water governance and reduce poverty through policy support and advisory services in multiple thematic areas, including: integrated water resources management, transboundary water, water supply and sanitation, climate change adaptation, South-South collaboration, experience and best practices exchange, gender, and capacity building. It provides access to tools and best practices for water management in general.
- *IUCN*: The IUCN Water and Nature Initiative (WANI) works towards managing and protecting water reserves and heritage for the future benefit of all. Stretching across 5 continents in 12 river basins, WANI works with governments and local communities to use and manage water resources

---

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.mca-jordan.gov.jo/index.php?&page\\_id=138](http://www.mca-jordan.gov.jo/index.php?&page_id=138)

more sustainably. WANI aims to help reduce poverty and protect the environment by helping people to manage river flows and improving access to all communities. In Jordan, water is the central theme for IUCN intervention. It works with MOE to develop a strategy for the development of the ZRB with the financial support of AECI. Elements of this strategy has been incorporated into the National Agenda and also in the formulation of the JP. An assessment of the ZRB was done a few years ago, which was endorsed by MOE. Current discussions are underway to establish a ZRB restoration unit within MOE.

- *GEF Funding:* GEF funding has been available in Jordan to fund climate change and water related activities. It includes funding for producing the national communications to UNFCCC and for developing policy relevant capacity for implementation of the global environmental conventions in Jordan (implemented by UNDP); other relevant projects implemented by IFAD include (i) to reduce the vulnerability to climate change of the agricultural system in Jordan, particularly from its impacts on water resources, by testing an innovative and efficient water-use technology and (ii) to mainstream sustainable land and water management practices.

80. Additionally, a “*Water Donor-Lender Group*” exists in Jordan where most international partners meet with key government ministries to discuss and coordinate water related initiatives. This group includes also a Zarqa Task Force focusing specifically on activities targeting the ZRB. The JP Coordinator is part of this group as well as the Zarqa Task Force.

81. The JP is not a stand-alone programme; it was developed on the basis of national priorities and related activities. It is implemented in collaboration with other initiatives underway in Jordan. Nevertheless, one specificity of the JP is the focus on climate change and its potential threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security under the conditions of severe water scarcity.

#### **4.1.7. Internal Programme Concept/Design**

82. The process to finalize the JP document and to approve the JP was cumbersome and led to some confusion when one needs to identify which JP document is the official version. The JP was approved in April 2008 by the MDG-F Steering Committee and a memorandum was sent to the UN-RC in Jordan. However, this approval was sent with a list of substantive comments to be addressed in the JP document before it is formally signed by all partners; they include:

- Review the narrative to explain the results frameworks (proposed outcomes, outputs and their complementarities)
- Review the management arrangements to ensure coherence, complementarity and coordination of implementation. It includes further details on project sites and appointment of the JP staff
- More information on UNESCO’s added value
- Review the appropriate re-distribution of resources and justify the budget allocation to WHO (high)
- Emphasize the participation of civil society
- Improve the monitoring and evaluation framework, including the review of indicators and targets

83. It seems that these comments were addressed and a revised JP document was produced. However, it seems that the signed document (official version) is not the revised version of the JP document. At the outset of this evaluation, the Evaluator was given the signed JP document version<sup>7</sup> but obtained a copy of the unsigned revised version during his mission to Jordan, which the JP team considers as the official version. The review indicates that the main changes were made to the management and coordination arrangements section, to the programme monitoring framework in annex 4 (indicators) and to the detailed JP results in annex 5.

---

<sup>7</sup> Which is also the version that is posted on the MDG-F web site.

84. Overall, the review of the signed JP document indicates a limited coherence among the various elements of the programme – its rationale, its internal logic (components, partners, structure, delivery mechanisms, scope and budget) and its expected results. The analysis of the document raises coherence questions such as what is the rationale of the JP? What is the climate change strategy in Jordan? What is the water management strategy in Jordan? What is the logic for most expected outputs? Why not to support Jordan to prepare a climate change strategy? Is there too much emphasis on studies? How will the JP deliverables be sustainable? etc. These comments are much in line with the comments made by the MDG-F Steering Committee during the approval stage. The revised JP document version addressed some of these comments but not fully.

85. However, we also need to consider that this project document is short (25 pages without annexes), which contribute to a limited analysis. The main weaknesses of the JP document can be summarized as follows:

- Limited analysis of the national context and the national stakeholders: why this joint programme?
- Limited capacity development strategy: how to increase the capacity of Jordanian organizations to address climate change adaptation?
- A non-existent sustainability strategy: how will JP achievements be sustainable in the long-term?

86. Nevertheless, it was decided that the JP would focus on the challenges facing Jordan’s MDG achievements due to crippling water scarcity and aggravated by climate change that bring additional threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security. The rationale was to address several critical areas in the water sector that were not addressed well and needed more investment and policy development. It included minimum household water security, drinking water quality, wastewater use safety, and water use efficiency. The JP has been particularly focused on three main barriers that were identified for the water sector to adapt to climate change:

- Climate change risks were not sufficiently taken into account in sectoral policies and investment frameworks;
- Existing climate information, knowledge and tools were not directly relevant for supporting adaptation decisions and actions; and
- Weak national capacity to develop sectoral adaptation responses.

87. As a result, the logic model of the JP consists of one strategy, two outcomes and six outputs as presented in the table below (see Annex 7 for an overview of expected outputs and related planned activities).

**Table 1: Joint Programme Logic Model**

Strategy	Outcomes	Outputs
<b>To enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change by addressing Jordan’s long-term adaptation needs.</b>	<b>Outcome 1:</b> Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change.	<b>Output 1.1:</b> National drinking water quality management system at central and periphery level is strengthened
		<b>Output 1.2:</b> Sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection is provided to all citizens
	<b>Outcome 2:</b> Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions.	<b>Output 2.1:</b> Rural sector adaptive capacity for climate variability and change is improved as well as the urban-rural linkage in water resources management and allocation developed.
		<b>Output 2.2:</b> National institutional and community capacity in integrated water resources management is improved.
		<b>Output 2.3:</b> Adaptation measures, by health sector and other sectors, to protect health from climate change are institutionalized.
		<b>Output 2.4:</b> Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened

88. In addition to the lack of coherence, the review of this model indicates an ambitious joint programme that “may try to do too many things”. If all expected outputs are delivered, the outcomes and strategies will be achieved. However, the question “Is it possible to deliver all expected outputs?” remains valid. The annex 5 of the JP document provides more information about what the JP plans to achieve; it is summarized in annex 7 of this report. It provides a list of planned activities that gives important details to understand how each output and outcome will be achieved.

89. However, this understanding is also raising important questions related to long-term sustainability. For instance, output 1.2 that is to provide all citizens with sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection will be achieved through 2 activities: (i) Identify minimum household water security requirements for health protection; and (ii) Develop national policy and issue legislative policy instruments on securing supply of minimum water requirements for health. This is a logical course of action; however, developing national policy and issue legislative policy instrument as a simple activity among 26 other activities to be implemented by the JP raises the question of feasibility and if not fully achieved the question of long-term sustainability of other achievements under this output remains.

90. Nevertheless, as discussed in Section 4.1.1, the JP is addressing national priorities. It may look somewhat “piecemeal” but it is important to consider that it corresponds to national needs. Nevertheless, the numerous planned activities look ambitious within the JP timeframe and financial resources and the long-term sustainability rests on national stakeholders to uptake achievements in their own strategies, policies and programmes. Therefore, the JP implementation team needs to constantly emphasize the involvement of key stakeholders; particularly those whom should become the logical custodians of JP achievements.

91. Finally, no change to the design of the JP took place since the implementation started. The JP document and particularly its annex 5 detailing the JP strategy is used as a guide by the JP implementation team.

## **4.2. Effectiveness of the Jordan Joint Programme**

92. This Section presents the findings on the effectiveness of the programme that is a measure of the extent to which formally agreed expected programme results (outcomes) have been achieved, or can be expected to be achieved in the future. It includes an overview of key results achieved to date by the programme, followed by the programme contribution to capacity development, the review of unexpected project achievements and finally the review of risks management and mitigation measures related to the implementation of the programme.

### **4.2.1. Achievements of Programme’s Expected Outcomes**

93. The progress made by the programme in achieving its expected outputs and outcomes so far is limited but this status should change in the months to come. The slow progress was noted by the MDG-F Secretariat when they commented the 2010 Bi-annual report: “*The report reflects that the JP, after almost 18 months of implementation, has done very little substantive progress towards the expected results*” (September 2010). However, despite that the JP is still behind schedule, it is finally implemented at full speed with a good participation of key stakeholders. This is confirmed by the JP implementation team that responded to the comment above: “*there are currently about 40 researchers and consultants working on six different consultations covering a substantial portion of JP activities*”. Currently the JP has an implementation team in place; has a fully developed work plan; has a participatory process in place with the involvement of key stakeholders through task forces that validate the implementation process such as finalizing TORs, selecting consultants and approving consultant deliverables; has a JP management committee chaired by the Secretary General of the MOWI to oversee the implementation of the programme; and more importantly has several assignments currently underway.

94. The strategy of the JP, that is to enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change by addressing Jordan’s long-term adaptation needs, is implemented through a set of two outcomes subdivided into 6 outputs, which are further divided into 27 activities. The achievements of the JP as of October 2010 are summarized in the table presented below.

**Table 2:** List of Jordan Joint Programme Achievements

Outputs	Activities	Achievements (as of October 2010)
<b>Outcome 1: Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change</b>		
<b>Output 1.1:</b> National drinking water quality management system at central and periphery level is strengthened	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 1.1:</b> Upgrade the national drinking water quality (DWQ) system for comprehensive national coverage</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.2:</b> Develop and implement 5 demonstration water safety plans (3 urban &amp; 2 rural).</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.3:</b> Design and implement training programme on DWQ management system for all levels</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.4:</b> Provide critical supplies and equipment for DWQ laboratory networks of the Ministry of Health</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review and assessment of current national DWQ systems including legislation, standards, and management practices at both the national and sub regional level and suggestions needed to upgrade the DWQ systems in Jordan is underway. An inception report had been delivered in September 2010 and an inception workshop was held in October 2010;</li> <li>• The analysis of the current training needs at all levels and the design of training programs to address these needs, including modules for DWQ management system in Jordan is underway. An inception workshop was held in September 2010 and a train-the-trainers session is planned for January 2011;</li> <li>• Critical supplies were identified early 2010, the procurement of equipment and supplies is almost completed; the estimated arrival date of this equipment and supplies is December 2011-January 2011.</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection is provided to all citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 1.5:</b> Identify minimum household water security requirements for health protection</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.6:</b> Develop national policy and issue legislative policy instruments on securing supply of minimum water requirements for health.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review of minimum household water security requirements for health protection both nationally and globally, as well as the development of methodologies for establishing and generating evidence to support recommendations on minimum water requirements for health, and convene expert consultations on the development of methods to identify minimum water requirements for health has started. Terms of reference and Request For Proposal (RFP) were prepared and the review should start in late 2010.</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 2: Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions</b>		
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Rural sector adaptive capacity for climate variability and change is improved as well as the urban-rural linkage in water resources management and allocation developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.1:</b> Assess the risks from climate change and water scarcity on food productivity.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.2:</b> Identify and screen adaptation measures to reduce climate change impacts on food productivity.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.3:</b> Identify and test adaptation options and improvements of crop / livestock for increased productivity in irrigating with treated wastewater.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.4:</b> Design and implement community awareness campaign, with focus on women farmers, on climate change adaptation measures.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.5:</b> Establish model farms using treated wastewater as adaptation to climate change for capacity building (jointly with WHO).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment of risks from climate change and water scarcity on food productivity is underway. The focal point at MOA has been fully involved in the process to finalize the TOR, select the consultant and monitor the deliverables. A stocktaking report was already submitted and the draft report on the assessment of risks is expected during the fall 2010;</li> <li>• A research to identify adaptation measures that can reduce CC impacts on food productivity is underway and also monitored by the MOA focal point;</li> <li>• As of October 2010, work has started to research crop and livestock more adapted to current climate conditions (less rainwater) under the leadership of one of the best specialist in plant breeding in Jordan. This work is supervised by NCARE, an agency within the MOA that is in charge of agriculture research and extension. NCARE will be the custodian of any achievements supported by the JP;</li> </ul>

Outputs	Activities	Achievements (as of October 2010)
<p><b>Output 2.2:</b> National institutional and community capacity in integrated water resources management is improved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.6:</b> Design and implement a training programme in integrated water resources management for the Ministry of Water and Irrigation, national NGOs, and stakeholders.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.7:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Design and implement community-base research projects on climate change adaptation.</li> <li>○ B. Improve database in integrated water resources management in arid and semi arid areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.8:</b> Develop water education and awareness programme focusing in curriculum, resources manuals, training of trainers and teacher-in-service training for the Ministry of Education with the close partnership of the Ministry of Water and Irrigation.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.9:</b> Design and establish one environmental and water resource centre for advocacy education and capacity building.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.10:</b> Develop a cooperative framework on the criteria for sustainable management of shared water resources including transboundary water resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of 2 training courses is underway: (i) climate change modelling; and (ii) groundwater modelling with the help of an international consultant. A fact-finding mission to assess the training needs is part of the process. The design and the delivery of these training courses is implemented by the International Research Center for Water, Environment, and Energy (IRCWEE). The target trainees are representatives from MOE and MOWI as well as staff from the IRCWEE.</li> <li>• Based on the submission of six proposed research projects by the IHP committee in May 2009, 3 research projects have been selected to be supported by the JP; it includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Assessment of Treated Wastewater Quality under Different Climate Change Scenarios in Jordan.</i> This research project is underway and it is implemented by the Jordan Valley authority;</li> <li>○ <i>Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Climate Change Impacts on the Quality of Water Resources in Amman Zarqa Basin.</i> This research project started in July 2010 and it is implemented by MOWI;</li> <li>○ <i>Assessment of Surface Water Harvesting due to Rainfall Irregularity in Intensity and Distribution.</i> This research project started in July 2010 and it is implemented by WAJ.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The JP (through the UNESCO team) participated in the negotiation to create the IRCWEE by reviewing the existing capacity, identifying the capacity gaps, proposing actions to address these gaps and drafting the terms of reference for this center. The JP supported the opening seminar held in December 2009;</li> <li>• A 2-week train-the-trainer course on “<i>Application of EIAs and Decision Support System to Study the Impact of Climate Change on Water Resources</i>” was conducted in December 2009. It was implemented by IRCWEE and targeted staff at MOE;</li> <li>• Regarding Act. 2.8, USAID is currently implementing a large environmental education programme in Jordan targeting the primary and secondary school system under the “<i>Public Action for Water, Energy and Environment Project (PAP)</i>”. As a result, the JP activity in this area was put on hold until the full PAP assessment is completed (October-November 2010). Then discussion with USAID will take place to decide who is doing what. The JP target is to integrate water management and climate change into the curriculum, using the Associated Schools Project Network (ASPnet) of UNESCO that is already present in Jordan;</li> <li>• A one-week training course on transboundary water management was offered to 20 participants (high level Officers) from Jordan and Syria; it was held in July 2010. IUCN-Jordan and a consultant designed and delivered the course. Planning is underway to deliver a similar course to Officers at the technical level;</li> <li>• Planning is underway to write an article on “<i>Impact of Climate Change on Wadi-</i></li> </ul>

Outputs	Activities	Achievements (as of October 2010)
<p><b>Output 2.3:</b> Adaptation measures, by health sector and other sectors, to protect health from climate change are institutionalized</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.11:</b> Conduct an assessment of direct and indirect risks to health from climate change</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.12:</b> Screen and prioritize adaptation strategies, by the health sector and others to protect health from climate change.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.13:</b> Develop and implement adaptation strategies to protect health from the negative effects of heat waves.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.14:</b> Design adaptation projects to protect health from identified high-risk environmental conditions induced by climate change.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.15:</b> Establish a national early warning system to monitor and assess health impacts of climate change</li> </ul>	<p><i>Fifa</i>” in the next World Water Development Report (WWDR) that is part of the UNESCO-World Water Assessment Programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment of direct and indirect risks to health from climate change and the dissemination of finding of this assessment to concerned stakeholders have started. The MOH technical committee reviewed the first draft RFP and the final RFP should be approved in October-November 2010.</li> <li>• The development and implementation of adaptation strategies to protect human health from the negative effects of heat waves have started. A draft RFP has been reviewed by the MOH technical committee and final approval of this RFP is expected for mid-November 2010.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 2.4:</b> Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.16:</b> Assess direct and indirect climate change risks to water availability and quality in Zarqa River Basin.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.17:</b> Assess opportunities and barriers to adaptation to climate change risks</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.18:</b> Formulate appropriate legal and institutional strategies and the needed interventions (strategy implementation plan) for Zarqa River Basin</li> <li><b>Activity 2.19:</b> Review ongoing national water policies, strategies, and action plans relevant to climate change and IWRM.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.20:</b> Upgrade local and national capacities and capabilities to respond adequately to the needs and requirements for adaptation to climate change and IWRM using effective participatory approaches and tools.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.21:</b> Develop, document, share and disseminate knowledge and transfer technologies generated from Zarqa River basin on the local and national levels, and establish linkages to regional and global experiences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment of climate change scenarios on water availability and quality in the ZRB is underway since June 2010. A stocktaking exercise was conducted and the consulting team is now conducting a socio-economic study in the ZRB;</li> <li>• Development of adaptation measures to climate change and formulation of needed strategic implementation plan relevant to climate change and IWRM for the ZRB is underway since June, 2010. An assessment of opportunities and barriers to adaptation to climate change risks has been carried out and an analysis of and prioritization of all possible adaptation measures for water availability and water quality for the ZRB was conducted and are now being reviewed by the MOE Task force and the SIWI.</li> <li>• A draft programme for the development of mechanisms to integrate these measures into national policies and action plans has been drafted and now being reviewed by the MOE.</li> </ul>

95. As presented in the table above, the JP is making in-roads in Jordan after a difficult start up phase. The main factor that contributed to this implementation delay was the hiring of JP staff (*see Section 4.3*). However, in addition to this delay, there seem to be an information gap between the perception of the progress of the JP at the MDG-F Secretariat and the reality in Jordan. On one hand, based on progress reports the progress is viewed as (very?) limited, including very low reported disbursements; on the other hand the reality in Jordan indicates that the JP is finally making progress, the fund is being disbursed and the management of the JP is in place to catch up with the original schedule in the coming few months (*see Section 4.3.6*).

96. The review of these achievements and the JP document indicates generally a strong focus on activities as opposed to developmental results (*see discussion on Results-based-management (RBM) in Section 4.3.1*). In addition, many of these achievements are studies, training events and workshops. There are indispensable deliverables for achieving developmental results but they also remain information products. Interviews conducted by the Evaluator in Jordan indicate that the “real story” is not about these products but rather the context in which these information products were developed and particularly approved. Most of these deliverables were conducted to respond to a need of a particular strategy or programme of Stakeholders. As a whole, the JP deliverables look “piecemeal” but they are individually part of national partners’ policies, plans and programmes. In other words, despite running the risk that these information products may “end up on a shelf”, they should be used to consolidate or develop a policy, plan and/or programme. They are part of implementing national partners’ programmes and projects. From a JP point of view, this approach makes it difficult to see the “big picture” about what the programme is trying to achieve overall; however, these activities are part of several government of Jordan climate change adaptation policies and programmes. The long-term impact and sustainability of JP achievements rely on the uptake of these achievements by these national partners (*see Section 4.5*).

97. The analysis of current achievements needs also to consider the early stage of implementation of the JP. The “official” starting date of the JP is discussed in Section 4.3. However, if the recorded official date is February 2009, UN agencies got their first tranche of funds in April-May 2009 and the JP Coordinator was hired in mid-July 2009. In effect, the implementation of the JP started during the summer of 2009; a little bit more than a year ago. Therefore, progress so far has to be analyzed within this context and in this regard the MTE is early to analyze real effectiveness of the JP. Nevertheless, a lot of effort has been spent during this first year on building partnerships and on preparing/launching consulting assignments. As a result, deliverables will start to accumulate in the coming months and progress toward achieving expected results should be more tangible in a few months.

#### **4.2.2. Contribution to Capacity Development**

98. Despite that capacity development is part of the logic of the JP, the contribution of the JP to capacity development of key stakeholders needs to be strengthened. The expected outcome 2 is a “*strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions*” and three outputs under this outcome are about capacity development (2.1, 2.2 and 2.4). However, neither capacity development approach nor strategies were explicitly stated in the joint programme document. The lack of guidance from the JP document affects the implementation of the JP. The review indicates that there is a tendency to emphasize more the delivery of key JP planned deliverables and emphasize less the development of an overall capacity to adapt to climate change. As a result, there are risks that some deliverables may not be sustainable in the long-term (*see Section 4.5*).

99. For instance, the development of 5 demonstration Water Safety Plans (WSPs) under the activity #1.2 may not be sufficient if only these 5 WSPs are applied in 5 demonstration sites. They should be part of a holistic approach driven by the MOWI to implement this process throughout Jordan, including a capacity needs analysis and the development of a roadmap detailing “how to get there”. Without a broader approach, the capacity developed through the application of WSPs in 5 demonstration sites may not be sufficient for the partners

(MOWI, WAJ, Miyahuna, etc.) to uptake this approach further. Another example is the development and delivery of training activities under the output 2.2. It is part of developing the capacity of staff through the transfer of skills and knowledge in the area of EIAs, climate change and groundwater modeling. However, this staff is often in organizations where other capacity issues exist such as inadequate organizational structure, lack of procedures and mechanisms and, sometimes, weak enabling environment to support these new capacities. Finally, in order to succeed in the ZRB (output 2.4), the JP will need to apply a strong participative approach, involving all local stakeholders, including the need to identify capacity gaps and capacity development activities to address these needs. Climate change adaptation measures will only be applied if there are understood and within an enabling environment.

100. Globally it is now well recognized that capacity refers to the overall ability of a system to perform and sustain itself<sup>8</sup>. Capacity development encompasses the acquisition of skills and knowledge for individuals, the improvements of institutional structures, mechanisms and procedures and finally the strengthening of an enabling environment (system) with adequate policies and laws. Capacity is the sum of a series of conditions, intangible assets and relationships that are part of an organization or system and that are distributed at various levels:

- Individuals have personal abilities and attributes or competencies that contribute to the performance of the system;
- Organizations and broader systems have a broad range of collective attributes, skills, abilities and expertise called capabilities which can be both 'technical' (e.g. policy analysis, marine resource assessment, financial resource management) and 'social-relational' (e.g. mobilizing and engaging actors to collaborate towards a shared purpose across organizational boundaries, creating collective meaning and identity, managing the tensions between collaboration and competition).

101. For the remaining implementation period of the JP, it is recommended to take a broader approach to develop the climate change adaptation capacity of key stakeholders, emphasizing the development of capacities throughout. The long-term impact and sustainability of JP achievements will depend a lot on capacities developed during the implementation of the JP.

#### **4.2.3. Additional Programme Achievements**

102. As a pioneer programme to develop the capacity of key stakeholders in climate change adaptation in Jordan (see Section 4.1.1), the JP is having a greater impact than just to achieve its expected results. The excellent JP implementation team is becoming a set of advisors to their respective ministries providing advisory services to their partners at all level including to the Secretary General level in these ministries. The staff is often called to participate in related climate change events and the JP Coordinator is now considered a government advisor on climate change adaptation.

103. Moreover, connected with the implementation of the JP, some unforeseen organizational developments are currently underway. It includes:

- The current development of an inter-ministerial committee on climate change;
- The establishment of a climate change and environment unit within the MOWI;
- The appointment of a liaison officer to the JP at MOWI;
- The appointment of an Officer under the direct supervision of the Secretary General to monitor the JP at MOH;
- The secondment of a Senior Officer by MOH to work on the JP for a few months until the new Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) is in place;
- The assignment of a dedicated office to the JP Coordinator at MOE (in addition to the JP office

---

<sup>8</sup> See the study on “Capacity, Change and Performance” conducted by the European Center for Development Policy Management; which explored the notion of capacity and capacity development (<http://www.ecdpm.org/>).

assigned by MOWI).

104. It is expected that by the end of this programme, some additional unplanned achievements will be recorded such as the possibility to support the government to develop a climate change adaptation strategy and more generally the development of a national climate change agenda in Jordan.

#### 4.2.4. Risks and Assumptions / Risk Mitigation Management

105. A list of 4 major risks was identified during the formulation of the JP (*see Table 3 below*) as well as their corresponding mitigation activities. They are high-level risks and, based on the review of these risks during the MTE, a rating is indicated for each risk.

**Table 3: List of Identified Risks and Mitigation**

Risk	Current Rating (MTE)	Mitigation
1. Lack of willingness and commitment from the governmental institutions to participate actively in implementing the activities, adopting successful stories and lessons learned and enforcing the suggested laws and legislations.	Medium	To alleviate the impact of this risk, governmental partners including policy makers will be involved from the planning stage of this programme and stakeholders meetings are conducted during all stages of this project to assess their needs and increase their awareness on the importance of the adaptation mechanisms for climate change. In addition, a major part of the training will be directed toward increasing the capacity of government staff that will lead to increasing the interest and commitment of these partners in implementing activities of the programme and sustain its activities.
2. Lack of interest and active participation of the local community is one of the constraints that should be addressed during the planning and implementation of this programme to ensure the sustainability of its activities. The local community is the end user, the key beneficiary and the most important stakeholder in sustaining the activities of the programme during and after the implementation of this programme.	Low	The measures taken by the programme to reduce the effect of this risk will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The project will ensure the participation of the local community in all stages of the programme as key for its successes and sustainability.</li> <li>○ The programme includes a local community training courses to increase the capacity of local community institutions and individuals.</li> <li>○ The programme includes a public awareness campaign that will be directed mainly at the local community and its leaders.</li> </ul>
3. Since the joint programme involves different UN agencies and government partners, conflict of interests among the different agencies and partners involved is a potential risk that must be addressed. This in turn will affect the proper implementation and coordination of the different activities.	Low	To overcome this risk and constraint, the programme will be adopting clear and transparent coordination mechanisms stating the roles and responsibilities of each agency. This will prevent any duplication in roles throughout the implementation phase of this programme
4. The last risk facing this programme is the unsecured financial resources from sources other than the MDG-F fund. These resources will be mobilized to complement the budget needed to implement the activities of the programme from different UN agencies.	Low	The following measures to remove this risk will be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify potential financial resources at the planning stage.</li> <li>○ Make sure that the existing financial regulation and roles of the UN agencies allow the transfer of identified resources to implement the activities of this joint programme.</li> </ul>

106. A key risk at start up was risk #3, which could affect directly the performance of the JP implementation team. However, after more than a year into the implementation, the “teething” issues were addressed and the JP

has now a clear and transparent coordination mechanism and well-defined roles and responsibilities for each agency. Nevertheless, the risk #1 was rated as medium as it is still a critical risk to maximize the long-term impact and sustainability of the JP. As it is indicated, the mitigation strategy is to ensure the strong involvement of key stakeholders and develop their capacity through training. It is happening and they are signs that indicate the ownership of the JP by these stakeholders, including non-anticipated achievements (*see Section 4.2.3*).

107. Regarding risk #2, it is rated as low by the Evaluator, considering that the participation of local communities is somewhat limited in this JP. As mentioned in the description of this risk, the local communities are the end users, the key beneficiaries to benefit from the impact of this JP. However, the nature of the JP is such that the primary targeted stakeholders are mostly staff in government ministries and agencies involved in climate change, water management and food production/security. Nevertheless, despite a lesser role in implementing the JP, they participate to JP activities where needed such as identifying climate change adaptation measures. Additionally, their participation is key for the piloting of climate change adaptation measures in the ZRB (output 2.4). An initial meeting with some community leaders in Zarqa took place during the mission of the Evaluator in Jordan and it is considered as the beginning of their involvement in implementing JP activities under output 2.4.

108. Finally, another risk may be added to this list that is “*the progress toward achieving JP expected results might be hampered due to limited expertise (skills and knowledge) used by the JP to implement its activities*”. This is a low risk. It is mitigated by selection and hiring procedures that include a systematic process to draft TOR for any position – including tasks, roles and responsibilities, a review process of TOR and potential candidates by the appropriate task force, and an open, documented and transparent selection process.

### **4.3. Efficiency of the Jordan Joint Programme**

109. This Section presents findings on the efficiency of the joint programme that is a measure of the productivity of the programme intervention process. It reviews to what degree achievements derive from efficient use of financial, human and material resources. It reviews the overall management approach and the use of adaptive management, the financial management of the programme, the technical assistance, the delivery mechanisms, the participation of stakeholders and the monitoring approach to measure the programme’s progress.

#### **4.3.1. Joint Programme Management Approach**

110. The overall management of the JP is satisfactory; particularly considering the involvement of several organizations including 4 UN Agencies and 5 Ministries. It was noted during the mission of the Evaluator to Jordan that the JP went through “growing pains” during its initial phase but the management structure in place today is satisfactory. An efficient JP implementation team is in place (*see Section 4.3.4*), a detailed work plan is guiding the implementation, assignments are underway and importantly a participatory process is in place with a strong involvement of key stakeholders through task forces. These task forces validate the JP implementation process at regular milestones such as finalizing TORs, selecting consultants and approving consultant deliverables. Finally, the Programme Management Committee (PMC) is now chaired by the Secretary General of the MOWI, indicating a high level of interest by the government of Jordan in the JP.

111. Considering the few delays at start up, the JP implementation team has been using an adaptive management approach to secure programme outputs while maintaining adherence to the overall joint programme design. The work plan for the remaining period of implementation had been reviewed to fast track some assignments in order to catch up on the implementation schedule. Overall, the review indicates that the implementation of the programme is well aligned with the JP document. The work plan reflects well the set of expected results and its management mechanisms are in line with what was anticipated in the JP document.

112. Based on the comparative advantage of each UN agency, clear roles and responsibilities were assigned to each agency for the implementation of the JP, including the technical and financial responsibility on the UN agencies side to support the implementation of their respective set of activities. The table below indicates these responsibilities:

**Table 4: Output and Activity Responsibilities per UN Agency**

UN Agency	GOJ Counterpart	Outputs / Activities
FAO	MOA	2.1: Act. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5
UNESCO	MOWI MOEd	2.2: Act. 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10
UNDP	MOE	2.4: Act. 2.16, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 2.20, 2.21
WHO	MOH MOE MOWI	1.1: Act. 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 1.2: Act. 1.5, 1.6 2.3: Act. 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15

113. Key management elements of the JP are discussed below:

### **Management Mechanisms**

114. The management and coordination arrangements for the implementation of the JP include:

- The Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) coordinates the joint programme;
- The UN Resident Coordinator (RC) facilitates collaboration between participating UN Organizations to ensure that the programme is on track and that expected results are delivered;
- A National Steering Committee (NSC) was formed with non-implementing parties to allow for independence. It is comprised of 3 members: the UN Resident Coordinator (co-chair), the Secretary General of the MOPIC (co-chair) and a representative from the Spanish government; the Secretariat is provided by the UN-RC’s office. It meets twice a year and provides oversight and strategic guidance to the programme; decisions are made by consensus. It has the overall responsibility for programme activities, including the approval of the Programme Document and its subsequent revisions and Annual Work Plans and Budgets. The approval of these programme documents takes place upon completion of a review of these documents by the PMC;
- A Programme Management Committee (PMC) was formed of all implementing parties including the UN agencies, Government Ministries, one NGO and one academic institution; it is chaired by the Secretary General of the Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MOWI). Its role is to provide operational coordination to the JP. It meets four times a year to address issues related directly to the management and implementation of the programme;
- A JP Coordinator was appointed in July 2009. He works under the guidance and direct supervision of the UN-RC and is accountable to UNDP and UNCT and report to the NSC. His responsibilities include the preparation of annual work plans and budgets, the drafting of programme reports, formulate job descriptions for project staff and consultants, act as the Secretary to the NSC and ensure the smooth operation of the programme on a day-to-day basis in collaboration with the Output Chief Technical Advisors (CTAs). He is also in charge of implementing the UNDP set of JP activities;
- Three CTAs (FAO, WHO and UNESCO) were recruited. Each CTA is accountable to his/her corresponding agency and report to the agency head and the JP coordinator. CTAs are responsible for day-to-day implementation of project activities in close collaboration with the JP Coordinator;
- Each UN agency implements its specific outputs according to its usual work modality with the Government;
- Task Forces were created with key stakeholders to review and endorse TORs and RFP processes, submitted bids and deliverables.

115. The review indicates that these management arrangements are now effective and supportive for an efficient implementation of the JP. Additionally, with the participation of stakeholders in the implementation process, including government representatives, the ownership of the JP by these stakeholders is good and growing.

### **Management Approach**

116. However, the review indicates that the management approach is much activity-based as opposed to be more results-based (RBM). Instead of having a focus on two outcomes and 6 outputs, there is a strong focus on implementing the 27 discreet activities. This focus on activities is reinforced by a design that is more activity based (*see Section 4.1.7*). It is also reflected in the JP document where activities are numbered under the two outcomes – from 1.1 to 1.n and 2.1 to 2.n - and not under each outputs as 1.1.1 to 1.1.n, 1.2.1 to 1.2.n, 2.1.1 to 2.1.n, 2.2.1 to 2.2.n, ..., 2.4.1 to 2.4.n. It looks like the concept of output was added on top of the initial logic of the programme.

117. Additionally, the structure of the result framework (outcomes and outputs) is not conducive to an effective RBM. Most activities are somewhat standalone activities or are rather grouped into sets of activities. However, the connection between activities and their related output and outcome is somewhat difficult. In many instances the analysis of activities to be supported by the JP and the related expected outputs indicates potential gaps. For instance, activities 1.1 to 1.4 are connected in a sequential logic. However, the connection between these activities and the achievement of the expected output 1.1 that is *a strengthened national drinking water quality management system at central and peripheral levels* is not straightforward. To reach this output, it seems that more will be needed such as the identification of a “roadmap” to implement the new concept of water safety plans nationwide, the identification of capacity gaps for improving the national system such as budget, infrastructure investment, adequate organizational structure, nationwide skills and knowledge requirements, and potentially the necessity to make decisions for new policies, laws and budget.

118. Nevertheless, despite the lack of focus on expected results, the set of planned activities is good. As discussed in Section 4.1.7, they may appear somewhat “piecemeal” but they also correspond to national priorities that were identified during the formulation of the JP and that are national priorities. They correspond to missing elements in broader national processes to strengthen the national capacity in climate change adaptation and its impact on water resources in Jordan. It is recommended that the JP implementation team considers a higher level of expected results when implementing these activities by asking the question “what are we trying to accomplish with this activity and how will it be sustainable?”.

### **Implementation Scheduling**

119. Overall, the Evaluator noted the ambitious scope of the programme to be implemented only over a three-year period. The review of the timetable to deliver activities and achieve the expected outputs indicates that the JP should be completed by the end date. However, considering the delays at the start-up phase, the JP will need this extended time (5-6 months) to complete the delivery of its work plan. It is too early in the implementation to assess how much time extension would be needed at the end but the review indicates that a time extension will be needed. The main delay was in the hiring of the JP Coordinator; he was hired mid-July 2009 as opposed to an official starting date of February 2009 that is 5 months later.

120. It is also important that the completion (ending) of the JP is done properly. As it is the case with many similar programmes, ending the implementation too early may impede its achievements and possibly its long-term impact and sustainability. For instance, the long-term impact of activities to be implemented under output 2.4 - piloting climate change adaptation measures in ZRB – will be greater if these activities are fully completed, assessed and results (best practices and lessons learned) discussed at national level to be replicated nationwide through policy changes and development of new programmes; rather than ending this pilot too early, which may prevent the stakeholders involved to have sufficient time to assess, learn and replicate.

121. Nevertheless, the Evaluator also noted that the “critical path<sup>9</sup>” for the implementation of this JP is the set of activities to be implemented by WHO (under output 1.1, 1.2 and 2.3). It includes 11 activities (out of 27); one activity is almost completed (Act. 1.4), four are underway (1.1, 1.3, 2.11 and 2.13) and the others 6 are at an early stage to be implemented. The implementation schedule discussed with WHO Officials indicates that these activities should be implemented by the end of the JP in early 2012. However, considering that some of these activities are to be implemented sequentially – for instance, activities 2.14 and 2.15 cannot really be implemented before 2.11, 2.12 and 2.13 are completed – the risk of any slippage in the implementation of an activity may have a negative impact on the implementation of other important activities for the long-term impact and sustainability of JP achievements. As discussed above, the impact of these activities will depend largely to how far the JP will go in supporting the relevant organizations to establish a new policy or replicate the results from a demonstration; such as replicating nationwide the results from the piloting of 5 WSPs or developing/adapting legislative and policy instruments to secure supply of minimum water requirements for health. Therefore, it is particularly recommended to monitor the implementation of these activities over the next 6 to 9 months and address any further slippages immediately.

### **Gender Approach**

122. Gender was briefly mentioned in the JP document (page 20) as a crosscutting issue that will be addressed by the programme. However it is not clear as to how gender will be addressed throughout the implementation of the JP. Additionally, it is not part of the MDG-F monitoring template<sup>10</sup>. As a result the monitoring framework of the JP does not include gender-based performance indicators and no gender-disaggregated data is reported through the bi-annual monitoring reports.

Jordan's GDI value of 0.743 is compared to its HDI value of 0.770 (96.5%). Out of the 155 countries with both HDI and GDI values, 144 countries have a better ratio than Jordan's GDI. The gender-related development index (GDI) is the HDI adjusted downward for gender inequality. The greater the gender disparity in basic human development, the lower is a country's GDI relative to its HDI.  
*Human Development Report 2009*

123. The lack of gender information from the JP is not assuming that the implementation of the programme does not consider women. On the contrary, they are part of the programme’s stakeholders; however, women are not targeted as a special group of stakeholders to adapt to climate change and since no gender-disaggregated monitoring information is produced, the JP produces no gender-based information. Considering that the programme still have one more year to go, it is recommended to review the list of monitoring indicators from a gender perspective and also to explore the possibilities to mainstream gender approaches in activities where possible (*see Section 7*).

### **4.3.2. Financial Management**

124. The management of the finances for the JP in Jordan presents some complexities, as it involves 4 different financial management systems (one for each UN agency). As per the fund management arrangements, each UN agency in Jordan is requested to report financial commitments and disbursements on a quarterly basis. In addition each UN Agency Headquarter is requested to provide certified annual financial reports - according to a budget template that is provided by the MDTF Office - stating expenditures incurred by the JP during the reporting period prior to April 30 of the following year and according to a budget template that is provided by the MDTF Office. A 7% management fee applied on programme expenditures compensates indirect costs for each agency. It is the mechanism to aggregate financial information coming from all these different systems.

125. Fund management arrangements were set to mobilize MDG-F financial resources in an efficient way. This

9 Defined as the sequence of project activities, which add up to the longest overall duration of a project. This determines the shortest time possible to complete the project and any delay of an activity on the critical path directly impacts the planned project completion date.

10 It is also noted that gender is not part of the “Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes”; though it states that the MDG-F supports joint programmes for the implementation of MDGs, including the MDG #3 – Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women.

arrangement was based on the “pass-through” fund management option as guided by the UNDG guidance note on joint programming. The MDG-F funds allocated to this JP are channeled through the UNDP Office of Finance and UNDP acts as the Administrative Agent (AA). The accountability rests with the Executive Coordinator of the MDTF Office with some delegation of authority to the UN-RC in Jordan. Each UN Agency assumes complete programmatic and financial responsibility for the funds disbursed to it by the AA and can decide on the execution process with its partners and counterparts following the organization’s own applicable regulations.

126. Once an annual work plan and budget is approved by the PMC and by the NSC, an annual Fund Transfer Request is made by the UN-RC on behalf of the NSC to the MDTF office. Once the request is cleared by the MDG-F Secretariat, the requested funds are transferred by the MDTF to the respective UN Headquarter Agencies. Each agency is, then, fully responsible for the funds received to implement “their” activities as well as for the execution modality, and method of transfer funds to its partners and counterparts. It is to be noted that the release of funds is subject to meeting a minimum commitment<sup>11</sup> threshold of 70% of the previous fund release to all UN agency and clear progress towards results.

127. However, it was noted during the mission in Jordan that the fund transfer process is currently not working very well. So far only one transfer was made to each UN agency implementing the JP in Jordan (*see table 6 below*). This transfer was based on an approved first year annual work plan as well as the signed JP document. As of October 2010, a second transfer is expected soon as several assignments are ready to proceed but waiting for additional funds from the second transfer. Several discussions on this topic occurred during the mission in Jordan indicating the need to understand better the transfer process instituted by the MDG-F Office.

128. A Fund Transfer Request (FTR) is made by the UN-RC on behalf of the NSC to the MDTF office and based on a PMC and NSC approved annual work plan and budget. The release of funds is subject to meeting the threshold of 70% of the previous fund release to all UN agency (expended and commitments) and clear progress towards results.

129. Based on the information reviewed by the Evaluator, 81% of the first transfer from MDG-F to the JP UN agencies was either disbursed or committed as of the end of August 2010. This is very different from the figures that are shown on the MDG-F web page for this programme where only 14.4% (\$194,289) of the first tranche was shown as being delivered (as of Dec. 31, 2009). The utilization of funds by UN agencies as of **end of August 2010** is as follows:

**Table 5: Utilization of 1<sup>st</sup> MDG-F Transfer by UN Agency**

Item	1 <sup>st</sup> Transfer (a)	Disbursed	Committed	Total (b)	% (b/a)
FAO	306,716	102,509	103,506	206,015	67%
UNDP	257,499	154,674	141,602	296,276	115
UNESCO	284,500	196,376	6,454	202,830	71
WHO	501,667	142,119	244,081	386,200	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,350,382</b>	<b>595,678</b>	<b>495,643</b>	<b>1,091,321</b>	<b>81%</b>

(\*) Source: Data obtained from UN Agency offices in Amman, Jordan.

11 Commitments are defined as legally binding contracts signed, including multi-year commitments, which may be disbursed in future years.

130. These numbers are as of the end of August 2010; they indicate that the JP has now passed the threshold of 70% committed from the first tranche. Therefore, a second fund transfer request is needed in the coming weeks for UN partners to continue committing JP activities.

131. Despite a high percentage of commitments from the first transfer, the review of the overall financial picture indicates that the JP “burnt” only 27% (\$1,091,320) of the total MDG-F budget (\$4M) as of end of August 2010. This is compared with 50% (18 out of 36 months) of the total “official” duration of the JP; however, when considering the more logical starting date of July 2009 when the JP Coordinator was hired as the first staff on the programme, this elapsed time is only 36% (13 out of 36 months). See details about the overall utilization of funds by UN agency in the table below:

**Table 6: Status of MDG-F Funds Utilization by UN Agency**

Item	Total Budget <sup>12</sup>	%	Expended & Committed	Budget Left	% Budget Left
FAO	827,667	21	206,015	621,652	75%
UNDP	873,333	22	296,276 <sup>13</sup>	577,058	66
UNESCO	699,000	17	202,830	496,170	71
WHO	1,600,000	40	386,200	1,213,800	76
Total	4,000,000	100	1,091,320	2,908,680	73%

(\*) Source: Data obtained from UN Agency offices in Amman, Jordan

132. As of the end of August 2010, the JP was slightly behind schedule in term of expending its JP budget versus its elapsed time. However, it was noted by the Evaluator that the period August to October 2010 was a period where more commitments were made through contracting additional consultants. At the time of the mission of the Evaluator in Jordan (October 2010), most of the first transfer was expended or committed and that some assignments are now waiting for the second transfer before the UN agencies can commit to more activities and sign new contracts. It is recommended for the JP implementation team to request a second transfer as soon as possible (see Section 7).

133. Assessing the value for money at this point in time is difficult. As of end of August 2010, the JP was in an acceleration phase to implement a series of JP activities; including contracting several consultants and the provision of laboratory equipment and supplies. As for most programmes and projects of this nature, expenses at this point in time include several payments made at contract signatures and only few deliverables can be shown. Nevertheless, the expenses plus commitments represent slightly more than ¼ of the total budget. When this figure is compared to achievements so far (table 2 in Section 4.2.1), it demonstrates a good value and also good potential over the medium term to increase this value. JP achievements are predicted to increase drastically between the period September 2010 and June 2011.

#### **4.3.3. Fund Leveraging / Co-financing**

134. The JP document stated that UNDP and others - from which UNDP-WGF at SIWI contributes \$105,000 - would contribute the sum of \$126,667 as co-financing. As of the end of August 2010, more than 50% of the planned co-financing was expended on the JP and it is expected that the remaining sum will be expended over the remaining period of implementation of the JP. The table below indicates the status of these commitments:

12 Budget figures are from the unsigned revised document.

13 This amount does not include an amount of \$19,979 received by UNDP from MDG-F to formulate the JP.

**Table 7: Status of Co-financing funds**

Item	Total Budget	Expended & Committed	Budget Left	% Budget Left
UNDP Track	26,263	1,769	24,494	93%
SIWI	98,487	57,717	40,770	41
Total	124,750	59,486	65,264	52%

(\*) Source: Data obtained from UNDP office in Amman, Jordan

#### 4.3.4. Quality of Technical Assistance / Use of National Capacity

135. A highly professional team implements the JP. There is a core team of 6 staff to coordinate the implementation of JP activities and it is complemented by national and few international experts when needed for specific work assignments such as training needs assessments, identification of climate change adaptation measures, identification of capacity gaps to improve the quality of water management systems, etc. The core team includes a Coordinator, 3 Chief Technical Advisors and 2 Assistants all financed by the MDG-F funds:

- JP Coordinator and UNDP-CTA: A full time position with 40% allocated to the JP Coordinator position and 60% to the coordination of UNDP activities;
- FAO-CTA: A part time position (50%)
- UNESCO-CTA: A full time position
- WHO-CTA: A full time position
- 2 Assistants full time

136. The recruitment of the JP staff took longer than anticipated and delayed the start of the implementation of the JP. The JP Coordinator was the first person recruited by the programme; he was hired mid-July 2009 as opposed to an “official” approval/starting date of February 2009. Additionally, following the recruitment procedures to hire the WHO-CTA, the selected person declined the offer at contract signature. As a result, a new hiring process had to take place and the new WHO-CTA started only in June 2010. In order to fast track the late start up phase for this component of the JP, the MOH seconded a Senior Officer to the JP for a few months pending for the recruitment of the CTA. This Senior Officer is currently helping the WHO-CTA to launch few assignments and she is phasing out her temporary position as interim CTA before going back to MOH to her previous position in the weeks to come.

137. A JP office was assigned to the implementation team by the MOWI, located within the Ministry’s building. The core team works, meets and coordinates out of this JP office at MOWI. In addition, a second office for the JP Coordinator who is also the CTA responsible for activities to be supported by UNDP was made available at MOE, the counterpart organization for these activities.

138. During the mission of the Evaluator in Jordan, discussion took place on the fact that the JP Coordinator is also the CTA for the UNDP component. This is not a perfect situation but considering the concept of value for money, 3.5 professional positions for a JP of this size is justified. However, it would be difficult to justify an additional 0.5 professional position. On the other hand, having one CTA for each set of activities to be implemented by each UN agency is conducive for an efficient implementation. Each CTA had to learn management procedures and systems for their respective agency. If one CTA was to work with more than one UN agency it could be confusing to have to follow 2 sets of rules and procedures.

139. Overall the review found a highly motivated staff and dedicated to the programme, going often beyond the call of duty. This professional staff has also become advisors to their respective counterpart ministries on matters related to climate change adaptation and impact on water management, food security and health. Additionally,

the involvement of focal points and other key stakeholders allow activities to be well supported by key institutions, which should ensure a better long-term sustainability.

#### 4.3.5. Country Ownership / Stakeholder Participation

140. The country ownership of the implementation of the JP is good. As discussed in Section 4.1.5 and 4.1.7, the programme was developed through a participatory process, which identified three main barriers to be addressed. Planned activities are responses to these barriers and all key Jordanian partners are involved in the implementation process reinforcing the country ownership. As indicated in Section 4.2.3, there are growing positive signs indicating a strong interest of national partners in the JP, including the nomination of a few Officers in key ministries to monitor the JP. This participation includes also the active role of the new chair of the PMC that is the Secretary General of the MOWI.

141. The participatory implementation process contributes also to develop this ownership. Task forces were created for each set of related activities to review TORs, RFPs and bids. As a result, the JP process “*is owned*” by key stakeholders. It is their response to address their needs to enhance their capacity to adapt to climate change by addressing Jordan’s long-term adaptation needs.

142. The implementation of the JP involves 6 government of Jordan (GOJ) counterpart organizations and a few other partners. The list of these organizations is provided in the table below:

**Table 8:** List of Counterpart Organizations and Others Partners

Counterpart Organizations	Other Partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC)</li> <li>➤ Ministry of Health (MOH)</li> <li>➤ Ministry of Agriculture (MOA)</li> <li>➤ Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MOWI)</li> <li>➤ Ministry of Environment (MOE)</li> <li>➤ Ministry of Education (MOEd)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE)</li> <li>➤ Water Authority of Jordan (WAJ)</li> <li>➤ Zarqa Governorate</li> <li>➤ Local Municipalities</li> </ul>

#### 4.3.6. Monitoring Approach and Progress Reporting

143. The JP is monitored and progress is reported according to the monitoring framework that was identified during the formulation of the programme. Progress reporting is done through management briefs, narrative joint programme progress reports and financial progress reports that are based on the monitoring framework. The monitoring framework includes 29 indicators with their related baseline, methods of data collection and responsibility centers.

144. However, the current monitoring process is not fulfilling its intent; the review indicates that information contained in the few progress reports does not provide a good “picture” of the reality on the ground. The review indicates that this information gap is partly due to the way information is reported; it reports activities as opposed to progress made toward the achievements of expected results. For instance, the bi-annual report produced at of June 30, 2010 includes a table under section *b. Joint Programme M&E Framework*. An important column in this table is “*Achievement of Target to Date*”, which need to be completed for each performance indicators (rows). However, in the June 2010 report most statements in this column states that “implementation of activities is to start as of [month] 2010”. In other words, it indicates that nothing has started yet and it will be done later in 2010 and 2011; the reality is different (*see Section 4.2.1*).

145. The list of these performance monitoring indicators is presented in the table below:

**Table 9: List of Performance Indicators to Monitor the JP**

Outcomes/Outputs	Indicators
<b>Outcome 1: Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change</b>	1. % of urban households with reliable access to minimum water requirements for health under water scarcity conditions induced by climate change
	2. Percentage of water supply systems meeting requirements of the national drinking water quality standards
<i>Output 1.1:</i> Strengthened national drinking water quality management system at central and periphery level	3. No. of operational water safety plans resilient to climate change
	4. No. of drinking water quality (DWQ) systems upgraded.
	5. No. of training courses conducted
<i>Output 1.2:</i> Sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection	6. Legislative instruments for the national policy on minimum water requirements for health, taking into account climate change and variability
	7. No. of inventories conducted to determine minimum water requirement
<b>Outcome 2: Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions</b>	8. Policies and adaptive capacities developed to manage environmental health and food security issues from the threat posed by climate change under water scarcity conditions
	9. Health vulnerability assessment, national adaptation strategy and plan of action for health protection from climate change
<i>Output 2.1:</i> Improved rural sector adaptive capacity for climate variability and change	10. No. of risk assessment studies to identify the impact of CC and water scarcity on food production.
	11. No. of adaptive mechanisms to reduce the impact of CC adopted
	12. No. of on-farm technical approaches developed for safe use of treated wastewater in agriculture
	13. No. of policy options suggested to support the adaptation mechanisms
	14. No. of stakeholders trained on the operational approaches
<i>Output 2.2:</i> Improved national institutional and community capacity in integrated water resources management (IWRM)	15. No. of training courses conducted
	No. of institutions participated (deleted)
	16. No. of concepts of IWRM introduced in the curricula
<i>Output 2.3:</i> Adaptation measures, by health sector and other sectors, to protect health from climate change are institutionalized	17. Establish environment and water resources center for advocacy education and capacity building.
	18. No. of adaptation measures adopted by each sector.
	19. No. of sectors adopted the adaptation measures
	20. No. of projects used the adaptation measures.
<i>Output 2.4:</i> Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened	21. Early warning system to monitor and assess health impacts of climate change established and operated
	22. No. of climate change impact studies on water availability and quality on Zarqa River basin conducted
	23. No. of opportunities and barriers to adaptation to climate change identified
	24. No. of policy options for adaptation to CC adopted by policy makers
	25. No. of training courses and workshops conducted
	26. No. of Community member participated
	27. No. of farms implementing the adaptation measures
	28. No. of successful cases documented and up scaled
	29. No. of linkages to regional and global experiences established IWRM plan for Zarqa River basin including adaptation measures. (re-added)

146. The indicator with no number under output 2.2 was deleted in the revised JP document and not use in the bi-annual report. The indicator #29 was deleted in the revised JP document but was re-added in the set of indicators that was used in the June 2010 bi-annual report.

147. These indicators are part of the monitoring framework and constitutes the main instrument to measure the progress made by the JP. However, as discussed above, this instrument is not fulfilling its intent; the review of these indicators raises three main issues:

- *Number of indicators:* Tracking 29 indicators is complex and run the risk that it will not be done accurately and timely.
- *Content of indicators:* Current indicators are quite SMART<sup>14</sup> but are also more targeted at monitoring progress of activities as opposed to monitoring the achievements of expected outcomes and outputs. A lot of these indicators are tracking “a number of ...”, which are the anticipated result(s) of most planned activities. However, they are not relevant enough to measure the progress made by the JP to achieve its expected outputs and outcomes. The challenge is to decrease the number of these indicators and add a few targeting the measurement of progress toward the expected outputs and outcomes.
- *Quality of progress information produced:* As a result of not having the most appropriate indicators, the monitoring framework is not providing summarized, accurate and timely progress information to managers of the JP. The reading of the bi-annual report is not providing much information above the delivery of particular activities.

148. The review of progress reports produced so far indicates that it is difficult to get the “big picture” about the progress of the JP. It is recommended to review the list of indicators (*see recommendation in Section 7*).

#### **4.4. Potential Impacts of the Jordan Joint Programme**

149. This section discusses the progress made so far toward the achievement of strategies and outcomes of the programme and the likelihood that programme achievements will have a long-term impact on the climate change agenda of Jordan.

##### ***4.4.1. Potential to Achieve the Programme’s Strategies***

150. It is too early to assess the potential for the JP to achieve its overall strategy. Nevertheless, activities underway supported by the JP and addressing Jordan’s long-term adaptation needs should contribute to the enhancement of the capacity to adapt to climate change in Jordan over the long term. As discussed in previous Sections, the pioneer role of this JP should have an impact on addressing climate change through identification and implementation of adaptation measures to climate change in order to mitigate impacts on water availability and food productivity. This potential is confirmed by some unforeseen positive developments such as current negotiations to set up an inter-ministerial committee on climate change and the creation of a climate change and environment unit at MOWI.

151. As discussed in Section 4.1, the JP is addressing national priorities. In addition, the analysis of national policies (*see Section 4.1.1*) indicates that climate change is not considered in most of these policies. The JP is providing resources to fill this gap. It is a programme that serves as a catalyst for establishing a climate change agenda in Jordan and from this angle, its long-term impact is almost certain.

152. However, the long-term impact of the JP will also depend on how far the implementation will go. It is an ambitious programme and there is a risk that it is spread too thin; preventing the consolidation of results at the end and the scaling up of results. As discussed in Section 4.3.1, there is a sequence “embedded” into the planned

---

14 S: Specific; M: Measurable; A: Achievable; R: Relevant; T: Time-bound

activities whereby activity x has to be completed before activity y can be implemented. Therefore, ensuring that enough time is allotted to the implementation of the last activities is going to be critical for the long-term impact and also sustainability (*see Section 4.5*) of JP achievements. For instance, the long-term impact of the JP support to identify adaptation measures - under output 2.1 – to reduce the impact of climate change on food productivity will depend largely on how these measures will be made known to local farming communities. This impact will depend greatly on the success of the planned community awareness campaign and the establishment of model farms, which will be done near the end of the JP.

#### **4.4.2. Contribution to the Implementation of MDGs in Jordan**

153. Jordan is committed to implement the obligations of the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It produced an assessment report in 2004 stating the progress made to achieve the main targets set globally. In this assessment two MDGs were identified as more difficult to be achieved by 2015; Goal 3 – *Promote gender equality and empowerment of women* and Goal 7 – *Ensure environmental sustainability*. Regarding Goal 7, based on the analysis of challenges and strengths, several recommendations were made and classified into few categories: policy/macro level, natural resource management, data, and advocacy. Reviewing this list of recommendations, the JP should have an impact on three of these recommendations:

- Establish policies in the agricultural, industrial and transport sectors, urban planning, biodiversity as well as energy consumption and renewable energy resources, accessibility of water, sewage networks and treatment facilities and integrated solid waste management.
- Improve the efficiency of water use in the municipal, industrial and agricultural sectors through the reduction of unaccounted for water
- Adopt a national policy to manage water resources, monitor usage, rehabilitate infrastructure and adopt sound treatment technologies.

154. The JP focuses on the challenges facing Jordan’s MDG achievements due to water scarcity induced by climate change. Its expected results include support to the government in improving its policy framework for water management and in strengthening its capacity to adapt to climate change and its impact on water availability, food security and health protection. For instance the JP will support the identification of a minimum household water security requirements for health protection; a major indicator for water policy development. The results will be used to support the development of new policy instruments to secure the supply of this minimum water requirement. Another example is the identification of new crop varieties to adapt to climate change. Finally the JP is supporting the implementation of WSPs for each water distribution system. This instrument aims to better manage the local water resources from the catchment area to the water treatment facility and distribution system to monitor the proper water usage.

#### **4.4.3. Potential Impacts on Local Environment and Socio-Economic Issues**

155. The JP should have positive impacts on the local environment and the welfare of local communities where the programme intervenes. However, the design of the JP is such that it does not target local communities as its primary target. Its primary target is to strengthen the capacity of organizations involved in water management to adapt to climate change and its impact on water availability and risks on food security and health. Nevertheless, the JP should have indirect positive impacts on local environment and welfare of local communities over the long term through adaptation measures as responses to negative impact of climate change on water availability.

156. For instance, the strengthening of the national drinking water quality system aims at upgrading the existing national drinking water quality system through the review and modifications of water quality standards and management practices. The expected result is an increase water quality for communities. Under output 2.2, the JP concentrates on enhancing adaptation measures capacities of local community institutions through workshops on water resource management and enhancing formal education on water resource management

concept through primary and secondary schools. Finally, activities under output 2.1 include the assessment of climate change risk on water availability and the identification of adaptation measures to reduce the impact of climate change on food productivity. Concrete actions will be piloted and tested at the farm level to demonstrate adaptation measures mitigating the impact of climate change to local communities.

#### **4.5. Sustainability and Replicability of the Jordan Joint Programme**

157. This section discusses the potential for the long-term sustainability of programme achievements. It is an indication of whether outcomes (end of programme results) and positive impacts (long-term results) are likely to continue after the programme ends.

##### **4.5.1. Sustainability of Results Achieved**

158. The sustainability strategy of JP achievements stated in the JP document is rather weak. It was anticipated that sustainability of the programme activities after the life of the programme will be ensured through the adaptation and implementation of risk alleviation mechanisms, especially awareness and training programmes that will be targeting local community leaders and policy makers.

159. It is true that awareness raising and training of local community leaders and policy makers will contribute to the sustainability of JP achievements. However, more is needed to ensure the sustainability of JP achievements. During implementation of JP activities two concepts are key for ensuring the sustainability of achievements: country ownership of the process and institutionalization of achievements.

160. Despite a weak strategy in the JP document detailing how JP achievements will be sustainable over the long-term, the implementation approach is conducive for ensuring this long-term sustainability. firstly, most activities that are supported by the JP are responding to national needs; secondly, the involvement of stakeholders throughout the implementation process encourages the ownership of the process by stakeholders; and, thirdly, achievements are to be institutionalized within the policy framework or the procedures of organizations. However, it is important that sustainability be constantly emphasized during the implementation of the JP and “go the extra mile” for institutionalizing achievements and scaling up results issued from demonstrations.

161. Under output 1.1, the JP supports the strengthening of the national drinking water quality system. A review and assessment of current national DWQ systems including legislation, standards, and management practices at both the national and sub regional level and suggestions needed to upgrade the DWQ systems in Jordan is underway. Additionally, training needs analysis at all levels and the design of training programs to address these needs, including modules for DWQ management system in Jordan is also underway. Critical supplies were identified in early 2010 and the JP has procured some equipment and supplies to the DWQ laboratory. The adoption of WSPs in 5 water supply systems will be demonstrated. However, sustainability will rely on the assessment of these demonstrations (lessons learned and best practices) as well as addressing identified capacity gaps through the development of proposals to improve the enabling environment for improving drinking water quality and through “roadmaps” for scaling up WSPs to all water supply systems in Jordan. Currently, it is not a distinct activity to be implemented but it is recommended to focus on these aspects at the tail end of Activities 1.1 and 1.2.

162. Regarding output 1.2, the JP supports the identification of minimum household water security requirements for health protection, as well as the development of methodologies for establishing and generating evidence to support recommendations on minimum water requirements for health. The sustainability of these achievements will rely on the JP support for new legislative and policy instruments - securing supply of minimum water requirements for health – to be developed. It is planned under Activity 1.6.

163. Output 2.1 supports the assessment of risks from climate change and water scarcity on food productivity as well as identifying adaptation measures to reduce climate change on food productivity and conducting research for crop and livestock more adapted to current climate conditions. All these findings will be communicated to farming and other communities through awareness campaigns and model farms. However, to ensure sustainability of these achievements, it is important that more emphasis be put on the scaling up of results. For instance, based on lessons learned and best practices from activities under output 2.1, it is recommended to scale up the results through the network of mobile agricultural extensionists from NCARE, which is the same institutions under which research for crop and livestock more adapted to current climate conditions is conducted.

164. Under output 2.2, training material is produced to deliver several training workshops on climate change and groundwater modelling as well as on applying EIAs to study the impact of climate change on water resources. The custodian of this material is the IRCWEE, which should ensure further use of it. Regarding the research projects, they are useful in the case of Jordan; however, it is not clear as to what and where these results will be used. It is recommended to review these research projects and through the IHP committee discuss the long-term sustainability of these results, including which organization will be the custodian of these results. Regarding the creation of the IRCWEE, it is now operational and all elements are in place to ensure the sustainability of this organization. Finally, regarding the development of a cooperative framework for the sustainable management of shared water resources including transboundary water resources, it is important that the JP review this activity and decide with relevant partners what water body or region could be a case study where a cooperative framework could start to be developed. The delivery of workshops is a good instrument to develop the capacity of stakeholders; however, it is recommended to apply the cooperative framework to a concrete example.

165. The focus of output 2.3 is to protect health from environmental conditions induced by climate change. Activities include an assessment of direct and indirect risks to health from climate change and the development of adaptation strategies and projects to address these risks. Additionally, the JP is to support the development of a national early warning system to monitor and assess health impacts from climate change. The sustainability of these achievements will be through the adoption of these strategies and system by national partners and the implementation of these identified projects (scale up). It is planned through the set of activities under this output but it is recommended to keep the emphasis throughout on institutionalization and scaling up of JP achievements.

166. Finally, output 2.4 is about developing the capacity of the ZRB stakeholders to adapt to climate change. One major result will be the formulation of appropriate legal and institutional strategies and the needed interventions for the ZRB. The sustainability for this output has a two-pronged approach: strategies and implementation plan for the ZRB need to be adopted by local governments in the ZRB area and lessons learned and best practices need to be replicated throughout Jordan. Activity 2.21 will provide resources for the dissemination of results; however it is important to keep the focus on scaling up the findings rather than just disseminating knowledge acquired under this output.

167. Overall, JP achievements should be sustainable in the long-term. Despite some weakness in the design of the programme, the facts that most activities were formulated to respond to specific national needs (demand driven) and that stakeholders are much involved the JP decision making, they should contribute greatly to the sustainability of these achievements over the long-term.

#### ***4.5.2. Enabling Environment: Policy, Legislation and Institutions***

168. The strategy of the JP is to enhance the capacity to adapt to climate change by addressing Jordan’s long-term adaptation needs. Its focus is divided into 6 outputs: 1.1 focuses on the national drinking water quality management system; 1.2 focuses on the reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection;

2.1 seeks to develop the capacity of the rural sector in adapting to climate change; 2.2 aims at developing the capacity of national institutions in IWRM; 2.3 seeks to institutionalize adaptation measures to protect health from climate change; and 2.4 aims at piloting the adaptation capacity in the ZRB to climate change.

169. The overall strategy has a focus on developing the adaptation capacity to climate change. It includes activities seeking to strengthen the enabling environment through the reinforcement of legislation, policy and institutional frameworks. For instance, the JP supports the development and implementation of adaptation strategies to protect health from the negative effects of heat waves; the establishment of a national early warning system to monitor and assess health impacts of climate change; the formulation of appropriate legal and institutional strategies and the needed interventions for the ZRB.

170. However, despite these discreet activities, a stronger focus on strengthening the enabling environment would be expected for a programme of this nature. The JP will accumulate a large body of knowledge about climate change adaptation, including risks and series of adaptation measures. Nevertheless, these results may not be well adopted and replicated if the related enabling environment is not conducive or may present barriers.

171. As mentioned above, the JP will support activities to strengthen these frameworks; however, more emphasis on these aspects is needed. For instance, the demonstration of WSPs with 5 water supply systems should contribute for a new approach to improve drinking water quality<sup>15</sup> in Jordan. However the scaling up of WSPs to all water supply systems in Jordan may face some legislative, policy and/or institutional barriers. Addressing these barriers would require additional resources and a lot of time but the minimum contribution of the JP should be the identification of these barriers and recommendations for the way forward.

172. Additionally, there are discussions in Jordan to develop a new water law (one goal of the water strategy), there is a growing interest in developing a national climate change adaptation strategy, and climate change is not yet integrated in the policy framework of Jordan. There is more and more recognition in Jordan that this high policy level needs to be strengthened and the JP should provide adequate support to strengthen the enabling environment related to its achievements in order to maximize their long-term sustainability.

#### **4.5.3. Replication and Scaling-up**

173. Replication is part of ensuring the long-term sustainability of JP achievements; however, there is not much emphasis on replication and scaling up of results in the JP document. It is often understood that replication is an intended impact over the long-term but it is not articulated well in the design of the JP.

174. For instance, considering the Activity 2.5 that is to establish model farms using treated wastewater as adaptation to climate change for capacity building; it is understood that the impact of this activity is to replicate and scale up the results of research on crops and livestock through the demonstration for local farming communities. This is a good approach but more emphasis on replication is recommended under this activity, such as the assessment of existing farming methods to identify any barriers for replicating these results and possibly any laws, policies or market barriers, which would prevent this replication.

175. The same analysis can be conducted for activities under output 2.4, which aims to pilot and strengthen the adaptive capacity of the ZRB to climate change. The main objective of activities under this output is to assess direct and indirect effects of climate change on water availability and quality in the ZRB; to identify

---

15 As described in Section 4.5.2, the WHO-CEHA supports Jordan for upgrading its water quality management system since 1985. A national vision for water safety management was drafted by the working teams of MoH and MWI in 2006. The demonstration project supported by the JP is one building block of many other building blocks that are needed to scale up the application of water safety management in Jordan. Nevertheless, it was noted during the mission of the Evaluator in Jordan that this initiative is not well “embedded” within the national water policy framework and no information was collected besides information received from WHO-CEHA.

opportunities and barriers to adaptation to climate change; to review and deliver reform strategies for legal and institutional frameworks and national water policies and action plans; to build local and national capacities for adaptation to climate change using participatory approach; and to document and share knowledge generated from these activities and establish linkages to regional and global experiences. These activities intend to develop the capacity of local development actors in climate change adaptation. Over the long-term, they should contribute to the socio-economic and environmental development of the Zarqa region. However, documenting and sharing the accumulated knowledge would not maximize the replication of these results. It is recommended that under the Activity 2.21, a review of the enabling environment be done with the identification of potential gaps for the replication of these results, as well as national seminars to present these results. One objective should be to replicate the results in at least one other region in Jordan.

176. Overall, the formulation of the JP did not emphasize much the replication and scaling up of results; it is barely mentioned in the JP document. However, considering the nature of this JP that supports several demonstrations and pilots, it is recommended to explore various actions that can be supported to maximize the replication of these pilots and demonstrations (*see Section 7*).

## 5. CONCLUSION

177. In conclusion, the JP is very relevant for Jordan; particularly to support Jordan to establish its climate change adaptation agenda. Water scarcity is a major challenge for Jordan’s development and it is impacted negatively by climate change; both are a threat to human health, food security and overall productivity. However, the review noted that climate change was not mentioned in the National Agenda that is guiding the development agenda in Jordan and in the “Water for Life” strategy, the main national policy instrument for water management in Jordan. Nevertheless, the focus of the National Agenda is on the development/strengthening of policies, legislation and institutions related to the overall objective of the National Agenda, including water and environment in general; and the water strategy identified the fact that climate change risks were not sufficiently taken into account in sectoral policies and investment frameworks. Consequently, the JP provides resources for the government of Jordan to develop its capacity to address and mainstream climate change adaptation into the national development agenda. From a UN perspective, the JP is well aligned with the UNDAF 2008-2012 and also the implementation of MDGs in Jordan. This is an ambitious programme aiming at many different intervention areas related to climate change. It may look somewhat “piecemeal” but it also reflects national priorities and address national needs. Reviewing all activities supported by the JP, it is difficult to see the “big picture” about what the programme is trying to achieve overall; however, these activities are part of several government of Jordan climate change adaptation policies and programmes.

178. After more than a year of implementation, the progress made by the JP is so far limited. The review confirms what was noted by the MDG-F Secretariat when they commented the 2010 Bi-annual report. However, despite that the JP is still behind schedule, it is finally implemented at full speed with a good participation of key stakeholders. The delivery of several assignments currently underway should change this assessment in the coming 6-9 months. Currently the JP has an implementation team in place; has a fully developed work plan; has a participatory process in place with the involvement of key stakeholders through task forces to validate the implementation process; has a JP management committee chaired by the Secretary General of the MOWI to oversee the implementation of the programme; and more importantly has several assignments currently underway. Nevertheless, the JP is about capacity development in climate change adaptation; however, no capacity development approach or strategies were explicitly stated in the joint programme document and the review indicates that the approach to develop the needed capacities needs to be strengthened; particularly to maximize the long-term sustainability of JP achievements. In term of achievements, it was also noted that the JP is having an impact on establishing a national agenda on climate change in Jordan. Already several unforeseen organizational developments such as the current development of an inter-ministerial committee on climate change have been observed during the mission for this review.

179. From a management perspective, it is a complex programme to coordinate and manage. It involves 4 UN agencies and 6 main counterpart organizations. The management aspects are well addressed in the programme document with the UN management modalities - including fund management - and overall management arrangements. Roles and responsibilities are clearly identified with a management structure that includes a small JP unit based at MOWI, a PMC and a NSC. According to the financial information reviewed, the JP utilized 27% (\$1.1M) of its MDG-F budget (\$4M) versus an elapsed time of 36% when considering the start-up delay. Disbursements should accelerate in the period September 2010 to June 2011 and it is anticipated that the budget should be entirely disbursed by the end of the programme; including a time extension of 5-6 months. However, it was found that the management of the programme is too activity-based as opposed to be more results-based (RBM); preventing a greater focus on what the programme needs to achieve (vision) as opposed to what activities need to be delivered. Finally, a monitoring framework with 29 indicators is used to monitor the programme. However, the monitoring process is not fulfilling its intent; information contained in the few progress reports does not provide a good “picture” of the reality on the ground. This information gap is partly due to the nature of these indicators and the way information is reported; it reports mostly activities as opposed to progress made toward the achievements of expected results.

180. Despite that it is too early to assess the potential for the JP to achieve its overall strategy, activities underway and its pioneer role should contribute to the enhancement of the capacity to adapt to climate change in Jordan. This contribution will be achieved through the identification and implementation of adaptation measures to climate change in order to mitigate impacts on water availability, health and food productivity. The potential for long-term impacts of the JP is also confirmed by some unforeseen positive developments such as current negotiations to set up an inter-ministerial committee on climate change and the creation of a climate change and environment unit at MOWI. The JP will also contribute to the implementation of MDGs in Jordan by responding directly to some recommendations made by a MDG assessment conducted in 2004.

181. Finally, despite a weak sustainability strategy stated in the JP document, JP achievements should be sustainable in the long-term. The implementation approach is conducive for ensuring this long-term sustainability: first, most activities that are supported by the JP are responding to national needs; second, the involvement of stakeholders throughout the implementation process encourages the ownership of the process by stakeholders; and, third, achievements are to be institutionalized within the policy framework or the procedures of organizations. However, it is important that sustainability be emphasized during the implementation of the JP – throughout its remaining period - and “go the extra mile” for institutionalizing achievements and scaling up results issued from demonstrations.

## **6. LESSONS LEARNED**

182. Based on the review of project documents, interviews and meetings with key informants, and the analysis of this information, the Evaluator collated several lessons learned. Due to the fact that the JP has been implemented for just over a year, lessons are still limited at this stage; there are presented below:

- The quality of the implementation of this type of development programme depends a lot on the quality of the design/formulation of these programmes. It is necessary that a programme document includes all the information to explain why this programme and how it will address existing barriers and national priorities. Strong design phase leads often to better country ownership, better stakeholder participation and better long-term sustainability.
- A joint programme document should be approved when it is completely finalized. It is particularly true when significant comments are made to the document and need an extensive review before it is satisfactorily finalized to be approved and funded. An earlier approval tends to diminish the importance of these comments. As a result, these comments may not be addressed properly, which can later affect the implementation of the joint programme.

- There is a need to better align management modalities among UN agencies involved into a joint programme under the “One UN” concept for an effective implementation. The differences between sets of rules and procedures from UN agencies are exacerbated when working together and it makes the implementation of these joint programmes difficult. This search for a better harmonization of rules and procedures cannot be done at the country level; it needs to be done at the UN agency headquarter level.
- A joint programme needs a defined inception phase at start up to review design elements, engage stakeholders and document possible changes to the programme strategy, management arrangements, monitoring framework and participation of stakeholders.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

183. Based on the findings of this mid-term evaluation, the following recommendations for the remaining implementation period of the programme are suggested; including recommendations for the overall MDG-F initiative. They are in no particular order.

### *Recommendations for the remaining period of implementation*

#### **Recommendation #1**

It is recommended that the JP implementation team requests a second transfer as soon as possible to avoid a slowdown of the current implementation pace; following the MDG-F procedures re-stated below:

*A Fund Transfer Request (FTR) is made by the UN-RC on behalf of the NSC to the MDTF office and based on a PMC and NSC approved annual work plan and budget. The release of funds is subject to meeting the threshold of 70% of the previous fund release to all UN agency (expended and commitments) and clear progress towards results.*

#### **Issue to Address**

As of the end of August 2010, the JP was slightly behind schedule in term of expending its JP budget versus its elapsed time. However, it was noted that the period August to October 2010 was a period where several additional commitments were made through contracting additional consultants. In October 2010, most of the first transfer was expended or committed and that some assignments are now waiting for the second transfer before the UN agencies can commit to more activities and sign new contracts. Considering the momentum gained by the JP in the recent few months, it is critical that the UN agencies receive the second transfer in a timely manner to avoid any disruption in the implementation.

#### **Recommendation #2**

It is recommended to monitor closely the implementation of all activities under outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.3 that are implemented by WHO over the next 6 to 9 months and address any slippage immediately.

#### **Issue to Address**

These activities represent the “critical path<sup>16</sup>” for the implementation of this JP. It includes 11 activities (out of 27 total): one activity is almost completed (Act. 1.4), four are underway (1.1, 1.3, 2.11 and 2.13) and the others 6 are at an early stage to be implemented. The work plan to implement these activities indicates that these activities should be implemented by the end of the JP in mid-2012. However, considering that some of these activities are to be implemented sequentially – for instance, activities 2.14 and 2.15 cannot really be implemented before 2.11, 2.12 and 2.13 are completed – there is the risk that any slippage in the implementation of an activity may have a negative impact on the implementation of other important activities; including the sustainability of achievements under these outputs. In order to monitor closely this implementation, WHO developed a self-monitoring implementation strategy and is negotiating with MOH for

16 Defined as the sequence of project activities, which add up to the longest overall duration of a project. This determines the shortest time possible to complete the project and any delay of an activity on the critical path directly impacts the planned project completion date.

to further expedite the implementation, enhance ownership and the long term sustainability.

**Recommendation #3**

It is recommended to develop with relevant stakeholders a “roadmap” for implementing WSPs throughout Jordan. This roadmap should include an implementation strategy and its implication in term of legislation, policy and institutional needs.

**Issue to Address**

The set of planned activities in implementing WSPs is focused on demonstrating/testing the implementation of WSPs in 5 water supply systems accompanied by relevant training. The recommendation implies to support further relevant institutions in charge of implementing WSPs in Jordan. WSP is a methodology that had already been tested with one water supply system and it is well accepted in Jordan. However, currently no strategy exists to expand/replicate WSPs throughout Jordan; the JP should support these institutions in identifying the way forward through a “roadmap”.

**Recommendation #4**

It is recommended to plan a time extension to complete the JP and ensure that achievements are sustainable and replicated. It is too early in the implementation to assess how much time extension would be needed at the end but the minimum would be the equivalent of the 5-6 months delay that occurred at start-up.

**Issue to Address**

The review of the timetable to deliver activities and achieve the expected outputs indicates that the JP should be completed after 36 months of implementation. However, considering the delay at the start-up phase, the JP will need at least this extended time to complete the delivery of its work plan. The main delay was in the hiring of the JP Coordinator, who was hired mid-July 2009 as opposed to an official starting date of February 2009 that is 5 months later.

**Recommendation #5**

It is recommended to make indicators included in the monitoring framework gender sensitive; that is to gather information about these indicators that would provide gender disaggregated information. Also to explore the possibilities to mainstream gender approaches in activities where possible.

**Issue to Address**

To date, the JP does not include gender-based performance indicators and no gender-disaggregated data is reported through the bi-annual monitoring reports. However, the review of the list of indicators reveals that some of them could be made gender sensitive without difficulty. For instance, tracking the “*number of stakeholders trained on the operational approaches*”, can be changed to “*number of men and women stakeholders trained on the operational approaches*”.

**Recommendation #6**

It is recommended to emphasize capacity development throughout the implementation of JP activities, taking a broader and holistic approach to develop the climate change adaptation capacity of key stakeholders.

**Issue to Address**

Capacity development is part of the logic of the JP; it is embedded into the strategy of the programme. The long-term impact and sustainability of JP achievements will depend a lot on capacities developed during the implementation of the JP.

**Recommendation #7**

It is recommended that the JP implementation team constantly emphasizes the involvement of key stakeholders; particularly those whom should become the logical custodians of JP achievements.

**Issue to Address**

The long-term impact of the JP in Jordan and the sustainability of its achievements rest mostly on national stakeholders to use their developed capacities and uptake achievements in their own strategies, policies and programmes. The process to involve stakeholders into the implementation is good; programmatic task forces

were created and they participate in the JP implementation process; and the PMC is now chaired by the Secretary General of MOWI. The review also found that there is a growing interest in the JP; it is important that the implementation team capitalize on this.

**Recommendation #8**

It is recommended to discuss the formalization of roles and responsibilities for the JP focal points with relevant ministries that nominated these focal points in order to increase the effectiveness of their intervention.

**Issue to Address**

It is an excellent indicator of commitment for these ministries to have nominated focal points to liaise with the implementation of the JP. These focal points and liaison officers participate in the preparation of TORs, identification of experts and mobilization of implementing partners and ministries resources to support the program. They also play a role in communicating awareness of the JP. However, in most cases these added tasks are not part of their job descriptions. As a consequence, liaising with the JP is sometimes not a top priority, hampering the effectiveness of the function of these focal points. A greater “officialization” of the involvement of these focal points in the implementation of the JP should be sought for a more effective participation.

**Recommendation #9**

It is recommended to develop a sustainability strategy, emphasizing institutionalization and scaling-up of results throughout the remaining implementation period.

**Issue to Address**

The strategy for the sustainability of JP achievements was not very well articulated in the JP document. However, the implementation approach is conducive for ensuring this sustainability through national ownership. Nevertheless, it is recommended to develop a strategy for the sustainability of JP achievements for the implementation team to “go the extra mile” for institutionalizing achievements and scaling up results issued from demonstrations and pilots.

**Recommendation #10**

It is recommended to create a UN Thematic Group on climate change and environment with the involvement of national stakeholders.

**Issue to Address**

As discussed in the analysis presented in Section 4 above, climate change is not mainstreamed yet into the national agenda and more generally in national development policies. However, more and more related projects and programmes are being developed. A greater coordination of these initiatives is needed and also to support the GOJ to develop its overall strategy to adapt to climate change.

**Recommendation #11**

It is recommended to create a Working Group in the ZRB to oversee the implementation of activities under output 2.4. This Working Group should be inclusive of all stakeholders, including government institutions, academia, civil society/community leaders and private sector. This group should identify its TORs, meet regularly to oversee the progress made under output 2.4 and participate in the decision-making process.

**Issue to Address**

At the formulation stage, a local community consultation group was planned. The recommendation goes beyond the notion of consultation and envisions a participatory decision-making process where Working Group Members will participate in the implementation of activities in ZRB including the contribution to decisions.

**Recommendation #12**

It is recommended to work in close collaboration with IUCN; particularly for activities to be implemented in the ZRB. They should be included in the Working Group recommended to oversee activities in the ZRB and the JP should use IUCN expertise in the region.

<p><b>Issue to Address</b> IUCN has an extensive worldwide expertise to influence water policies; including their Water and Nature Initiative (WANI). IUCN-Jordan developed a development strategy for the ZRB in collaboration with the MOE and the financial support of AECI. This strategy was done based on an in-depth assessment of the region. Partnering with IUCN is a logical step for the JP to benefit from their expertise and knowledge.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #13</b></p>
<p>It is recommended to organize high-level seminar(s) targeting Minister level participants to raise awareness of climate change impacts on water resources, food productivity and health protection as well as adaptation measures to be implemented.</p>
<p><b>Issue to Address</b> The JP has already a good country ownership. However, considering that climate change is not part of major development policies such as the National Agenda and the Water-for-Life Strategy, more awareness of high-level Officials is needed to contribute to any significant changes in areas such as legislation, policy and institutional structure.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #14</b></p>
<p>It is recommended to collaborate with the team that is producing the 3<sup>rd</sup> National Communication to the UNFCCC and as much as possible integrate current findings from the JP such as adaptation measures and several assessments of climate change impacts on food productivity and health.</p>
<p><b>Issue to Address</b> The 3<sup>rd</sup> National Communication to UNFCCC is supported by a UNDP-GEF project. This is a first international opportunity to disseminate JP findings, which should be validated first by relevant government institutions.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation #15</b></p>
<p>It is recommended to review the list of performance indicators to monitor the progress of the JP. A first attempt at reviewing these indicators is proposed in the table below.</p>
<p><b>Issue to Address</b> As discussed in Section 4.3.6, the monitoring process is not fulfilling its intent; the review indicates that information contained in few progress reports does not provide a good “picture” of the reality on the ground. There are many indicators and they focus more on the delivery of activities than progress toward achieving expected results. It is proposed to shorten the list of indicators with a greater focus on monitoring progress in achieving the JP’s expected results. A proposed list is presented below. A new list of indicators should also be accompanied by a table presenting for each indicator, its baseline, its target by end of programme and its source(s) of verification.</p>

**Table 10: Proposed List of Performance Indicators to Monitor the JP**

Outcomes/Outputs	Indicators
<b>Outcome 1: Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change</b>	1. Percentage of water supply systems meeting requirements of the national drinking water quality standards
<i>Output 1.1: Strengthened national drinking water quality management system at central and periphery level</i>	2. Number of operational WSP 3. An approved strategy to upgrade the national DWQ system. 4. An approved roadmap for implementing WSPs throughout Jordan
<i>Output 1.2: Sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection</i>	5. An adopted minimum household water security requirements for health protection 6. Drafted legislation to secure supply of minimum water requirements for health

Outcomes/Outputs	Indicators
<b>Outcome 2: Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions</b>	7. Adopted material for reforming policies, programmes and legislation related to environmental health and food security threaten by climate change and water scarcity conditions
<i>Output 2.1:</i> Improved rural sector adaptive capacity for climate variability and change	8. An adopted list of adaptation measures to reduce climate change impacts on food productivity 9. Tested adaptation measures to improve crop and livestock productivity with treated wastewater irrigation 10. Model farms established using treated wastewater
<i>Output 2.2:</i> Improved national institutional and community capacity in integrated water resources management (IWRM)	11. Number of male and female trained in IWRM 12. Adopted climate change adaptation measures to be implemented at community level 13. An operational environment and water resources center for advocacy education and capacity building.
<i>Output 2.3:</i> Adaptation measures, by health sector and other sectors, to protect health from climate change are institutionalized	14. Adopted and disseminated adaptation strategies to protect health from the negative effect of heat waves 15. Adopted adaptation projects to protect health from identified high risk environmental conditions induced by climate change. 16. An operational early warning system to monitor and assess health impacts of climate change
<i>Output 2.4:</i> Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened	17. Implemented approved strategies for reforming legal, policy and institutional frameworks related to water resources management 18. Formulated and approved climate change adaptation measures implementation plan for the ZRB 19. Piloted adaptation measures by communities in ZRB 20. Documented and disseminated knowledge about ZRB results

### Recommendations for the MDG-F initiative

#### Recommendation #16

It is recommended to strengthen the formulation stage for these joint programmes; including stronger guidelines. These guidelines should include the need to review the legislative, policy and institutional frameworks, identify national priorities, existing barriers, rationale for the programme, proposed strategy/set of expected results, management arrangements, budget, stakeholder involvement, risks management, long-term sustainability and performance measurement framework.

#### Issue to Address

A JP document should include all the information to explain why this programme and how it will address existing barriers and national priorities. Experience shows that good formulation leads often to good implementation and sustainable achievements. Additionally, the involvement of national stakeholders at the formulation stage is an important factor for the future success of any programme or project.

#### Recommendation #17

It is recommended to the MDG-F Secretariat to institute an inception phase when starting up these joint programmes, including an inception report to finalize and document this initial phase of implementation. Guidance material and report template would be needed to direct the process.

#### Issue to Address

An inception phase should be directed for the implementation of these joint programmes. The implementation of the JP was slow and no real guidance was available to start-up the JP. Additionally, an inception workshop took place only in April 2010 or 14 months after the approval of the JP; that is too late. An inception phase is a start up phase that should be completed in 3-4 months with an inception workshop to review results of this inception phase. The objective of this inception phase should be to review the strategy of the joint programme (objective(s), outcomes and outputs); the performance monitoring framework (how to measure progress); the

technical assistance to be used by the joint programme; management arrangements; coordination mechanisms and the participation of stakeholders; the review of risks and mitigation measures; and, finally the formulation of the first year work plan and its related budget.

### **Recommendation #18**

It is recommended to introduce gender as a crosscutting theme to be applied in all joint programmes into guidelines produced by the MDG-F Secretariat. It includes the “*Implementation Guidelines for MDG-F Joint Programmes*” but also other guiding documents such as the “*MDG-F TOR for Thematic Window on Environment and Climate Change*”.

#### ***Issue to Address***

Currently, very little is said about gender into the MDG-F guiding materials. Gender was briefly mentioned in the JP document as a crosscutting issue that will be addressed by the programme. However, gender has not been applied to the implementation of the JP and there is only limited resources and guidance to do so. Gender needs to be fully part of the implementation of joint programmes and guidance should be provided to implementation teams.

### **Recommendation #19**

It is recommended to streamline the template for the bi-annual monitoring report.

#### ***Issue to Address***

This is an extensive template to report progress, which often leads to not being entirely completed or at least not timely. Some Sections could be streamlined such as the table in Section *I-b. Joint Programme M&E Framework*. The four right columns could be deleted. Focusing on results, the section “*I-c. Joint Programme Results Framework with Financial Information*” could be simplified and be kept at the output and outcome level (not activity). A Section on risk management should be added to review the risks. The validity of the table in Section II-b is questionable. A simple listing of managerial practices implemented jointly by implementing UN agencies should be sufficient.

### **Recommendation #20**

It is recommended to review the management modalities among UN agencies to manage/coordinate programmes and projects and explore how these modalities could be better aligned among UN agencies.

#### ***Issue to Address***

It is a lesson learned from implementing these joint programmes. Each UN agency has its own set of rules and procedures to implement programmes and projects. When it comes to working together, these differences are exacerbated and it makes the implementation of these joint programmes difficult; sometimes preventing a greater participation of stakeholders. Applying the “One UN” concept necessitates the harmonization of these rules and procedures to maximize the implementation effectiveness and efficiency of this type of joint programme.

## Annexes

### Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TORs)

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF JOINT PROGRAMMES ON ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

##### **General Context: The MDGF Environment and Climate Change Thematic Window**

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €28 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDGF supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

The MDGF operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs.

The Environment and Climate Change thematic window aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability in eligible countries by supporting interventions that improve environmental management and service provision at the national and local levels, as well as increasing access to new funding mechanisms and expanding the ability to adapt to climate change.

The Window includes 17 joint programmes that encompass a wide range of subjects and results. Nevertheless, certain similar underlying characteristics can be identified across most of these joint programmes. The majority of the programmes in the window seek to contribute to three types of result: making the environment, natural resource management and action against climate change a mainstream focus in all public policy; improving national capacities to plan and implement concrete actions in favor of the environment; and assessing and improving national capacities to adapt to climate change.

The joint programmes within this thematic window serve a variety of participants<sup>17</sup>, ranging from national governments to local populations. All joint programmes include a support component directed at national and local governments. Other beneficiaries include civil society, communities and citizens.

##### Description of the joint programme and goals

Jordan has made strategic advances towards the achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) including reduction of poverty rates from 21% in 1997 to 14% in 2005 (MDG 1), achieving adult literacy rate of 97% (MDG 2), infant mortality rate of 24 per 1000 (MDG 4), 97% access to water, and 65% access to sanitation (MDG 7). However these achievements are compromised by crippling water scarcity and aggravated by climate change, thus bringing about additional threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security. This Joint Programme titled, Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements will help Jordan address the above key strategic issues through achieving the following outcomes:

- 1) Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change;
- 2) Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions.

---

<sup>17</sup> It refers to what previously was referred as beneficiaries

These outcomes address identified barriers to adaptation and provide support to Jordan’s national strategies and action plans for sustainable management of its natural resources; reducing poverty; and enhancing health indicators. Barriers to adaptation include the following:

- a) Climate change risks are not sufficiently taken into account within sectoral policies and investment frameworks;
- b) Existing climate information, knowledge and tools are not directly relevant for supporting adaptation decisions and actions; and
- c) Weak national capacity to develop sectoral adaptation responses.

The Programme, which started in March 2009, further translates the two outcomes into six outputs which will be achieved through implementing 27 activities, over three years from the date of inception. The six outputs are:

- Output 1.1: National drinking water quality management system at central and periphery level is strengthened.
- Output 1.2: Sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection is provided to all citizens.
- Output 2.1: Rural sector adaptive capacity for climate variability and change is improved as well as the urban-rural linkage in water resources management and allocation developed.
- Output 2.2: National institutional and community capacity in integrated water resources management is improved.
- Output 2.3: Adaptation measures, by health sector and other sectors, to protect health from climate change are institutionalized.
- Output 2.4: Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened.

The proposed JP focuses on the challenges facing Jordan’s MDG achievements due to water scarcity induced by climate change. In addition, it supports the United Nations Country Team’s (UNCT) efforts to achieve the UNDAF outcome of healthy and sustainable environment. The National Agenda that sets Jordan’s development vision till 2015, as well as UNDAF document (2008-2012), stress that Jordan's remarkable development achievements are under threat due to the crippling water scarcity, which is expected to be aggravated by climate change. The Initial National Communication (INC) to the United Nations Framework Convention to Climate Change (UNFCCC) shows that Jordan will witness a rise in temperature, drop in rainfall, reduced ground cover, reduced water availability, heat-waves, and more frequent dust storms over the next three decades. The Second National Communication (SNC) to the UNFCCC identifies water as a priority area.

The implementation of some of the activities of the Joint Programme suffered delays during the first year but is progressing at a fast pace during the second year (March 2010-February 2011) thus compensating for that and without any changes in the Joint programme since implementation began in March 2009.

### **Joint Programme scale of complexity, human and financial resources**

The Total estimated Joint Programme budget is USD 4,126,667.

Out of which the planned resources are USD 126,667 from UNDP and others (from which UNDP WGF at SIWI contributes USD 105,000) and USD 4,000,000 from the Spain MDG Achievement Fund.

The Joint Programme adopted a participatory approach that involves many institutions and stakeholder groups including the four UN agencies, UNDP, UNESCO, FAO and WHO; governmental agencies, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture; research institutions; local community and local NGO’s. An added value is the intervention of the UNDP Water Governance Facility at

SIWI, which has the necessary expertise to provide policy support and advisory services in multiple thematic areas, including: integrated water resources management, water supply and sanitation services, climate variability, best practices exchange, gender, as well as capacity building. In addition, UNESCO brings a wealth of international experience through the International Hydrological Programme (IHP) which focuses on broad ranges of water sciences programmes including climate change and water resources, integrated watershed and aquifer dynamics, integrated water resources management, eco-hydrology, land-habitat hydrology, water and society and water education and training for a revolving six year cycle.

The government agencies are responsible for implementing the project strategies and will benefit from the training programmes to improve their capacities. Research institutions will also benefit from the capacity building programmes and their participation will ensure quality data generating to be used in developing the policy framework. They are also involved in the training of local communities. The local community and NGO’s will be involved in training, experimentations and monitoring. Many of the local communities will be participating in the programme as individuals or as local community based institutions (CBO’s). In the early stage of the programme, the potential of these CBO’s was assessed and their role in the programme was determined. The assessment included the needs, fears, concerns and potential support to the programme by the local communities, especially women and poor. This assessment and actual involvement of stakeholders will be repeated throughout the life span of the project from planning up to impact assessment.

The Joint Program geographic scope is the whole country with specific emphasis on the Zarqa River Basin and rural areas. Public awareness and capacity building programme will be implemented in this pilot area to empower local communities, including women and the poor, and strengthen their institutions’ capacity for climate change adaptation within the Zarqa governorate and other rural / urban pilot areas.

The cross cutting issues that will be addressed in this programme include gender, unemployment, poverty, food security, and education. Some activities of the programme will be implemented in rural areas. This include sites for the implementation of improved drinking water quality systems, as well as sites for wastewater reuse in agriculture as part of a food security scheme in the designated regions. Furthermore, adaptation mechanisms for climate change will also be tested. It is evident that the implementation of the above activities will certainly impact various social and economical parameters of many of the stakeholders in the sites under consideration.

The achievement of the programme outcomes will positively affect the economic, social, political, environmental and institutional context of Jordan. Providing access to a secure and sustainable minimum water supply and attaining food security in Jordan despite the expected water scarcity problem which is expected to be manifested by climate change It is also anticipated that the programme outcomes will contribute to a stable social and economic system, thus reducing poverty and improving livelihood of local communities in target areas. They will also attain environmental sustainability. Moreover, the institutional adaptive capacity for climate change will be strengthened.

This Joint Programme will develop Jordan’s key government and civil society counterparts’ capacity to adapt to climate change threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security under the conditions of severe water scarcity that is expected to be compounded by climate change. Moreover, the capacity of vulnerable communities, including women and the poor, within the Zarqa governorate and other rural / urban pilot areas to adapt to climate change will be strengthened.

## **2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION**

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDGF. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes lasting longer than two years will be subject to an mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are highly formative in nature and seek **improved implementation of the programmes during their second phase of implementation. They also seek and generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned** that could be transferred to other programmes. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund.

### 3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

**The unit of analysis or object of study for this mid-term evaluation is the joint programme**, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

1. To discover the programme’s **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the **Millennium Development Goals**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **One UN** framework.
3. To identify the programme’s **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the **Environment and Climate Change thematic window**, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

### 4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

#### Design level

- **Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**
  - a) Is the identification of the problem and its causes in the joint programme being addressed? (Environmental and human)
  - b) Does the joint programme address the problem’s most salient, urgent and prioritized causes? Does it address the health, environmental and socio-economic needs of the population in the areas of involvement? Does it reflect the role of the Programme in solving problems and meeting identified needs?
  - c) Is the strategy adapted to the socio-cultural context to which it is applied?
  - d) Are the monitoring indicators relevant? Are they of sufficient quality to measure the joint programme’s outputs and outcomes?

- e) To what extent has the MDGF Secretariat contributed to improving the quality of the formulation of joint programmes?
- **Ownership in the design: national social actors’ effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**
  - a) To what extent do the joint programme’s goals and lines of action reflect national and regional plans and programmes, identified needs (environmental and human) and the operational context of national policy?
  - b) To what degree have national and local authorities and social actors been taken into consideration in designing the development intervention?

### Process level

- **Efficiency: The extent to which the resources/inputs (funds, time etc.) have been turned into results**
  - a) How well does the joint programme’s management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?
  - b) To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society?
  - c) Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded?
  - d) Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme’s results?
  - e) Are work methodologies, financial tools etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes?
  - f) Have the most efficient measures for the context been adopted to solve the environmental issue?
- **Ownership in the process: National social actors’ effective exercise of leadership in the development interventions**
  - a) To what extent have the target participants taken ownership of the programme, assuming an active role in it?
  - b) To what extent have national public/private resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s goals and impacts?

### Results level

- **Efficacy: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been met or are expected to be met, taking into account their relative importance.**
  - a) Is the programme making progress towards achieving the stipulated results?
    - a. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?
    - b. To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways?
  - b) Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met?
  - c) Do the outputs produced meet the required quality?
  - d) Is the programme providing coverage to participants as planned?
  - e) What factors are contributing to progress or delay in achieving outputs and outcomes?
  - f) To what extent has the programme contributed innovative measures towards solving the problems?
  - g) Have any success stories been identified, or examples that could be transferred to other contexts?
  - h) To what extent have the behaviors causing the environmental problem been transformed?

- i) To what extent has the joint programme contributed to putting environmental problems on the country's policy agenda?
- j) What differential impacts and types of effect is the joint programme producing among population groups, such as youth, children, and adolescents, the elderly, indigenous communities and rural populations?
- **Sustainability: The probability that the benefits of the intervention will continue in the long term.**
  - a) Are the necessary preconditions being created to ensure the sustainability of the impacts of the joint programme?
    - i. At the local level: are local knowledge, experiences, resources and local networks being adopted?
    - ii. At the country level: have networks or network institutions been created or strengthened to carry out the roles that the joint programme is performing?
    - iii. Is the joint programme’s duration sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions into the future?
  - b) To what extent are the visions and actions of partners consistent with or different from those of the joint programme?
  - c) In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future?

### Country level

- a) During the analysis of the evaluation, what lessons have been learned, and what best practices can be transferred to other programmes or countries?
- b) To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards the Millennium Development Goals in the country?
- c) To what extent and in which ways is the joint programmes helping make progress towards United Nations reform? One UN
- d) How have the principles for aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, managing for development results and mutual accountability) been developed in the joint programmes?
- e) To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country’s public policy framework?

## 5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The mid-term evaluations will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyze all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. Consultants are also expected to use interviews as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at a minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

## 6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the Secretariat of the MDGF:

**Inception Report** (to be submitted within seven days of the submission of all programme documentation to the consultant)

This report will be 5 to 10 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose an initial theory of change to the joint programme that will be used for comparative purposes during the evaluation and will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers.

#### **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be shared with evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

#### **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within seven days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page
2. Introduction
  - Background, goal and methodological approach
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Methodology used in the evaluation
  - Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
3. Description of interventions carried out
  - - Initial concept
  - - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.
4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions
5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)
6. Recommendations
7. Annexes

## **7. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION**

The mid-term evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.

- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

## 8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION

The main actors in the interim evaluation process are the Secretariat of the MDGF, the management team of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee that could be expanded to accommodate additional relevant stakeholders. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
- Providing input on the evaluation planning documents,( Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
- Facilitating the evaluation team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

The Secretariat of the MDGF shall promote and manage Joint Programme mid-term evaluation in its role as proponent of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the joint programme evaluation. As manager of the evaluation, the Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated, promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process. It shall also support the country in the main task of disseminating evaluation findings and recommendations.

## 9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

### A. Design phase (15 days total)

1. Each of the Secretariat's portfolios managers shall send the generic TOR for the window in question to the specific country where the evaluation take place. These are then to be adapted to the concrete situation of the joint programme in that country, using the lowest common denominator that is shared by all, for purposes of data aggregation and the provision of evidence for the rest of the MDGF levels of analysis (country, thematic window and MDGF). This activity requires a dialogue between the

Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation (the body that comments on and reviews but does not interfere with the independent evaluation process). This dialogue should be aimed at rounding out and modifying some of the questions and dimensions of the study that the generic TOR do not cover, or which are inadequate or irrelevant to the joint programme.

2. The TOR will be sent to the MDG-F Secretariat consultant.
3. From this point on, each programme officer is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the consultant, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (consultant, joint programme team in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.

## **B. Execution phase of the evaluation study (55-58 days total)**

### **Desk study (15 days total)**

1. Briefing with the consultant (**1 day**). A checklist of activities and documents to review will be submitted, and the evaluation process will be explained. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. Review of documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. Submission of the inception report including the findings from the document review specifying how the evaluation will be conducted. The inception report is sent and shared with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (**within seven days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal person for the evaluation (joint programme coordinator, resident coordinator office, etc) and the consultant prepare and agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc) (**Within seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

### **Field visit (9-12 days)**

1. The consultant will travel to the country to observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document revision. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, the Secretariat’s programme officer may need to facilitate the consultant’s visit by means of phone calls and emails, making sure there is a focal person in the country who is his/her natural interlocutor by default.
2. The consultant will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

### **Final Report (31 days total)**

1. The consultant will deliver a draft final report, which the Secretariat’s programme officer shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group (**within 10 days of the completion of the field visit**).
2. The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the Secretariat’s programme officer can and should intervene so that erroneous data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report**). The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgments contained in the evaluation, but these may not affect the evaluator’s freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.

3. The Secretariat’s programme officer shall assess the quality of the evaluation reports presented using the criteria stipulated in the annex to this evaluation strategy (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report**).
  4. On the completion of input from the reference group, the evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit. The Secretariat’s programme officer shall review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report to the evaluation reference group in the country (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments**).
- C. Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within seven days of delivery of the final report):**
1. The Secretariat’s programme officer, as representative of the Secretariat, shall engage in a dialogue with the joint programme managers to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.
  2. The Secretariat’s programme officer will hold a dialogue with the point person for the evaluation to develop a simple plan to disseminate and report the results to the various interested parties.

## 10. ANNEXES

### a) Document Review

#### MDG-F Context

- MDGF Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

#### Specific Joint Programme Documents

- Joint Programme Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan
- Financial information (MDTF)

#### Other in-country documents or information

- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One

### c) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan

After the interim evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together

all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

<b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 1</b>				
<b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b>				
<b>Key actions</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>	
1.1			<b>Comments</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.2				
1.3				
<b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 2</b>				
<b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b>				
<b>Key actions</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>	
2.1			<b>Comments</b>	<b>Status</b>
2.2				
2.3				
<b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 3</b>				
<b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b>				
<b>Key actions</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>	
3.1			<b>Comments</b>	<b>Status</b>
3.2				
3.3				

**b) Evaluation timeline**

## Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix below served as a general guide for the evaluation. It provided directions for the evaluation; particularly the collect of relevant data. It was used as a basis for interviewing people and reviewing programme documents. It also provided a basis for structuring the evaluation report as a whole.

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<b>Evaluation criteria: Relevance</b> - <i>How does the joint programme relate to the needs of Jordan, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies and strategies of programme’s partners and donors?</i>				
<i>Is the JP relevant to MDG implementation at local and national level in Jordan?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the programme support the objectives of the MDGs</li> <li>Does the programme participate in the implementation of the MDGs in Jordan?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between programme objectives and the MDGs</li> <li>Degree of coherence between the programme and national priorities, policies and strategies in the area of climate change</li> <li>MDGs status in Jordan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies to implement the MDGs or related to environment more generally</li> <li>Key government officials and other partners</li> <li>MDG web site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with government officials and other partners</li> </ul>
<i>Is the JP relevant to UN objectives in Jordan?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the programme support the objectives of the UN organizations – including the UNDAF 2008-12 - in Jordan?</li> <li>To what extent and in which ways are the joint programme helping make progress towards United Nations reform (One UN)?</li> <li>How have the principles for aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, managing for development results and mutual accountability) been developed in the joint programmes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of a clear relationship between the programme objectives and sustainable development objectives of UN organizations including those in UNDAF 2008-12</li> <li>Principles on aid effectiveness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents</li> <li>UNDAF 2008-12 and other UN strategies and programmes</li> <li>National policies and strategies to implement the MDGs or related to climate change adaptation</li> <li>Key government officials and other partners</li> <li>Related web sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with government officials and other partners</li> </ul>
<i>Does the JP contribute to goals of the thematic window?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent is the programme contributing to the goals set by the thematic window, and in what ways?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree of coherence between the JP objectives and the goals of the environmental sustainability thematic window</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MDG-F web site</li> <li>JP document</li> <li>Other programme documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with government officials and other partners</li> </ul>
<i>Is the JP relevant to Jordan development objectives?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do the JP’s goals and lines of action reflect national and regional plans and programmes, identified needs (water, human health and food security) and the operational context of national policies in Jordan?</li> <li>How does the programme support the objectives of the development of Jordan?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which the programme support national objectives related to the impact of climate change on water management, human health and food security</li> <li>Degree of coherence between the programme and national priorities, policies and strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies on climate change adaptation, water management, human health, food security and PRSP</li> <li>Key government officials and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with government officials and other partners</li> </ul>

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme “Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements”

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How country-driven is the programme?</li> <li>Does the programme adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional framework and programming, in its design and its implementation?</li> <li>To what extent were national partners involved in the design of the joint programme?</li> <li>Does the JP address the problem’s most salient, urgent and prioritized causes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of programme design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities?</li> <li>Level of involvement of Government officials and other partners into the joint programme</li> <li>Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and criteria contains in the MDG-F thematic window and in the JP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>other partners</li> <li>MDG-F web site</li> <li>JP document</li> </ul>	
<i>Is the JP addressing the needs of target beneficiaries?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the programme support the needs of target beneficiaries?</li> <li>Does it address the health, environmental and socio-economic needs of the population in the areas of involvement?</li> <li>Has the implementation of the programme been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>Are local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in programme design and implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strength of the link between expected results from the programme and the needs of target beneficiaries</li> <li>Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of beneficiaries and stakeholders in programme design and implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beneficiaries and stakeholders</li> <li>Needs assessment studies</li> <li>Programme documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<i>Is the JP internally coherent in its design?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a direct and strong link between expected results of the programme and the programme design (in terms of components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?</li> <li>Is the length of the programme conducive to achieve programme outcomes?</li> <li>Is the strategy adapted to the socio-cultural context to which it is applied?</li> <li>Is the identification of the problem and its causes in the joint programme being addressed?</li> <li>Have the most efficient measures for the context been adopted to solve the barriers identified during the formulation of the JP?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between programme expected results and programme design internal logic</li> <li>Level of coherence between programme design and programme implementation approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents</li> <li>Key programme stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Key Interviews</li> </ul>
<i>How is the JP relevant in light of related initiatives in Jordan?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considering other related on-going initiatives in Jordan, does the programme remain relevant in terms of areas of focus and targeting of key activities?</li> <li>How does the JP help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are crucial but are not covered by other initiatives funded by the government of Jordan and other donors?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other government and donor programming in Jordan and regionally</li> <li>List of programs and funds in which the future development, ideas and partnerships of the programme are eligible?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government and other donors’ policies and programming documents</li> <li>Government and other donor representatives</li> <li>Programme documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with government officials and other donors</li> </ul>
<b>Future directions for similar JP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons have been learnt and what changes could have been made to the programme in order to strengthen the alignment between the programme and the Partners’ priorities and areas of focus?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme “Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements”

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How could the programme better target and address priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?</li> </ul>			
<b>Evaluation criteria: Effectiveness – To what extent are the expected outcomes of the joint programme being achieved?</b>				
<p><i>How is the JP effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the programme being effective in achieving its expected outcomes?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change</li> <li>○ Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Do outputs produced meet the required quality?</li> <li>▪ Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the JP’s expected results?</li> <li>▪ To what extent has the JP contributed to putting climate change threats on the country’s policy agenda?</li> <li>▪ To what extent have the behaviors contributing to water scarcity and health issues been transformed?</li> <li>▪ Is the identification of barriers in the JP being addressed?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Climate change risks not sufficiently taken into account within sectoral policies and investment frameworks;</li> <li>○ Existing climate information, knowledge and tools are not directly relevant for supporting adaptation decisions and actions;</li> <li>○ Weak national capacity to develop sectoral adaptation responses</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adaptation strategies through alternatives economic development activities</li> <li>▪ Change in climate change adaptation practices</li> <li>▪ Change in capacity for information management: Knowledge acquisition and sharing; Effective data gathering, methods and procedures for reporting on vulnerability assessment, early warning and adaptation strategies.</li> <li>▪ Change in capacity for awareness raising                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stakeholder involvement and government awareness</li> <li>○ Change in local stakeholder behavior</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Change in capacity in policy making and planning                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policy reform for climate change adaptation</li> <li>○ Legislation/regulation change to improve climate change adaptation</li> <li>○ Development of national and local strategies and plans supporting climate change adaptation</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Change in capacity in implementation and enforcement                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Design and implementation of risk assessments</li> <li>○ Implementation of national and local strategies and action plans through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance</li> <li>○ Monitoring, evaluation and promotion of demonstrations</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Change in capacity in mobilizing resources                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Leverage of resources</li> <li>○ human resources</li> <li>○ appropriate practices</li> <li>○ mobilization of advisory services</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents including monitoring and evaluation documents</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Research findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documents analysis</li> <li>▪ Meetings with main Partners</li> <li>▪ Interviews with programme beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<p><i>What is the ownership of the process?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent have the target population and participants taken ownership of the programme and assuming an active role in it?</li> <li>▪ To what extent have national public/private resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme’s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Degree of engagement of programme partners and beneficiaries in programme activities and achievements</li> <li>▪ Nature of the decision-making processes of the programme and degree of participation of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents</li> <li>▪ Programme Partners</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews</li> </ul>

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme “Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements”

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</i>	goals and impacts?	partners and beneficiaries in these processes		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How well are risks and assumptions being managed?</li> <li>▪ What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed?</li> <li>▪ Were these sufficient?</li> <li>▪ Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the programme?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during programme planning</li> <li>▪ Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues?</li> <li>▪ Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents</li> <li>▪ Programme staff and programme partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Future directions for similar Programmes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What lessons have been learnt for the programme to achieve its outcomes?</li> <li>▪ What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the programme in order to improve the achievement of the programme’s expected results?</li> <li>▪ How could the programme be more effective in achieving its results?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation criteria: <i>Efficiency</i> - How efficiently have the joint programme resources been turned into results?</b>				
<i>Is the JP support channeled in an efficient way?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How well does the joint programme’s management model – that is, its tools, financial resources, human resources, technical resources, organizational structure, information flows and management decision-making – contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?</li> <li>▪ Does the pace of implementing programme outputs ensure the completeness of the joint programme’s results?</li> <li>▪ Is the stipulated timeline of outputs being met?</li> <li>▪ Is adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? To what extent has the programme contributed innovative measures towards solving the problems?</li> <li>▪ Are the programme results framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>▪ Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for programme management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>▪ Are progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>▪ Are the monitoring indicators relevant? Are they of sufficient quality to measure the joint programme’s outputs?</li> <li>▪ Has the leveraging of counterpart funds happened as planned?</li> <li>▪ Are financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>▪ How is RBM used during program implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Availability and quality of progress and financial reports</li> <li>▪ Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>▪ Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>▪ Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>▪ Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar programmes from other organizations</li> <li>▪ Adequacy of programme choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</li> <li>▪ Quality of RBM reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> <li>▪ Occurrence of change in programme design/ implementation approach (ie restructuring) when needed to improve programme efficiency</li> <li>▪ Existence, quality and use of M&amp;E, feedback and dissemination mechanism to share findings, lessons learned and recommendation on effectiveness of programme design and implementation.</li> <li>▪ Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> <li>▪ Gender disaggregated data in programme documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ PMC and NSC representatives</li> <li>▪ Beneficiaries and partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Key interviews</li> </ul>

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme “Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements”

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>How efficient are partnership arrangements for the JP?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanisms to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to programme design and implementation effectiveness are shared among stakeholders and partners involved in programme implementation for ongoing programme adjustment and improvement?</li> <li>▪ Does the programme mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</li> <li>▪ Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which one can be considered sustainable?</li> <li>▪ To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other and with the government and civil society (level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements)?</li> <li>▪ Are there efficient mechanisms for coordination that prevent counterparts and beneficiaries from becoming overloaded?</li> <li>▪ Are work methodologies, financial tools etc. shared among agencies and among joint programmes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</li> <li>▪ Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>▪ Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>▪ Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents</li> <li>▪ Programme Partners</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews</li> </ul>
<i>Does the JP efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</li> <li>▪ Did the programme take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the programme?</li> <li>▪ Was there an effective collaboration with scientific institutions with competence in climate change adaptation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proportion of total expertise utilized taken from Jordan</li> <li>▪ Number/quality of analyses done to assess local potential and absorptive capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents</li> <li>▪ Programme partners</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Future directions for similar Programmes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What lessons can be learnt from the programme on efficiency?</li> <li>▪ How could the programme have more efficiently addressed its key priorities (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</li> <li>▪ What changes could have been made (if any) to the programme in order to improve its efficiency?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation criteria: <i>Impacts</i> - What are the realized and potential impacts of activities carried out in the context of the joint programme?</b>				
<i>How is the JP effective in achieving its long-term objective?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will the programme achieve its strategy that is to:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Develop Jordan’s key government and civil society counterparts’ capacity to adapt to climate change threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security under the conditions of severe water scarcity that is expected to be compounded by climate change.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ To what extent is the JP helping to influence the country’s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Change in capacity for:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pooling/mobilizing resources</li> <li>○ Related policy making and strategic planning,</li> <li>○ Implementation of related laws and strategies through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance,</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Change to the quantity and strength of barriers such as change in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents</li> <li>▪ Key Stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Research findings; if available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documents analysis</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ Programme partners</li> <li>▪ Interviews with programme beneficiaries and other stakeholders</li> </ul>

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>How is the JP effective in contributing to the MDGs?</i>  <b>Future directions for the Programme</b>	public policy framework? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What differential impacts and types of effect is the JP producing among population groups, such as youth, children, adolescents, the elderly and rural populations?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Knowledge about climate change and national incentives for climate change adaptation</li> <li>○ Cross-institutional coordination and inter-sectoral dialogue</li> <li>○ Knowledge of climate change adaptation practices by end users</li> <li>○ Coordination of policy and legal instruments incorporating climate change adaptation strategies</li> <li>○ Climate change adaptation economic incentives for stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Change in use and implementation of sustainable alternatives</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To what extent and in what ways is the JP contributing to the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels?</li> <li>▪ What are the impacts or likely impacts of the JP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On the local environment;</li> <li>○ On poverty; and,</li> <li>○ On other socio-economic issues.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide specific examples of impacts at those levels, as relevant</li> <li>▪ List of potential funds to be used to assure long term sustainability of MDG objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents</li> <li>▪ MDGs documents</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Research findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews with key stakeholders</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How could the programme build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation criteria: Sustainability – What are the probabilities that the joint programme achievements will continue in the long run?</b>				
<i>Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in programme design?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the programme?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evidence/Quality of sustainability strategy</li> <li>▪ Evidence/Quality of steps taken to address sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ Programme partners</li> <li>▪ Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews</li> </ul>
<i>Are JP achievements sustainable?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the necessary preconditions being created to ensure the sustainability of impacts of the JP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Local level: have local knowledge, experiences, resources and local networks been adopted?</li> <li>○ Country level: have networks or network institutions been created or strengthened to carry out the roles that the JP is performing?</li> <li>○ Is the joint programme’s duration sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of interventions into the future?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Degree to which JP activities and results have been taken over by governments or other stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Evidence of commitments from governments or other stakeholders to sustain programme achievements in the long run</li> <li>▪ Mechanisms in place to sustain programme achievements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>▪ Government documents</li> <li>▪ Media reports</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ Programme partners</li> <li>▪ Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews</li> </ul>

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme “Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements”

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>Are JP achievements financially sustainable?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent are visions and actions of partners consistent with or different from those of the JP?</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the programme adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?</li> <li>Are the recurrent costs after programme completion sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities in Jordan after programme end?</li> <li>Evidence of commitments from government or other stakeholder to financially support relevant sectors of activities after programme end</li> <li>Level of recurrent costs after completion of programme and funding sources for those recurrent costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>Programme staff</li> <li>Programme partners</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<i>Are organizational arrangements sustainable and will activities continue?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are results of efforts made during the JP implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures?</li> <li>Is there evidence that programme partners will continue their activities beyond programme support?</li> <li>What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results?</li> <li>Are appropriate ‘champions’ being identified and/or supported?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which programme activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations</li> <li>Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after programme end</li> <li>Number/quality of champions identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>Programme staff</li> <li>Programme partners</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<i>Was an enabling environment developed?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the programme, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?</li> <li>Are the necessary related capacities for lawmaking and enforcement built?</li> <li>What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of the programme?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies</li> <li>State of enforcement and law making capacity</li> <li>Evidences of commitment by the political class through speeches, enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>Programme staff</li> <li>Programme partners</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> <li>Political speeches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<i>Were institutional and individual capacity built?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the capacity in place at national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of results achieved to date?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elements in place in those different management functions, at appropriate levels (national, regional and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>Programme staff</li> <li>Programme partners</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> <li>Capacity assessments available, if any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Documentation review</li> </ul>
<i>Will JP achievements be replicated?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are programme activities and results replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?</li> <li>What is the programme contribution to replication or scaling up of innovative practices or mechanisms that support the climate change policy of the government of Jordan?</li> <li>What lessons have been learned, and what best practices can be transferred to other programmes or countries?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number/quality of replicated initiatives</li> <li>Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives</li> <li>Volume of additional investment leveraged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other donors programming documents</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> <li>Programme staff</li> <li>Programme partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

Mid-Term Evaluation of the MDG-F Joint Programme “Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements”

Evaluated component	Sub-Question	Indicators	Sources	Data Collection Method
<i>What are the challenges for the sustainability of JP achievements?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts?</li> <li>▪ Have any of these been addressed through programme management?</li> <li>▪ What could be the possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the programme?</li> <li>▪ In what ways can governance of the joint programme be improved so as to increase the chances of achieving sustainability in the future?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Challenges in view of building blocks for long-term sustainability</li> <li>▪ Recent changes which may present new challenges to the programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme documents and evaluations</li> <li>▪ Beneficiaries</li> <li>▪ Programme staff</li> <li>▪ Programme partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document analysis</li> <li>▪ Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Future directions for the Programme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Which areas/arrangements under the programme show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results?</li> <li>▪ What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the programme initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data analysis</li> </ul>

### **Annex 3: List of Documents Consulted**

Al-Balqa Applied University, “*Proposal*” - *Logistic Support for the International Research Centre for Water, Environment and Energy*

FAO, *Draft Letter of Agreement - Provision of Funds from the FAO to the National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE)*

FAO, June 2, 2010, *RFP for Identify and screen adaptation measures to reduce climate change impacts on food productivity*

FAO, May 10, 2010, *RFP for Assessment of the risks from climate change and water scarcity on food productivity*

GEF, MOE, UNDP, December 2005, *NCSA – Climate Change Thematic Assessment Report*

GEF, MOE, UNDP, *Jordan GEF National Dialogue Workshop – Amman, Jordan, September 19-21, 2005*

GEF, MOE, UNDP, March 2006, *NCSA - Environmental Policy Framework in Jordan 2006*

General Corporation for the Environment Protection, January 1997, *Initial Communication Report under the UN Framework Convention on the Climate Change*

IHP, *Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Climate Change Impacts on the Quality of Water Resources in Amman Zarqa Basin - A proposal submitted by the National IHP committee of Jordan to the Amman, UNESCO office*

IRCWEE, 2009, *IRCWEE Overview Presentation*

IRCWEE, *Proposed Training Course - Application of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Decision Support System (DSS) Tools to Study the Impact of Climate Change on water Resources*

IRCWEE, *Terms of Reference*

IUCN, *The Restoration and Economic Development of Zarqa River Basin Presentation*

Jordan Valley Authority, *Assessment of treated wastewater Quality under different climate change Scenarios in Jordan*

JP, April 2010, *Inception Workshop Report*

JP, November 2009, *Minutes of NSC Meeting – November 25, 2009*

JP, February 2010, *Minutes of NSC Meeting – February 3, 2010*

JP, June 30, 2010, *Bi-annual Monitoring MDG-F Report*

JP, March 2010, *1<sup>st</sup> Annual Report*

JP, *Mini Monitoring Report 2009*

JP, *Minutes of PMC Meeting – August 11, 2010*

JP, *Minutes of PMC Meeting – February 28, 2010*

JP, *Minutes of PMC Meeting – September 2, 2010*

JP, *Programme 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarterly Progress Update (August 2009)*

MDG-F, December 2009, *MDG-F Mission Report - Lebanon, Jordan and the Occupied Palestinian Territory*

MDG-F, *Implementation Guidelines for MDG Achievement Fund Joint Programmes - June 2009*

MDG-F, *MDG-F Advocacy and Communication Strategy*

- MDG-F, *MDG-F Advocacy and Partnerships: Guidance Note for Elaborating Advocacy Action Plans*
- MDG-F, *Monitoring and Evaluation System – Learning to Improve – Making Evidence Work for Development*
- MDG-F, *Terms of Reference for the MTE of Joint Programmes on Environment and Climate Change*
- MDG-F, *Thematic Indicators for the Environment and Climate Change Window*
- MDTF Office, October 11, 2010, *Jordan Factsheet – Finances*
- MOE, IUCN, February 2007, *Proposal - Capacity Building for Restoration of Zarqa River: A Holistic Approach*
- MOE, January 2007, *National Capacity Self-Assessment of Global Environmental Management (NCSA) – Jordan*
- MOE, March 2009, *Fourth National Report on Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity – Jordan*
- MOE, 2007, *Third Country Report on the Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)*
- MOPIC, *The National Social and Economic Development Plan (2004-2006)*
- MOPIC, UN, *The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) – Jordan Report 2004*
- MOPIC, UNDP, The Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development, *Jordan Human Development Report 2004 – Building Sustainable Livelihoods*
- MOWI, *National Report on IHP Related Activities, Jordan*
- Prime Ministry, *Summary and Key Findings – “Problem Tree” Workshop for the Water Sector in Jordan*
- Science Triangle for Research, Training and Management, May 26, 2010, *Work Plan*
- The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, *Jordan’s Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)*
- UN, 2006, *Common Country Assessment – Jordan*
- UN, August 5, 2002, *Country Programme Outline for Jordan (2003-2007)*
- UN, *The MDGs in Jordan*
- UNDP, April 21, 2008, *Interoffice Memorandum – MDGF-1646-Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements (approval and comments)*
- UNDP, April 28, 2010, *Contract between UNDP and Jordan University of Science and Technology (JUST) for Assessment of Climate Change Scenarios on Water Availability and Quality in the Zarqa River Basin*
- UNDP, *Arab Human Development Report 2009 – Challenges to Human Security in the Arab Countries*
- UNDP, *Contract for Professional Consulting Services between UNDP and Science Triangle for Research, Training and Management – Development of Adaptation Measures to Climate Change and Formulation of Needed Strategy Implementation Plan Relevant to Climate Change and IWRM for the Zarqa River Basin*
- UNDP, *Gender Mainstreaming and Sustainable Environment*
- UNDP, Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, June 2008, *UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) – 2008-2012*
- UNDP, MOE, 2006, *National Strategy and Action Plan to Combat Desertification*
- UNDP, *Project Document (PIMS 3248) – Piloting Climate Change Adaptation to Protect Human Health*
- UNDP, *Project Document – Water Governance Programme for Arab States*

UNDP-Spain MDG Achievement Fund, June 6, 2007, *MDGF-1646: Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements – Concept Note*

UNDP, UNESCO, WHO, FAO, *Jordan UNCT Joint Programme Advocacy and Communication Plan*

UNDP, *UNDP Project Document (MSP) - Developing policy-relevant capacity for implementation of the Global Environmental Conventions in Jordan*

UNESCO-IHP, December 2003, *Policies and Strategy Options for Water Management in the Islamic Countries*

UNESCO-IHP, June 8, 2010, *Results of IHP-VIII Implementation since the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the Intergovernmental Council of IHP*

UNESCO-IHP, June 22, 2010, *Endorsement of the Concept Paper for the Eighth Phase (IHP-VIII, 2014-2019) of IHP*

UNESCO-IHP-VII, *Water Dependencies – Systems under Stress and Societal Responses (2008-2013)*

USAID, *KAP Household – Baseline Survey (PAP) and Survey Findings* (6 documents)

WAJ, *Quality of Drinking Water Presentation*

WHO, April 6, 2010, *RFP to analyze the current training needs assessment and design the needed training programs and modules for Drinking Water Quality (DWQ) management system in Jordan at all levels*

WHO, April 25, 2010, *RFP to conduct an assessment of direct and indirect risks to health from climate change and disseminate the finding of the assessment to concerned stakeholders*

WHO, April 28, 2010, *RFP to review and assess current national DWQ systems including, but not limited to, legislations, standards, and management practices at both the national and sub regional level and suggest needed upgrading on the DWQ systems*

WHO, *Framework for health sector action in Member States to protect health from climate change*

WHO, July 25, 2010, *RFP to develop and implement adaptation strategies to protect health from the negative effects of heat waves*

WHO, *Regional Committee for the Eastern Mediterranean, October 2008, Resolution – Climate Change and Health*

WHO, September 21, 2010, *RFP to review evidence on minimum household water security requirements for health protection both nationally and globally, develop methodologies for establishing and generating evidence to support recommendations on minimum water requirements for health, and convene expert consultations on the development of methods to identify minimum water requirements for health*

WHO, *Work Plan with Activities Relevant to Outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.3*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Assessment of Surface Water Harvesting due to Rainfall Irregularity in Intensity and Distribution*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Concept Paper - Regional Training Workshop On IWRM for Transboundary Water Management - Amman – Jordan – May 2010*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Contract between FAO and Al Shamil Engineering Office*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Contract between FAO and Science Triangle for Research, Training and Management*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Coordination and Effectiveness of Aid – Jordan*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Gender Mainstreaming in Practice – A Toolkit: Part II: Sectoral Briefs*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Government Implementation Plan – 2010 (Jordan)*

\_\_\_\_\_, *Institutional Capacity Building for the Rehabilitation of Zarqa River Basin project*

- \_\_\_\_\_, January 2008, *Final Draft The Restoration And Economic Development Of The Zarqa River Basin In Jordan*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Joint Programme Document - Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jordan – CSD Guidelines for National Reporting to CSD-16*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Law of Agriculture #44 for 2002*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *MDG-F Framework Document*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *National Agenda – The Jordan We Strive For – 2006-2015*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Revised Standard Joint Programme Document*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Roads to “Vision” (for WSP)*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Legal and Institutional Role of the Ministry of Environment in Zarqa River Rehabilitation*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Zarqa River Basin Rehabilitation Vision*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *United Nations Development Assistance Framework – Jordan 2008-2012*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Water for Life – Jordan’s Water Strategy – 2008-2022*
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Work Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change to Sustain Jordan’s MDG Achievements (Jan, 2010 – Feb. 2012)*

## Annex 4: Discussion Guide

*Note: This is only a discussion guide for the Evaluator; it is a simplified version of the evaluation matrix. All questions will not be asked to each meeting; it is a reminder for the Evaluator on the type of information required to complete the evaluation exercise and a guide to prepare the semi-structured interviews.*

---

### **I. RELEVANCE** – *How does the joint programme relate to the needs of Jordan, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies and strategies of programme’s partners and donors?*

---

- I.1. Is the JP relevant to MDG implementation at local and national level in Jordan?
- I.2. Is the JP relevant to UN objectives in Jordan?
- I.3. Does the JP contribute to the goals of the thematic window?
- I.4. Is the JP relevant to Jordan development objectives?
- I.5. Is the JP addressing the needs of target beneficiaries?
- I.6. Is the JP internally coherent in its design?
- I.7. How is the JP relevant in light of related initiatives in Jordan?

#### ***Future directions for similar programmes***

- I.8. What lessons have been learnt and what changes could have been made to the JP in order to strengthen the alignment between the JP and the Partners’ priorities and areas of focus?
- I.9. How could the JP better target and address priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?

---

### **II. EFFECTIVENESS** – *To what extent are the expected outcomes of the joint programme being achieved?*

---

- II.1. How is the JP effective in achieving its expected outcomes?
  - o Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change
  - o Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions
- II.2. To what extent have the behaviours contributing to water scarcity and health issues been transformed?
- II.3. What is the ownership of the process?
- II.4. How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?

#### ***Future directions for similar joint programmes***

- II.5. What lessons have been learnt for the JP to achieve its outcomes?
- II.6. What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the JP in order to improve the achievement of the JP’s expected results?
- II.7. How could the JP be more effective in achieving its results?

---

### **III. EFFICIENCY** - *How efficiently have the joint programme resources been turned into results?*

---

- III.1. How well does the joint programme’s management model contribute to generating the expected outputs and outcomes?
- III.2. Has adaptive management been used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
- III.3. Do the JP result framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?
- III.4. Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for programme management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
- III.5. Are progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
- III.6. Is the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned?
- III.7. Are financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?
- III.8. How is RBM used during program implementation?

- III.9. Are there institutionalized or informal feedback or dissemination mechanism to ensure that findings, lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to programme design and implementation effectiveness are shared among programme stakeholders and partners involved in programme implementation for ongoing programme adjustment and improvement?
- III.10. Does the JP mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?
- III.11. How efficient are partnership arrangements for the JP?
- III.12. Does the JP efficiently utilize local capacity for its implementation?

***Future directions for the Programme***

- III.13. What lessons can be learnt from the JP on efficiency?
- III.14. How could the JP have more efficiently addressed its key priorities (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?
- III.15. What changes could have been made (if any) to the JP in order to improve its efficiency?

---

**IV. IMPACTS** - *What are the realized and potential impacts of activities carried out in the context of the joint programme?*

---

- IV.1. Will the JP achieve its strategy that is to:
  - a. Develop Jordan’s key government and civil society counterparts’ capacity to adapt to climate change threats to health, food security, productivity, and human security under the conditions of severe water scarcity that is expected to be compounded by climate change.
- IV.2. To what extent is the JP helping to influence the country’s public policy framework?
- IV.3. What differential impacts and types of effect is the JP producing among population groups, such as youth, children, adolescents, the elderly, and rural populations?
- IV.4. How is the Programme effective in contributing to the MDGs?

***Future directions for the Programme***

- IV.5. How could the programme build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?

---

**V. SUSTAINABILITY** - *What are the probabilities that the joint programme achievements will continue in the long run?*

---

- V.1. Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in programme design?
- V.2. Are JP achievements sustainable?
- V.3. Are JP achievements financially sustainable?
- V.4. Are organizational arrangements sustainable and will activities continue?
- V.5. Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the programme, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?
- V.6. Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?
- V.7. Are programme activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?
- V.8. What are the challenges for the sustainability of JP achievements?

***Future directions for the Programme***

- V.9. Which areas/arrangements under the programme show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results?
- V.10. What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the programme initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed?

----- ***End*** -----

**Annex 5: Evaluation Mission Agenda**

<b>DAY</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Meeting/visit</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<b>Tuesday/ Sept 28<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	9:30 – 10:30	Mr. Luc Stevens, RC	RC office	Marta
	11:00 – 12:30	JP Team	JP offices, MWI	Munjed
	12:30 – 1:30	Lunch		
	2.30 – 3.00	UN Agencies in JP and UNCT members	UNU Building	Marta
<b>Wednesday/ Sept 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	9:00 – 11:15	PMC	MWI	Munjed
	11:15 – 1:00	JPC		
	1:00 - 2:00	Lunch		
	2:30 – 3:30	MOH Committees	JP offices	Rola/Maysoon
<b>Thursday/ Sept 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	9:00 – 1:00	Balqa Applied University water research center		Lama
	1:00 - 2:00	Lunch		
	2:00 – 3:00	UNESCO and CTA	UNESCO offices	Lama
	3:30 – 4:30	IUCN	IUCN offices	Munjed
<b>Sunday, Oct 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2010</b>	9:00- 10:00	MOA focal point, FAO-CTA	JP offices	Saeb
	10:00 – 11:00	IHP committee	MWI	Lama
	11:00 – 1:00	Water Authority of Jo	WAJ Offices	Rola/Maysoon
	1:00 – 2:00	Lunch		
	2:30 – 4:00	WSP at Wadi Essir site		Rola/Maysoon
<b>Monday, Oct 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	9:00 – 10:00	MOE Task force	MOE	Munjed
	10:30 – 12:30	MCC	MOPIC	Munjed
	1:00 – 2:00	Lunch		
	3.00 – 4.00	RC + JPC	RC office	Marta
	4:30 – 5:30	UNDP and CTA	UNDP	Munjed
<b>Tuesday, Oct 5<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	9:00 – 11:00	JP consultants	JP offices	Munjed
	11:30 – 12:30	WHO and output CTA		Rola/Maysoon
	12:30 – 1:30	Lunch		
	2:00 – 3:00	AEICD (Spain)	AEICD offices	Munjed
<b>Wednesday, Oct 6<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	9:00 – 10:00	FAO and output CTA	JP offices	Saeb
	10:00 – 11:00	MWI focal committee	JP offices	Munjed
	11:30 – 12:30	MIYAHUNA	Miyahuna offices	Rola/Maysoon
	1:00 - 2:00	Lunch		
	2:30 – 3:30	NCARE	NCARE	Saeb
<b>Thursday, Oct 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>	9:00 – 11:00	Stakeholders (NGOs, CBOs, water authority, environment, farmers, women association, local government, charity Assoc., etc..)	Zarqa Environmental directorate	Munjed
	12:00 – 1:30	JP team/RC	UN Board Room	Munjed
	2:00 – 2:30	PMC debriefing	MWI	Munjed
	3:30 – 4:30	JP Wrap up	JP offices	Munjed

**Annex 6: List of People Met**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>
Prof.	A. Khresat Sa’eb	Chief Technical Advisor, FAO
Eng.	Abbadi Mohammad	MOH
Mr.	Abbady Mufleh	IUCN
Dr.	Abdel- Fattah Ahmad	Future environment
Dr.	Abu Slaih Ahmad	MOH
Eng.	Al-Assa’d Tamer	Project Coordinator, MC Unit, Prime Minister Office
Ms.	Al-Emam Rola	Chief Technical Advisor, WHO
Mr.	Al-Harwa Tareq Abu	AECID
Eng.	Al-Hassouneh Omar	Future Environment
Eng.	Al-Hiyari Salah	Director of Environmental Health Directorate, MOH
Dr.	Al-Jayyousi Odeh	Regional Director IUCN
Eng.	Al-Kilani Haitham	Production and Quality Director, Miyahuna
Ms.	Al-Otaiby Anfal	Riyadah
Dr.	Al-Sharif Munjed	Joint Program Coordinator
Dr.	Al-Yousfi A. Basel	Director, Regional CEHA, WHO
Dr.	Al-Zu’bi Jarrah M.	International Research Center for Water, Environment and Energy (IRCWEE)
Ms.	Al-Zu’bi Maha	Environment Analyst, Environment and Climate Change Portfolio, UNDP
Eng.	Al-Zubi Maysoon	Secretary General, MOWI
Eng.	Al-Zoubi Majeda	Miyahuna
Ms.	Alian Fathia	Director, “Prince Faisal” NGO
Mr.	Almahamed Zakaria	Chemical Engineer, Watershed Protection Section, WAJ
Dr.	Alouran Nedal	International Research Center for Water, Environment and Energy (IRCWEE)
Eng.	Atrash Mohammad	Director, Water Resource Studies Directorate, MOWI
Dr.	Awawdeh Faisal	Director General, NCARE
Ms.	Awyyash Amal	Social Activist, “Prince Faisal” NGO
Mr.	Bakir Hamed	WHO
Ms.	Barrims Jacinta	UNDP Representative in Jordan
Eng.	Bseiso Maysoon	Ex. Chief Technical Advisor, WHO-MOH
Prof. Dr. Eng.	E. Abbassi Bassim	International Research Center for Water, Environment and Energy (IRCWEE)
Dr.	El-Naqa Ali	Science Triangle
Dr.	Elminiawy Ahmed	FAO Representative in Jordan
Dr.	Elsheikh Ali Sami	MOH

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>
Mr.	Garrido Gregorio Maranon	Coordinator General, AECID
Ms.	Haddad Fida	IUCN
Dr.	Halim Mousa Abdel	MOH
Dr.	Hindiyeh Muna	Riyadah
Dr.	Jiries Anwar	Prof. Hydrogeology, Muta’h University
Mr.	Kalbouneh Abbas	Director, Planning and Evaluation Directorate, WAJ
Dr.	Kanani Khalil	MOH
Eng.	Khabour Abdel Majeed	MOE Zarqa
Ms.	Khriesat Eslam	Chemical Engineer, Watershed Protection Section, WAJ
Ms.	Kilani Suzan	Assistant Secretary General, WAJ
Ms.	Lanzoni Marta	Office of the UN Resident Coordinator
Ms.	Mahmoud Fadwa	Head, Studies and Assessment Section, WAJ
Mr.	Marashda Adel	Deputy Chair, JES Zarqa
Ms.	Masalha Lama	Chief Technical Advisor, UNESCO
Ms.	Moaado Samera	Representative from Farmers’ Union
Eng.	Momamy Mohammed	Assistant SG, MOWI
Dr.	Nimri Omar	MOH
Ms.	Omary Areeg	Technical Assistant
Mr.	Oweimer Tha’er	Geologist, WSP Section, WAJ
Dr.	Paolini Anna	UNESCO Representative in Jordan
Ms.	Qaqa Hiam	Member, Municipal Council and Assistant Chair, Women Association
Mr.	Qaraan Ali Al	Miyahuna
Dr.	Qinna Mohammed	Science Triangle
Dr.	Qudah Khaldoon	UNESCO Chair, Yarmouk University
Ms.	Rawashdeh Nasab	NCARE
Dr.	Saidam Muhammad	Programme Manager, UNDP
Eng.	Samara Mowayia	Director, Monitoring Directorate, MOWI
Eng.	Samawi Mohammed	Assistant General Director, Meteorology Department
Dr.	Samir El- Habbab Mohammad	Science Triangle
Eng.	Shahin Hussein	Nature Protection Directorate, MOE
Dr.	Sharef Hasan Hazem	International Research Center for Water, Environment and Energy (IRCWEE)
Dr.	Shraideh Fadi	Deputy Coordinator, REWARD Programme, IUCN
Mr.	Stevens Luc	UN Resident Coordinator
Mr.	Subah Ali	Director, Water Master Plan Unit, MOWI
Dr.	Taani Rakad	Balqa University

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>
Ms.	Tuffaha Randa	Director, Laboratories and Quality Sector, WAJ
Mr.	Wardam Batir	Project Coordinator, Capacity Building for the Rehabilitation of Zarqa River, MOE
Ms.	Zawahra	Chair, Community Women Group of Zarqa
Mr.	Zawahreh Mohammad	Advisor to Mayor of Zarqa
Mr.	Zraikat Ali	Deputy Governor Zarqa

## Annex 7: Joint Programme Expected Results and Planned Activities

Output Description	Financial resources	Implementation Partners	Activities
<b>Outcome 1: Sustained access to improved water supply sources despite increased water scarcity induced by climate change.</b>			
<b>Output 1.1:</b> National drinking water quality management system at central and periphery level is strengthened	\$710,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOH</li> <li>• MOWI</li> <li>• WAJ</li> <li>• Water Supply Companies</li> <li>• WHO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 1.1:</b> Upgrade the national drinking water quality (DWQ) system for comprehensive national coverage</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.2:</b> Develop and implement 5 demonstration water safety plans (3 urban &amp; 2 rural).</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.3:</b> Design and implement training programme on DWQ management system for all levels</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.4:</b> Provide critical supplies and equipment for DWQ laboratory networks of the Ministry of Health</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Sustainable and reliable supply of minimum water requirements for health protection is provided to all citizens	\$350,000		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 1.5:</b> Identify minimum household water security requirements for health protection</li> <li>• <b>Activity 1.6:</b> Develop national policy and issue legislative policy instruments on securing supply of minimum water requirements for health.</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 2: Strengthened adaptive capacity for health protection and food security to climate change under water scarcity conditions.</b>			
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Rural sector adaptive capacity for climate variability and change is improved as well as the urban-rural linkage in water resources management and allocation developed.	\$827,667	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOA</li> <li>• NCARE</li> <li>• FAO</li> <li>• WHO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.1:</b> Assess the risks from climate change and water scarcity on food productivity.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.2:</b> Identify and screen adaptation measures to reduce climate change impacts on food productivity.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.3:</b> Identify and test adaptation options and improvements of crop / livestock for increased productivity in irrigating with treated wastewater.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.4:</b> Design and implement community awareness campaign, with focus on women farmers, on climate change adaptation measures.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.5:</b> Establish model farms using treated wastewater as adaptation to climate change for capacity building (jointly with WHO).</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2.2:</b> National institutional and community capacity in integrated water resources management is improved	\$699,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOWI</li> <li>• MOE</li> <li>• UNESCO</li> <li>• FAO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.6:</b> Design and implement a training programme in integrated water resources management for the Ministry of Water and Irrigation, national NGOs, and stakeholders.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.7:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Design and implement community-base research projects on climate change adaptation.</li> <li>○ B. Improve database in integrated water resources management in arid and semi arid areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.8:</b> Develop water education and awareness programme focusing in curriculum, resources manuals, training of trainers and teacher-in-service training for the Ministry of Education with the close partnership of the Ministry of Water and Irrigation.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.9:</b> Design and establish one environmental and water resource centre for advocacy</li> </ul>

Output Description	Financial resources	Implementation Partners	Activities
			education and capacity building. • <b>Activity 2.10:</b> Develop a cooperative framework on the criteria for sustainable management of shared water resources including transboundary water resources.
<b>Output 2.3:</b> Adaptation measures, by health sector and other sectors, to protect health from climate change are institutionalized	\$540,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOH</li> <li>• WAJ</li> <li>• MOWI</li> <li>• Local municipalities</li> <li>• WHO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.11:</b> Conduct an assessment of direct and indirect risks to health from climate change</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.12:</b> Screen and prioritize adaptation strategies, by the health sector and others to protect health from climate change.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.13:</b> Develop and implement adaptation strategies to protect health from the negative effects of heat waves.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.14:</b> Design adaptation projects to protect health from identified high risk environmental conditions induced by climate change.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.15:</b> Establish a national early warning system to monitor and assess health impacts of climate change</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2.4:</b> Adaptation capacity of Zarqa River Basin to climate change is piloted and strengthened	\$1,000,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOE</li> <li>• MOWI</li> <li>• Zarqa Governorate</li> <li>• IUCN</li> <li>• Local municipalities</li> <li>• Communities</li> <li>• UNDP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Activity 2.16:</b> Assess direct and indirect climate change risks to water availability and quality in Zarqa River Basin.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.17:</b> Assess opportunities and barriers to adaptation to climate change risks</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.18:</b> Formulate appropriate legal and institutional strategies and the needed interventions (strategy implementation plan) for Zarqa River Basin</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.19:</b> Review ongoing national water policies, strategies, and action plans relevant to climate change and IWRM.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.20:</b> Upgrade local and national capacities and capabilities to respond adequately to the needs and requirements for adaptation to climate change and IWRM using effective participatory approaches and tools.</li> <li>• <b>Activity 2.21:</b> Develop, document , share and disseminate knowledge and transfer technologies generated from Zarqa River basin on the local and national levels, and establish linkages to regional and global experiences</li> </ul>