

EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT OF
JORDAN COUNTRY PROGRAMME
2023-2027 COMMISSIONED BY
UNICEF JORDAN COUNTRY
OFFICE

LTA ON
EVALUATION

LED BY:

CENTER FOR
EVALUATION AND
DEVELOPMENT
(C4ED)

MANNHEIMER
ZENTRUM FÜR
EVALUATION UND
ENTWICKLUNGS-
FORSCHUNG
(MZEEF)

WWW.C4ED.ORG

IMPLEMENTED BY

CONSORTIUM PARTNERS

CEvalGmbH



Center for Evaluation
and Development

MARCH 2024

Evaluation managed by CEval in the framework of the Consortium led by C4ED

Core team

Team Leader: Dr. Susanne Johanna Väh

Junior Evaluator: Dafina Sinatra

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the Evaluability Assessment (EA) Team, and do not necessarily reflect those of UNICEF. Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report rests solely with the authors. Publication of this document does not imply endorsement by UNICEF of the opinions expressed. The designation employed and the presentation of material in maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNICEF concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or sea area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADAP	Adolescent Development and Participation
CO	Country Office
CEED	Climate, Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction
CP	Country Programme
CPD	Country Programme Document
CSG	Child safeguarding
CSI	Core Standard Indicators
CWD	Children with disabilities
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
DOS	Jordan Department of Statistics
ECD	Early Childhood Development
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GPR	Gender Programmatic Review
HQ	Headquarters
HR	Human Resources
IPDET	International Program for Development Evaluation Training
JCO	Jordan Country Office
JPFHS	Jordan Population and Family Health Survey
KPI	Key Progress Indicators
MTR	Mid-term-review
OIAI	Office of Internal Audit and Investigations
OIC	Officer in charge
PSEA	Protection from sexual exploitation and abuse
SBC	Social behaviour change
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SMART	Acronym for <u>s</u> pecific, <u>m</u> easurable, <u>a</u> ttainable, <u>r</u> ealistic, and <u>t</u> ime-bound
ToC	Theory of Change
TIMSS	Trends in Mathematics and Science Study
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UNV	United Nations Volunteers

TABLE OF CONTENT

Versioning and Disclaimer iii

List of Abbreviations.....iv

1. Introduction..... 1

2. Methodological Approach.....3

3. Conceptual Requirements to Ensure Evaluability (EQ1.1, EQ1.2).....6

4. Technical Requirements of Systems and Data to Ensure Evaluability (EQ1.1., EQ1.2) 23

5. Operational Requirements to Ensure Evaluability (EQ 1.3.)..... 32

6. Synthesis (EQ 1, EQ2.1) 37

7. Conclusions and Recommendations (EQ2.2)..... 42

Annex 1: Evaluability Matrix 47

Annex 2: List of Documents Consulted..... 51

Annex 3: Practical Implementation 54

Annex 4: List of Stakeholders Consulted 57

Annex 5: Evaluability Assessment Perception Tool 59

Annex 6: Interview Guideline And Informed Consent Form..... 62

Annex 7: Indicator review 66

Annex 8: Terms of Reference 67

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND: THE INTERVENTION AREA FOR UNICEF JORDAN

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan faces complex demographic, economic, and humanitarian challenges which are intensified by a large refugee population. Despite gradual progress, it is further highly dependent on foreign aid. Notwithstanding achievements in child health and education, persistent challenges include high school dropout rates and mental health issues, particularly among refugees and disadvantaged children, as well as unfavourable learning environments and lack of support for teachers. Furthermore, violence against children, child labour and early marriage threaten the realisation of children's rights. Scarce water and energy resources, worsened by climate change, pose a particular threat to vulnerable children (UNICEF, 2023).

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) aims to address critical issues, including limited access to health and education, the economic impact of COVID-19 and water scarcity. Moreover, it works with the government of Jordan to promote children's rights, climate resilience, including disaster risk reduction and climate education and to prepare communities for the impacts of climate change (UNICEF, 2023).

UNICEF's previous country programme for Jordan (2018-2022) was positively evaluated for efficiently supporting government strategies, particularly in reaching children in vulnerable communities. Its multifaceted approach addressed the complex challenges facing Jordan, focusing on the well-being and development of children and vulnerable populations.

1.2. UNICEF'S CURRENT INTERVENTION IN A NUTSHELL

The UNICEF Jordan Country Programme Document (CPD) for 2023-2027 aims to further support the host government. With an indicative budget of \$4,855,000 from regular resources and \$203,611,000 from other resources, the programme addresses development challenges in Jordan over the five-year period.

Key components of the programme's theory of change (ToC) include:

- ❖ “Equitable access and utilisation of quality health and nutrition services for mothers, children, and adolescents.
- ❖ Equitable access and completion of quality early childhood and basic education for all girls and boys.
- ❖ Empowerment and capacity development of adolescents and youth, especially young girls.
- ❖ Quality preventive and responsive protection services for the most vulnerable children and adolescents.
- ❖ Improved physical environment resilient to climate change impacts, with access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services.
- ❖ Increased access to evidence-driven, inclusive, and integrated social protection services and socioeconomic opportunities for vulnerable children and young people.” (ToR)

The **ultimate goal** is to enable all girls and boys in Jordan, including the most vulnerable, to progressively realise their human rights and contribute to building an equitable, green and resilient society and economy in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).

Drawing on lessons learnt from the previous intervention, the new programme focuses on, stronger addressing the needs of refugees, better engaging local communities, and emphasising long-term outcomes for sustainable change. It aims at strengthening systems, improving information sharing, and supporting evidence-based policy change by ensuring rigorous evaluation (UNICEF, 2023).

1.3. PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

An earlier audit of the UNICEF Jordan Country Office (JCO) by the Office of Internal Audit and Investigations (OIAI), recommended the initiation of an evaluability assessment for the current UNICEF Jordan Country Programme (2023-2027) because of identified issues related to the management of the key risks evaluated. The UNICEF JCO has also decided to commission this assessment in response to significant changes of its country programme planning, monitoring, reporting guidelines and processes in the recent years.

The **purpose** of the evaluability assessment of the recent country programme is to ensure that medium- and long-term results can ultimately be demonstrated. The scope of the evaluability assessment will cover JCO Country Programme Document (CPD) 2023-2027, including its programme sections, monitoring systems, annual planning, and evaluation plans.

The **objectives** of the evaluability assessment are (1) to provide an independent assessment of how well JCO is prepared for a country programme or strategic framework evaluation and (2) to provide recommendations to enhance the evaluability of the CPD. The aim is to examine whether JCO has planned to effectively manage key risks, to establish mechanisms for timely implementation of evaluation recommendations, and whether it possesses the essential resources and infrastructure required to prove results achievement. Ultimately, the assessment seeks to enhance JCO's preparedness for an evaluation of the CPD.

Table 1 presents the **questions for the evaluability assessment** aligned with the objectives according to the ToR (see annex 7).

Table 1 Objectives and key questions of the evaluability assessment

Objectives	Key questions
Q.1. Assess the feasibility of the country offices' medium- and long-term results evaluation against OECD criteria.	<p>Q1.1 To what extent the current JCO country programme has adequate approach, systems, tools, data, and evidence (including ToC, logframe, monitoring and evaluation systems) in place and adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of medium and long terms results?</p> <p>Q1.2 To what extent cross-cutting priorities and interventions (gender, disability, climate change and equity) are meaningfully integrated and will be measurable?</p> <p>Q1.3 To what extent are the financial, human resources, systems and document management tools are in place, adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of country programme efficiency?</p>
Q.2. Highlight and provide specific analysis and recommendations to ensure the country offices' medium- and long-term results can be demonstrated and assessed.	<p>Q2.1 Are there any potential limitations that could affect the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the medium and long terms results?</p> <p>Q2.2 What programmatic, technical, human, and financial resource improvements should be made to ensure the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the country offices' medium- and long-term results?</p>

1.4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The report is structured as follows: After this introduction (chapter 1), elaborations on the methodological approach are provided in chapter 2. Chapter 3 provides first and preliminary insights from the inception phase and finally, chapter 4 presents a workplan with timeline and milestones. The Evaluability Matrix, a list of documents consulted, an overview of the practical implementation, a list of stakeholders consulted, the Evaluability Assessment Perception Tool, and interview guideline and informed consent form, a table with an indicator review, as well as the Terms of Reference are provided in the annex.

2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

2.1. APPROACH OF THE EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

In evaluations, a **theory-based evaluation approach** refers to the programme's Theory of Change (ToC) and examines not only whether something has an impact, but also how a programme unfolds its results, starting from inputs and activities towards output, outcomes and ultimately impacts. This is a precondition to evaluate the OECD-DAC criteria effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

For an evaluability assessment the theory-based approach translates, first, to analyse whether methodological preconditions for assessing effectiveness, impacts and sustainability are met. Methodological preconditions thereby comprise: (i) the existence of clear definitions of programme results and their operationalisation with SMART indicators which are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound to set unambiguous target values, (ii) the existence of baseline data, and (iii) timely availability of target data for the assessment. Second, it requires an investigation whether meaningful results hypotheses can be derived to perform a contribution analysis for disclosure of plausible cause-results mechanism between UNICEF's Country Programme and potentially observed future development results (i.e., existence of a results hierarchy).

In addition, contextual factors play an important role for a valid analysis of underlying results mechanisms and must be sufficiently acknowledgeable in future evaluations. Thus, it was assessed whether potential risks and other framework conditions have been appropriately considered and are continuously monitored. This also includes an assessment of JCO's risk management and mitigation strategies, procedures, and related monitoring actions.

For a systematic analysis, the evaluability assessment was guided by a detailed evaluability matrix (see annex 1) which lists the sub-questions to be answered (rows of the matrix) and specifies the basis for assessment, the data sources, data collection instruments, data analysis methods applied and limitations (columns of the matrix). The evaluability matrix structured the data collection as well as data analysis, aggregation, synthesis of findings and reporting.

Beyond the questions from the terms of references (ToR), UNICEF's Gender Action Plan 2022-2025, social behaviour change (SBC), gender equality assessment tools as well as UNICEF's guiding documents related to the areas of climate change and disaster risk reduction (i.e., A Liveable Planet for Every Child – UNICEF's strategy-at-a-Glance for Climate, Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction (2022-2030)), to early childhood development (e.g., The Nurturing

Care Framework for Early Childhood Development – A framework for helping children survive and thrive to transform health and human potential by WHO, UNICEF and World Bank), and to children with disabilities (i.e., UNICEF Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy (DIPAS) 2022-2030), were consulted as key documents by UNICEF to further guide this assignment with respect to cross-cutting priorities.

Following a **mixed-methods approach**, the evaluability assessment was grounded on a balanced mix of primary and secondary data sources, and qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods, leveraging the strengths of each approach. To enhance the validity and reliability of findings, individual questions were addressed using data gathered through various methods (method triangulation) and from diverse sources (data triangulation). Additionally, the "four-eyes-principle" was applied (researcher triangulation). All findings from primary data collection and secondary data analysis were discussed within the team, minimising potential bias stemming from evaluators' individual backgrounds and experiences.

A **participatory approach** was followed throughout all stages of the assignment with active involvement of relevant stakeholders, through interviews, consultations, a validation workshop, and feedback loops to incorporate stakeholders' interests and needs as well as their tacit knowledge and experience into the assignment. Key stakeholders were invited to review deliverables, discuss results and conclusions, and validate recommendations.

2.2. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Secondary data collection departed from an initial desk review of available programme-related data and documentation which were shared by the evaluation manager after the kick-off of the assignment, or which were made available after exploratory interviews. Material which underwent an **initial review** includes programme documents, programme ToC and rationale, information on the monitoring system, and the country evaluation plan.

After the inception phase, a **systematic review** of all M&E related data and documents followed to check expected availability, reliability, and completeness of data for future evaluations (see annex 2). It was facilitated by a semi-standardised evaluability assessment perception tool which was grounded on the evaluability matrix (see annex 4).

Each section was broken down into different sub-sections containing summarised sets of different aspects. Individual aspects were scored dichotomously when appropriate and sufficient, using presence as a quality marker. Otherwise, four-point scales were used to differentiate quality levels with respect to evaluability. A skewed four-step scale avoided oversimplification and the well-documented human tendency towards centrality, and supported identification of learning fields. The nature of the standardised tool, a pre-test and ad hoc exchanges between evaluators facilitated high inter-rater reliability.

Primary data collection commenced after an initial desk review. During the inception phase 13 stakeholders were approached in seven **exploratory interviews** to gather a better understanding of the functioning of the CPD and JCO's M&E systems, to fill potential information gaps and to finally discuss the knowledge interests. Interviewed stakeholders comprise UNICEF staff in the fields of Monitoring, Evaluation, ICT, Finance, Reporting, Operations and two Deputy Representatives (see annex 3).

Insights from the inception interviews were jointly used with the evaluability matrix to develop interview guidelines for **semi-structured key informant interviews**. In total, 14 interviews with 17 stakeholders, i.e. the (deputy) representatives, chiefs of the six programme sections, other UNICEF staff, as well as with the team leader of the evaluation of the previous CPD were conducted (see annex 3). The aim was to gather in-depth information on the systems in place, their operationalisation and functionality, as well as to contextualise and improve the validity and quality of the data obtained for the analysis. Interview protocols were produced based on notes taken during the interview to facilitate a differentiated analysis.

2.3. DATA ANALYSIS

Qualitative data, like interview protocols underwent **qualitative content analysis** based on a category scheme developed by the evaluability assessment (EA) team. The protocols were broken down into text segments and assigned to categories. New categories were developed inductively from the data when aspects and contexts not yet covered by the category scheme emerged.

After subsuming all protocols into the category system, the text segments within a category were systematically compared and assessed against the questions in the evaluability matrix. The analysis process was supported by the software MAXQDA particularly suitable for processing large amounts of text data.

Standardised information gathered with the evaluability assessment perception tool was quantitatively analysed with Microsoft Excel. This culminated in synthesised results from reviewing different data sets and documents. Quantitative and qualitative results of the systematic review was further synthesised in a SWOT-analysis of strength, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the Country Programme's M&E system.

Important data analysis steps were carried out jointly to include different perspectives and to discuss and balance different interpretations and alternative explanatory patterns (researcher triangulation). Finally, results of the qualitative and quantitative analysis were triangulated and judgements for each evaluability question were made by the EA team.

2.4. (POTENTIAL) LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

The lack of access of the evaluability assessment (EA) team to JCOs systems posed a limitation to the evaluability assessment as it prevented the EA team from an efficient review of actual monitoring efforts in this early phase of CPD implementation. Further, it slowed-down an efficient review of the methodology of standard indicators and additional indicators. To cope with this short coming the EA team undertook a virtual tour through the three systems (VISION, RAM and eTools) with a planning and monitoring officer and put several follow-up requests to gain access to further documents and exemplary data beyond the package shared at the beginning.

In addition, the standardised approach for the systematic review reduced the level of detail and complexity in contrast to in-depth qualitative analysis. However, it was the only efficient and effective way to assess a larger number of documents and data at the programme level with the given resources and was therefore considered the most methodologically appropriate choice to minimise biased analysis.

With regard to cross-cutting priorities the evaluation questions explicitly focussed on gender equality, social equity, inclusion of persons with disabilities and climate change. The request of

analysing social behaviour change (SBC) and protection from sexual abuse and exploitation (PSEA) was only added after primary data collection. This poses the limitation, that the analysis is only grounded on document analysis and written comments shared with the EA team.

Finally, time and budget constraints limited the breadth and depth of the analysis. As a coping strategy, we promoted a fit-for-purpose approach that was fine-tuned in the inception phase according to insights gained from exploratory interviews and initial document review. However, with the given resources it was not possible to review raw data, instead the EA team reviewed systems and protocols in place while also considering the perceptions of JCO staffs at different levels. Primary data collection was therefore mainly limited to JCO management level and a selection of senior staff. This poses a limitation to the analysis of the cross-cuttings as the EA team was only able to talk to the gender and humanitarian experts but not to staff in charge for climate, SBC and PSEA.

3. CONCEPTUAL REQUIREMENTS TO ENSURE EVALUABILITY (EQ1.1, EQ1.2)

3.1. PLAUSIBILITY OF THEORY OF CHANGE AND RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Summary Box

EQ1.1 - The extent to which JCO country programme's Theory of Change is clearly defined.

At large JCO CP ToC is clearly defined. Six of seven outcome statements can be plausibly linked to the impact statement. The seventh outcome is not an outcome in its narrow sense, rather a quality marker for implementation which is mandatory for all country offices as per UNICEF HQ guidance. However, the impact statement lacks focus and is rather made in broad and aspirational lines. This is also reflected in the alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) outcomes for Jordan. The CP misses the opportunity to clearly flag UNICEF's strengths with respect to contributions to UNSDCF's outcome 2 ("The poorest and all people living in vulnerable situations in Jordan are to be supported based on their needs and human rights and empowered to become self-reliant."). The allocation of CP outcomes to UNSDCF outcomes is instead rather general, grounded on high aspirations instead of key value addition. From a theoretical stance it is plausible that outputs contribute towards the outcome. However, against the aspirational and broad formulation of outcomes, some gaps at output level can be observed.

EQ1.1 - The extent to which the results framework is complete, and its components align with programme objectives (output and outcome level).

In the fields of health & nutrition, education and child protection, three complementary outputs per field are comprehensive and well aligned with the outcome. In the field of education, however, the completeness of the results framework at output level is questionable. An output putting explicitly emphasis on translation of evidence into action is missing. With respect to child protection and health, output 1 is very broad and potentially overloaded. These weaknesses, such as an overloaded output or a lack of link from evidence to action, could have been addressed by creating additional outputs. A limitation to three outputs per programme outcome could be detrimental to the full alignment of the JCO result framework components with its programme objectives.

Although a modification of outcomes is not possible at this stage given UNICEF's procedures, the EA team would like to share the following observations: In the field of adolescents & youth, WASH and social policy & protection, the results framework is not complete. In the field of adolescents & youth, economic resilience is targeted at outcome level, but rarely reflected at output level. In the field of WASH, climate aspects are

strongly emphasised at outcome level, but not sufficiently reflected in the outputs; further outputs (2 and partially 3) are a reformulation of the outcome. In the field of social policy & protection, the aspect of utilising socioeconomic opportunities, is not directly reflected at output level. **EQ1.1 - The extent to which the ToC is consistently described across various documents (e.g. CPD, M&E plans, exemplary progress reports) and the extent to which different stakeholders hold the same views about the project objectives and about how objectives will be achieved.**

The EA did not reveal inconsistencies or ambiguities in written or oral presentations of the CP ToC. This suggests that stakeholders inside JCO share the same understanding of CP objectives and key strategies to achieve outcomes.

EQ 1.2 - Assessment of adequate integration of cross-cutting priorities in the ToC (i.e. output and outcome level): Gender, Disability, Climate, Equity (for operationalisation see chapter 3.2)

The cross-cutting priorities gender, equity and to a large extent disability are adequately reflected in the CP ToC, while climate is not plausibly mainstreamed. Even worse, the impact statement suggests a strong focus on climate aspects which is not reflected at outcome level. Only one outcome statement (out of seven) comprise climate change in one among several result areas. A review of outputs led to comparable results regarding the weaker integration of climate change as a cross-cutting priority.

Social behaviour change (SBC) is not explicitly addressed in the TOC at the outcome level, but indirectly reflected by two outcomes. In contrast, mainstreaming at output level is rather strong. Protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) is explicitly addressed in one outcome and indirectly in two other outcomes while at output level is rather weak in the results framework.

The programme theory of the CPD is provided as short narrative in the Country Programme Document 2023-2027 which causally links envisaged outcomes at CPD-level to the overall impact goal: **“All girls and boys in Jordan, including the most vulnerable, will progressively realize their human rights and participate in building an equitable, green and resilient society and economy, contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.”** A visualisation of the ToC at CPD-level exists.

According to the CPD and (exploratory) interviews, impact and **outcomes were formulated based on stakeholder consultations** with representatives from government and civil society. It is at large plausible that the seven outcomes are contributing directly or indirectly to achieve the impact goal:

1. The most vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls and children with disabilities, have **equitable access to and utilization of quality health and nutrition services** for improved survival, cognitive development, and physical and mental well-being.
2. Vulnerable girls and boys, including adolescents, **complete early childhood and basic education**, learning to their full potential.
3. The most vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls and children with disabilities, at risk of or survivors of violence, abuse, exploitation, neglect and harmful practices, **benefit from quality preventive and responsive services**.
4. Adolescent girls and youth, especially young girls, and children with disabilities, **are empowered and equipped with knowledge, skills, and opportunities to become socially and economically resilient**.
5. Vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls and children with disabilities, **live in an improved physical environment that is safe and resilient to the impacts of**

climate change, and use improved water, sanitation and hygiene services while adopting appropriate hygiene behaviours and care practices.

6. Vulnerable children and young people in Jordan, especially girls and children with disabilities, are **increasingly utilizing evidence-based, inclusive, integrated social policies, and enhanced social protection services and socioeconomic opportunities**, to fulfil their potential.
7. Jordan Country Programme is efficiently designed, coordinated, managed and monitored to **meet quality programming standards** in achieving results for children, especially girls and children with disabilities.

The **formulation of the impact goal is very broad**, providing flexibility at the one hand, while lacking specificity, thus stronger focus, on the other hand. The EA team assess the first part of the impact statement “All girls and boys in Jordan, including the most vulnerable, will progressively realize their human rights” as plausibly linked to outcomes 1 (health and nutrition), 2 (basic education), 3 (child protection), 5 (WaSH), and 6 (social policy and protection). The second part of the impact statement “and participate in building an equitable, green and resilient society and economy...” addresses a higher level of ambition which is solely plausibly linked to outcome 4 (youth and adolescents) but here only with respect to equitable and resilient society, but not to a green society. Although indirect linkages from outcomes 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 are plausible, the results path is assessed as too long and thus, not fully convincing for the EA team. Please note that this assessment is not shared by the entire JCO management which pointed to ambiguity regarding the interpretation of the wording. For example, outcome 2 and 3 could from their perspective also contribute to the second part of the impact statement.

On a different note, **outcome 7 can be only indirectly linked to the impact statement**. The EA team observes a misfit: The outcome statement reads as a marker for CP’s design and quality of implementation. According to the OECD-DAC guidance on its evaluation criteria, these aspects are anyways to be assessed under the criteria relevance (for design), coherence (for coordination), and effectiveness (for quality of implementation). From a methodological stance, it is not plausible that UNICEF HQ decided to insert such an outcome indicator in its CP.

Across key informant interviews with chiefs of the six sections (which each correspond to one outcome) and the (deputy) representatives, the **CP ToC was assessed as complete at outcome and impact level**. Interviewees neither point to ambiguous goal setting nor to different understanding between the CP-level ToC and key underlying strategies to work towards outcome achievement as specified in the Programme Rational Notes for each section.

During the EA no fundamentally differing views about CP objectives and strategies for programme delivery could be observed. Further, the systematic review reveals that the **ToC is largely consistently described across various documents** like, the CPD, the programme rational notes, in M&E plans and across exemplary progress reports.

With respect to the **cross-cutting priorities climate aspects** are prominently mentioned in the impact statement (“...green...economy and society”), while only one of seven outcomes refers directly to climate change (i.e. outcome 5). This imbalance is aggravated by the fact that climate-resilience is only one of several envisaged achievements specified in outcome 5 (“i.e. ...[1] live in an improved physical environment that is safe and [2] resilient to climate change, and [3] use improved water, sanitation and hygiene services while [4] adopting appropriate hygiene behaviours and care practices.”). However, it is important for contextualisation to acknowledge

that climate aspects are a key result area of UNICEF's strategic plan goal area 4 (WASH), and thus particularly visible in the corresponding results path.

In contrast, the **cross-cutting priority gender equality** is better mainstreamed in the CP ToC at outcome and impact level. All seven outcomes incorporate gender equality language with 2, 5, and 7 being gender sensitive, 1, 3, and 6 being gender responsive and 4 being gender transformative goals. According to UNICEF Strategic Plan 2022–2025, key actions for the integration of gender equality throughout the life course are incorporated in five Goal Areas: (1) quality maternal health care and nutrition, and HIV testing, counselling and care; (2) gender-responsive education systems and equitable access to education for all; (3) addressing violence against girls, boys and women, as well as harmful practices; (4) equitable WASH systems; and (5) gender-responsive social protection systems and care work. JCO programming aims to support gender-responsive interventions that are aligned to the global GAP and the JCO CPD in all five Goal Areas. Only in the CP ToC outcome 2 (on education) shows a results statement that only aims at gender sensitiveness (Goal Area 2), instead of gender responsiveness.

While disability is not explicitly mentioned at impact level, all thematic outcomes, except for education, emphasise people with disabilities in their objectives. Mainstreaming of the **cross-cutting priority disability** throughout different outcome goals is therefore rather strong.

The **cross-cutting priority equity** is explicitly mentioned in one outcome only. However, it is plausible that the concept implicitly informed the formulation of the other outcomes. Nevertheless, visibility of equity considerations at the CP ToC is assessed as limited.

The aspect of social behaviour change (SBC) is not explicitly addressed in the Theory of Change (ToC). However, elements of social behaviour change may be indirectly targeted within some of the objectives, such as empowering adolescent girls and youth (Outcome 4) or promoting inclusive and integrated social policies (Outcome 6). At the output level, SBC is strongly mainstreamed in five of six programme sections (exception is the social policy and protection area).

With regard to protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), we identified three outcomes which indirectly address PSEA and child safeguarding. Outcome 3 explicitly addresses the issue of protection from various forms of violence, including exploitation and abuse. By providing preventive and responsive services, the programme aims to mitigate risks and support survivors, which indirectly includes protection from sexual exploitation and abuse. The outcome encompasses safeguarding measures by ensuring that vulnerable children and adolescents receive quality preventive and responsive services. Outcome 4 refers to empowerment of adolescent girls and youth with knowledge and skills and by that contributing to their ability to recognise and protect themselves from exploitation and abuse. This empowerment contributes to safeguarding by enhancing children's ability to protect themselves and seek help when needed. Outcome 7 indirectly supports the programme's ability to address protection concerns, including those related to sexual exploitation and abuse. At output level, we assess mainstreaming of PSEA and child safeguarding as rather weak in the result framework. Only two outputs are PSEA-focused both assigned to the child protection (due to the thematic affiliation). Interviewed gender and humanitarian specialists confirm a **fair level of mainstreaming, despite weaknesses regarding climate change at the level of output and outcome statements.**

To ensure **alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF)** outcome goals have been flagged for contributions to the four UNSDCF indicators for Jordan as shown in table 2:

Table 2. CPD outcomes allocation to UNSDCF outcomes

UNSDCF outcomes	CPD outcomes
1. Ensure that Jordan’s growth is green, that it benefits all, and that everyone has access to skills and opportunities to contribute to such growth.	Outcomes 2, 3, 4, 7
2. The poorest and all people living in vulnerable situations in Jordan are to be supported based on their needs and human rights and empowered to become self-reliant.	Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
3. Jordan is to have safe, sustainable and reliable access to water, food and energy and everyone is to have equitable, affordable and sufficient access to such resources.	Outcomes 5, 7
4. Jordanian institutions, the United Nations and partners are to listen to people, be responsive and transparent, and ensure meaningful participation and follow-up on their commitments.	Outcome, 3, 4, 7

A review reveals that **some linkages are very plausible** (e.g. that CPD outcome 4: “Adolescent[s]... are empowered and equipped with knowledge, skills, and opportunities to become socially and economically resilient” is contributing to UNSDCF outcome 2: “The poorest ... are to be supported based on their needs and human rights and empowered to become self-reliant.”).

However, other **linkages are perceived as partially superficial** grounded on long and indirect results paths only (e.g. It is not clear how CPD outcome 3: “The most vulnerable ... at risk of or survivors of violence, abuse, exploitation, neglect and harmful practices, benefit from quality preventive and responsive services.” is contributing to UNSDCF outcome 1: “Ensure that Jordan’s growth is green, that it benefits all, and that everyone has access to skills and opportunities to contribute to such growth.”

Instead of highlighting the strongest linkages which are highly plausible given the direct contributions of expected CP outcome achievements to UNSDCF outcomes, a partially artificial picture is drawn. This increases the **risk of missing the opportunity to set realistic priorities**.

The **most plausible linkage** for the EA team is **towards UNSDCF outcome 2**: While six of seven outcomes are expected to contribute to UNSDCF outcome 2, UNSDCF outcomes 1, 3 and 4 are each backed by a single CP outcome only. This further underlines broad and rather aspirational goals across all outcome areas and suggests room for setting a stronger focus on UNICEF key strengths as shown in table 3.

Table 3. Suggested CPD outcomes alignment to UNSDCF outcomes by the EA team

UNSDCF outcomes	CPD outcomes
1. Ensure that Jordan’s growth is green, that it benefits all, and that everyone has access to skills and opportunities to contribute to such growth.	Outcome 2, 3, 4, (7) Explanation: Outcomes 2 and 3 rather contribute to creation of preconditions but are not specific to foster green growth. Outcome 7 is contributing only indirectly given its support function.

2. The poorest and all people living in vulnerable situations in Jordan are to be supported based on their needs and human rights and empowered to become self-reliant.	Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, (7) Explanation: Outcome 7 dito
3. Jordan is to have safe, sustainable and reliable access to water, food and energy and everyone is to have equitable, affordable and sufficient access to such resources.	Outcome 5 (with focus on water and WASH-related contributions, not on food and energy aspects), (7) Explanation: Outcome 7 dito
4. Jordanian institutions, the United Nations and partners are to listen to people, be responsive and transparent, and ensure meaningful participation and follow-up on their commitments.	Outcome 3, 4, 7 Explanation: Reversed causality, UNSDCF outcome 4 is expected to contribute to CP outcome 3 and 4.

With respect to **the output level** JCO has set a total of 18 outputs for its six thematic sections. For each section, three outputs shall contribute to its envisaged outcome as shown in tables 4 to 9.

Health & Nutrition Section

In the area of health & nutrition where JCO aims at equitable access to and utilisation of quality health and nutrition services it is plausible that the three outputs contribute to this goal.

Table 4. Outcome and output statements for thematic section on health

Outcome	Outputs
HEALTH Outcome 001: Most vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls and children with disabilities, have equitable access to and utilization of quality health and nutrition services for improved survival, cognitive development, and physical and mental well-being.	Output 001/001: Government and partners have enhanced capacity to develop policies, strategies, standards and guidelines based on evidence generated by determinants analysis of key health, nutrition, mental health and health services besides social health behaviors and functional health information system. Output 001/002: Health workers & institutional health coordinators in high burden areas have adequate knowledge and skills to implement quality , integrated and comprehensive health, nutrition and mental health services focusing on the most vulnerable populations. Output 001/003: Individuals , especially girls, families and communities, increasingly adopt critical health, nutrition and mental health behaviors , including timely care-seeking.

Output 1 addresses the enabling environment and sets a focus on enhanced capacity of government and partners to develop evidence-based policies, strategies, and standards. The output is expected to lay the foundation for equitable access to health and nutrition services and thus, plausible to support outcome achievement. However, the latter part of output statement 1 is very broad and it is not fully clear what is meant by “based on evidence generated by determinants analysis ... besides social health behaviors and functional health information system”. This poses challenges to operationalisation and provides a hint for being potentially overloaded (see chapter 3.2).

Output 2 emphasises the supply side with aiming at health workers and institutional health coordinators being adequately skilled to implement quality health, nutrition, and mental health services. It is plausible that the supply side is key to achieve utilisation of quality health and nutrition services.

Finally, output 3 is directed to the demand side and relates to social behaviour change. It seeks to enhance adoption of critical health, nutrition, and mental health behaviour by individuals to achieve utilisation of quality health and nutrition services. In the thematic field of health, the **three complementary outputs are assessed as comprehensive and as well aligned with the outcome.**

With regard to the cross-cutting priorities, gender, disability, SBC, and equity aspects are reflected at output level and thus correspond with the emphasis to these cross-cutting issues in the outcome statement. PSEA is not explicitly mentioned in the results statements.

Education Section

In the area of education JCO aims at vulnerable girls and boys completing early childhood and basic education. To reach this outcome JCO, similarly, set outputs corresponding to the enabling environment, as well as supply and demand sides as shown in table 5.

Table 5. Outcome and output statements for thematic section on education

<p>EDUCATION Outcome 002: Vulnerable girls and boys, including adolescents, complete early childhood and basic education, learning to their full potential.</p>	<p>Output 002/001: Improved evidence and data for national policy and plans to increase access to early childhood, basic and alternative education pathways.</p> <p>Output 002/002: Improved capacity of teachers and school leadership to boost inclusion and learning outcomes for all vulnerable children.</p> <p>Output 002/003: Improved parental and community engagement to increase demand for quality, inclusive and gender-transformative education.</p>
---	--

It is plausible that output 1 aiming at improved evidence and data for national policy and plans to increase access, is likely to contribute towards the outcome. Furthermore, it is plausible that output 2 on improved capacity of teachers and school leadership forms an equally important contribution at supply side, like output 3 improved parental and community engagement to increase demand for quality education.

Taken this together, in the field of education **it is expected that the three output goals are considerably contributing to the envisaged outcome and are thus well aligned.** However, the **EA team is not convinced regarding the completeness of the results framework at output level.** Albeit the importance of output 1, it is questionable whether this is sufficient to lay the foundation for complete early childhood and basic education for all. An **additional output/ rephrased output to put stronger emphasis on support to translate evidence into action** might have been beneficial to acknowledge the importance of bridging the gap from the enabling environment to the supply side. It is not yet fully plausible how improved evidence, better capacitated teachers and enhanced community engagement will allow achieving the outcome without further measurements supporting system reform.

The cross-cutting priorities gender equality, disability, SBC, and equity are often implicitly addressed at output level. Output 3, however, addresses three cross-cutting themes directly, namely gender transformative education, inclusive education and social behaviour change for parents and the community through engagement in education matters. Climate and PSEA are not mentioned in the field of education.

Child Protection Section

In the area of child protection, JCO aims at the most vulnerable at risk or survivors of violence benefit from quality preventive and responsive services. Again, the three output goals to reach this objective are directed to the enabling environment, and to supply and demand sides as shown in table 6.

Table 6. Outcome and output statements for thematic section on child protection

<p>CHILD PROTECTION Outcome 003: By 2027, most vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls and children with disabilities (CWDs), at risk of or survivors of violence, abuse, exploitation, neglect, and harmful practices benefit from quality preventive and responsive services.</p>	<p>Output 003/001: GOJ has increased its capacity to develop, amend and implement policies, standards, and guidelines related to violence against children and child protection based on evidence generation and analysis.</p> <p>Output 003/002: Service providers have increased skills, knowledge, and capacity to implement integrated quality child protection services for the most vulnerable boys, girls, and women.</p> <p>Output 003/003: Children, caregivers and communities have increased skills, knowledge and capacity to prevent all forms of violence and discrimination, under all conditions.</p>
---	--

Output 2 addresses the supply side of service providers which should possess increased capacity to implement integrated quality child protection services. Output 3 targets the demand side and implies social behaviour change through increased knowledge and skills, aiming at increasing the capacity among children, caregivers, and communities to prevent all forms of violence. Both outputs are expected to plausibly contribute to the outcome.

The same holds true with respect to the enabling environment for output 1, where increased capacity of the government to develop, amend and implement policies related to evidence-based child protection is expected to contribute towards the outcome. Similarly, as in the field of health the EA team assess the **three outputs as well aligned and comprehensive but deems output statement 1 as very broad and potentially overloaded**.

The outcome of this section is to support the most vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls and those with disabilities, by providing quality preventive and responsive services against violence and exploitation, explicitly addressing the cross-cutting issues of gender, disability, protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), and child safeguarding (CSG). The three outputs recognise rather implicitly the inclusion of children and adolescents with disabilities and those affected by sexual exploitation and abuse as these are not directly mentioned. While the outputs indicate efforts to strengthen policy development, service provider capacity and community engagement in child protection, there is room for improvement. The section could more explicitly address gender disparities and the inclusion of children with disabilities, integrate climate change and environmental sustainability considerations, strengthen social behaviour change strategies and incorporate principles of prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.

Adolescents and Youth Section

In the cross-sectoral area of adolescents & youth, JCO wants to ensure that adolescents and youth are empowered to become socially and economically resilient. Table 7 displays the three outputs selected to strive towards this objective.

Table 7. Outcome and output statements for thematic section on adolescents & youth

<p>ADOLECENTS & YOUTH Outcome 004: Adolescent girls and youth, especially young girls and children with disabilities, are empowered and equipped with knowledge, skills and opportunities to become socially and economically resilient.</p>	<p>Output 004/001: Improved public institutions’ and civil society organization’s capacity to plan and implement youth-friendly policies and policies enhancing meaningful, equitable and gender- and disability-responsive opportunities for responsible citizenship.</p> <p>Output 004/002: Improved Government and national partners’ capacity to provide adolescents and youth, especially girls and persons with disabilities in most vulnerable communities, with transferable life, digital and vocational skills, and opportunities to practice those skills.</p> <p>Output 004/003: Adolescents, young people and communities have increased knowledge of how to adopt positive behaviors and practices to engage and support national Government on social behavior change policies and programmes.</p>
--	--

Output 1 referring to the enabling environment and addresses public institution’s and CSO’s capacity which should be uplifted to plan and implement youth friendly policies and policies enhancing meaningful, equitable and gender- and disability-responsive opportunities for responsible citizenship. Thereby it is not fully clear what is meant with the term “opportunities for responsible citizenship”. Further, it is not clear to which extent CSO have the mandate to plan and implement policies. Given this lack of clarity it is not fully convincing how output 1 contributes to the envisaged outcome.

Output 2 targets the supply side, aiming at improved capacity of government and national partners to provide adolescents and youths with transferable life, digital and vocational skills, and opportunities to practice those skills. The contribution to social behaviour change through transferable skills to the outcome is plausible, however, it remains unclear to which extent these actors have sufficient room to manoeuvre to offer opportunities to practice such skills. Particularly when it comes at targeted economic resilience, it is not convincing that private sector actors are not mentioned at all at output level (although being addressed at activity level).

Output 3, is again directed to the demand side, addressing adolescents, young people and communities whose enhanced knowledge of positive behaviours and practices shall allow them to engage and support national government on social behaviour change policies and programmes and thus influence the meso and macro levels. It is evident that three outputs are mutually reinforcing, however, it is not fully convincing that output 3 directly contributes to outcome achievement at large. It is an SBC-focused output, although the formulation could be more specific around particular behaviours. Reverse causality might be partially an issue, as outcome achievements may also contribute to achievement of output 3 (i.e. if adolescents are empowered to become socially and economically resilient, they can plausibly use their increased capacity to engage in supporting government on social behaviour change policies).

At large **the results framework is assessed as only partially aligned and not complete**, putting **too little emphasis towards the economic resilience** targeted amongst others in the outcome statement.

The outcome of this section is to empower adolescent girls and youth, with a strong focus on young girls and children with disabilities, to become socially and economically resilient. By emphasizing gender- and disability-responsive opportunities, output 1 and 2 aim to address gender inequality and social equity issues and they reflect an effort towards inclusion of children with disabilities. However, there could be a clearer emphasis on ensuring accessibility and inclusion for all marginalised groups. Output 3 directly addresses SBC and aims to increase knowledge and engagement with government policies and programs. However, there is no explicit mention of inclusion of marginalised groups such as girls and children with disabilities in the process of adopting positive behaviours, which could be improved. While the outputs address gender equality, inclusion of children with disabilities and SBC, they could be strengthened by explicitly mentioning climate change and environmental considerations, emphasising inclusion and accessibility in marginalised communities, incorporating intersectional approaches and implementing robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

WASH Section

In the field of WASH, JCO aims at vulnerable children and adolescents living in an improved, safe, and climate-resilient environment and use improved WASH services as well as adopt to appropriate hygiene practices. At large it is plausible that the outputs as shown in table 8 contribute towards this goal.

Table 8. Outcome and output statements for thematic section on child protection

<p>WASH Outcome 005: Vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls and children with disabilities, live in an improved physical environment that is safe and resilient to the impacts of climate change, and use improved water, sanitation and hygiene services while adopting appropriate hygiene behaviors and care practices.</p>	<p>Output 005/001: Children and adolescents rights to climate resilient WASH services are supported by strengthened, risk informed, evidence based, inclusive, and child-sensitive evidence-based programs and policies.</p> <p>Output 005/002: Children and adolescents have access to, and use, adequate, safe, and resilient water and sanitation services.</p> <p>Output 005/003: Children and adolescents, especially girls, have increased knowledge of and demonstrate improved practices of hygiene, and of environmental and climate-sensitive behaviors.</p>
--	---

Output 1 sets a focus at the enabling environment on children and adolescents’ rights to climate-resilient WASH services which should be supported by evidence-based programmes and policies. The output requires slight rephrasing to become a grammatically correct statement. It appears to be similar to other outputs on the enabling environment discussed above, being rather broad and referring to both the legislative environment and implementation.

Outputs 2 and 3 address the supply and demand side. Output 2, children and adolescents have access to and use adequate, safe, and resilient WASH services, is however overlapping with the outcome, which also aims at the same: (1) living in an improved physical environment (i.e. having access to WASH) and (2) use of improved WASH services, indicating social behaviour change. Thus, the results level of the output is assessed as too high.

Similar overlaps are observed with respect to output 3, children and adolescents have increased knowledge and demonstrate improved practices of hygiene and climate-sensitive behaviours. The latter part of the output statement is a reformulation of parts of the outcome statement i.e.

adopting hygiene behaviours and care practices. While aiming at increased knowledge is correctly anchored at output level, the result level of the remainder is too high and repetitive.

To sum up, **outputs are partly regarded as reformulation of the outcome (2 and parts of 3) and partly assessed as plausibly contributing (1 and parts of 3) to the envisaged outcome.** However, the EA team assesses **the strongly emphasised climate aspect (i.e. living in an improved physical environment that is safe and resilient to the impacts of climate change) not sufficiently reflected in the outputs.** The results framework is in this regard not complete.

The WASH outcome specifically mentions vulnerable children and adolescents, especially girls, reflecting attention to gender-responsive measures. However, the outputs do not explicitly mention gender approaches or considerations, such as ensuring girls' equal access to water, sanitation and hygiene services. There may be scope to explicitly address gender dynamics in outputs 1 and 2. With regard to the inclusion of CWD, the outcome indicates consideration of disability inclusion. While the outputs do not explicitly mention children with disabilities, ensuring accessibility and inclusivity in WASH services could be implicit in outputs 1 and 2. However, it could be improved by making these measures explicit. The outcome emphasises resilience to the impacts of climate change and an improved physical environment. Outputs 1 and 2 directly address climate-resilient WASH services and access to safe and resilient water and sanitation services, which aligns well with this priority.

In terms of social equity, the outputs focus on vulnerable children and adolescents, suggesting attention to social equity. However, the outcome does not explicitly mention social equity considerations, such as targeting marginalised communities or ensuring equitable distribution of resources. There may be scope for incorporating such considerations into the design and implementation of the outputs. Output 3 directly addresses SBC by aiming to improve hygiene practices and environmental and climate-sensitive behaviours among children and adolescents. It would be beneficial to provide more details on the specific behaviour change strategies and communication approaches to be used. The results and outputs presented do not explicitly address SBC.

Social Policy and Protection Section

In the area of social policy & protection, JCO aims at vulnerable children and young people utilising integrated social policies, enhanced social protection services and socioeconomic opportunities to fulfil their potential. It is plausible that the three outputs as shown in table 9 are contributing to achieve the outcome.

Table 9. Outcome and output statements for thematic section on social policy and protection

<p>SOCIAL POLICY & PROTECTION Outcome 006: Vulnerable children and young people in Jordan, especially girls and children with disabilities, are increasingly utilizing evidence-based, inclusive, integrated social policies, and enhanced social protection services and socioeconomic opportunities, to fulfil their potential.</p>	<p>Output 006/001: Routine disaggregated national child-relevant evidence is generated and used for policy development and monitoring progress towards the realization of Children Rights and Sustainable Development Goals 1.</p> <p>Output 006/002: The social protection system [is (sic!)] strengthened (and more shock responsive) to facilitate the access and utilization of integrated, gender responsive and inclusive services for vulnerable children and young people.</p>
--	--

	Output 006/003: Knowledge and capacity is built at national level to advocate for better allocation and efficient public spending on social protection , especially for women, girls and boys.
--	---

However, output 2 is partially a reformulation of the outcome as it also addresses utilisation of integrated services for vulnerable children and young people. Apart from this output 2 aims at a strengthened social protection system to facilitate access which is expected to contribute to the outcome. The first part of the output statement equally addresses the enabling environment, thus the system level, then outputs 1 and 3. Whereas the second part of the output statement is directed to the supply side. This underlines the complexity of the output which, from a methodological stance, complicates its operationalisation, and, from thematic considerations, has to potential to result in overloading.

Output 1 points to evidence-generation used for policy development and progress monitoring towards Children Rights and Sustainable Development Goal 1 (i.e. eradication of poverty). This is understood as a plausible foundation towards the outcome achievement.

Output 3 aims at capacity development at national level to advocate for better allocation and efficient public spending on social protection, which again is plausible to reach the outcome. Taken this together, the **three outputs are well aligned with the outcome statement**. However, the **EA team assesses them not as complete**. The **aspect of aiming at vulnerable children and young people utilising socioeconomic opportunities, is not directly reflected at output level**. Further, it comes as a surprise that all outputs are directed to the enabling environment and the supply side. In this regard, the EA team observes that no output addresses the target group and stakeholders to foster demand has been developed; similarly to such goals formulated in other areas. There may be good thematic reasons to deviate from the approach addressing the enabling environment, supply and demand as chosen for other areas. However, a deeper analysis goes beyond the scope of this assignment. Thus, the EA team solely wants to raise JCO's attention to this aspect.

The Social Policy and Protection outcome explicitly mentions girls at risk, indicating a focus on gender equality. Output 2 also mentions gender-responsive and inclusive actions. There is potential for improvement if the outputs could specify actions to ensure gender mainstreaming in all interventions, ensuring equal access and benefits for girls and boys. Similarly, while CWDs are mentioned in the outcome, they should be more explicitly addressed in each output to ensure tailored approaches for their inclusion in data generation, strengthening of social protection and capacity building. Climate change and environmental considerations are not explicitly mentioned in the proposed outcomes and outputs. Integrating environmental considerations into the section work plan, such as promoting sustainable practices in service delivery or advocating for environmentally friendly policies, could enhance its impact on both children and the environment. The SP section aims to provide socio-economic opportunities for vulnerable children, which is in line with social justice objectives. Outputs could specify actions to address systemic inequalities that contribute to vulnerability and ensure that socio-economic opportunities are accessible to all, regardless of socio-economic status or other factors. In terms of SBC and PSEA, no explicit social behaviour change or PSEA strategies were mentioned.

To sum up, in the areas of Health, Education and Child Protection, three complementary outputs per field are comprehensive and as well aligned with the outcome. However, the completeness of the results framework at output level is questionable in the field of Education. An output explicitly

emphasising on the translation of evidence into action is missing. In the field of Child Protection and Health, one output is very broad and potentially overloaded.

In contrast in the areas of Adolescents & Youth, WASH and Social Policy & Protection, the results framework is not regarded as complete given the ambitious and broad formulation of corresponding outcome statements. In the field of Adolescents & Youth, economic resilience is rarely reflected at output level and in the field of WASH, climate aspects are not sufficiently reflected in the outputs. Moreover, in this field outputs are partially a reformulation of the outcome. In the field of Social Policy & Protection, the aspect of utilising socioeconomic opportunities raised in the outcome, is not directly reflected at output level and against the aspiration expressed at outcome level an output addressing the demand side is missing. Therefore, the EA team assesses the results framework given the aspirational outcomes as incomplete at output level.

By analysing the programme outcomes and outputs in the context of the cross-cutting priorities, we can see how each priority is reflected and where improvements could be made. In terms of gender equality, the country programme explicitly mentions targeting vulnerable girls and ensuring equal access to services and opportunities in several outcomes and outputs. Further emphasis on gender mainstreaming in policies and interventions is missing, including gender transformative aspects, which can ensure that gender inequalities are continuously addressed and that girls are not only beneficiaries but also active participants in decision-making processes.

The inclusion of children with disabilities is recognised in the programme by mentioning them alongside vulnerable groups in several outcomes and outputs. There is a lack of more targeted measures to ensure accessibility and inclusion in all services and opportunities provided. Also, the active involvement of children with disabilities in the planning and implementation of interventions could have been considered. Concerning the environment, the programme addresses resilience to the impacts of climate change in outcome 5, but it could further integrate environmental sustainability in all outcomes and outputs. Interventions that promote environmentally sensitive/friendly practices, such as sustainable water and sanitation solutions, which actively contribute to climate resilience, are missing.

The programme aims to address social inequalities by targeting vulnerable populations, including girls, children with disabilities and those at risk of violence or exploitation. A more explicit focus on addressing the underlying social determinants of inequities, such as poverty and discrimination, could be improved to ensure that all children have equal opportunities to thrive. SBC is addressed in several outputs, particularly in promoting positive health and education behaviours. However, it missed strengthening the evidence base for behaviour change interventions by ensuring that they are culturally sensitive and contextually appropriate. Although not explicitly mentioned, there are efforts to integrate PSEA into the programme to protect children from violence and exploitation. Here again, strengthening safeguarding measures, including reliable reporting mechanisms and staff training, have not been considered to prevent and respond effectively to cases of abuse or exploitation.

3.2. OPERATIONALISATION WITH SMART INDICATORS

Summary Box

EQ1.1 - The extent to which standard and additional indicators are SMART

Outcome and output indicators, CSI, standard and additional, are well defined, SMART, and can be theoretically used to track progress towards CP objectives. However, few output indicators may face challenge of achievability due to uncertainty of data availability.

EQ1.1 - The extent to which SMART indicators adequately operationalise core programme outcomes.

While the outcome indicators operationalise the thematic outcomes defined in the CPD adequately, room for improvement remains at output level.

EQ1.2 - Assessment of availability of specific indicators for each cross-cutting priority.

Specific outcome indicators exist for each cross-cutting priority but these are not included in the results framework. The cross-cutting priorities are partially embedded in outcome and output indicators. The number of available stand-alone indicators and the extent to which cross-cutting priorities are reflected in outcome and output indicators varies among themes.

EQ1.2 - The extent to which (i) gender equality indicators, (ii) indicators related to inclusion of persons with disabilities, (iii) indicators related to climate change adaptation and mitigation, and (iv) social equity indicators are SMART.

Indicators related to cross-cutting priorities are considered SMART but the total number of indicators is limited. Indicators reflecting gender equality are most prevalent, followed by indicators related to social behaviour change (SBC) and inclusion of people with disabilities. Mainstreaming climate change adaptation and mitigation, social equity, and protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) is less prominent in the operationalisation of the thematic CP outcomes.

EQ1.2 - Assessment of quality of indicators, measurability and tracking of the programme's outcomes related to each cross-cutting priority.

Since most indicators are core standard indicators, the EA team assumes that quality assessment was done at institutional level. With regard to measurability and tracking of outcomes related to cross-cutting priorities, the picture is mixed: Concerning gender equality, a fully-fledged gender policy exists and provides adequate guidance: The JCO Gender Action Plan outlines the strategic approach (aligned with the global Gender Action Plan (2022-2025)) of JCO to address gender barriers and to promote gender equality in Jordan. It builds upon the JCO Gender Roadmap and aims to operationalise gender considerations into programme implementation and institutional benchmarks. The Gender Equity Markers provide the basis for an integral instrument to M&E and fund tracking systems. Looking at the integration of SBC in the programme, specific SBC-related outputs are included and indicators are present in most programme sections, covering SBC priorities on immunisation, nutrition and mental health in the health section; improved parental engagement in learning in the education section; prevention of violence against children in the child protection; youth participation and changing attitudes towards vocational training in the area of Adolescent Development and Participation (ADAP). However, the current CP lacks robust mechanisms tailored to the other cross-cutting priorities to ensure accurate measurement of its performance regarding the inclusion of persons with disabilities, climate change adaptation and mitigation, PSEA, and social equity. While cross-cutting priorities are prominently featured into outcome statements, missing methodologies to assess effectiveness and impact of interventions with regard to these priorities are a significant challenge.

A document review revealed that **the outcome indicators, comprising CSI indicators, standard and additional indicators, are overall SMART**. For detailed review results please refer to annex 7.

It should be noted that the CP evaluation (CPE) requires access to all guidelines and methodology notes related to indicators and evidence of the implementation status. At first sight, without detailed insight into the documentation, the formulation of few outcome and output indicators, especially those related to policy, strategy and programme development (see the information in the column “Comment on SMART criteria” indicators in Annex 7), does not appear to be fully SMART, as a (unambiguous) indicators definition is not always provided with the results framework. For example, in the case of strategic outcome indicators, the mere existence of documents will not be sufficient to measure the achievement of the outcome indicator. For this reason, it is important to have the methodological guidelines for CSIs, SIs and additional indicators, including the cross-cutting stand-alone indicators, to check the data points and calculation methods of the actual and target values.

The EA team observed a good example of adaptation from a non-specific and non-measurable formulation in the CPD to a SMART formulation of the same indicator in the work plan. It relates to the outcome indicator “Effective implementation of a national programme for youth and young people's participation and civic engagement”, which was changed to “Number of inclusive and climate- and gender-responsive institutional mechanisms, policies and strategies for adolescent and youth participation and engagement”, including the specification of policy areas and a quantifier.

A review of the outcome indicators at CP-level confirms **the provided SMART indicators represent an adequate operationalisation of the thematic programme outcomes** specified in the CPD. A closer **look at the output indicators suggests, however, several weaknesses regarding operationalisation**. The **indicators in the field of health and nutrition** cover various important aspects related to health and nutrition services for children and adolescents. However, taken together, they **do not fully cover all dimensions of the programme outcome to which they shall contribute**, for instance additional indicators related to nutrition services, access to primary healthcare, and comprehensive mental health support are missing to fully operationalise the outcome. In addition, **some outcome indicators leave room for further clarification or refinement** for better operationalisation of the outcome. **Indicators provided in the field of education** address different aspects of the outcome “Vulnerable girls and boys, including adolescents, complete early childhood and basic education, learning to their full potential.” They cover various aspects, including access, equity, quality, and inclusiveness of education, as well as innovative approaches to improving learning outcomes for vulnerable populations. The operationalisation of the indicators **collectively covers** different stages of education from early childhood to adolescence and addresses both access and learning outcomes, which are **essential components of the outcome**. **Indicators cover a wide range of topics related to child protection and well-being**. While few indicators directly measure aspects related to the outcome, such as prevalence of violence and availability of alternative care, others focus more on enabling factors or specific areas of intervention. Taken together, they **do not operationalise all dimensions of the outcome**, as no indicator serves as a proxy for quality preventive services. **Indicators in the thematic field of youth and adolescent cover multiple dimensions of empowerment and resilience building** among adolescent girls and youth, addressing aspects such as skills development, civic engagement, institutional support and

broader societal issues, capturing the intended outcomes of the programme. Yet, special emphasis to CWD, economic resilience, and the needs of children in contact with the law is not addressed. Thus, **operationalisation lacks completeness**.

Indicators in the field of WASH provide a framework for operationalising the outcome statement, **covering different aspects of climate resilience and WASH services**. Missing operationalisation of the aspects of adopting appropriate hygiene behaviours and care practices point to **incomplete operationalisation**.

Indicators related to the field of social policy and protection also cover **many areas of the outcome** and provide valuable insights into progress towards ensuring that vulnerable children and youth in Jordan have access to inclusive, integrated and improved social protection services. Taken together, they **do not fully cover all dimensions of the programme outcome** as utilisation of socio-economic opportunities is not operationalised.

With respect to the cross-cutting priorities, **single outcome indicators are not available for cross-cutting priorities**. However, as mentioned above (chapter 3.1), all six thematic outcomes, include gender aspects in their statements and outcome indicators refer to sex-disaggregated means of verification. Apart from this, the analysis disclosed a **mismatch between mainstreamed cross-cutting priorities in outcome statements and lack of adequately reflecting cross-cutting priorities in indicators**. For example, while several outcomes put emphasis on inclusion of children with disabilities (CWD), the corresponding indicators do not reflect this and do not allow measurement of this aspect when disaggregated baseline and target values are missing and at the same time envisaged achievement rates are not set at 100%. Despite disability being integrated in all outcome statements, except for education outcome, it is neither reflected in the indicators nor by disability-disaggregated means of verification.

The picture is **somewhat different for output indicators**. Although there are few quantifiable indicators, we find gender-responsive aspects in the thematic field of health, gender-equitable access to learning opportunities in the field of education and gender-discriminatory aspects addressed under child protection. In addition, gender and disability responsive and inclusive services are present in the thematic fields of youth and adolescence, and social policy and protection. While climate change aspects are reflected in WASH output indicators and in the thematic fields of youth & adolescents and social policy & protection, with one indicator each addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation measures, social equity is not explicitly mentioned in output indicators and only embedded once in the outcome indicators (i.e. in the thematic field social policy & protection).

There are three special indicators, i.e. not embedded in the sections, with the focus on disability inclusion (H2.6b, H8.5, and E3.6a), which highlight the implementation of capacity development programmes for front-line workers focusing on disability inclusion, the provision of disability-inclusive humanitarian programmes and services, and the application of disability-inclusive standards in UNICEF programmes in line with United Nations standards. However, limitations may arise regarding the depth of inclusivity achieved, potential gaps in reaching marginalised groups within the disabled community, challenges in accurately measuring outcomes for persons with disabilities, and the need for ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure sustained progress in disability inclusion efforts across UNICEF's operations.

Social behaviour change is explicitly reflected in the selected output statements in the areas of health, education, child protection, WASH and adolescents and youth. From eight SBC composite indicators (H2.1, H2.2a, H2.2b, H2.3, H2.4, H2.5, H2.7, and H2.8), two (H2.3 and H2.8) are integrated in the output indicators of the adolescents and youth section. The SBC indicators provide a structured framework for assessing JCO's performance in community engagement, monitoring, feedback mechanisms, strengthening systems for youth participation, reducing discrimination, supporting integrated parenting programmes etc. However, the issue remains in their universal formulation and the lack of ability to capture the qualitative impact and sustainability of these efforts at the CP-level, as well as the depth of community engagement and ownership. Additionally, there may be challenges in establishing clear and universally applicable benchmarks across diverse contexts, and in ensuring that these benchmarks adequately address the various needs of different populations, particularly of marginalised groups.

PSEA is addressed in three output indicators, one in the area of health, two on the child protection section, and one composite indicator (E3.5).

All output indicators that aim at mainstreaming cross-cutting priorities of gender-equality aspects, inclusion of persons with disabilities, climate change adaptation and mitigation, SBC, PSEA, and social equity issues **are SMART**. However, as mentioned above, the **level of representation is widely varying among the different cross-cutting priorities**. Indicators directed to gender equality are most prevalent, followed by indicators related to social behaviour change (SBC) and inclusion of people with disabilities. Mainstreaming climate change adaptation and mitigation, PSEA, and social equity are less prominent in the operationalisation of the thematic CP outcomes.

The EA revealed that cross-cutting priorities are prominently featured into outcome statements. They are partially and to varying extent embedded in SMART outcome and output indicators. This lays the **foundation for measurability, but it is no automatism for progress tracking**. Key informant interviews revealed several challenges in this regard (INT_9, 8, 13, 10): With respect to **gender equality**, there is a global Gender Action Plan 2022-2025 and the JCO Gender Action Plan **in place guiding implementation** and a gender specialist at programme level as well as gender focal points in the thematic sections to put efforts ensuring sufficient attention to this cross-cutting priority throughout the entire programme cycle. There are five specific gender equality indicators (H2.5, H2.6a, H5.2, H5.5, and H9.8) that aim to assess various aspects of gender equality promotion and implementation within UNICEF programmes. They include measuring the extent of at-scale interventions targeting gender discriminatory practices among children and capacity-building programmes for frontline workers on gender equality. Additionally, they evaluate UNICEF's adherence to organisational standards outlined in the Gender Action Plan and the implementation of measures to mitigate gender-based violence risks. Furthermore, these indicators gauge the identification and financing of transformative child rights policies and programmes aimed at promoting gender equality with UNICEF support, reflecting a comprehensive approach to advancing gender equality within UNICEF's mandate. This enhances the likelihood of **more and better indicators, consequently better mainstreaming throughout programme activities and better record keeping**. Nevertheless, by the time of the EA, there were **still some concerns** that even gender aspects are sometimes treated as tick boxes rather than being fully integrated. Interviewees, however, also reported that **consistent support and persistence by the gender expert strengthened measurability and tracking progress** of the cross-cutting priority.

For the **other cross-cutting priorities** interviewees perceived a **lack of strategic orientation and clear guidance**. This expected to **hamper tracking of the programme's outcomes** related to the inclusion of persons with disabilities, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and social equity.

4. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS OF SYSTEMS AND DATA TO ENSURE EVALUABILITY (EQ1.1., EQ1.2)

4.1. AVAILABILITY OF BASELINE DATA AND CONSIDERATION OF RIGOROUS EVALUATION

Summary Box

EQ1.1 - The extent to which baseline data exists (inclusive of partner data)

Baseline data is available for all thematic programme outcomes and the majority of output indicators. However, 15 out of 101 output indicators lack consistent baseline data being either exclusively reported in RAM or in internal work plans, displaying different values in RAM and in work plans or entirely missing data. It is of concern that baselines available often refer to older statistical data from 2020 and 2021, partially even from 2018 and 2019. While data was rather actual by the time of developing the CPD it is in some cases a weak proxy for actual state at baseline.

EQ1.2 - The extent to which baseline data exists on (i) gender-sensitive indicators, (ii) indicators related to inclusion of persons with disabilities, (iii) indicators related climate change adaptation and mitigation, and (iv) social equity exists (incl. availability of disaggregated data, data from comparison groups)

Baseline data for cross-cutting priorities is rarely and only related to gender equality available. Out of 127 outcome and output indicators for which the existence of baseline data is plausible, one third (38) include disaggregation at endline and for only nine indicators (out of 38) sex-disaggregated baseline data or in one case disaggregation for persons with disabilities is available.

EQ1.1 - The extent to which preconditions for rigorous impact evaluation have been considered. Despite commitments in the CPD, the EA reveals that preconditions for rigorous impact evaluation (i.e. for (quasi-) experimental designs) were not met.

According to the annual work plans of the thematic sections and the annual JCO Full RAM Report (approved end of January 2024), **baseline data is available for all core programme outcomes and the majority of output indicators**. The information refers also only to the indicators included in the result framework i.e., the composite indicators related to cross-cutting priorities are not part of the present analysis. However, the **actuality is of concern**, as available baseline data is mainly older statistical data rarely from 2022, instead partly dating back to 2018, five years before the current CPE started. This is understandable from the perspective of data availability by the time of CPD development, yet it poses a threat to evaluability if not replaced with more recent data. Most baseline information reported is from 2020 or 2021, in few cases from 2018 and 2019.

According to the approved JCO RAM Report, **15 out of 101 output indicators** distributed over 5 sections **lack information on baseline data**. These are health (CSI CSI 1.4.4b), education (CSIs 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.2.1 to 2.2.6), child protection (CSIs 3.1.3 and 3.1.7), adolescent and youth (CSI H2.3), and WASH (CSIs 4.1.5 and 4.3.2). Only in the thematic field of social policy & protection baseline

data for all indicators is available. Out of these 15 indicators without baseline data, five are presented exclusively in the RAM system (CSIs 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6), two indicators are not included in the RAM but in the internal work plans (CSI H2.3, CSI 4.3.2), , and for four indicators the information on baseline data is missing in the RAM report but is available in the respective work plans (CSIs 3.1.3, 3.1.7, 3.3.3, 4.1.15). The latter should be revised and accordingly adjusted in the RAM system.

Limited availability, actuality and quality of baseline data is reported as a considerable challenge by several interviewees, as it is essential for the entire programme cycle, from planning and implementation to monitoring and evaluation (INT 6, 7, 9, 13, 10, 8).

Challenges regarding data collection and reporting for several indicators were raised, threatening accountability, and hampering monitoring and evaluation efforts. In addition, the **long intervals between baseline assessments**, as seen in large surveys such as the DHS, make it difficult to track progress in a timely manner. However, the EA team regards the five-year data collection cycle of the DHS as in principle valuable to assess results achievement after the end of the recent CPE. Data of the last round collected in 2023, is expected to be available soon and allows replacement of DHS data from 2018, thus forming a solid baseline. Limitations of the DHS are, however, that endline data from 2027 will be only released in 2028 (see chapter 5.5).

Beyond this, the lack of more recent baseline information was explained by a **lack of adequate and reliable data collection mechanisms and timely submission of data from the government**. According to some interviewees, the lack of baseline data on institutional arrangements highlights a **gap in assessing the institutional landscape for evaluation purposes**. A coping strategy, practised by only a few teams, is to triangulate data sources, other partners' data and publications to reconstruct a reliable baseline and to verify reported trends and observations, especially when partners' data lack supporting evidence.

Furthermore, the **lack of disaggregation of statistical data from partners** is challenging and threatens the evaluability of cross-cutting priorities. The EA reveals that disaggregated information is required by the six thematic sections. The disaggregation criteria vary between sections and outputs. For example, in health & nutrition, data on age, gender, location and disability, and sometimes nationality, are requested. The education section focuses on humanitarian/development, region, gender, and disability, although data on disability is not always available. Child protection outputs have a more disaggregated data profile, including age groups, gender, disability, type of intervention (health services, social work/social services, justice/law enforcement), migration status (migrant, refugee, IDP, returnee) and humanitarian/development. Despite of the disaggregated data profile provided by UNICEF's baseline efforts, the statutory bodies face data management challenges. For example, the efforts to strengthen the child protection system in Jordan continue to be hindered by a number of factors, including human resources in social services, knowledge and skills of service providers in child protection, limited and/or multiple information management systems, and inadequate data quality and national ownership of the data. The section on youth & adolescents aims to provide data on age, gender, location, disability, climate resilience, humanitarian/development. Similar disaggregated data is required by the WASH section, except for age and location, but including service level instead in line with the guidance provided by the CSI. Social policy & protection wants baseline and monitoring data disaggregated by age, sex, location, and disability.

The EA review discloses that for all outcome indicators (26) and most of the output indicators (for 86 out of 101) some kind of baseline information is available. According to the work plans (the information is not consistently available on the JCO RAM report or the CSI 2023 Report), one third of all indicators (38) refer to some kind of disaggregation based on age, sex, location, disability, climate resilience, humanitarian/development, vulnerability, migration status or nationality.. However, **disaggregated baseline data is only available for nine indicators (out of a total of 127 outcome and output indicators for the entire CP)**. This baseline data is **mainly sex-disaggregated** data, i.e. referring to statistical count of cases and not to the gender equity-related value. The data is available for four indicators referring to child protection and two indicators referring to youth & adolescents. **Disaggregated baseline data by persons with disability, nationality or social equity marker is not available.**

The availability of adequate baseline data is one important pillar to facilitate more (rigorous) evaluation to which JCO committed in the current CPD (p.4) and which would strive towards UNICEF's general commitment and ambitions to more rigorous evaluations. The CPD underlines, that lessons learned from the previous evaluation influenced the direction of new country programme, and that UNICEF's interventions will be rigorously evaluated to allow upscaling by the Government of Jordan. In the **design phase of the CPD JCO has, however, not yet undertaken measures to support the ambitions for more rigorous evaluation.** Thus, the foundation for (quasi-)experimental designs, i.e. **randomisation of treatment was not considered for specific elements of the CP.** Pipeline approaches are means to overcome general ethical concerns of such approach. Moreover, possibilities to exploit the rich DHS data set for difference-in-difference designs were not yet consequently explored at planning stage. In these lines, the EA team sees room for improvement.

4.2. MONITORING OF RESULTS: SYSTEM AND DATA

Summary Box

EQ1.1 - Assessment of adequacy and sufficiency of the monitoring system and the degree of its integration into programme management.

Established monitoring processes and mechanisms are in place but they are not yet fully adequate and sufficient to overcome data collection challenges, delayed reporting, limited harmonisation and incomplete analysis of monitoring data. Efforts are undertaken to address these challenges through capacity development and quality assurance measures. The integration of monitoring systems into programme management is at large adequate with strong linkages and systematic approaches but provision of cross-sectoral monitoring results and incorporating real-time feedback from beneficiaries could be stronger.

EQ1.1 - The extent to which the monitoring systems allows risk monitoring and adapting to changing circumstances.

The monitoring system allows for comprehensive risk monitoring and adaptive management, with regular evaluations, risk analysis and collaborative efforts to address emerging challenges. Proactive responses to changing circumstances are facilitated through regular review meetings and dashboards, ensuring that JCO remains agile and focused on achieving results for children.

EQ1.1 - The extent to which data collection tools and methods are suitable and reliable.

Efforts to strengthen data collection tools and methods are ongoing, while manual data collection methods are still applied. There is a recognised need to improve monitoring tools, outcome-level measurement, and digitisation of data collection processes to improve data reliability and timeliness.

EQ1.2 - The extent to which adequate data collection mechanisms exist to measure progress in cross-cutting priorities.

Beyond the lack of disaggregated data, limited quality assurance mechanisms for partner data pose challenges in accurately measuring progress on cross-cutting priorities. Efforts to better include gender, disability, climate change, SBC and PSEA in programme planning are ongoing, but further capacity development and systematic approaches are needed, including the establishment of policies, guidelines, and data collection mechanisms aligned with inclusive targets and cross-cutting priorities. Strategies aim at strengthening data collection, engaging stakeholders, and improving monitoring guides to ensure representation of vulnerable populations and outcomes related to cross-cutting priorities. Some of JCO's partners (government and CSOs) are lagging behind regarding the implementation of adequate data collection to improve measuring progress of cross-cutting priorities.

EQ1.1 - Assessment of consistency, accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of data in terms of collecting and reporting (inclusive of partner data).

The assessment reveals ongoing difficulties in collecting and reporting accurate and timely data, especially when involving partner. Bureaucratic processes and ministerial approval requirements cause delays in government data reporting. Despite efforts to improve, challenges persist in meeting reporting requirements due to data availability issues. This discloses room for improvements related to capacity development, system enhancements, and better collaboration with partners.

The **Planning, Monitoring and Research (PMR) Section** is the entity **responsible to fulfil the monitoring function** under the CPD. It comprises seven **staff** inclusive of two national UN volunteers (UNV). The section is working with three **online-based systems**: RAM (Result Assessment Module) for output and outcome monitoring, VISION (for programme structure and transaction processing), and eTools for partnership management. The systems are interlinked, and a virtual tour provided to the EA team and interviewee's elaborations suggests that their structure is clear (INT_19, 4, 6, 1, 20).

The **monitoring system** of the JCO is **based on planning and measuring performance through key indicators and targets**. Key performance indicators on programme delivery are reviewed **monthly** at **Country Management Team (CMT)** meetings and **dashboards are used to track** resource allocation and spending across departments, but also quality assurance, and risk assessment.

Monitoring is seen as an integral part of programming, which is done on regular basis with regular field visits, progress review meetings combined with quarterly review and joint progress annual review meetings with partners, like allied ministries and civil society partners. At annual review meetings, the involved parties critically look at the thematic programme indicators, their achievements, and the gaps. They discuss new plans and how to address the concerns in a timely manner with the given funding (INT_2, 6).

The CPD is implemented through programme rationale notes, work plans and other programme documents which are developed jointly by **UNICEF and Government and CSO**

partners, respectively, and are accompanied by the results framework, indicating progress monitoring in terms of achievement of agreed targets.

The **PMR section coordinates and leads the monitoring process**, provides guidance, templates and frameworks, and manages end-of-year reporting. Standard processes for monitoring are targeted, including monthly review meetings with partners and Government, mid-year and end-of-year reviews, and feedback mechanisms from beneficiaries to address concerns in a timely manner (e.g., in the WASH sector per camp, where complaint mechanisms exist through which users can report issues with the provision of services which will then be verified and addressed.) (INT_6, 10).

Monitoring systems to document progress towards programme outcomes are sophisticated and comprehensive (e.g. see Bayanati). The online-based RAM system is used to monitor the CSI outputs and outcomes. At the same time, it is difficult to produce an objective assessment of the CSIs and their data points, which are also used to monitor output-level indicators. While the **breadth of monitoring activities is satisfactory**, there is a **need for deeper analysis of monitoring data** to understand the underlying factors that affect results. Challenges exist in data collection and reporting due to somewhat inadequate outcome and measurement frameworks. For example, some partners find it difficult to fit their data into JCO's standard reporting formats, they mostly use their own templates for reporting and some do not have digitalised workflows i.e., they are likely to carry out monitoring and reporting tasks manually (INT_6, 13). Efforts have been made in planning and implementing capacity development workshops and trainings for partners to address the capacity issues and the gaps in data quality, timeliness and completeness of the collected data. Also investments have been made to **increase capacity in the PMR section, including hiring more field monitors and improving templates for field visits**. In addition, efforts will be made to harmonise monitoring tools across sectors in order to streamline monitoring activities (INT_5, 9). Quality assurance measures will be implemented to ensure the reliability of monitoring data (INT_6, 8).

The evaluability assessment reveals **varying degrees of integration of monitoring systems into programme management**. In some areas the EA identified a strong integration and systematic approaches of monitoring reporting workflows. There is a seamless integration of monitoring into the results framework and annual work plans of each section, where measures and methods for monitoring are explicitly outlined, and ensures that monitoring data is used to improve and adapt the programme. Monitoring tools are also integrated into the simplification process, allowing partners to submit documentation online. They also allow tracking of financial data alongside programme indicators, ensuring comprehensive reporting and accountability (INT_6, 4).

Risk assessment and monitoring is adequate. It includes tasks such as annual reviews that assess whether objectives have been met, whether spending has been effective, and whether adjustments are needed for future planning, particularly in response to time-sensitive situations such as outbreaks. JCO discusses emerging issues, such as crises and funding challenges, on a weekly basis and takes immediate action to address them. Various platforms and mechanisms are in place to effectively identify and respond to issues affecting programming.

Monthly and weekly meetings, such as Country Management Team (CMT) meetings, focus on key performance indicators related to risk management, budget utilisation and programme

implementation. Dashboards are regularly prepared to highlight areas of concern and to review performance indicators, resource allocation, expenditure and fundraising aspects (INT_2, 6, 1, 19). Appropriate adjustments will be made based on monitoring data, in particular during the planning process for the coming years. Regular risk analysis, including contextual and operational risks, is conducted through platforms such as the Emergency Preparedness Platform and Risk Register Report. The office **continuously tracks and updates risk assessments and adapts programme strategies accordingly**. Mitigation measures are implemented in response to funding shortfalls or changing donor priorities (INT_4, 6, 8, 9).

Risk identification and mitigation is seen as a collaborative effort involving both operational staff and management (INT 4, 9, 14). On risk analysis and mitigation measures, JCO collaborates with partners and various regional country offices which is a priority in order to ensure agile and responsive risk management. There are potential limitations, however, when collecting data from partners, indicating challenges in effective risk monitoring and adapting to changing circumstances due to delays or inconsistencies in availability of partner data (INT_2, 6, 9).

With respect to suitability and reliability of data collection tools and methods it can be summarised that from JCO perspective data collection and monitoring mechanisms are in place, such as the review of quarterly reports from implementing partners to ensure data accuracy and completeness. Data validation is carried out through field visits, regular meetings with government officials and capacity development sessions with implementing partners. Additionally, spot checks, audits and programmatic visits are used to verify information collected from beneficiaries and partners. Some programmes have strong internal data systems that facilitate pre- and post-assessment of skills data (INT_2, 6, 7).

Challenges to data collection relate to data collected from partners. It includes delays and difficulties in obtaining data, indicating potential issues with the reliability and suitability of data collection methods.. Some challenges arise due to the lack of digitisation in data collection processes, leading to manual reporting and potential quality issues. Obtaining data from government sources can be challenging also due to bureaucratic approval processes, since reports often undergo multiple levels of approval before being released, leading to delays in receiving timely information and in data availability (INT_2, 6, 8, 12).

However, the data collection and reporting mechanisms vary between the government divisions. Administrative systems in certain sectors like health and education have well-established data collection mechanisms, while administrative challenges persist in areas like child protection. For example, health sector assesses campaigns, including immunisation and nutrition campaigns, to evaluate their effectiveness (INT_2, 6).

Interventions are designed to strengthen data collection. The use of technology to automate processes and engage with partners electronically is seen as an effort to improve the reliability and appropriateness of data collection methods. The capacity building of government staff in terms data collection turned out to be challenging (INT_4, 6).

Mechanisms to collect data on cross-cutting priorities are not yet adequate, but there is a demand for improvement in data collection methods, capacity development and integration across thematic sectors for JCO to effectively measure progress in these areas. For reasons of the limited quality assurance mechanisms for partner data, the EA team identifies potential

challenges in accurately measuring progress on cross-cutting priorities. There are challenges in collecting data at the outcome level, particularly for progress tracking at annual basis, and when it requires data at the household level like DHS which is only available every five years. This is beyond UNICEF's control, however, it hampers results-oriented monitoring and is problematic for the evaluability of the CPD as data to track outcome achievement will not be available for a CPE before 2028. (INT_6, 9, 14).

Government partner data is reasonably available with reliance on administrative data and on periodic surveys such as DHS and Censuses, although challenges exist in collecting certain types of data but due to the five-year cycle and the year-lasting publication process it is only available in year two and after the end of the CPE. Collaboration with government agencies and Department of Statistics is emphasised to ensure systematic data collection, with data used to inform program planning and monitoring including usability for cross-cutting priorities (INT_8, 13).

Efforts are made to ensure the inclusion of cross-cutting themes such as gender, disability, and climate into programme planning and implementation. PMR does reviews jointly with partners as well as internally in UNICEF where achievements of the various targets are reviewed, including cross-cutting elements. Cross-cutting specialists observe and provide quality assurance throughout the whole process. SBC and PSEA have not yet full attention in programming. Ideally, they would be included in a ToC and the mainstreaming should be operationalised in the result framework to adequately address more prominently these topics. Specialists jointly with sections and PRM must ensure that specific strategies, action plans, guidelines and data collection mechanisms, and M&E systems and data are strengthened and in place within each outcome and output to directly tackle these cross-cutting issues.

Interventions **aim at strengthening data collection and capacity development to ensure the collection of disaggregated data** relevant to cross-cutting themes (INT_3, 6, 9). Strategies focus on engaging stakeholders and creating space for gender-responsive, disability-inclusive, climate change resilient and nationality or status equity themes within programmes. Moreover, room for improvement exists with regard to monitoring guides and checklists that need to be adapted to ensure the representation of vulnerable populations and the measurement of outcomes related to each cross-cutting priority (INT_4, 10, 12). Suggestions include also a more integrated approach to knowledge management and the establishment of cross-cutting focal points to facilitate cross-sectoral cooperation and integration.

As already mentioned, there are challenges with regard of **quality and timeliness of partner data**, which indicate potential issues regarding the **consistency, accuracy, completeness and timeliness of data in terms of collecting and reporting** (INT_6, 9). Government reports and data are often subject to delays due to bureaucratic processes and layers of approval, resulting in data not being available in a timely manner. For instance, quarterly progress reports from government sources are often received late, sometimes in the middle or third week of the following month. Despite long-standing cooperation with the partners, especially ministries, and due to limited quality assurance mechanisms for partner data, the challenges in obtaining timely data from partners persist (INT_2, 6, 7, 14).

Data availability varies across sectors of the government. A key challenge is that some sectors rely on periodic surveys such as the DHS, which is not helpful for annual monitoring as data is only available every five years, Furthermore, reliance on multiple sources and triangulation of information is sometimes necessary to verify the accuracy of data reported by partners. Challenges in obtaining data from some partners require significant efforts to ensure data accuracy and completeness (INT_4, 6, 8, 9).

Data quality and completeness as well as disaggregation also represent an issue, especially when relying on partner data (INT_6, 9). As some partners face difficulties in providing data of good quality in due time, significant follow-up and capacity development efforts are often required (INT_6, 9). Efforts have been made to strengthen data collection systems, automate processes, and improve data retrieval mechanisms, but challenges remain in ensuring data reliability and usability (INT_4, 6, 8, 13). The quality of reporting by some partners is weak due to limited capacity.

4.3. EVALUATION FUNCTION OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME

Summary Box

EQ1.1 - Assessment of adequacy and sufficiency of evaluation system and the degree of its integration into programme management.

The evaluation function has been considerably uplifted since the previous CP and is at large adequate: With the new position of an evaluation specialist, accountability was structurally improved by separating the evaluation function from the programme section and PMR. Incoming expertise was used to align JCOs tools and procedures with UNICEF's evaluation policy and good evaluative practice while at the same time ensuring stronger buy-in of stakeholders throughout the entire evaluation process. However, room for improvement remains with respect to adequacy of timelines.

Integration into programme management is ensured by continuous follow-up of the implementation state of management responses, and by anchoring of evaluation as item on the agenda of monthly country management team meetings and management dashboards.

In 2023 UNICEF has released its revised evaluation policy and a theory of change for its evaluation function. The guiding documents display amongst others evaluation goals, key procedures, resource requirements and an implementation note towards its Vision 2030: "UNICEF and partners consistently leverage rigorous, strategically, prioritised evaluative evidence to realise the rights of every child in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals and the Decade of Action." (UNICEF, 2023). To strive towards this vision, **JCO has undertaken** with the current country programme a couple of **measures to uplift its evaluation function**.

With respect to human resources, the **position of an evaluation specialist** (P4-level) under the office of the representative was introduced. Interviewees confirmed that this strengthened the evaluative capacity in JCO tremendously (INT_14, 20, 6, 4, 1, 10, 9). The evaluative capacity in JCO was assessed as relatively better-off in comparison to other country offices in the region without an evaluation specialist, this is also reflected by a relatively high number of evaluations scheduled (INT_14, 12, 1).

The new position of an evaluation specialist in JCO led to a **separation of the evaluation function from the programme section and PMR**, and thus enhance accountability by demonstrating better compliance with UNEG norm 4 Independence (UNEG, 2016). Some interviewees elaborated that this reduces the potential of conflict of interest as reporting lines of the evaluation specialist and staff of the programme sections differ (INT_14, 9).

A practical implication of this modification of the JCO organogram is, that commissioning and managing of evaluations are no more resting with different individuals from the programme sections but are completely under the responsibility of the evaluation specialist. This is regarded as efficiency boost and one **determinant for better harmonisation** of evaluations by the EA team and was highlighted by many interviewees (INT_1, 4, 6, 20, 18).

Adequacy against and compliance with UNICEF's revised evaluation policy is further addressed by introducing new **tools and processes** for JCO's evaluation function (INT 20, 18, 4). The evaluation specialist developed the UNICEF Jordan Evaluation Theory of Change 2023-2027 and a road map for the evaluation journey, with key steps, roles, and responsibilities. In this regard, protocols for commissioning, managing, and supporting evaluations were developed **in line with good evaluative practice**. New elements, for example, are that each evaluation undergoes an internal evaluability assessment before final commissioning and that evaluation users and stakeholders are heard in the course of a co-creation process for ToR development and initial reconstruction of the ToC. Many interviewees expressed their satisfaction with and the benefits of these developments (INT_9, 4, 20, 1, 14).

A yearly **evaluation plan** for 2023-2024 exists and provides a timeline for seven scheduled evaluations (inclusive of this EA) in the given timeframe. General elaborations to ensure high quality evaluations as well as broad dissemination and use are captured in an **evaluation action plan** while risks have been identified and mitigation measures developed. At large **modifications are expected to improve evaluation capacity** within the CP. After the first year of the programme, two evaluations have been completed and management responses are in preparation, another three assignments are on-going (inclusive of this EA) (annual report, 2023).

So far **some but no serious delays** were accumulated. The EA team regards the **average timeline** as partially ambitious, and thus **as plausible driver of delay**. While on average the entire evaluation process is scheduled for 15-16 months comprising preparation, procurement, inception, data collection, reporting, dissemination, and management response, net time for the evaluation teams sums up to 8-9 months. The EA team regards this from experience as too ambitious, anticipating time requirements for feedback loops and approval, as well as limited availability of stakeholders due to seasonal breaks. The two months allocated for inception (including kick-off) are regarded as particularly short. Thus, average timelines remain room for improvement.

The integration of the evaluation function and evaluation results into programme management is institutionalised by an agenda item of the monthly country management team meeting. Monthly management dashboard wrap-up the state of planned, on-going and completed evaluations.

Every evaluation is closed with a management response deriving actions to address evidence-based recommendations. According to the annual report 2023, three new evaluation management responses were launched, and eight evaluation management responses were quarterly updated according to the state of implemented actions. Although 100% of the actions have been completed

or are underway, programme reprioritisation and funding constraints resulted in cancellation of some management response actions. In line with the perception of several interviewees (INT_6, 4, 1, 9), integration of the evaluation function into programme management is assessed as good.

5. OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS TO ENSURE EVALUABILITY (EQ 1.3.)

5.1. HUMAN RESOURCES OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME

Summary Box

EQ 1.3 - The extent to which the skills of the workforce align with monitoring and evaluation requirements (i.e. clear responsibilities, understanding of tasks and periodicities).

The skills of the workforce align well with monitoring and evaluation requirements. While the workforce in the field of monitoring is with some exceptions regarded as sufficient, it is questionable whether a single evaluation specialist is sufficient. The learning and development strategy ensures that results-based monitoring (RBM) is widely anchored and refreshed among CPE staff. Although at management level no major challenges were identified, suggesting clarity of tasks and labour division, some concerns were raised that the given monitoring resources limit the number of field visits which in turn threatens optimal fulfilment of monitoring requirements.

Under the new CPE a people strategy aligned with UNICEF's OneHR strategy was developed. The staffing structure from the old CPE remained at large the same, with the important difference of introducing a P4-level position for an evaluation specialist. By the time of the evaluability assessment all positions were filled and interviewees across programme sections, PMR and senior management level reported **no major lacks with respect to the workforce and their skill in the field of monitoring and evaluation** (INT_4, 6, 9, 8, 2).

Despite acknowledging being better-off than other country offices in the region, without further support **a single evaluation specialist was deemed as insufficient** by some interviewees (INT_1, 14, 6). Particularly, given the short timeline per evaluation and the number of evaluations scheduled in the costed evaluation plan, the EA team shares this concern.

Based on a needs assessment prior to the CP a lack of evaluative capacity and room for improvement of monitoring skills were identified. **Evaluative capacity came in with the skills and expertise of the new specialist** which was in several interviews highly appreciated (INT_4, 6, 1, 9). Further, **results-based management (RBM) and M&E capacity needs** were anchored as a **key pillar in the newly developed learning and development strategy** and have also been appreciated among different interviewees (INT_19, 6, 4, 1). Accordingly, **new staff members receive a full RBM training and others get refreshers**.

Monitoring is implemented at different levels and anchored in the job descriptions. First, there is the **PMR section** comprising nine staff and in charge of satisfying the monitoring, planning and research needs at **CP-level**. The compile for example the monthly dashboard to inform the country management meetings. Second, there are the **six thematic sections** which each conduct **monitoring for their interventions**. Due to resource constraint the EA team was not able to delve deeper into monitoring on the ground. **Key informant interviews** with the section chiefs, PMR and HR staff did, however, **not provide hints on unclear responsibilities or limited**

understanding of task (INT_8, 2, 9, 7, 13, 5). Yet, a single voice claimed not being aware about exact division of monitoring responsibilities among the different levels.

Nevertheless, **some interviewees were concerned** that the number of spot visits to verify reliability and accuracy of data was not sufficient (INT_12, 19) which tends to be the case in many country offices. They elaborated that the **given monitoring resources limit the number of field visits** which in turn hampers optimal fulfilling of monitoring requirements.

5.2. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Summary Box

EQ1.3 - The extent to which the financial resources and budgetary allocations are adequate to ensure a high-quality evaluation.

The financial resources allocated to evaluations are just about a third of UNICEF's spending goal and thus at large not yet adequate. The budget allocation of for the CPE with 200,000 USD is in relation to thematic section evaluations (range between 100,000 and 300,000 USD) rather low. Also, in absolute terms the budget is assessed as rather low against the broad skillset required with expertise covering all thematic sections and all cross-cutting priorities. This is particularly the case given the limitations with regard to sequencing of thematic section evaluations, which are partly scheduled in parallel or after the CPE negatively affecting their value for money. In light of budget cuts, reprioritisations are likely and affect the adequacy of budget allocations in the costed evaluation plan. There is room for agile management of evaluation budgets.

With respect to **financial resources**, UNICEF's revised evaluation policy clearly emphasises the **1%-spending goal**. A yearly forecast for **2023** expected funding of 0.46% only, **clearly lagging behind** UNICEF's goal. Put differently, the gap between ideal spending of 899,810 USD and expected actual funding of 413,912 USD was forecasted 485,898 USD. Several interviewees reflected that this tends to be the case in many countries, particularly if the respective country programmes possess a relatively large budget like JCO (INT_14, 1, 4, 12). Due to delays of one on-going evaluation, an unsuccessful procurement process for another assignment, and postponing of one evaluation to 2024, actual spending was even only at 0.32% and, thus, just about a third against the global goal and about two thirds against expected funding (0.46%). Given UNICEF evaluation policy the financial resources used for evaluation are after year one of the CPE not on track.

Looking at the total expected budget of 280,466,000 USD (exclusive of expected emergency funding) for the entire CPD and the total evaluation cost budgeted (inclusive staff cost) of 4,382,585 USD financial resources would clearly exceed the 1%-spending goal amounting to roughly 1.5%. This forecast is, however, weak. Anticipating emergency funding of 250,000,000 USD, the share would dramatically reduce to 0.1%. In the light of the global funding crises JCO experienced already in year 1 a funding deficit of 16% and several interviewees projected that funding goes further down (Int_8, 3, 1, 6), some assuming even by 40%. Taken this trend into consideration, the set evaluation budget moves closer to the 1%-spending goal. However, the EA team is rather concerned that the evaluation budget might be proportionally reduced in relation

to the funding gap. Thus, there is **need to closely monitor budget trends and actual spending for evaluations** to allow **adaptations of the costed evaluation plan if required**.

A **review of the budget allocation** in the costed evaluation plan reveals that **resources for the CPE are not considerably higher than those for thematic section evaluations**. At a first view, this comes as a surprise as the CPE is expected to analyse all thematic sections. One rationale behind is that thematic section evaluations can lay the foundation for the CPE. In such case less budget would be required as synergies from the thematic section evaluations reduce data collection efforts. This assumption is, however, weak as according to the evaluation plan, the scheduling does not occur in such sequence. Thus, the **planned budget for the CPE, 200,000 USD** is assessed as **rather low in relation to thematic evaluations** with a budget range from 100,000 to 300,000 USD. Similar-sized country offices in UNICEF, however, seem to allocate a comparable budget for the CPE

In addition, the **CPE budget is assessed as rather low against the human resource needs** for the external CPE evaluation team. In interviews it was expressed that specific thematic expertise for each section and on the cross-cutting priorities would be required to generate value addition of a CPE evaluation (INT_5, 10). This would be even more important if the external CPE evaluation team could not rely on insiders from the section evaluations due to weak sequencing. Thus, there is room for improvement, while sequencing of evaluations and resource endowment of the CPE are influencing each other.

Finally, **in light of budget cuts for the CP, a reprioritisation to adapt to reduced funding is likely**. The relation of earmarked funds per thematic section might result in shifting priorities. In such scenario, earlier identified evaluations might gain either more or less attention at CP level. This, in turn is **expected to affect value-for-money and usefulness** of single evaluations for the CPE. Together with sequencing, this ultimately affects the budget requirements for the CPE, depending on information needs, availability of evaluative evidence for the CPE and emanating expertise required for the CPE team. The **adequacy of budget allocations is thus expected to vary over time**. By the time of the EA the budget allocation is rather not adequate to ensure a high-quality evaluation.

5.3. TECHNOLOGICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Summary Box

EQ 1.3 - Assessment of adequacy and functionality of the current technological infrastructure with respect to continuous programme monitoring. (methodological quality of M&E systems to be assessed under EQ1.1)

Adequate technological infrastructure is available and functional.

JCO uses global systems of UNICEF (RAM, VISION, and e-Tools) and own systems at country level (INT_16, 17). The government feeds data into the CRAVE system (Country Report and Validation Exercise). Furthermore, sharepoint is used. The EA team did not come across complaints regarding the technological infrastructure (INT_4, 16, 17, 6). Perception of interoperability of systems and tools used slightly vary, while some interviewees are fully satisfied other identified

room for improvement towards a higher degree of interoperability. Beyond this general assessment, no specific suggestions were shared with the EA team. This suggests at least satisfactory functionality of the current technological infrastructure, which is running stable for two years.

5.4. INTEGRATION OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS AND DATA AT MANAGERIAL LEVEL

Summary Box

EQ1.3 - Assessment of how well different systems (financial, human resources, etc.) integrate with each other (and across programme sections) and how accurate and timely reports are generated from the systems.

The integration and accuracy of different systems within JCO and the timeliness of generated reports are not feasible without further endeavours. Efforts are underway to integrate systems and improve accuracy of reports. The assessment reveals broad recognition of the need for improved integration among different systems, particularly in terms of knowledge management, but also the importance of integrating systems across thematic sectors through collaborative efforts by identifying entry points for alignment and develop the capacity of professionals to support multisectoral approaches.

Systems, including ePD and E-tools, exist which are linked, allowing data to be shared and used across different stages and thematic programmes. However, there are **still gaps** regarding interoperability, with some systems not communicating effectively with each other. This creates challenges in generating and comparing data across systems (INT_2, 4, 17, 19).

Efforts have been made to embed tools in the simplification process for online submissions, like facilitating financial assurance and reporting through the HACT framework. A unit is responsible for developing monitoring tools, demonstrating a structured approach to the use of technology (INT_4, INT_8).

The assessment shows that the unit has made significant **progress in integrating different systems, particularly through the establishment of a dedicated knowledge management operations section.** This section focuses on analysing data and distilling learning from evidence more effectively than before. This initiative is unique within the organisation and demonstrates a commitment to driving the knowledge management agenda. While **integration efforts exist**, they **differ across different parts of JCO** based on available resources and priorities which vary among thematic sections. **Currently, data collection structures are observed to be siloed across program sections**, hindering the ability to have an integrated programme response. There is a suggestion to have cross-cutting focal points for knowledge management to facilitate the integration of information from various sectors. This integrated approach is seen as more effective in addressing programmatic challenges compared to a siloed approach (INT_4, 9, 19).

The **importance of multi-sectoral approaches is recognised**, particularly aiming at **identification of entry points for greater alignment with outcomes from other sectors.** For example, in education, efforts are being made to align with social policies on cash transfers, while in health, collaboration is being sought to use public health systems to identify cases of violence in family settings. Collaboration to improve alignment across sectors includes working with

educators, social policy experts, health professionals and other stakeholders to identify synergies and support multi-sectoral objectives.

5.5. FRAMEWORK CONDITIONS FOR THE CPE

Summary Box

EQ1.3 - The extent to which sufficient time (remote and in country) and adequate timing is scheduled for the evaluation.

The timeline for the CP evaluation (CPE) is assumed to be challenging and the timing is of concern. Scheduled in 2026 the CPE will come too late to allow formative, evidence-based planning of the next CPE and too early for a summative results assessment when to CP has not yet ended.

EQ1.3 - The extent to which barriers threaten timely and effective evaluation (i.e. physical security risks, weather constraints, absence of key stakeholders)

The unavailability of DHS data before 2028, is a barrier threatening the effective evaluation of outcome achievement. Another potential barrier threatening a timely CPE is the volatile security situation in the region, exacerbated by the war in Gaza. It is possible that regional crises may limit stakeholders' attention and capacity to support the CPE.

The analysis revealed that the **framework conditions for the country programme evaluation (CPE) are demanding**. Interviewees assessed the **timeline as challenging**, assuming comparability to the previous CPE (INT_12, 14). A major constraint was the state of data package, arriving late and in an incomplete state. Thus, data access, digging for data and data crunching led to serious delays. Ultimately, the evaluation team ended up with a UNICEF address to access RAM directly. As another constraints the size of the reference group was mentioned, which was reported to be hardly manageable taken three months from submission of the draft report to approval of the final report.

Furthermore, the envisaged **timing of the CPE which is managed by the Regional Office is of concern** (INT_12, 5, 14). Scheduled in 2026, the CPE comes too late to inform planning of the follow-up CPE and thus cannot unfold its full formative potential. Similarly, it would come too early for a robust summative assessment of outcome achievements as many data will be not available by then. Further, exploiting results of evaluations at section level is only to a limited extent possible within the current schedule. According to the costed evaluation plan, currently six evaluations are scheduled after or in parallel with the CPE and will be at different stage during the inception and data collection phase of the CPE. It is not clear whether the external evaluators of the other evaluations can share robust findings to inform the CPE. A lack of sequency was also mentioned as threat towards the previous CPE.

As outcome indicators are grounded on DHS data, which even when bypassing official release, will not earlier available than late 2027, **unavailability of data will pose a key barrier to an effective CPE evaluation** (Int_14, 12). This is aggravated by **losing synergies when the CPE cannot be grounded on** evaluation results and data crunching conducted in the course of sectoral **evaluations** (INT_15, 12). The EA team is well aware that sectoral evaluations, are partially also affected by lack of available data to verify results achievement. However, the challenge is regarded

as less severe, as given comparable total budgets, sectoral evaluations allow a much deeper dive than a CPE considering all sections. In addition, the previous CPE suffered from limited verifiability. The number of field staff was assessed as too low or limited and the number of field visits to verify data, one every three months, as insufficient (Int_12, 14).

Finally, the volatile security situation in the region, currently exacerbated by the war in Gaza, may pose a threat to a timely CPE as stakeholder could lack time resources and attention to support the CPE (INT_9, 6, 4). A crisis situation could further threaten an effective CPE as it may limit free movement of the evaluation team to verify data.

6. SYNTHESIS (EQ 1, EQ2.1)

6.1 ADEQUACY OF SYSTEMS, TOOLS AND DATA FOR MEASURING RESULTS (EQ1.1)

EQ1.1. To what extent the current JCO country programme has adequate approach, systems, tools, data, and evidence (including ToC, logframe, monitoring and evaluation systems) in place and adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of medium and long terms results?

The JCO CP's Theory of Change (ToC) is generally well-defined and thus adequate, with six out of seven outcome statements plausibly linked to the impact statement. (From a methodological stance, it is not plausible that UNICEF HQ opts for an outcome which is solely a marker for CP's design and quality of implementation. OECD-DAC guidance on its evaluation criteria, provides clarity that these aspects are to be assessed under the criteria relevance (for design), coherence (for coordination), and effectiveness (for quality of implementation).

The impact statement lacks focus and is highly aspirational. There is a room for clearer alignment with UNSDCF outcomes and a more specific delineation of UNICEF's contributions. So far, the CP misses the opportunity to underline its unique value addition towards UNSDCF's outcome 2 (i.e. the poorest and all people living in vulnerable situations in Jordan are to be supported based on their needs and human rights and empowered to become self-reliant.) Additionally, gaps are observed in linking outputs to outcomes, indicating a need for more specificity and alignment.

The results framework is deemed incomplete in some thematic areas, such as adolescents & youth, WASH, and social policy & protection. **Outputs do not fully align with outcomes**, hindering effective monitoring and evaluation. In other fields, i.e. health, education, and child protection, outputs are comprehensive and well-aligned with desired outcomes.

Stakeholders within the JCO demonstrate a consistent understanding of the programme's objectives and strategies, indicating a shared vision and purpose among stakeholders involved in programme implementation.

Indicators, CSI, standard and additional, are deemed SMART, allowing for effective tracking of progress towards programme objectives. However, few output indicators lack achievability due to uncertainty of data availability. **While outcome indicators operationalise thematic outcomes defined in the CPD adequately, room for improvement remains at the output level.**

Baseline data exists for all thematic programme outcomes and most output indicators, although inconsistencies and gaps are noted in some cases (15 out of 101 output indicators). Efforts to address these issues are ongoing, with a focus on improving data quality and timeliness.

Despite ambitions in the CPD, **preconditions for more rigorous evaluation have not been undertaken**. This suggests room for further development and implementation of evaluation methodologies to assess programme results effectively.

Established **monitoring processes and mechanisms are in place but are not fully adequate** to overcome data collection challenges and ensure timely reporting, particularly with respect to cross-cutting priorities. Efforts are undertaken to address these challenges through capacity development and quality assurance measures. Integration into programme management is adequate, but improvements can be made in providing cross-sectoral monitoring results and incorporating real-time feedback from beneficiaries.

The monitoring system allows for comprehensive risk monitoring and adaptive management, with regular evaluations and collaborative efforts to address emerging challenges. Proactive responses to changing circumstances are facilitated through regular review meetings and dashboards.

Efforts to strengthen data collection tools and methods are ongoing, with a recognised need to **improve outcome-level measurement and digitisation processes** for enhanced data reliability and timeliness. Challenges persist, especially involving partners. Room for improvement exists in capacity development, system enhancements, and better collaboration with partners.

The evaluation system has been significantly improved, with enhanced accountability and integration into programme management. However, there is room for improvement in terms of evaluation timelines and stakeholder buy-in throughout the evaluation process.

To sum up, the assessment of the JCO country programme's approach, systems, tools, data, and evidence shows a generally clear Theory of Change (ToC), but with some gaps in terms of results specificity and alignment with UNSDCF results. The results framework is comprehensive in some thematic areas but lacks completeness and alignment between outputs and outcomes in others. Monitoring and evaluation systems are adequate but need improvement to overcome data collection challenges and ensure timely reporting. Efforts are underway to improve data reliability, evaluation methodologies and integration into programme management, highlighting areas for further development and refinement.

6.2 ADEQUATE INTEGRATION AND MEASURABILITY OF CROSS-CUTTING PRIORITIES (EQ1.2)

EQ1.2. To what extent cross-cutting priorities and interventions (gender, disability, climate change and equity) are meaningfully integrated and will be measurable?

The integration of cross-cutting priorities in the ToC (i.e. at output and outcome level) is adequate for the cross-cutting priority gender equality. However, there is room for more robust alignment to UNICEF's corporate position on gender responsive and/or gender transformative results. The cross-cutting priorities inclusion of people with disabilities

social behaviour change, protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, and social equity are incorporated in the ToC, while there is room for more prominent mainstreaming. However, for the cross-cutting priority of climate change adaptation and mitigation this is not the case. An additional challenge is that the impact statement suggests a strong focus on climate aspects, which is not reflected at the outcome level.

Specific outcome indicators exist for each cross-cutting priority, but these are not included in the results framework. The cross-cutting priorities are partially embedded in outcome and output indicators. The number of available stand-alone indicators and the extent to which cross-cutting priorities are reflected in outcome and output indicators varies among themes.

Indicators related to cross-cutting priorities are considered SMART. Indicators addressing gender equality by sex-disaggregation only are most prevalent, followed by indicators related to social behaviour change (SBC) and inclusion of people with disabilities. Specific indicators (at a programme level, not section) related to climate change adaptation and mitigation (H1.1b and E3.6b), social equity (CSI 3.3.2), and protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) (E3.5) are rather rare.

With regard to measurability and tracking of outcomes related to cross-cutting priorities, the picture is mixed. Concerning gender equality, a JCO Gender Action Plan exists and provides adequate guidance. This is **expected** to support **measurability and tracking of gender-specific programme outcomes.** Yet, synchronisation with tools and guidance by the Gender Programmatic Review (GPR) Toolkit to facilitate UNICEF's corporate position towards gender-responsiveness as minimum benchmark, is not yet given.

JCO did not yet carry out a GPR for the current CPD. A GPR would have been useful at design stage, and its recommendations should have been incorporated into all relevant programme planning documents e.g., CPD, Strategic Notes, and Country Programme Management Plan (CPMP). Without a GPR key components are missing to guide JCO in conducting a comprehensive review of gender programming within its country context and to develop effective strategies promoting gender equality. A GPR is planned as part of the mid-term review (MTR) to meet UNICEF's requirement of conducting one throughout the programme cycle.

Moreover, the **current CP lacks robust mechanisms tailored to the other cross-cutting priorities to ensure accurate measurement** of its performance regarding the inclusion of persons with disabilities, climate change adaptation and mitigation, social equity, SBC and PSEA.

Baseline data for cross-cutting priorities is rarely, and if available related to sex rather than gender equality. Out of 127 outcome and output indicators for which the existence of baseline data is plausible, 38 cases refer to disaggregated data at baseline and endline. However, for only nine indicators (out of 38) sex-disaggregated baseline data is available highlighting a miss match between envisaged results and pronounced measurability of progress. Beyond the lack of disaggregated data, **limited quality assurance mechanisms for partner data pose further challenges in accurately measuring progress on cross-cutting priorities.** Efforts to better include gender, disability, SBC, PSEA, and climate change in programme planning are ongoing, but further capacity development and systematic approaches are needed, including the establishment of policies, guidelines, and data collection mechanisms aligned with inclusive targets and cross-cutting priorities. Solely for gender equality JCO Gender Action Plan provides guidance. **JCO is still**

lagging behind regarding the implementation of adequate data collection mechanisms to improve measuring progress of cross-cutting priorities.

To sum up, cross-cutting priorities are prominently featured into outcome statements but methodologies, baseline data to assess effectiveness and impact of interventions targeting cross-cutting priorities and adequate data collection mechanisms are missing with the cross-cutting priority gender equality being relatively better off. Measurability to allow results achievement for cross-cutting priorities is currently weak.

6.3 ADEQUACY OF OPERATIONAL FRAME TO ENSURE EVALUABILITY (EQ1.3)

EQ1.3. To what extent are the financial, human resources, systems and document management tools in place, adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of country programme efficiency?

Financial resources and budget allocations are not yet sufficient to ensure high quality CPE.

At present, the financial resources of the CP dedicated to evaluation are only about one third of UNICEF's 1% spending target. This is significant as expenditure determines the level of evidence generated during programme implementation that can later be used to inform the CPE. The budget allocation of USD 200,000 for CPE is rather low compared to thematic section evaluations (range: USD 100,000 - 300,000). Also in absolute terms, the proposed CPE budget is considered rather low in relation to the broad range of skills required, with expertise covering all thematic sections and cross-cutting priorities. This is exacerbated by the constraints on the sequencing of thematic section evaluations, some of which are planned in parallel with or after the CPE, thus preventing their usability for the CPE. In the context of projected budget cuts, reprioritisation is likely to further challenge the adequacy of budget allocations in the costed evaluation plan. There is room for agile management of evaluation budgets.

Human resources are largely satisfactory and supportive for a CPE, which is managed by the Regional Office. The skills of the workforce are well aligned with the requirements of monitoring and evaluation. They are expected to lay the foundations for a high-quality CPE by ensuring sound packages of monitoring data for the CPE team and by managing evaluation processes of earlier evaluations well to expand the evidence base for the CPE.

The JCO's learning and development strategy ensures that results-based monitoring (RBM) is widely embedded and refreshed among CP staff. The EA suggests clarity of tasks and division of labour. In general, with some exceptions, monitoring staffing levels are considered sufficient. Single concerns have been raised about the limited number of field visits to validate data, which threatens the optimal fulfilment of monitoring requirements – an observation which is not unique to JCO and associated to limited resources. On a different note, relying solely on a single evaluation specialist to bring valuable expertise and the required evaluation resources to the CP poses significant challenges. Tasks such as thorough planning, including the design of evaluation methodologies; coordination, ensuring diverse perspectives and comprehensive coverage of evaluation components; facilitating stakeholder engagement by aligning evaluation objectives with stakeholder needs; and overseeing data collection and analysis, ensuring quality and adherence to ethical standards are demanding and time critical. Thus, hiring additional staff to support the evaluation specialist in her preparatory role is essential to improve the readiness of the evaluation team and ultimately support a robust and effective country programme evaluation.

The current technological infrastructure with respect to continuous programme monitoring is assessed as adequate and functional. To allow the external CPE team exploiting data from different system (RAM, Vision, e-Tools) an UNICEF email address would, however, be required. Different data and documents reviewed during the EA revealed some inconsistencies. Accuracy of stored data, particularly avoiding multiple versions with varying figures leave room for improvement.

Efforts are underway to **integrate different systems (financial, human resources, etc.) and improve report accuracy.** The assessment reveals broad recognition of the need for improved integration among different systems, particularly in terms of knowledge management, but also the importance of integrating systems across thematic sectors through collaborative efforts by identifying entry points for alignment and capacity develop of professionals to support multisectoral approaches.

Expected CPE timing and timeframe is currently inadequate and of concern. Scheduled in 2026, the CPE will come too late to allow formative, evidence-based planning of the next CPE and too early for a summative results assessment when to CP has not yet ended. An assumed net time of 9 months for the CPE (exclusive of preparation, procurement, and management response by JCO) is from experience too ambitious, anticipating time requirements for feedback looks, seasonal breaks and sickness-induced delays.

Other barriers threatening a timely and effective CPE are: (1) unavailability of DHS data to meaningfully evaluate outcome achievement before 2028, (2) losing synergies when the CPE cannot be grounded on evaluation results and data crunching conducted in the course of sectoral evaluations and (3) the volatile security situation in the region, exacerbated by the war in Gaza which may limit stakeholders' attention and capacity to support the CPE.

Taken together, the operational framework conditions to ensure a meaningful CPE are currently only to some extent adequate.

6.4. POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS AFFECTING THE FEASIBILITY OF THE CPE

2.2 What programmatic, technical, human, and financial resource improvements should be made to ensure the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the country offices' medium- and long-term results?

The CPE must attain to the OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability).

With respect to **assessability of the criteria relevance and coherence** the EA did **not reveal major constraints.** Secondary documents and data to provide a valid assessment are comprehensively available and primary data can be easily conducted. **A minor limitation** which may threaten a comprehensive assessment is the short timeline to deliver the CPE which may negatively affect the volume of primary data collection (here: key informant interviews with a wide range of stakeholders) due to time constraints for remote and onsite data collection.

With regard to **assessability of the criteria effectiveness and impact** the EA identified **several limiting factors** for the CPE.

- ❖ Following the envisaged timing of the CPE, measuring results achievement at outcome level will not be possible due to missing DHS data.
- ❖ The incomplete results framework poses limitations to a comprehensive contribution analysis to assess the plausibility of result paths.
- ❖ For some outputs results achievement cannot be measured given the absence of baseline data.
- ❖ As of CP year one, disaggregated data is only available for nine out of 38 output indicators tackling cross-cutting priorities and mainly refers to sex-disaggregation, thus counting numbers but hardly measuring progress towards gender equality on the gender continuum. This prevents a valid assessment of results related to gender equality.
- ❖ As of CP year one, a lack of disaggregated data for inclusion of persons with disability, social equity, social behaviour change (SBC), prevention from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), and climate mitigation and adaptation prohibits a sound assessment in this regard.
- ❖ The aspirational alignment of the CP with UNSDCF goals hampers a sound assessment of CP's tangible contributions. Instead of clear causal linkages according to UNICEF's strength and backed-by evidence, a normative relationship must be explored against large data gaps.
- ❖ As a consequence of the planned sequencing as displayed in the costed evaluation plan at hand, less evaluative evidence will be available to serve as data source for the CPE. This limits exploitation of synergies and thus, reduces expected value-for-money while increasing inefficiencies related to data collection and analysis.

With respect to **assessability of the criterion efficiency some limitation** is expected.

- ❖ For an efficiency analysis, output and outcome achievements must be set into relation to CP funding, therefore earlier-mentioned limitations in this regard apply.
- ❖ Without granting a UNICEF email address to the CPE team, integrated systems cannot be adequately explored to conduct sound follow-the-money assessments.

With respect to the assessability of the criterion sustainability the EA did not suggest major limitations. A **minor limitation** refers again to the timing of CPE, which might be rather early to assess sustainability. Further, minor limitations raised on the criteria relevance and coherence apply accordingly.

Finally, some additional limitation may arise from further unfavourable framework conditions:

- ❖ The volatile security situation in the region may pose limits to the evaluability as it could distract stakeholders' attention and reduce their resources to support the CPE. Further, it may compromise availability of comprehensive monitoring data and the freedom to move for conducting site visits for data verification and for collecting independent primary data.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (EQ2.2)

2.2 What programmatic, technical, human, and financial resource improvements should be made to ensure the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the country offices' medium- and long-term results?

Conclusion 1: From a programmatic stance, the ToC of the country programme is generally well-defined but lacks strategic focus and suffers from too aspirational outcome and impact statements and some gaps at output level. This drives incompleteness of the results framework where high and far-reaching ambitions cannot always be plausibly derived from lower-level results. Although, outcome and output indicators are SMART, for few output indicators there is uncertainty of data availability and room for improved operationalisation remains.

Conclusion 2: With respect to cross-cutting priorities, gender equality, the inclusion of people with disabilities, social behaviour change (SBC), protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), and social equity are featured in the result statements of the ToC (i.e. at output and outcome level) but leave room for more prominent mainstreaming. Despite gender equality, being at the forefront, there is room for more robust alignment to UNICEF's corporate position on gender responsive and/or gender transformative results.

UNICEF Jordan's programme demonstrates a commitment to addressing climate, environment, energy, and disaster risk reduction (CEED) priorities, especially in the WASH section, but improvements can be made. Adherence to the JCO Climate Strategy objectives, i.e., integrating CEED considerations across all outcomes, implementing regular monitoring and evaluation, and ensuring long-term sustainability are crucial and needed.

The country programme demonstrates integration of PSEA-elements (outcome 3, 4 and 6) related to child protection and well-being, including aspects relevant to addressing sexual exploitation and abuse. However, the PSEA has not been explicitly addressed in the result framework. Direct interventions at the community level (such as awareness campaigns, survivor support services, and establishment of reporting mechanisms) and reliable monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that could strengthen the program's approach to combating sexual exploitation and abuse are missing.

The outputs and outcomes of the CP demonstrate a recognition of the importance of social behaviour change (SBC) in addressing the needs of vulnerable children and adolescents across sectors. The intention to promote behaviour change through capacity building, community engagement and knowledge dissemination is evident. However, a key limitation is the lack of specificity regarding the integration of SBC strategies within the outlined outputs. Without explicit SBC strategies, efforts to address critical issues such as health-seeking behaviour, school attendance, violence prevention and environmental behaviour may fall short. The lack of a roadmap for SBC integration risks undermining the intended impact of interventions aimed at promoting behaviour change among vulnerable populations.

Although specific outcome indicators exist for each cross-cutting priority, they are not included in the results framework. SMART indicators related to gender equality refer mainly to sex-disaggregation and are most prevalent, followed by SMART indicators related to SBC and inclusion of people with disabilities. Specific indicators related to climate change adaptation and mitigation (H1.1b and E3.6b), social equity (CSI 3.3.2) and PSEA (E3.5) are very rare.

Recommendations for programmatic improvements by adaptation of the design:

1. The EA team recommends JOC to **revise the ToC** and/or to develop Explanatory Notes to the CPD outcomes by the following means (1) enhance its alignment and strategic

orientation related to UNSDCF's outcome 2 for Jordan, and (2) review identified gaps in the ToC and the results framework and carefully, decide on a case-by-case basis, whether revised results statements at output level or additional indicators at output and outcome level are required to better reflect the nature of the CP. For the design of the next CPD, JCO should further prove whether explicit aspirational references to specific intervention areas (at outcome and impact level) can be operationalised accordingly. If this is not the case it should be withdrawn.

2. The EA suggest further to critically **review each cross-cutting priority** for over- or under-emphasis in the ToC against the nature of the CP and refine according to best conceptual fit. In general, the programme demonstrates a commitment to addressing cross-cutting priorities, but there are opportunities for improvement in ensuring greater integration and coherence across all aspects of the programme. This could include strengthening coordination between stakeholders, improving monitoring and evaluation systems to track progress on cross-cutting priorities, and continuously adapting interventions based on lessons learned and changing needs.

With respect to gender equality, we recommend to use the GPR toolkit to conduct a gender programme review, as it supports the CO in integrating gender into country programmes by analysing gender priorities within the national context and identifying key areas for intervention and root causes of gender inequitable outcomes to inform programmatic responses, but also by identifying gender transformative solutions, developing outputs and indicators to track progress, and documenting the gender strategy and action plan to ensure that gender priorities are effectively integrated into the country programme.

The programme outcomes 5 and 6 and the respective outputs demonstrate a commitment to integrating CEED (Climate, Environment, Energy, and Disaster Risk Reduction) priorities into UNICEF Jordan's work, particularly in areas related to climate resilience, environmental sustainability, and disaster risk reduction. The EA suggests to focus on the defined JCO Climate Strategy objectives and provide guidance on how to mainstream CEED throughout JCO programmes and operations, as well as outline guidance and priorities for each section to make use of in developing their Annual Workplans (AWP) and related interventions during 2023-2027.

The cross-cutting topics of disability inclusion and social equity have the potential to be more incorporated in the programme objectives and interventions. We recommend to the climate and disability specialists to push forward their agenda and develop country strategies and action plans that are achievable and make sure these topics are mainstreamed throughout the sections and are timely integrated in the design of the next CPD.

SBC as a mainstreaming topic is represented cross-sectionally. However, we recommend strengthening the integration of social behaviour change as a mainstream topic within the programme by introducing more SBC-related outputs and indicators that can better address the underlying determinants of health, education, and social protection outcomes for vulnerable children and adolescents in Jordan.

The EA recommends applying the UNICEF CO PSEA Action Plan and the UNICEF PSEA results monitoring framework to the JCO results monitoring framework and to explicitly

incorporate PSEA-specific strategies and measures within the programme design and implementation. This could involve targeted training, awareness campaigns, survivor support services, and mechanisms for reporting and responding to incidents of exploitation and abuse.

Conclusion 3: From a technical perspective, the monitoring system and availability of data is only somewhat adequate and not yet in the position to overcome challenges related to data collection, delayed reporting, and digitisation. Availability of adequate and reliable data is an issue reflected in partly outdated or in some cases missing (baseline) data, in a tremendous lack of disaggregated data related to all cross-cutting priorities, limited means for spot visits and partially weak and/or delayed partner data. Strong features of the monitoring system comprise risk monitoring, its integration into programme management, and continuous learning efforts.

Conclusion 4: The evaluation function is at large adequate and considerably improved under the current CP. Accountability enhanced with the institutional separation from PMR and thematic sections, buy-in of stakeholders was fostered by revised participatory evaluation processes, and integration of the programme management have been strengthened.

Conclusion 5: The evaluation function sets important framework conditions for the CPE which are currently sub-optimal. The costed evaluation plan regulates timing, timeline, sequencing, and resource endowment and the definition of the ToR which set the purpose and scope of evaluative evidence for the CPE.

Recommendations for technical improvements:

3. The EA team recommends continuing efforts for **capacity development inside JCO and among partners** to sensitise for the importance of disaggregated data, to improve the monitoring system and to enhance timely access of reliable monitoring data. In the light of the funding crises, it is highly recommended to refrain from reducing capacity development measures.
4. Upon availability **use of recent DHS data** is recommended to replace inappropriate DHS baseline data from the previous round. Further, inquiries on compilation of proxy data for baseline and updating means of verification according to expected data availability at endline is recommended to prepare the ground for an efficient CPE.
5. The EA team also suggests to **improve mainstreaming of cross-cutting priorities into the monitoring system** and inquire the potential of focal points.
6. It is recommended to improve **evaluative framework conditions** in course of agile adaptation of the costed evaluation plan to: (1) expand the timeline of the CPE (and other evaluations) by 3-6 months to mitigate potential delays; (2) adjust the timeline of the CPE to allow either a stronger formative or summative character of the CPE; (while an ex-post evaluation in 2028 would enable measurement of outcome achievements with DHS data, a formative evaluation in 2025 would be more utilisation-focused); (3) inquire adaptation needs against reprioritisation to attain expected utility, (4) check adjustments of sequencing to maximise the evidence base for the CPE as well as to use synergies to enhance value-for-money; and (5) carefully inquire additional budget given limited resource endowment and wide-ranging expertise requirements of the CPE team, despite CPE-spending of similar-sized Country Offices seems to be comparable.

Conclusion 6: With respect to human resources, well-skilled M&E staff is enrolled as budgeted and expected to create an adequate foundation for the feasibility of the CPE. A learning and development strategy broadly anchors results-based monitoring (RBM) among CP staff. Evaluative expertise largely depends on one individual which potentially marks a bottleneck for timely implementation of evaluative tasks, and establishing a sound evidence base from earlier scheduled evaluations for the CPE evaluation.

Recommendations for human resource-related improvements:

7. The EA team recommends **sustaining the full workforce** in PMR and creatively explore potentials to ensure additional evaluative support if required. Considering persistent challenges, reducing the number of monitoring staff proportionally to expected budget cuts will negatively affect CP evaluability and should be avoided. The EA also recommends considering the recruitment or allocation of additional evaluation specialists to optimise JCO's evaluation efforts.

Conclusion 7: A view at financial resources reveal imbalances at risk to negatively affect the evaluability of the CP. **Evaluation spending** is clearly below UNICEF's 1% spending goal, while evaluative evidence to be generated by evaluative spending is an important data base for the CPE.

Recommendations for finance-related improvements:

8. The EA team recommends strengthening efforts to **increase evaluation funding** to maximise evidence-based insights for programme development and as valuable information source for the CPE. In the light of expected budget cuts, refrain from decreasing evaluation budget.

ANNEX 1: EVALUABILITY MATRIX

Objectives	Evaluation questions	Basis for assessment	Data sources	Data collection and analysis methods, expected limitations
<p>1. Assess the feasibility of the country offices' medium- and long-term results evaluation against OECD criteria.</p> <p>(1.1. and 1.2 refer to OECD-DAC criterion effectiveness, to a lower extent to impact and sustainability</p> <p>1.3 refers to OECD-DAC criterion efficiency</p> <p>OECD-DAC criteria relevance and coherence are not requested in the EQs))</p>	<p>1.1 To what extent the current JCO country programme has adequate approach, systems, tools, data, and evidence (including ToC, logframe, monitoring and evaluation systems) in place and adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of medium and long terms results?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The extent to which the JCO country programme's Theory of Change is clearly defined. - The extent to which the ToC is consistently described across various documents (e.g. CPD, M&E plans, exemplary progress reports) - The extent to which different stakeholders hold the same views about the project objectives and about how objectives will be achieved - The extent to which the results framework is complete, and its components align with programme objectives (i.e. operationalisation). - The extent to which standard and additional indicators are SMART - The extent to which SMART indicators adequately operationalise core programme outcomes - Assessment of adequacy and sufficiency of monitoring and evaluation systems and the degree of their integration into programme management. - The extent to which the monitoring systems allows risk monitoring and adapting to changing circumstances. - The extent to which data collection tools and methods are suitable and reliable. - Assessment of consistency, accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of data in terms of collecting and reporting (inclusive of partner data). - The extent to which baseline data exists - The extent to which preconditions for rigorous impact evaluation have been considered. 	<p>Secondary data sources: CPD Document, Programme ToC, areas ToC (if available), logframe, JCO Monitoring Result Framework, JCO Evaluation Strategy ToC, M&E documents for areas of intervention, UNEG – United Nations Evaluation Group, Norms and Standards for Evaluation, JOC 2023 Annual Management Plan, Programme Rational Notes for each specific section, Virtual tour through M&E systems and tools (i.e. VISION, RAM, eTools), additional documents to be provided: e.g., summary results reports (expected after Jan, 5th), methodology of the indicators</p> <p>Primary data sources: UNICEF staff members of PMR, Evaluation Specialist, Deputy Representatives, Chiefs of the six programme sections, representative of Jordan Department of Statistics (DOS), Regional Evaluation Advisor, the evaluators of the previous CPD.</p>	<p>For secondary data: Desk review, evaluability assessment perception tool, qualitative content analysis and descriptive analysis</p> <p>For primary data: Explorative interviews and semi-structured key informant interviews, qualitative content analysis</p> <p>Limitations: Lack of access to M&E online systems may hampers review of state of monitoring, actual data, and integration into programme management.</p> <p>Mitigation measures: Request downloads from the system by M&E staff.</p>

ANNEX 1: EVALUABILITY MATRIX

Objectives	Evaluation questions	Basis for assessment	Data sources	Data collection and analysis methods, expected limitations
	1.2 To what extent cross-cutting priorities and interventions (gender, disability, climate change and equity) are meaningfully integrated and will be measurable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of adequate integration in the ToC (i.e. output and outcome level) and availability of specific indicators for each cross-cutting priority. - The extent to which (i) gender-sensitive indicators, (ii) indicators related to inclusion of persons with disabilities, (iii) indicators related climate change adaptation and mitigation, and (iv) social equity indicators are SMART and adequately integrated at output and outcome levels (i.e. availability of disaggregated data, baseline data, data from comparison groups). - Assessment of quality of indicators, measurability and tracking of the programme's outcomes related to each cross-cutting priority. - The extent to which adequate data collection mechanisms exist to measure progress in cross-cutting priorities. 	<p>Secondary data sources: Gender Action Plan 2023–2024 Jordan Country Office, July 2023 – Internal paper, Climate Action Strategy Jordan 2022, UNICEF's Gender Action Plan 2022-2025, A Liveable Planet for Every Child – UNICEF's strategy-at-a-Glance for Climate, Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction (2022-2030), UNICEF Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy (DIPAS) 2022-2030, additional documents to be provided: e.g., summary results reports (expected after Jan, 5th), methodology of the indicators.</p> <p>Primary data sources: Chiefs of the six programme sections, PMR staff, Evaluation Specialist, Deputy Representatives, representative of DOS, Regional Evaluation Advisor, the evaluators of the previous CPD.</p>	<p>For secondary data: Desk review, evaluability assessment perception tool, qualitative content analysis and descriptive analysis</p> <p>For primary data: Explorative interviews and semi-structured key informant interviews, qualitative content analysis</p> <p>Limitations: Lack of access to M&E online systems may hamper review of actual evidence related to cross-cutting priorities</p> <p>Mitigation measures: Request downloads from the system by M&E staff.</p>

ANNEX 1: EVALUABILITY MATRIX

Objectives	Evaluation questions	Basis for assessment	Data sources	Data collection and analysis methods, expected limitations
	1.3. To what extent are the financial, human resources, systems and document management tools in place, adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of country programme efficiency?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The extent to which the skills of the workforce align with monitoring and evaluation requirements (i.e. clear responsibilities, understanding of tasks and periodicities). - The extent to which the financial resources and budgetary allocations are adequate to ensure a high-quality evaluation. - The extent to which sufficient time (remote and in country) and adequate timing is scheduled for the evaluation. - The extent to which barriers threaten timely and effective evaluation (i.e. physical security risks, weather constraints, absence of key stakeholders) - The extent to which partner data is managed according to evaluative needs. - Assessment of adequacy and functionality of the current technological infrastructure with respect to continuous programme monitoring. (→ methodological quality of M&E systems to be assessed under EQ1.1)- - Assessment of how well different systems (financial, human resources, etc.) integrate with each other (and across programme sections) and how accurate and timely reports are generated from the systems. 	<p>Secondary data sources: Country Programme Management Plan (CPMP) 2023–2027, UNICEF Jordan, Country Programme of Cooperation, 2023–2027, Annex: Results and resources framework, JCO Budget 2023-2027, Cost Evaluation Plan, Jordan CEP-2023-2027 Clean Final 310522, Jordan CPE Final Evaluation Report 2018-2022</p> <p>Primary data sources: Deputy Representative Operations, Deputy Representative Programmes, Evaluation Specialist, PMR Staff, Regional Evaluation Advisor</p>	<p>For secondary data: Desk review, evaluability assessment perception tool, qualitative content analysis and descriptive analysis</p> <p>For primary data: Explorative interviews and semi-structured key informant interviews, qualitative content analysis</p> <p>Limitations: - Due to specificity of domains triangulation may be not possible. - Lack of access to M&E online systems may hamper the analysis of adequacy of systems and actual document management.</p> <p>Mitigation measures: - Providing transparency whenever empirical base is limited. - Request downloads from the system by M&E staff.</p>

ANNEX 1: EVALUABILITY MATRIX

Objectives	Evaluation questions	Basis for assessment	Data sources	Data collection and analysis methods, expected limitations
2. Highlight and provide specific analysis and recommendations to ensure the country offices' medium- and long-term results can be demonstrated and assessed.	2.1 Are there any potential limitations that could affect the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the medium and long terms results?	<p>Weaknesses and threats identified from EQ 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 to evaluate OECD-DAC criteria effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency</p> <p>Additional weaknesses identified to evaluate relevance and coherence</p> <p>Identification of additional limitations and if any, extent to which they hamper evaluability (e.g., political (in)stability, regional or global crises etc)</p>	<p>Secondary data sources: UNICEF Country Programme Document – Jordan, July 2022, Jordan CPE Final Evaluation Report 2018-2022, JCO Monitoring Result Framework (draft), Evaluation Working Plan 2023-2024, Evaluation Timeline and Budget, JOC_2023 Annual Management Plan, Programme Rational Notes for each specific section.</p> <p>Primary data sources: Deputy Representatives, chiefs of the six programme sections, Operations section, Evaluation Specialist, Regional Evaluation Advisor</p>	<p>For secondary data: Desk review, evaluability assessment perception tool, qualitative content analysis and descriptive analysis</p> <p>For primary data: Explorative interviews and semi-structured key informant interviews, qualitative content analysis</p> <p>Synthesis: Triangulation of different evidence streams, SWOT analysis</p> <p>Limitations and mitigation measures: as identified under EQ1.1., 1.2 and 1.3.</p>
	2.2 What programmatic, technical, human, and financial resource improvements should be made to ensure the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the country offices' medium- and long-term results?	<p>No basis for assessment, open question</p> <p>Derivation of recommendations from findings for EQ1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 2.1.</p>	<p>Primary data sources: UNICEF staff members of PMR and Operations, Evaluation Specialist, Deputy Representatives, Chiefs of the six programme sections, selected representative of Jordanian government, other stakeholders (t.b.d.), Regional Evaluation Advisor.</p>	<p>For primary data: Explorative interviews and semi-structured key informant interviews, qualitative content analysis</p> <p>Synthesis: Triangulation of primary data with aggregated insights from systematic review against UNICEF key guiding documents, SWOT analysis</p>

ANNEX 2: LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

General references

United Nations Children's Fund (2023). *Revised evaluation policy of UNICEF*.

United Nations Children's Fund (2023). *Theory of Change for the Evaluation Function in UNICEF*.

United Nations Children's Fund (2023). *UNICEF Annual Review Guidance - Using programme monitoring and situation data to improve effectiveness and performance*.

United Nations Children's Fund (2022). *Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy (DIPAS) 2022-2030*. New York: UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.org/media/134511/file/An%20inclusive%20world,%20starts%20with%20me,%20with%20you,%20with%20all%20of%20us.pdf>

United Nations Children's Fund (2021). *UNICEF Gender Action Plan 2022-2025*. [https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/7046/file/2021-31-Gender Action Plan 2022-2025-EN-ODS.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/7046/file/2021-31-Gender%20Action%20Plan%202022-2025-EN-ODS.pdf)

United Nations Children's Fund (2021). *A Liveable Planet for Every Child – UNICEF's strategy-at-a-Glance for Climate, Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction (2022-2030)*. <https://www.unicef.org/media/122881/file/UNICEF%20Strategy%20Climate,%20Environment,%20Energy%20and%20DRR.pdf>

United Nations Children's Fund (2021). *Healthy Environments for Healthy Children Global Programme Framework*. New York: UNICEF. www.unicef.org/media/91216/file/Healthy-Environments-for-Healthy-ChildrenGlobal-Programme-Framework-2021.pdf

UNSDCF (2019) United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework - Internal Guidance. <https://unsdg.un.org/download/1512/687>

World Health Organization, United Nations Children's Fund, World Bank Group (2018). *Nurturing care for early childhood development: a framework for helping children survive and thrive to transform health and human potential*. Geneva: World Health Organization. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. UNICEF Disability Inclusion Policy and Strategy (DIPAS) 2022-2030 https://nurturing-care.org/resources/Nurturing_Care_Framework_en.pdf

United Nations Evaluation Group (2016). *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*. New York: UNEG. <https://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

UNICEF (2016) Procedure on Country Office Outcome and Output Results Structure. Document Number: FRG/PROCEDURE/2015/003.1. Issued by: The Field Result Group

UNICEF (2022) Country Programme Planning (CPP) – Guidance to achieve SGDs by 2030.

UNICEF (2020) Planning Country Programme Evaluations - Summary Guidance.

General programme documents

- Terms of Reference Evaluability Assessment of Jordan Country Programme 2023-2027
- UNICEF JCO: Country Programme Document 2023-2027 – Jordan, July 2022
- UNICEF JCO: Jordan CPE Final Evaluation Report 2018-2022
- UNICEF JCO: Country Programme Management Plan (CPMP) 2023–2027
- UNICEF JCO Country Programme of Cooperation, 2023–2027: Annex: Results and resources framework
- UNICEF JCO: 2023-24 Jordan CO Analytical Plan-Q3
- UNICEF JCO Budget 2023-2027: Planned budget VS AWP Budget
- UNICEF JCO Cost Evaluation Plan: Jordan CEP-2023-2027 Clean Final 310522

Monitoring and Evaluation documents

- JCO Monitoring Result Framework (draft)
- UNICEF JCO: Evaluation Working Plan 2023-2024, Evaluation Timeline and Budget
- JCO Evaluation Strategy ToC 2023-2027
- UNICEF JCO: Overview of an Evaluation Journey
- JOC_2023 Annual Management Plan FINAL 10 APRIL 2023
- UNICEF JCO 2023 Annual Management Review: 2023 AMP mid-year Review_July 2023
- UNICEF JCO IMEP: 2023-24 Jordan CO Analytical Plan-Q3
- JCO Full Approved Report 2023 – RAM
- CSI 2023 Report for JCO
- 2023 End of Year Results Summary Narrative

Section-specific documents

- Programme Rational Note – Child Protection (2023 – 2027)
- Work_plan _ 2023 - 2024-CP - Internal Version
- RAM Standard Indicator Guidance, Goal Area 3 (2022-2025)
- Programme Rational Note – Education (2023-2027)
- Work_plan _ 2023 - 2024-Education
- Education - RAM Standard Indicators, Result Area: Goal Area 2 (2022-2025)
- Programme Rational Note – Health & Nutrition (2023-2027)
- Work_plan _ 2023 - 2024-HN-new
- HEALTH GUIDANCE NOTES - RAM Standard Indicators, Goal Area 1, Result Areas 1-5 (2022-2025)
- NUTRITION GUIDANCE NOTES - Standard Indicators (2022-2025)
- Programme Rationale Note – Social Protection & Policy (2023-2027)
- Social Protection and Policy_tools and systems
- Work_plan _ 2023 – 2024-SP
- Social Policy & Social Protection - RAM Standard Indicator (SI) Guidance (2022-2025)
- Programme Rationale Note – Water Sanitation and Health (2023-2027)
- Work_plan _ 2023 – 2024_WASH
- RAM STANDARD INDICATORS WASH - GUIDANCE NOTES (2022-2025)
- Programme Rationale Note – Youth and Adolescent Development and Participation (2023-2027)

- Work_plan _ 2023 - 2024-Ado & Youth

Cross-cutting themes

Gender

- Gender Action Plan 2023–2024 Jordan Country Office, November 2023 – Internal *LIVE* paper
- Jordan Country Office Gender Roadmap 2023-27: Conceptual Framework October 2022 (INTERNAL JCO UNICEF PAPER)
- Gender Programmatic Review Toolkit To support gender equality programming in UNICEF country offices in alignment with UNICEF’s Gender Action Plan and Strategic Plan 2022–2025
- Gender Action Plan 2022-2025 Institutional Accountability and M&E

Climate

- Climate Action Strategy Jordan 2022
- Climate Landscape Analysis for Children in Jordan August 2021

SBC

- SBC Core Standard Indicator (CSI) Methodology notes

PSEA/ CSG

- GUIDANCE NOTE 1 Including PSEA In Programme Design Monitoring Evaluations and Reporting (2)
- PSEA Action Plan (Excel file)
- UNICEF Procedure on Child Safeguarding Framework
- UNICEF PSEA Results Monitoring Framework

ANNEX 3: PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION

WORK PLAN, LABOUR DIVISION, AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluability assessment was implemented in three phases which were partially overlapping: inception (5 working days), data collection (7 working days), and reporting (13 working days). Table x summarises specific tasks, proposed labour division, and the timeline for each phase.

The inception phase started with a virtual launch meeting (October, 26th) between the UNICEF Evaluation Specialist and the EA team. It was followed by an initial desk review and a short remote inception mission with seven exploratory interviews which laid the foundation for the development of the evaluability matrix and the data collection instruments. Insights from the inception phase were presented in a draft inception report (December, 11th) and finalised upon UNICEF's feedback (January, 8th).

The data collection phase comprised semi-structured key informant interview and systematic desk review (January) and partially overlapped with the analysis and reporting phase which was centred around primarily qualitative content analysis and descriptive analysis (January/February). This laid the foundation for synthesising findings supported by a SWOT analysis. In an internal synthesis workshop, the evaluators brought different evidence streams together, ensured triangulation to minimise potential biases of results and drew joint conclusions and recommendations. An external virtual validation meeting with JCO staff facilitated a utilisation-focused evaluability assessment.

The evaluability assessment report was drafted in line with UNICEF's evaluation norms and standards and was submitted to UNICEF's steering committee for review (February, 7th). After feedback and comments on the draft report have been shared with the EA team, revisions and the preparation of PowerPoint presentation highlighting key findings took place until February, 23rd. After approval by UNICEF, the EA team submitted the final evaluability assessment report on February, 29th.

The roles and responsibilities for the assignment were as follows: The team leader was responsible for the development of the methodology, led the data collection, analysis and reporting, and ensured that all deliverables are of high quality and submitted in time. She was the primary contact point for the evaluation manager. The emerging evaluator worked closely with the team leader and supported her in all tasks throughout the assignment. Beyond the operational implementation of the evaluability assessment, she ensured smooth and timely logistics and documentation.

Table x. Workplan with labour division, timeline, and proposed deadlines for deliverables

No.	Tasks	2023		2024		Dates and deadlines (DL)		
		SJV	DS	10/11	12		1	2
1	Inception Phase (5 days)	2,5	2,5					
1.1	Launch meeting: Introductory briefing by UNICEF Evaluation Specialist	0,25		week 1			October 26th	
1.2	Initial desk review of available project data and documents	0,5	0,75	week 2				
1.3	Remote inception mission: exploratory interviews with key stakeholders and/or virtual inception meeting with the JCO-project team to discuss draft methodology and knowledge interests t.b.d.	0,5	0,5	week 3-6				
1.4	Development of methodology for the evaluability assessment (incl. evaluability analysis grid, with guiding questions, data sources, data collection, and analysis methods, data collection instrument for systematic desk review, and guidelines for interviews)	0,5	0,75	week 6				
1.5	Draft inception report (in line with UNEG and UNICEF evaluation norms and standards)	0,5	0,5		week 6		December 11th (DL)	
Revision by UNICEF (2 weeks) and end-of-year break (2 weeks)								
1.6	Revision and finalization of the inception report based on feedback and comments	0,25				week 10	January 8th (DL)	
2.	Data collection (7 days)	3	4					
2.1	Secondary data collection: Systematic desk review of County Programme documents (i.e. proposal, results model, operational plans, progress reports) and brief SWOT analysis of M&E system (i.e. data collection protocols, data storage, data quality)	1	3			week 11-13	January	
2.2	Primary data collection: semi-structured interviews with key informants (e.g. JCO staff, Evaluation Specialist, M&E experts, evaluators of predecessor programme, etc., incl. logistical preparation, and documentation)	2	1			week 11-13		
3.	Reporting (13 days)	6,5	6,5					
3.1	Data analysis, (i.e. qualitative content analysis, descriptive statistical analysis, aggregation, and synthesis); external virtual validation/debriefing meeting with JCO staff t.b.d.	2	2			week 12	week14	
3.2	Draft evaluability assessment report (in line with UNICEF evaluation standards)	3	3				week 14-15	February 8th (DL)
Revision by UNICEF (1 week)								
3.3	Revision of evaluability assessment report based on UNICEF steering committee feedback and comments, preparation of a PowerPoint presentation highlighting key findings, presentation of results to steering group	1	1				week 17	February 23rd (DL)
3.4	Finalisation of the evaluability assessment report and PowerPoint presentation,	0,5	0,5				week 18	February 29th (DL)
Total Working Days		12	13					
SJV=Dr. Susanne J. Våth (team leader), DS=Dafina Sinatra (junior evaluator)								

QUALITY ASSURANCE

To ensure effective and efficient implementation of the evaluability assessment, several measures were employed. Within the EA team, the team leader provided continuously technical backstopping at every phase of the evaluability assessment. Furthermore, findings were constantly communicated within the team creating a continuous internal feedback loop to enhance the reliability, validity, and objectivity of the evaluability assessment. The four-eye principle was applied throughout the entire assignment. Aside from researcher triangulation, primary data collected was triangulated with secondary data to ensure soundness and cross-validation.

With their institutional affiliation to CEval GmbH, a Germany-based evaluation firm with well demonstrated evaluation capacity skills (e.g. as service provider of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)), the EA team had access to backstopping services if required. At the consortium level, the lead partner C4ED ensured financial management.

From UNICEF JCO, the evaluation manager signed responsible to conduct rigorous quality control of the evaluability assessment. She further provided logistical support to facilitate appointments for key informant interviews on short notice. Furthermore, UNICEF JCO has set up a steering committee to comment and endorse on the evaluability assessment deliverables.

The EA team worked independently and fully attained to the ToR, despite delays due to a late kick-off. No potential conflict of interest could be identified. The assignment was delivered fully remote, thus without any safety issues.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Evaluations must conform to the ethical guidelines of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG, 2020). Accordingly CEval GmbH was responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluability assessment. This included ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity of participants, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of participants, ensuring fair selection of participants, and ensuring that the results of the evaluability assessment do no harm to participants or their communities.

As the objective of this assignment was to assess the evaluability of but not to evaluate the CPD, identified key informants were primarily staff of JCO. They were fully informed about the purpose of the assessment and were assumed to be capable to grant informed consent after a short introduction. As external key informants, the evaluation team leader of the previous CPD evaluation and a representative of Jordan Department of Statistics (DOS) were identified. Upfront information on the purpose of the evaluability assessment and data protection measures were shared with them to ensure voluntary participation and facilitate informed consent in accordance with UNEG's norms and standards (see annex 6). Interactions with more vulnerable stakeholders and final beneficiaries did not take place, as assessing results achievement was not under the scope of this assessment.

During the assignment no ethical issues or related risks could be identified.

ANNEX 4: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

A total of 21 interviews were conducted with 26 individuals. The EA team conducted seven exploratory interviews with 13 interviewees during the inception phase, 14 guideline-based interviews were conducted with 17 persons during the data collection phase.

Date	Section	Position
13.11.2023, 11h	Operations, Administration	Deputy Representative Operations
	Operations	HR Manager
	ICT and Finance	Finance Officer
	Operations	Operation Specialist
13.11.2023, 12h	Partnerships	Reports Specialist
13.11.2023, 13h	ICT and Finance	ICT Specialist
14.11.2023, 10h	Planning, Monitoring, and Research (PMR)	Chief
	Planning, Monitoring, and Research (PMR)	Planning and Monitoring Specialist
	Planning, Monitoring, and Research (PMR)	Planning and Monitoring Officer
	Planning, Monitoring, and Research (PMR)	Monitoring Officer
14.11.2023, 14h	Programmes	Deputy Representative Programmes
05.12.2023, 10h	Office of Representative	Evaluation Specialist
06.12.2023, 11h	Administration	Senior Administration Associate
10.01.2024, 10h	Social Protection and Policy	Chief
11.01.2024, 11h	WASH	Chief
11.01.2024, 12.30 h	Education	Chief
11.01.2024, 14 h	Gender	Specialist
17.01.2024, 13 h	Child Protection	Chief
17.01.2024, 16 h	CPE 2018-22 Evaluation	Team leader
18.01.2024, 10 h	Regional Office	Regional Evaluation Advisor (OIC)
18.01.2024, 11.30 h	Adolescents and Youth	Chief
18.01.2024, 13 h	Health and Nutrition	Chief in charge,
	Health and Nutrition	Immunization specialist

22.01.2024, 9 h	Partnership	Partnership Manager
23.01.2024, 9 h	Office of the Representative	Representative Senior Executive Associate
23.01.2024, 12 h	Planning, Monitoring, and Research (PMR)	Chief
	PMR	Planning and Monitoring Officer
24.01.2024, 10 h	Operations, Administration	Deputy Representative Operations
	Operations, Administration	Humanitarian Affairs Manager
24.01.2024, 12 h	Humanitarian, Field Coordination Section	Humanitarian Affairs Manager

ANNEX 5: EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT PERCEPTION TOOL

The evaluability assessment perception tool is auxiliary tool to efficiently review data and documents and assess whether they are available in sufficient quantity and quality to perform the country programme evaluation according to good evaluative practice. Whenever required, additional observations can be captured in open text format. Binary rating scales are applied to differentiate between presence and absence. Four-step scales will be applied to provide further differentiation to express different levels of adequacy based on EA teams expert judgement.

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Rating Scale
1. Availability of documents		
	Theory of Change (ToC)	0= no, 1= yes
	Logical or result Framework (logframe)	0= no, 1= yes
	Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems documentation	0= no, 1= yes
	M&E documentation for each of the programme sections (<i>further differentiation possible</i>)	0= no, 1= yes
	Documents outlining how gender, disability, climate change, and equity considerations are integrated into the programme	0= no, 1= yes
	Documentation on how these cross-cutting priorities will be measured	1= inadequate, 2= need for improvement, 3= satisfactory, 4= good or very good
	Documents outlining programmatic, technical, human, and financial resources related to the feasibility of the evaluation	0= no, 1= yes
	Financial management documents	0= no, 1= yes
	Human resources management documents	0= no, 1= yes
2. Results framework and ToC		
	Is the results framework complete?	0= no, 1= yes
	Are the objectives clearly formulated on output, outcome and impact level?	1= None of the objectives specific 2= Majority of objectives not specific 3= Majority of objectives specific 4= All objectives specific
	Are plausible results hypotheses defined for the country programme?	0= no, 1= yes
	Does the JCO country programme have a visualised ToC?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is the ToC consistent? (<i>further differentiation possible</i>)	1= Not consistent, 2= rather not consistent, 3= rather consistent, 4= fully consistent
	Have assumptions about the roles of other actors outside the project been made explicit?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is the results framework aligned with the ToC?	0= no, 1= yes
	Are objectives of the programme operationalised with indicators?	0= no, 1= yes
	Are standard indicators SMART?	1= None of the indicators SMART 2= majority of indicators not SMART 3= majority of indicators SMART 4= all indicators SMART
	Are additional indicators SMART?	1= None of the indicators SMART 2= majority of indicators not SMART 3= majority of indicators SMART 4= all indicators SMART
	Are indicators related to [section-specific] integrated at output and outcome levels?	0= no, 1= yes
	Are indicators related to [section-specific] SMART?	1= None of the indicators SMART 2= majority of indicators not SMART 3= majority of indicators SMART 4= all indicators SMART
	Is baseline data for [section-specific] indicators available?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Are specific indicators for [each of cross-cutting priority] available?	0= no, 1= yes

	Are the [each of cross-cutting priority] indicators SMART?	1= None of the indicators SMART 2= majority of indicators not SMART 3= majority of indicators SMART 4= all indicators SMART
	Is baseline data for [each of cross-cutting priority] indicators available?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Are the [each of cross-cutting priority] indicators in the ToC adequately integrated?	1= None of the indicators is integrated 2= majority of indicators not adequately integrated 3= majority of indicators adequately integrated 4= all indicators adequately integrated
	To what extent are financial resources and budgetary allocations considered aligned with the ToC and results framework?	1= not aligned, 2= rather not aligned, 3= rather aligned, 4= fully aligned
3. Monitoring and evaluation systems and data		
	Are monitoring and evaluation systems in place within the programme adequate?	0= no, 1= yes
	To what degree are monitoring and evaluation systems integrated into programme management framework?	1= not integrated, 2= partially integrated 3= moderately integrated, 4= fully integrated
	To what degree do monitoring and evaluation systems enable effective risk monitoring?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	How adaptable is the monitoring and evaluation system to changing circumstances?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Are the data collection tools and methods deemed suitable for M&E processes?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	How reliable are data collection tools and methods?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Are tools for collecting and reporting the data overall consistent?	1= not consistent, 2= rather not consistent, 3= rather consistent, 4= fully consistent
	Is the collected and reported data accurate (i.e. complete, valid, and reliable, free from larger measurement error)?	1= inaccurate, 2= somewhat accurate, 3= accurate, 4= very accurate
	How well does the current system ensure the prompt collection and reporting of data?	1= not timely, 2= somewhat timely, 3= timely, 4= very timely
	Do adequate data collection mechanisms exist for measuring progress in cross-cutting priorities? (<i>differentiated by each cross-cutting topic</i>)	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is it possible to measure/ track the association between programme's outcomes and single cross-cutting priorities?	0= no, 1= yes
	Have measures been undertaken to allow rigours impact evaluation (e.g. randomisation of treatment and control groups, pipeline approaches, definition of comparison groups)?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	If applicable, is there a monitoring on whether actors outside the programme act as enablers or constrainers?	0= no, 1= yes
4. Programme resources and management systems		
	Are the skills of the workforce aligned with the monitoring and evaluation requirements of the program?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	To what extent are financial resources and budgetary allocations considered sufficient for an adequate M&E system?	1= inadequate, 2= need for improvement, 3= satisfactory, 4= good or very good
	How well is partner data managed in accordance with evaluative needs within the programme?	1= not at all managed, 2= partially managed 3= well managed, 4= very good managed
	Is the current technological infrastructure for continuous programme monitoring functional?	1= inadequate, 2= need for improvement, 3= satisfactory, 4= good or very good
	How effectively do different systems (financial, human resources, etc.) integrate with each other?	1= not integrated, 2= partially integrated 3= moderately integrated, 4= fully integrated
	How accurate are the reports generated from these systems?	1= inaccurate, 2= somewhat accurate, 3= accurate, 4= very accurate
	How timely are the reports generated from these systems?	1= not timely, 2= somewhat timely, 3= timely, 4= very timely
5. Feasibility of the JCO's medium- and long-term results evaluation against OECD criteria		
Relevance	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to thoroughly assess whether the CPD objectives align with the identified needs of the target group?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation address the consistency of the CPD objectives with Jordan policies?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CPD is designed to address international conventions, policies, strategies, or goals, as discussed in the report?	0= no, 1= yes

	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess how well the CPD supports Jordan government/regional policies?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what degree the CPD is aligned with international conventions, policies, strategies, or goals?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD is sensitive to contextual and capacity conditions?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
Coherence	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD possess internal coherence (i.e. is coherent with other programmes or projects by UN agencies)?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD possess external coherence?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD is complementary to other donor's activities (i.e. adds value)?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD coordinates with other donors to avoid duplication?	0= no, 1= yes
Effectiveness	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD has achieved outputs and outcomes for the final beneficiaries and target groups, disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity (nationality) and disability?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CPD is gender-specific?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CPD explored differentiated results across various groups, beyond gender, such as age groups or different target groups?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CPD discussed variations in the importance of results comprehensively?	0= no, 1= yes
Efficiency	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the implementation of the CPD interventions was on time?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CP converted inputs into high-quality outputs within the intervention?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CP converted inputs into high-quality outcomes?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CP was efficient in terms of costs?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent the CP was efficient in terms of managing HR?	0= no, 1= yes
Impact	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD contributed to enhancing the quality of life for final beneficiaries?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD contributed to enhancing institutional quality, i.e., improvements in institutions/services in Jordan?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess whether the CPD contributed to sector reforms in Jordan?	0= no, 1= yes
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess differential impacts across various groups, such as gender, ethnicity (nationality), age groups, and different target groups?	0= no, 1= yes
Sustainability	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess economic, social, and environmental sustainability of the programme?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly
	Is sufficient data available or can be collected in the course of the CPD evaluation to assess to what extent benefits for final beneficiaries and the capacity of national partners addressed in the CPD will last?	1= not at all, 2= partially, 3= moderate, 4= highly

ANNEX 6: INTERVIEW GUIDELINE AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This interview guideline can be understood as master version with modular blocks. Priority was always given to themes to which an interviewee was most knowledgeable. All interviewees received information of the purpose of the evaluability assessment and data protection measures prior to the interview to ensure informed consent.

Introduction

- Please introduce yourself with your position and role in the programme.
- How well are you entrusted with issues related to the evaluability of an intervention?

Programme Theory

One important element to ensure evaluability of an intervention is a sound Theory of Change which displays results paths starting from activities ranging to output goals which in turn are expected to yield to outcome goals and contribute ultimately to higher-level impact goals.

- From your perspective how do you assess the quality of the Theory of Change (ToC) of the Jordan Country Programme 2023-2027? Are goals formulated in a clear and realistic way? Are the linkages between lower-level results to higher-level results plausible?
- Is the ToC consistently described across various documents (e.g. CPD, M&E plans etc.)? From your perspective, do different stakeholders hold the same or different views about the project objectives? Do they hold the same or different views about how objectives will be achieved?
- Does the ToC guide your work? If yes, please specify in which areas? If no, why not?
- Which parts of the ToC do you regard as important to assess the results of your work, and in ideal case to demonstrate results achievement after the end of the current CPD? Did you ever come across gaps of the ToC? If yes, please specify.
- What about cross-cutting priorities? Are they adequately reflected in the programmes' output and outcome objectives?
- Have assumptions about the roles of other actors outside the project (i.e. enablers and/or constrainers) been made explicit?
- To what extent are financial resources and budgetary allocations considered aligned with the ToC and results framework?

Operationalisation

Beyond a clear ToC, adequate operationalisation of goals with SMART (i.e., specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound indicators) is required to facilitate evaluability. The Jordan Country Programme is operationalised with different indicators: Core Standard Indicators (CSI) from UNICEF HQ, standard indicators for Jordan, and additional indicators.

- From your perspective are the selected indicators at outcome level appropriate to measure results achievement in the course of an evaluation?
- What about indicators at output level? Are they appropriate to measure results achievement?
- How do you assess the quality of the standard indicators and the additional indicators? Have you observed any challenges in this regard? If yes, please specify for which indicators.

- Is the results framework aligned with the ToC? From your perspective, is there any part of the programme theory which is not sufficiently and adequately operationalised by the indicators? If yes, please specify.
- From your perspective to which extent are indicators for each cross-cutting priority (gender, disability, climate change, and equity) adequately operationalised at output and outcome level?

Monitoring

Results-oriented monitoring is a key data source for evaluators, particularly to assess results achievement at output and outcome level.

- In your position, to which extent are you involved in monitoring and/or to which extent do you rely on output and outcome monitoring?
- How do you assess the quality of the monitoring systems overall and in relation to your section? How do you assess it with respect to (i) output monitoring, (ii) outcome monitoring, and (iii) risk monitoring? What are strengths and weaknesses?
- How do you assess the quality of the monitoring data? Are data collection tools adequate? Is data obtained consistent, accurate and available when it is needed? Is baseline data available? Is data sufficiently disaggregated (e.g. for gender, disability, ethnicity (nationality))?
- Does the monitoring data allow to track progress of programme outcomes related to each cross-cutting priority? Is partner data of sufficient quality and available when it is needed? Are data collection mechanisms, responsibilities, and timelines fully clear to you and your staff?
- If applicable, is there a monitoring on whether actors outside the programme act as enablers or constrainers?
- How do you assess the integration of the monitoring into programme management and how well is it linked to evaluation?

Evaluation Function

The evaluation function is important to facilitate evaluability towards the end of the country programme.

- From your perspective how do you assess the evaluation function? What are strengths and weaknesses?
- How well does the evaluation function serve the needs of programme management? Is adequate and sufficient evidence timely generated to facilitate adaptive management?
- From your perspective how well coordinate monitoring and evaluation with each other?
- Have measures been undertaken to allow rigours impact evaluation (e.g. randomisation of treatment and control groups, pipeline approaches, definition of comparison groups)?

Operational environment

Operations lay the foundation to efficient programme delivery in general and to evaluability in specific.

- How well do the skills of JCO's workforce align with monitoring and evaluation requirements? Are responsibilities, understanding of allocated tasks and periodicities clear? Is the monitoring expertise and evaluation capacity sufficient to run efficient M&E systems? If no, what gaps do you identify?

- Are the financial resources allocated to evaluation following the UNICEF commitment to allocate 1% to evaluations?
- From your perspective, how well does the technological infrastructure serve the needs of continuous programme monitoring, as well as mid-term and final evaluations?
- How well is partner data and own monitoring data managed according to evaluative needs? Are there weaknesses regarding data and document management? If yes, please specify.
- To assess programme efficiency information from different systems has to be linked. How well can financing and HR information be put in perspective to monitored output and outcome achievements? How often are efficiency analyses conducted? How accurate and timely are related reports?
- From your perspective, can you identify any barriers which threaten a timely and effective CP evaluation (e.g. physical security risks, weather constraints, absence of key stakeholders? If yes, please specify. If any, what are measures to mitigate barriers?

Limitations and Recommendations

- When you think about the challenges and limitations you mentioned earlier, are there any limitations you would like to put special emphasis on or are there any limitations which threaten the evaluability of the CPD which have not yet been addressed during the interview? If any, please specify.
- Do you have any recommendations to address limitations? Are there any programmatic, technical, human and/or financial resources related measurements you would recommend enhancing assessment of medium- and long-term results towards the end of the CPD, and thus to improve its evaluability? If yes, please specify.

Closure

The interview has come to an end. Before we close, would you like to add anything to this interview or provide a final statement?

Thank you very much for participation.

Informed consent for Key Informant Interview (KII) – UNICEF Jordan Country Programme 2023-2027 Evaluability Assessment

You are invited to participate in a Key Informant Interview for the evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Jordan Country Programme 2023-2027.

The objectives of the evaluability assessment are:

- 1. Assess to what extent the country program evaluation will be feasible and medium- and long-term results will be measurable against Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) criteria.*
- 2. Highlight and provide specific analysis and recommendations to ensure that the country offices' medium- and long-term results can be demonstrated and evaluated.*

Your involvement is voluntary, and you can withdraw at any time without consequences. Your decision will not impact your relationship with UNICEF.

Your responses will be confidential, and your name will not be disclosed in any reports or publications. Instead, a pseudonym will be assigned to protect your identity.

All interview data will be stored securely with restricted access. Only the research team will have access to the data, ensuring that your information remains confidential. We will retain the data for the duration of the project, after which it will be securely and permanently deleted.

The interview will take approximately one hour, focusing on your experiences and insights related to the UNICEF program.

For questions, contact the research team at CEval GmbH: Dr. Susanne Vaeth, s.vaeth@ceval.de or Dafina Sinatra, d.sinatra@ceval.de.

Your participation signifies informed consent. Thank you for contributing to the evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Jordan Country Programme 2023-2027.

ANNEX 7: INDICATOR REVIEW

Please refer to separate excel list.

Terms of Reference

Assignment: Evaluability Assessment of Jordan Country Programme 2023-2027 Commissioned by UNICEF Jordan Country Office.

Location: Jordan.

Duration: 4 months

Estimate number of working days: Up to 30 days

Reporting to: UNICEF JCO Evaluation Specialist

1. INTRODUCTION

1. These Terms of Reference (TOR) are for an evaluability assessment of Jordan country programme document (CPD) 2023-2027 and is commissioned by UNICEF Jordan Country Office (JCO).

2. BACKGROUND & RATIONALE

2. Endowed with one of the youngest populations in the region, of whom 39 per cent are under the age of 18 years, Jordan is at a crossroads of tremendous opportunity.¹ Jordan is one of the most hospitable nations in the world, with the second highest presence per capita of refugees.² Having successfully transitioned to upper-middle-income status in 2011, the World Bank has downgraded Jordan to the status of lower-middle-income country in a recent revision of its classification data in 2022, mainly due to the result of a large upward revision (+8.6%) to population estimates published by the United Nations Population Division reflecting new data from the latest population census.³
3. Jordan has begun its recovery from the COVID-19 shock — real GDP grew by 2.2% in 2021 following a 1.6% contraction in 2020. Growth rebounded to 2.5 percent in Q1-2022, supported by the reopening of the economy and the recovery of contact-intensive services notably tourism. However, higher global commodity prices led to an acceleration in headline inflation and labor market conditions remain challenging. The unemployment rate is still above pre-pandemic levels (22.6% in Q2-2022), especially among women (29.4%) and youth (46.1% among those under 25 years old) and labor force participation is also low, (33.5% in Q2-2022), particularly for women (14.2%), one of the lowest rates in the world.⁴
4. Jordan is highly dependent on foreign aid, receiving an estimated \$3 billion in official development assistance (ODA) annually.⁵ The country has initiated and sustained a series of national development programmes to guide the effective use of international assistance. Current political and economic reforms are aimed at addressing concerns about reliance on external resources for social protection systems and improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the use of resources.
5. The impact of hosting an estimated 3 million refugees will continue to be a development challenge and an opportunity. Some 2.2 million registered Palestinians have been living in Jordan for generations, with about 18 per cent still in camps.⁶ Over 674,268 Syrian refugees are registered with

1 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, World Population Prospects, 2019.

2 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Jordan Fact Sheet, April 2021.

3 World Bank Group country classifications by income level for FY24 (July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024), August 2023.

4 The World Bank in Jordan, 2023.

5 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Jordan aid at a glance chart.

6 United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, 2020.

the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Jordan, with the majority living outside the camps. Sixty-four per cent of urban refugees live on three Jordanian dinars or less per day (the international poverty line for middle-income countries), and 20 per cent of Syrian children are both monetarily and multidimensionally poor.⁷

6. Over the past decade, Jordan has made significant progress in human development by providing insurance for family health care and unemployment. An ongoing challenge is the capacity of national institutions to deliver social services while being stretched by a significant refugee population.
7. The overall health and nutrition situation of children has improved, as demonstrated by decreases in the infant mortality rate. However, immunization coverage fell below 80 per cent in 2020 for all antigens.⁸ Among school-age children, 31 per cent are overweight and predisposed to diseases in adult life and 47.6 per cent of preschool children are iron-deficient.⁹
8. Mental health issues, especially for children and youth, have been exacerbated by the impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic.¹⁰
9. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, school attendance and learning outcomes in Jordan were improving. Still, in 2017/18, only 74 per cent of those who reached Grade 7 completed 10 years of schooling.¹¹
10. Dropout rates are higher for boys than girls, and highest for Syrian refugee girls and boys from poor families.¹² In 2018, girls outperformed boys, by nearly two years, in secondary reading, mathematics and sciences.¹³ There is little demand for technical and vocational education and training, with only 3.5 per cent of secondary students enrolled in this education stream.¹⁴ Only 67 per cent of children currently attend pre-primary education.
11. Jordan has made significant commitments to reduce violence against children. In the 2021 World Justice Project Rule of Law Index, Jordan ranked fifty-fifth out of 139 countries and second in the region. During their lifetime, 81 per cent of children have experienced at least one form of physical violence and 21 per cent of women aged 15–49 years have experienced physical or sexual violence.¹⁵ The Committee on the Rights of the Child called for increased support for unmarried mothers to accelerate the transition to family-based care for children.¹⁶ In its third universal periodic review (2018), the Government supported recommendations to accelerate efforts to end and discourage child labour, particularly among girls working as domestic workers. Jordan wants to ensure that legal action is taken and raise awareness through public campaigns to combat child labour and human trafficking as well as child marriage.¹⁷
12. Water and energy resources are increasingly scarce in Jordan. As per the National Water Strategy 2023 – 2040, Jordan’s population annual water share per capita of renewable resources is 61 cubic meter per capita in 2021.¹⁸
13. Withdrawal of water is already above renewable limits and demand is expected to exceed supply by 30 per cent over the next decade. Despite elevated levels of coverage for water supply and sanitation systems, access to reliable and safe water services are affected by scarce water resources and their inadequate management, leading to 60 per cent of people living under high water stress.¹⁹ In its National Water Strategy 2023 - 2040 forecasts, the government of Jordan envision that this will drop

7 UNHCR, Vulnerability Assessment Framework for Refugees in Jordan, March 2022.

8 Data available at <https://data.unicef.org/resources/immunization-coverage-estimates-datavisualization/>. 11 Jordan National.

9 Jordan National Micronutrient and Nutrition Survey 2019, Jordan Ministry of Health, 2021.

10 Global Burden of Disease, available at: <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/>.

11 UNICEF, Jordan Country Report on Out-of-School Children, December 2020.

12 Assaad, R., Krafft, C., and Sieverding, M., Youth Transitions to Adulthood in Jordan: High Aspirations, Challenging Realities. UNICEF, 2021.

13 OECD, PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, 2019.

14 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, TVET Country Profile: Jordan, 2019.

15 USAID, Jordan Demographic and Health Survey, 2018.

16 Committee on the Rights of the Child, CRC/C/JOR/CO/4-5, paras 39, 40, 2014.

17 See A/HRC/40/10, Universal Periodic Review recommendation 137.68.

18 Jordan National Water Strategy 2023 – 2040, available at:

https://www.mwi.gov.jo/EBV4.0/Root_Storage/AR/EB_Ticker/National_Water_Strategy_2023-2040_Summary-English_-ver2.pdf

19 Ibid.

to as little as 35 m³/capita in 2040.²⁰ At the moment, only one third of schools have access to appropriate sanitation facilities.²¹

14. The increased climate variability, including increased temperatures, lower precipitation levels and more erratic rainfall, will lead to an increase in disaster risk and an acute impact on people in Jordan, and children are the most vulnerable. Girls and boys, adolescents and youth have limited awareness of, or opportunities to engage in dialogue on climate change mitigation and environmental degradation policy and the impact these issues will have on their lives, including access to basic and protective services such as water and food.
15. An evaluation of the previous UNICEF country programme, 2018–2022, found that its efficiently delivered coherent and complementary support to the Government and other stakeholders' strategies, particularly in reaching children in vulnerable communities across the country, including in refugee camps.
16. Three key lessons learned from the evaluation have influenced the direction of this new country programme: (a) enhance information-sharing and planning across different sections of the country office; (b) meet the service needs of refugees and the local community; and (c) focus on achieving long-term outcomes that measure sustainable change within Jordanian society. By focusing on societal-level outcomes, the new country programme will ensure that lessons learned from UNICEF interventions are rigorously evaluated so they can be taken to scale by the Government.

COUNTRY PROGRAMMES DOCUMENT (CPD) 2023-2027

17. UNICEF's CPD is derived from the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) and aims to support the host Government to reduce inequities and disparities and achieve the progressive realization of the rights of all children, adolescents and women, especially the most vulnerable. UNICEF Jordan Country Office has developed their country programme in synchronicity with and in parallel to the UNSDCF.
18. Jordan CPD includes a proposed aggregate indicative budget of \$4,855,000 from regular resources, subject to the availability of funds, and \$203,611,000 in other resources, subject to the availability of specific-purpose contributions, for the period January 2023 to December 2027.
19. Jordan CPD was presented and approved by the Executive Board in September 2022.

JCO CPD PRIORITIES

20. The UNICEF JCO vision for the country is based on priorities identified in consultation with Government and civil society partners. The Jordan country programme's theory of change is as follows:
 - (a) If all mothers, children and adolescents have equitable access to, and adequate utilization of, quality health and nutrition services and adopt appropriate health and nutrition practices and behaviors;
 - (b) If all girls and boys have equitable access to, and complete, quality early childhood and basic education;
 - (c) If adolescents and youth, especially young girls, are increasingly empowered and equipped with knowledge, skills and opportunities to become socially and economically resilient;
 - (d) If the most vulnerable children and adolescents at risk of, or survivors of, violence, abuse, exploitation, neglect and harmful practices benefit from quality preventive and responsive protection services;
 - (e) If all children and adolescents live in an improved physical environment that is resilient to the impacts of climate change, with access to improved water, sanitation and hygiene services, while adopting appropriate hygiene behaviors and care practices;
 - (f) If vulnerable children and young people have increased access to evidence - driven, inclusive, integrated and enhanced social protection services and socioeconomic opportunities to fulfil their potential;

²⁰ Jordan National Water Strategy 2023 – 2040, available at: https://www.mwi.gov.jo/EBV4.0/Root_Storage/AR/EB_Ticker/National_Water_Strategy_2023-2040_Summary-English_-ver2.pdf

²¹ UNICEF and WHO, Progress on drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene in schools, 2020.

(g) Then all girls and boys in Jordan, including the most vulnerable, will progressively realize their human rights and participate in building an equitable, green and resilient society and economy, contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

21. The programmatic strategy will focus on strengthening systems and supporting evidence-based policy change. Social and gender norms, harmful practices and behaviors will be addressed through cross-sectoral programming. A key shift will be to engage communities, with a focus on adolescent girls, to identify and address socioeconomic constraints to self-reliant development. Climate change, disaster risk reduction, early childhood development and attention to disability dimensions will be mainstreamed across all components.

3. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, PURPOSE AND SCOPE

22. The Office of Internal Audit and Investigations (OIAI) conducted an audit of the UNICEF Country Office in Jordan, covering the period from January 2021 to June 2022.
23. The audit made a number of observations related to the management of the key risks evaluated, and recommended “performing an evaluability assessment, for the upcoming country programme, to ensure the country offices’ medium- and long-term results can be demonstrated. This should be done while also establishing the necessary mechanisms for timely implementation of the recommended actions from evaluations”.
24. In recent years, many changes have been made in UNICEF’s approach to country programme planning, monitoring, reporting, guidelines, and processes. Moreover, considering the challenges faced in most evaluations in sourcing documents, data, stakeholders, partners, government entities and ultimate programme beneficiaries for a speedy and credible evaluation, it appeared imperative to ensure that the medium- and long-term results of JCO CPD, 2023-2027 can be demonstrated.
25. Based on those observations, UNICEF JCO is now commissioning an evaluability assessment of JCO Country Programme, 2023-2027 to provide the country office with an independent assessment on how well the country office is prepared for a country programme or strategic framework evaluation.
26. The objectives of the evaluability assessment are:
 - **Objective 1.** Assess to what extent the country program evaluation will be feasible and medium- and long-term results will be measurable against Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) criteria.
 - **Objective 2.** Highlight and provide specific analysis and recommendations to ensure that the country offices’ medium- and long-term results can be demonstrated and evaluated.
27. The purpose of the evaluability assessment is to ensure that JCO country program has adequate documents, data, systems and evidence in place and/or planned to ensure the feasibility of country strategic evaluation.
28. The scope of the evaluability assessment will cover JCO CPD 2023-2027, including all programme sections, monitoring systems, annual planning and country evaluation plan.

4. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

29. The table below presents strategic questions for the evaluability assessment, aligned with the objectives.
30. Applicants are expected to further develop the evaluation framework at the proposal stage, with suggested evaluation questions and related data collection methods and sources. The final evaluation framework will be developed at the inception stage in collaboration with UNICEF and included in the inception report.

Objectives	Key questions
Objective 1. Assess the feasibility of the country offices' medium- and long-term results evaluation against OECD criteria.	1. To what extent the current JCO country programme has adequate approach, systems, tools, data, and evidence (including ToC, logframe, monitoring and evaluation systems) in place and adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of medium and long terms results?
	2. To what extent cross-cutting priorities and interventions (gender, disability, climate change and equity) are meaningfully integrated and will be measurable?
	3. To what extent are the financial, human resources, systems and document management tools are in place, adequate, functional, consistence, of quality and accurate to enable meaningful measurement of country programme efficiency?
Objective 2. Highlight and provide specific analysis and recommendations to ensure the country offices' medium- and long-term results can be demonstrated and assessed.	4. Are there any potential limitations that could affect the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the medium and long terms results?
	5. What programmatic, technical, human and financial resource improvements should be made to ensure the feasibility of the country programme evaluation and measurement of the country offices' medium- and long-term results?

5. METHODOLOGY

31. In their proposal, the applicant(s) will be expected to suggest a comprehensive and realistic evaluability assessment approach which should be further developed by the selected team and finalized in consultation with UNICEF evaluation specialist during the inception stage.
32. The applicant(s) should follow an appropriate approach, with primary and secondary data collection, adapted to the purpose and objectives of the evaluability assessment questions.
33. Integrating innovative approaches will be considered as an asset.
34. The methodology should ensure meaningful analysis of gender perspectives, social behavior change (SBC), environment, and equity perspectives.
35. The evaluability assessment framework should draw on UNICEF's Gender Action Plan and gender equality assessment tools such as the 'gender equity continuum' and consider the other cross-cutting themes into the analysis.

6. DATA AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY

36. The main sources of information available to the applicant(s) will include programme documents, programme ToC and rationale, data from UNICEF Engagement Monitoring System (EMS), country evaluation plan.
37. The completed list and library will be shared with the applicant(s) during the inception phase.
38. Concerning the quality of data and information, the applicant(s) should:
 - assess data availability and reliability as part of the inception phase. This assessment will inform the data collection process.
 - systematically check the accuracy, consistency, and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data.

7. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

39. The Evaluation Specialist was not involved in the project design or implementation of UNICEF CPD.
40. The evaluation leader will not have been involved in the design or implementation of the subject of the evaluability assessment (UNICEF CPD) or have any other conflicts of interest. Further, he will act impartially and respect the code of conduct of the evaluation profession.
41. The Evaluation Specialist will have regular meetings with the evaluation leader.
42. A Steering committee will be formed to comment and endorse the evaluability assessment deliverables.

8. REPORTS REQUIREMENTS

43. The report structure will be as per United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) required norms and standards²². UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards will be shared with the applicant(s) as part of the evaluability assessment library.
44. The applicant(s) needs to meet and fulfill UNICEF's quality assurance requirements.
45. An inception report and an evaluability assessment report, with a stakeholder analysis, will be expected to be developed by the applicant(s).

9. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT

46. The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for ensuring the evaluation progresses as per UNICEF guide and for conducting rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their finalization.
47. Data and information collected will be triangulated to ensure soundness and cross-validated at key points in time, as deemed relevant by the evaluator.

10. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

Phase	Item	Type	Description	Timeline
Inception	Introductory briefing by UNICEF Evaluation Specialist	Activity	The Evaluation Specialist will brief the applicant(s) on the evaluability assessment and clarify any pending issues.	3-5 days
	Remote inception mission	Activity	The applicant(s) will undertake a desk review of key documents and conduct a remote inception mission	
	Submission of draft inception report	Deliverable	The applicant(s) will provide a first draft of the inception report, in line with UNEG and UNICEF evaluation norms and standards for inception report	
	Review and validation of the inception report	Activity	The evaluation specialist will review the inception report and provide feedbacks and comments.	
	Submission of final inception report	Deliverable	The applicant(s) should submit a final inception report that addresses UNICEF feedback and comments.	
Data collection and analysis	Data collection	Activity	The applicant(s) conduct a desk review and data collection according to the inception report.	8-10 days
Reporting	Draft evaluability assessment report	Deliverable	The applicant(s) provide a first draft of the evaluation report, in line with UNICEF evaluation standards for evaluation reports.	10-15 days
	Review of the evaluability assessment report	Activity	UNICEF steering committee will review the draft report and provide feedback and comments.	

²² UNEG Norms and Standards: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>.

	Final evaluability assessment report submission	Deliverable	The applicant(s) submit a final evaluability assessment report that address UNICEF feedback and comments. The applicant(s) prepare a powerpoint presentation highlighting key findings of the evaluation.	
--	---	-------------	--	--

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Deliverable	Payment Schedule
Inception Report	30%
Final evaluability assessment report submission	70%

12. OFFICIAL TRAVEL INVOLVED

48. There is no official travel required for this assignment.

13. CALL FOR PROPOSALS

A. Technical proposal

49. Applicant(s) shall prepare a proposal as an overall response to ToR ensuring that the purpose, objectives, and deliverables of the assignments are addressed. Proposal should include (but not limited to):

- A brief cover letter and understanding of the assignment required.
- A proposal detailing the purpose, objective, approach, methodology, deliverables, timeline is required.
- Quality assurance mechanism(s) and risk mitigation measure(s) in place.

B. Financial Offer

50. A financial proposal with a breakdown of all costs that are to be charged to UNICEF and based on deliverables. This includes estimated number of working days, fees, all office administrative costs, as well as any additional requirements needed to complete project or that might have an impact on cost or delivery of products.

51. The financial proposal (this section) should be submitted on a separate page from the technical proposal.

52. No financial information should be contained in the technical proposal.

53. Proposals not complying with the terms and conditions contained in this ToR, including the provision of all required information, may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive and therefore not considered further.

C. Timetable

54. This section should include a proposed time/delivery schedule. An action plan specifying the timeframe with various milestones and activities should be included under this section.

14. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AND WEIGHTING CRITERIA

55. Submitted proposals will be assessed using Cumulative Analysis Method. All request for proposal will be weighed according to the technical (70 points) and financial considerations (30 points). The minimum technical score is 49 points.

56. Financial proposals will be opened only for those application that attained 70% or above on the technical part.
57. The contract shall be awarded to a bidder obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores.
58. Below are the criteria and points for technical and financial proposals.

A. Technical Proposal (70 points)

A.1. Overall Response (50 points)

- General adherence to Terms of Reference (5 pts).
- Elaborated and articulated understanding of scope, objectives and overall assignment requirements (20 pts).
- Approach, methodology, and deliverables are addressed as per TOR (20 pts).
- Proposed timeline is met (5 pts).

A.2. Applicant(s) experience (20 points)

- At least one sample of previous or similar relevant work undertaken successfully by applicant(s) (10 pts).
- Name(s) and CV(s) of applicant(s) entailing their specific academic, professional backgrounds and roles in the assignment for UNICEF review and approval (10 pts).

B. Financial Offer (30 points)

- Financial proposal is aligned with the number of days planned for this assignment (30 pts).

15. UNICEF RECOURSE IN CASE OF UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

59. UNICEF reserves the right to withhold payment until the applicant(s) provide satisfactory quality output as reviewed by the evaluation specialist.
60. In case of unsatisfactory performance, the payment will be withheld until quality deliverables are submitted.

16. CONDITIONS

61. The applicant(s) will work on its own computer(s) and use its own office resources and materials in the execution of this assignment.
62. The applicant(s) fee shall be inclusive of all office administrative costs.
63. Please also see UNICEF's Standard Terms and Conditions.