

# **Final External Evaluation**

**UNIFEM-Government of Jordan e-Village Project**

## **FINAL REPORT**

**19 December 2010**

**Independent Evaluation Team**

**Nadia Hijab, Team Leader**

**Camillia Fawzi El-Solh, Team Member**

## Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
1. Introduction and Evaluation Objectives.....	12
2. Methodology.....	13
a. Methodology.....	13
b. Constraints.....	15
c. Acknowledgements.....	16
3. Programme Context.....	17
a. Jordan, ICT, and Gender.....	17
b. Using ICT to Address Poverty and Gender Inequality.....	18
4. The e-Village Project.....	19
a. Process of Selecting Libb and Mleih and Needs Assessment.....	20
b. e-Village Project Objectives, Activities, and Partnerships.....	21
5. Evaluation Observations .....	23
a. Relevance.....	24
i. Project concept .....	24
ii. Positive aspects of project site selection.....	24
iii. Problematic aspects of project site selection and needs assessment.....	25
b. Effectiveness.....	26
i. Project design.....	26
ii. Project implementation.....	27
iii. Partnerships.....	31
c. Efficiency.....	32
i. Monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management.....	32
ii. Project process and oversight .....	33
d. Sustainability.....	35
e. Impact.....	37
i. Qualitative observations.....	37
ii. Quantitative Observations.....	37
6. Conclusions and Lessons Learned.....	40
7. Recommendations.....	43
Table 1 Evolution of Project Objectives and Activities.....	44
Table 2 UNIFEM staff timelines.....	46
Table 3 e-Village Project activities timeline.....	47
Table 4 Project phases timeline.....	49
Annex 1. Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation.....	50
Annex 2. Agenda and List of People Met.....	62
Annex 3. List of Documents Reviewed.....	66
Annex 4. Evaluation Questions as Amended after the Desk Review.....	74
Annex 5. Questions for e-Village Partners and Stakeholders .....	76
Annex 6. Results of Questionnaire for Project Beneficiaries .....	81
Annex 7. Logical Framework Analysis – e-Village Initiative.....	94

## **Acronyms**

APAS	Asia, Pacific, and Arab States division at UNIFEM Headquarters.
ASRO	Arab States Regional Office
CDC	Community development centre (JOHUD)
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
ERS	UNIFEM Economic Security and Rights Programme
FHH	Female-headed households
GoJ	Government of Jordan
HRBA	Human-rights based approach
ICT	Information and communication technology
JD	Jordanian dinar
JOHUD	Jordan Hashemite Fund for Human Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MoICT	Ministry of Information and Communication Technology
NICT	National Information Technology Centre
MoPIC	Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation
MOU	Memorandum of understanding
NHF	Noor al-Hussein Foundation
NGO	Non-governmental organization
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
WHO	World Health Organization

## **Executive Summary**

### **1. Background**

In 2004, UNIFEM and the Government of Jordan (GoJ) embarked on a three-year, US \$2.5 million pilot project to bridge the rural-urban as well as the gender digital divides by introducing the use of ICT for development in two villages - Libb and Mleih – in Madaba Governorate.<sup>1</sup> It also sought to promote employment and entrepreneurship, with the objective that at least 60% of beneficiaries should be women. The project continued for an additional year in 2007 and went into a second phase in 2008 with an additional \$108,000 from the GoJ/Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MoICT). The Project was formally ended in March 2010.

UNIFEM procedures mandate a final external evaluation for projects of this size and scope and, after a bidding process, the organization commissioned an independent, external team of consultants in September 2010. The Evaluation Team was tasked to determine the Project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact (see full terms of reference in Annex 1).

### **2. Methodology and Constraints**

The Evaluation Team methodology consisted of:

- A desk review of all relevant project and non-project materials to which it had access that was the basis for the Inception Report accepted by UNIFEM/ASRO.
- A beneficiary questionnaire, designed to elicit quantitative information about the project's relevance, effectiveness, and impact on their lives.
- Individual interviews and focus group meetings with present and former project staff, partners, stakeholders, beneficiaries, and volunteers.
- Field visits to the village project sites to better understand how activities were implemented and sustained.

The Evaluation Team faced serious constraints in carrying out its work. These included the non-availability of key project documentation and lack of evidence-based reporting. A logframe was produced for the project at the start, but the Team could not find reports against this logframe, making it very difficult to review progress against planned objectives, outcomes or impact. This was compounded by shifting project objectives and the complexity of project design. The lack of a database posed problems in the conduct of the questionnaire. Other major constraints included; gaps in institutional memory; and the short time allocated for the Evaluation Team's fieldwork. Indeed, in order to be able to even understand what happened during the course of the project, the Team had to construct detailed timelines covering the Project's activities, phases, structure, and staff/management (see Tables 1 to 4).

---

<sup>1</sup> Cash contributions: GoJ \$847,000 primarily MoICT; UNIFEM \$73,000; third party cost-sharing \$330,000. In kind: GoJ \$1 million; UNIFEM \$50,000; other partners (\$200,000).

The Evaluation Team acknowledges the valuable support and assistance of all the people with whom it came into contact in UNIFEM, the GoJ, the private sector, the non-profit sector, and the site villages.

### **3. The e-Village Project**

The Team reviewed studies in order to situate the e-Village Project within Jordan's efforts to promote ICT as well as to include women in this sector. It identified obstacles to the sector's development, such as the early stages of development of e-commerce and low Internet penetration largely due to cost. Jordanian women's ability to compete was affected by their lower incomes and educational background, given that academic choices generally followed a gendered pattern. The Team also examined past UNIFEM/ASRO efforts in using ICT to address poverty and gender inequality, in particular the 'Achieving E-Quality in the ICT Sector Project' in Jordan launched in 2002. This aimed to facilitate access by women in underprivileged communities to ICT and develop the technical and livelihood skills of local communities, especially females.

The e-Village Project was designed in 2003. A national task force selected Mleih and Libb in Madaba Governorate as the pilot e-village based on key criteria. Thereafter an assessment was conducted covering education and literacy levels, economic activity rates and unemployment levels, basic and social services, including ICT. At that time, the population in Mleih and Libb was 5,171 and 4,410 respectively. Among other findings, high unemployment affected both male and female villagers, though rates among women tended to be higher. There was some ICT-related training but rather as stand-alone skills than linked to entrepreneurial and other employment opportunities. Women were less likely to take advantage of ICT services due to constraints on physical mobility and cost.

The project Development Objective was to transform a Jordanian village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life, by:

- Raising women and men villagers' awareness on different village initiatives in respect of use of technology and gender-related issues.
- Building the capacity and professional skills of villagers allowing them to benefit from ICT services.
- Enhancing economic opportunities within the village by creating new jobs and providing professional marketing and entrepreneurial services.

Much of the first year of project implementation was taken up in construction and renovation, and only a few activities were carried out. The project components changed somewhat by the time of the March 2004 – April 2005 annual report and changed significantly by the time of the April 2005 - March 2006 annual report. A new Project team decided to put more emphasis on economic activities so as to generate income for the population. The project was re-organized around eight programmes: Livelihood Skills Development and Employment; Technical Skills Development Programme; Extracurricular Education Programme; Media Programme; Information and Awareness Programme; Volunteerism Programme; Special Needs Programme; and Technology

Programme. By the time of the third annual report the number of programmes had been reduced to six, with no explanation why.

The original Project period was 2004-6; went on for an additional year in 2007. It was officially extended as an “expansion” in 2008. The GoJ (MoICT) made an additional contribution of \$108,301 and UNIFEM contributed \$162,592. The aim was to consolidate existing activities, fundraise for 2009-10; and introduce new activities. The Project engaged a wide range of Government, inter-governmental, non-governmental, and private sector partners at different stages and levels; the numbers dropped from 29 in the original project document to 16 at the end. There were several changes in project staff and UNIFEM/ASRO management during the course of the project. It was formally closed in March 2010 and handed to GoJ as the national partner.

## **5. Evaluation Observations**

The Evaluation Team has used the term “observations” rather than “findings” in the title of this section due to the lack of credible data generated by the project to support findings in the full sense of the word. It has organized its observations under the five evaluation areas used by the UN Evaluation Group and set out in the Team’s TOR: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

*Relevance* The Project concept was relevant and was well situated in national and regional plans, as well as within international conventions and goals and within UNIFEM’s strategic plan. There were some positive aspects to site selection. By choosing a rural village, the Project showed that social mores are not an obstacle to change. The Evaluation Team’s interviewees, focus groups, and field visit observations revealed that that after initial reluctance girls were able to go to a Computer Clubhouse alongside boys. The interviews also showed that there appeared to be no obstacles to women working in places frequented by men and that the need for income was driving women to work outside the home, in addition to their traditional home-based work.

However, there were problematic aspects to site selection that undermined the Project’s relevance; these can be traced back to the needs assessment. Libb and Mleih had originally been two separate villages that were combined into one municipality and the needs assessment report downplayed the differences between these two localities. These include: Mleih is on the main road to Madaba city while Libb is relatively isolated; Libb’s households are more scattered and further apart; Mleih has had the advantage of an established community centre for some 20 years (JOHUD) whereas Libb has not; and the women of Mleih appear to have more advanced home- and shop-based income-generating activities and capable of forming cooperatives compared to Libb. The fact that there were in fact two villages instead of one resulted in duplication of some activities, undermining the potential for economies of scale. All the income-generating activities were placed in the more isolated locale that had less access to and experience of urban areas/markets, limiting their success potential.

*Effectiveness* Several factors related to the Project design had implications for effectiveness and sustainability. The proposed structure, multiple levels and activities were complex and difficult to grasp, making it more difficult to implement, monitor and evaluate. The terminology kept changing; e.g. the Project document set out activities under the development objectives, but these were renamed “levels” in an annex. The objectives appeared too extensive and wide-ranging against Libb and Mleih’s limited absorptive capacity and level of development. Although this was a pilot, the Evaluation Team did not find references to plans to phase activities and learn from experience before moving on to additional phases. Nor did the Team find references to research regarding experience in comprehensive development or area development schemes, or to lessons learned from other attempts to create new job opportunities in Jordan or the region.

Based on the timeline the Team constructed to track educational/skills development, economic, and social activities under the Project, which drew on available documentation, field visits and interviews, the Team observes:

- In terms of educational activities targeted at youth, good outputs were achieved at the Intel Computer Clubhouse and Robotics lab in Mleih. The Robotics Labs placed in the Mleih and Libb girls’ schools faced more of a challenge because they were not part of the school curriculum.

As regard skills development, 125 villagers, of whom were 100 women, graduated from the IT Academy in Libb sponsored by Microsoft in 2006-7 and 19 trainees found jobs. The Team is not able to judge how significant the numbers are vis-à-vis the needs of the population at large, nor the use to which the training was put, or whether those who found jobs sustained them.

- The Team finds it difficult to assess the effectiveness of social activities without access to workshop evaluations and a sense of the numbers that actually participated vis-à-vis potential participants. There appeared to be a missed opportunity to directly address gender equality as an issue.
- Several different economic initiatives were started - e.g. mosaics, a cafeteria, a call centre, among others – but the only one somewhat active at present is packaging/labelling. The Team could not judge how effective the economic activities were even at the height of their functioning because: there appeared to be no cost-benefit analysis in terms of the funds invested vs. the numbers of jobs generated; it was unclear whether the activities would be able to take advantage of economies of scale; clients for the products appeared to consist mainly of project partners or their contacts; and the Project heavily subsidized production costs. Finally, given that the Project development objective was “ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life,” the link between these economic activities and ICT was not evident. It is worth noting that the Team could not find any reference to market analysis, strategy reports, or feasibility studies that had been done before introducing specific income-generating activities.

The Evaluation Team examined the effectiveness of Project partnerships. It found several positive aspects: the partnerships leveraged support in both cash and kind, attracted new partners during the course of implementation, and was innovative in that partners had not had experience of being brought together before. However, the Team also found limited joint planning and knowledge sharing among partners. The large number of partners may have expanded the project's scope (by, for example, adding a radio station or film club), adding to the challenges of implementation and sustainability. The Team found that the use of UNVs to contract village-based project workers skewed the meaning of volunteerism. Most seriously, the Project appeared to have remained identified with UNIFEM from its inception to the end.

*Efficiency* Sound monitoring systems are essential for the efficient management of development activities and much more so for a pilot project in which considerable investment has been made. Although a database manager, tracking system, and monitoring and evaluation strategy were mentioned in the Project Document, the Team could not find these in the documentation to which it had access. The needs assessment did not appear to have been used to construct a project baseline. Field staff did generate regular reports, but these appear to have been mainly used in the three annual reports, which were descriptive and short on analysis and quantitative information. Sound monitoring might have enabled timely identification of constraints, enabled course correction, and contributed to sustainability. The Team was concerned that an evaluation was not carried out when the Project was extended from 2006 to 2007, or before the agreement on a new Phase in 2008, which might also have enabled course correction.

The Team also identified several issues related to knowledge management, including gaps in documentation and lack of coherence in Project files. It did not find a systematic attempt at documentation for the purposes of lessons learned, although this would have been important for a pilot project.

The Team observed that the introduction of several activities at the same time – rather than phasing and sequencing of activities – may have prevented income generating activities from taking root before new ones were embarked upon. Phasing might have also dealt with issues like economies of scale, the capacity of different beneficiaries, market demand and issues relating to family and tribal relationships. In some instances, activities were embarked upon without sufficient study or understanding of the regulatory framework, such as the radio station or call centre.

There were many changes in UNIFEM/ASRO as well as Project staff management at the end of 2007, which affected Phase II and the efficiency of the handover process. This was also affected by changes in government.

*Sustainability* A sustainability plan was prepared in 2004 but the Team found no indication that this plan was updated to reflect realities on the ground, challenges, changes, obstacles and lessons learned. The Team found that, of all the initiatives attempted by the Project, some of the educational and skills development activities were the most sustainable, specifically the Computer Intel Clubhouse, the Lego Robotics, and



the Film Club. This was partly due to the fact they were hosted in established institutions. The IT Academy was apparently sustained until 2009 but its status is uncertain. The remaining educational and skills activities are inactive or never became operational.

By contrast, almost all the economic activities were unsustainable, with the exception of the packaging/labelling activity, which currently has only one client. The Team found cause for concern regarding workers' health given the materials used in production. Some of the reasons for the non-sustainability of the income generating activities include the lack of feasibility studies and market analysis; the fact that they were not phased in a way that enabled some to take root before others were started; attention was not apparently paid to the issue of economies of scale; transport and transport costs remained an issue between Libb and Mleih, and with the rest of the country; among others.

Although members of Qanater, the new cooperative that was established with the support of the Project had the benefit of extensive training, it did not have the time to develop as an institution and did not appear to be fully functioning during the Team's mission. In spite of its brief existence, the cooperative was supposed to take on the Project's challenging income-generating activities initiatives with limited experience of managing such activities, exploring potential markets and ensuring product quality.

*Impact* Based on interviews, observations, and some of the information generated by the questionnaire, the Evaluation Team observed that the Project's educational activities has had some impact on youth, social change, and the use of ICT in education and employment. However, it was not able to judge the significance of such impact in the absence of a baseline, in terms of the numbers served vis-à-vis the broader population, or the cost-effectiveness. There was little impact in terms of economic opportunity and income-generation.

## **6. Conclusions and Recommendations**

The Team concludes that the overall Development Objective to "transform a Jordanian village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life" is not measurable because no quantitative baseline was established at the start. Nevertheless, based on its observations the Team concludes that the Project overall did not have an effective and sustainable impact on Libb and Mleih. Most importantly, size and scope of the Project was not commensurate with the level of socio-economic development and capacity of the villages to absorb and sustain activities, or the Project's capacity for effective and efficient management. Furthermore, the Team does not believe that the Project, as designed, would be relevant to a more populous semi-rural or urban area. It concludes that the simultaneous introduction of a multiplicity of activities in each of three separate spheres – economic, education, and cultural – did not give the time and space necessary for effective implementation of all activities.

In terms of raising women and men villagers' awareness on different village initiatives in respect of use of technology and gender-related issues (Objective 1), the Project did raise the awareness of some villagers, though there is not enough information to gauge the

impact. The Project does not seem to have directly addressed gender equality as an issue, although it ensured that the majority of beneficiaries were women and girls. Nevertheless, it has shown that traditions – and gender roles – change and evolve in line with needs and opportunities and that social mores and location in a rural area are not obstacles to the kind of social, educational, and economic activities proposed.

As for building the capacity and professional skills of some villagers allowing them to benefit from ICT services (Objective 2), the Project did expand the skills and knowledge of some villagers in ICT. The project was most effective and sustainable in educational activities targeted at young girls and boys. The Team believes that the extra-curricular educational activities are worth replicating, if sustainable funding can be secured, but that the educational activities sited in schools pose more of a challenge.

With regard to enhancing economic opportunities within the village by creating new job opportunities and providing professional marketing and entrepreneurial services (Objective 3), the Project cannot be said to have had an impact. In spite of substantial investment, it did not sustainably address the economic needs, rights and capacities of more than a few women and their families, whether in terms of income, access to finance and markets, or accessible transport, among others. The Team also concludes that the private sector was not tapped as a potential partner in the economic sphere. This might have helped to identify whether income-generating activities and assumptions of community entrepreneurship were a realistic solution to the economic needs identified, or whether a different type of economic approach and structure might be more relevant.

The Team believes that accessible information indicates that Project staff and management were dedicated to the Project and committed to making it a success. However, it cannot conclude that planning, monitoring, and evaluation supported effective and efficient delivery, or contributed to the prospects for sustainability. The Team concludes that the size and scope of the Project as described above, as well as its grassroots development nature, challenged the organization's capacity, experience, and expertise. Moreover, UNIFEM/ASRO was unable to transition out of a predominant project management role so as to ensure national ownership of the Project. The Project did not appear to contribute to national ICT or gender equality strategies and policies or convincingly demonstrate the value or otherwise of ICT to economic development.

The Team concludes that a more modest project that was directly focused on one or two activities – sited in one location with arrangements made for transport from other locations – might have had a better chance of success in demonstrating the contribution of ICT to income-generation and educational/skills development and contributing to the community's economic empowerment. It might have later been able to support additional activities based on lessons learned and the consolidation of outputs.

#### *Recommendations for UNIFEM HQ and ASRO*

- Large-scale projects that tackle new areas such as the e-Village should be subjected to rigorous assessment at the design stage, including independent expert review, tapping

experience in other regions, and ensuring that they are tailored to UNIFEM's mandate, organizational structure, and experience.

- The Project has underscored the need for oversight mechanisms and processes that can flag issues and constraints in a timely manner, and examine the quality and reliability of the evidence that supports claims of progress, including up-to-date logical frameworks and annual work plans.
- The needs assessment data should be developed into a baseline that is regularly updated so as to support Project implementation, which must be phased and sequenced in a way that allows for systematic and effective monitoring, evaluation, lessons learned, and course correction.
- The Project has spotlighted the importance of systematic and efficient documentation and knowledge management to disseminate lessons learned in a timely fashion, and to mitigate the impact of staff and management turnover.

#### *Recommendations for Government*

- Government counterparts should play a more effective oversight role, ensuring that they regularly receive project implementation reports that include up-to-date logical frameworks and annual work plans.
- National ownership of projects requires that the role and responsibilities of national partners should be clearly identified and agreed upon in a regularly updated work plan that ensures synergy between partner inputs.
- Government should call for regular joint meetings with implementing and other partners during which work plans, potential constraints and required adjustments are discussed and acted upon in a timely and effective manner.
- So as to sustain the activities, Government could consider convening a meeting of partners in the educational sphere, including e-Village partners, to discuss ways of investing in the sustainability of the educational/skills development activities as well as possibilities of replicating these activities, taking into account the issues raised in the evaluation observations.
- Government could also consider convening private sector partners to present the investment already made in skills development and site development and to solicit ideas about ways in which this can be capitalized, including ideas about new structures and management arrangements for economic development, while taking account of community roles, structures, and expectations.

## **1. Introduction and Evaluation Objectives**

In 2004, UNIFEM/ASRO and the Government of Jordan embarked on a three-year, \$2.5 million pilot project to bridge the rural-urban as well as the gender digital divides by introducing the use of ICT for development in two villages - Libb and Mleih – in Madaba Governorate.<sup>2</sup> The project continued for an additional year in 2007 and went into a second phase in 2008 with an additional \$108,000 from the GoJ (MoICT). The project was formally ended in March 2010.

The e-Village Project was conceptualized under UNIFEM/ASRO's Economic Security and Rights Programme, which promoted new approaches to women's economic security and rights in line with the third MDG, CEDAW, and the Beijing Platform for Action.<sup>3</sup> It was formulated under the previous UNIFEM strategic plan (2004-2007). The Project was also designed with reference to Jordan's National ICT Strategy as well as its National Strategy for Women.<sup>4</sup> In addition, it drew on UNIFEM/ASRO's 'Achieving E-Quality in the ICT Sector Project' launched in Jordan in 2002, which aimed to facilitate the access of women in underprivileged communities to ICT tools.

The e-Village Project was developed based on: an analysis of ICT in Jordan including ICT initiatives and organizations; an overview of UNIFEM/ASRO-supported ICT activities in Jordan; collaboration with the Government of Jordan and national and international partners on the development of criteria for the selection of pilot villages; and an assessment of the selected villages, Libb and Mleih in Madaba Governorate. In addition to bridging the gender and rural-urban digital divides, the Project sought to promote employment and entrepreneurship, with the objective that at least 60% of beneficiaries should be women. Project activities will be discussed in greater detail in Section 4.

UNIFEM procedures mandate a final external evaluation for projects of this size and, after a bidding process, the organization commissioned an independent, external team of consultants in September 2010. The Evaluation Team's Terms of Reference are set out in Annex 1. These include: helping UNIFEM gain better insights on how to implement community-based initiatives for advancing women's human rights through ICT to create job opportunities and eliminate gender inequality; determine if this pilot initiative would be replicable in other rural and semi-rural areas in Jordan and/or in other countries in the region; and assist the community organizations, which will take over the operational responsibility of the E-Village project, to better and more efficiently plan for the sustainability, continuation and improvement of the Centres supported by the project.

More specifically, the evaluation aims to:

---

<sup>2</sup> Cash contributions: GoJ \$847,000 primarily MoICT; UNIFEM \$73,000; third party cost-sharing \$330,000. In kind: GoJ \$1 million; UNIFEM \$50,000; other partners (\$200,000).

<sup>3</sup> UNIFEM/ASRO, no date/q. The ERS targets power relationships within the household, local community and in the marketplace, and aims to empower women by enabling them to take advantage of economic opportunities at national, regional and international levels.

<sup>4</sup> GoJ, 2007 and JNCW, respectively.

- Evaluate the extent to which the project has achieved its planned objectives and contributed to the outcomes as indicated in its Logframe.
- Identify the strong points and challenges that the project has experienced and the good practices in partnering and coordinating with different parties.
- Assess the sustainability of each of the economic initiatives of the e-Village and their replicability in other national or regional contexts.
- Provide lessons learned on the use of information and communication technology (ICT) for the empowerment of women in Jordan and on community-based initiatives to improve implementation of future projects and avoid implementation bottlenecks and risks.

The Evaluation Team was tasked to cover all the project initiatives and determine their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, being guided by the Evaluation Questions as reviewed and revised by the Team (see Annex 4). It was also asked to measure the extent to which the project had increased women's participation in the local community and promoted the use of ICT for development. This is the first UNIFEM/ASRO evaluation of a community project, and its findings and recommendations could contribute to development of other community projects.

## 2. Methodology

The methodology the Team used to seek qualitative and quantitative information is presented below, followed by constraints faced, and acknowledgements of support received.

### a. Methodology

The Evaluation Team drew on the proposed methodology provided in the TOR to develop its methodology in line with the performance criteria in the UNIFEM Evaluation Policy, the UNIFEM Evaluation Guidelines, and UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards.

- Desk review. The Team conducted a home-based desk review of all relevant project documents and materials to which it had access, as well as related non-project materials (see list in Annex 3). Based on the desk review, the Team produced a comprehensive Inception Report, summarizing its findings and identifying areas to be further explored in the field. The Inception Report was discussed with and accepted by UNIFEM/ASRO staff in Amman. Once in Amman and after most meetings and field visits had been conducted, the Team set aside a full day to review project files and identify additional key documents to try to plug some of the considerable information gaps.
- Beneficiary questionnaire. The Evaluation Team designed a questionnaire to elicit quantitative information from project beneficiaries relating to the relevance, effectiveness, and impact of the project on their lives (see Annex 6). The aim was

to administer 80 questionnaires, using stratified random sampling techniques and to fall back on snowball sampling methods if it proved impossible to ensure a statistically significant sample following the stratified sampling methodology.

- Individual interviews and focus group meetings. The Team held seven focus group meetings and conducted 35 interviews with present and former project staff, partners, stakeholders, selected beneficiaries, and volunteers – see agenda and list in Annex 2. In addition, the Team submitted written questions to each of the past and present regional programme directors as well as the UNIFEM/ASAP desk officer, who handled Arab states at UNIFEM HQ and also briefly served as officer in charge of UNIFEM/ASRO. The questions used in interviews and focus group discussions are presented in Annex 4.
- Field visits. The team spent four days visiting the village project sites to better understand how activities were implemented and which activities are on-going. It also met with project beneficiaries, as well as women who were not beneficiaries, in order to get a sense of other economic activities in Libb and Mleih, as well as how the various population groups viewed the Project.

In presenting its findings and observations, the Team has sought to apply triangulation to the extent possible given the constraints it faced. In other words, it has drawn on the information gathered by using two or more of the methods outlined above so as to support statements made, from among the following: documents, interviews, focus groups, and field visits. If more than two were not available, it made observations rather than definitive statements. Where necessary, it footnoted sources, while respecting in full the confidentiality of the interview process.

Further the Team sought to apply a human rights-based approach in conducting the evaluation, with particular attention to the equal rights of women and men as well as the other rights impacted by the project activities; for example, the right to health. In addition, the overall approach of the evaluation was participatory, engaging beneficiaries in data collection and ensuring that women and men, different age groups, and different economic strata were represented. The Team also ensured that ethical safeguards were upheld during the evaluation; for example, guaranteeing the anonymity of the information used in the report, and maintaining the Team's independence throughout the process.

The UNIFEM/ASRO Evaluation Task manager established a Reference Group to give guidance during the evaluation process. The Reference Group met twice, once at the start of the evaluation to share knowledge and experience and once at the end to discuss and comment on the preliminary report back.<sup>5</sup> The process of producing the Final Report was as follows:

- The Team presented the draft final report on November 14;

---

<sup>5</sup> See Annex 2 for names and titles of Reference Group members.

- The Team addressed some minor comments from UNIFEM/ASRO and returned the draft on November 21, after which the Task Manager sent the report to the Reference Group;
- Some Reference Group members reviewed the Final Report and had no comments to make. Other Reference Group members as well as the UNIFEM Evaluation Unit/HQ gave detailed comments that were helpful in finalizing the report.
- The Team addressed all the comments received, and produced a matrix showing where and how these have been addressed.

*b. Constraints*

The Evaluation Team faced serious constraints in carrying out its work. These included the non-availability of key project documentation and lack of evidence-based reporting, the shifting project objectives, the fact that the evaluation is taking place nearly two years after the main operational period ended and when most of the original actors involved are no longer in place, and the short time allocated for field work. Four of these constraints are worth spelling out in more detail.

First, the Team found considerable gaps in the documents available for review. Although a good deal of documentation was generated during the course of the project, materials like monthly implementation reports do not appear to have been synthesized in any way beyond the three annual reports. Much of the existing documentation was not filed in an organized fashion, and it was unclear as to whether gaps in paper files could be addressed by referring to electronic email archives, a task the Team could not undertake within the short time frame for the mission. Several partners reported that their own documentation was inadequate, and they had to turn to UNIFEM/ASRO for copies of annual reports.

Many of the documents available had no date, as is clear from the list in Annex 3. Moreover, it was unclear whether some of the key file documents were simply drafts produced by a desk officer that never left the desk, or were discussed in-house, or were shared with partners for discussion. In sending documents to the Evaluation Team, the Task Manager noted that he had only sent signed or clearly official documents. The Team nevertheless asked for and received further documentation in advance of their mission, and searched for other documentation in the files while in Amman. Otherwise, this evaluation report would have been sparse indeed.

Perhaps most seriously, a log frame was produced for the project at the start, but the Team could not find reports against this log frame, making it very difficult to review progress against planned objectives, outcomes or impact.

Second, the Team faced serious gaps in institutional memory given the many changes among Project staff and management (see Table 2), as well as among Project partners, which included changes of government and staff. If the Evaluation Task Manager and others had not made the effort to locate former staff and partners, the Team would not have been able to collect sufficient information for the evaluation.

Third, there was no database and/or clear-cut tracking system of project beneficiaries as was originally envisaged in the project document. This meant that a major source of evidence for reporting was simply not available, and the data sources for the three annual reports produced were open to question. For example, in listing workshop participants, it was not clear whether a participant had participated more than once; or whether the number of trainees was the same as those who found employment. As a result, in finalizing this report, the Team has changed the title of Section 5 from Evaluation Findings to Evaluation Observations because it does not have enough data and information to present solid findings.

The lack of a database affected the Team's ability to conduct a questionnaire. Insufficient information was available in project files to support a stratified random sample. Nor was it possible to organize a snowball sample without spending most of the 12-day mission in the e-village. Moreover, due to time constraints, it was not possible to pilot the questionnaire.

The Team initially decided to drop the questionnaire because there seemed to be no way to secure scientifically valid results. However, during meetings with JOHUD staff, it was decided to ask young female volunteers and students to administer the questionnaire in each of Libb and Mleih. This was an unscientific approach, but the Team thought it worth trying to glean some insights into project benefits as well as differences between the two villages. The findings from the questionnaire – and their value or otherwise – will be discussed further in Section 5.e.ii, and the tabulated questionnaire results are available in Annex 6, with the caveats emphasized.

The fourth constraint was the complexity of the original project design, compounded by changes in project structures, activities, and terminology over the course of implementation. Implementation was also complex because it involved a multiplicity of activities and partnerships of different kinds and levels of engagement.

In order to even be able to understand what happened during the course of the project, the Team had to construct detailed timelines covering the project's activities, phases, structure, and staff/management (see Tables 1 to 4), drawing on diverse reports as well as interviews. It should be emphasized that none of this information was available in the annual reports and there was no project final report. Without engaging in this excavation, the Team would not have been able to conduct the evaluation.

### *c. Acknowledgements*

The Evaluation Team would like to acknowledge the support and assistance of all the people with whom it came into contact in UNIFEM, the GoJ, the private sector, the non-profit sector, and the site villages. Almost everyone made time available, even if their relationship to their organization or Project had ended years previously.<sup>6</sup> Interviewees communicated a strong sense of commitment to development and to the Project. Their

---

<sup>6</sup> As of this writing, no response was received to the questions sent to the two former regional programme directors.



sincere interest in learning from the experience supported the Team's determination to produce a report that would hopefully be of value to them in their future work.

The Team would particularly like to thank UNIFEM/ASRO Regional Programme Director Dena Assaf and her staff, and especially the Team's direct liaison Project Coordinator Mohamed Jinini, who served as evaluation Task Manager, as well as Project Assistant Rasha Jouhar. We appreciated the professional manner in which they all supported our work while respecting our independence. The Team would also like to thank Shoa Al-Tawalbah, whose support was crucial in the administration of the questionnaire. Furthermore, Government counterparts, particularly in MoPIC and MoICT, were very supportive, going out of their way to review their files to share information, and the Team greatly appreciates their efforts.

Finally, the Team would like to note that its approach has been to recognize that there is nothing easier than hindsight. It arrives at the end of a seven-year period for a short visit and can never fully appreciate the enthusiasm, excitement, and benefits at different stages of the Project, nor the complexities of social, political, tribal, and family dynamics that promoted or impeded the process. Therefore, it has made every effort to avoid judgemental comments and to focus on the essential value-added of an evaluation: as honest a review as possible of what took place and the lessons for the future, confident that everyone wanted the best outcomes, and will want to know what to replicate and/or do differently.

### **3. Programme Context**

The Team reviewed a number of strategy documents and studies in order to situate the e-Village Project within the country, as well as regional and global contexts, as they relate to the use of ICT for socio-economic development. It presents the highlights below.<sup>7</sup>

#### *a. Jordan, ICT, and Gender*

Jordan is recognized as one of the pioneers in the Arab Region in using ICT to promote socio-economic development.<sup>8</sup> Its 2007-11 national ICT strategy aims to identify national ICT sub-sectors best suited for growth, and define Government actions to facilitate growth of the ICT sector. Jordan aims to increase the size of, and employment in, the ICT sector, increase internet penetration to cover some 50% of the population, contribute to growth in the economy, as well as improve citizen's quality of life. These efforts are relevant both to addressing poverty alleviation and gender inequality. The strategy also identifies hurdles to ICT growth, as well as the necessary enabling environment.<sup>9</sup> The ICT market in Jordan was expected to reach an estimated \$3 billion by 2011, up from \$1.8 billion in 2007. However, e-commerce is at an early stage of development,<sup>10</sup> and

<sup>7</sup> A fuller discussion can be found in the Inception Report.

<sup>8</sup> Mofleh, et. al, 2008, p. 4; MICT, 2004, pp. 1-2; and <http://www.jordanictforum.com>

<sup>9</sup> GoJ, 2007, p 1.

<sup>10</sup> Tarawneh, no date

Internet penetration remains relatively low at 20% of the population,<sup>11</sup> largely due to the cost of local telephone calls and cost of personal computers.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, government agencies generally face capacity problems, partly due to the fact that the country has launched several e-initiatives at the same time.<sup>13</sup>

A global review of gender aspects of ICT and its “transformative potential” recognizes that the availability, content and relevance of ICTs contribute to a digital divide that disadvantages the poorer sectors in society, in particular income and capability poor women. In spite of efforts to empower women through ICTs, women tend to be under-represented in needs assessments of ICTs for development.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, women in the Arab Region have not had wide access to ICT tools compared with males, particularly male youth. The reasons include cost, skills, language and literacy level. However, there is also increasing evidence that various groups of Arab women have been using ICTs effectively in “virtual activism” for some notable campaigns.<sup>15</sup>

A study that tracked the progress of Jordanian women in ICT space concluded that, overall, the educational system did not provide students with the necessary ICT skills to increase their access to employment opportunities in the labour market. Furthermore, academic choices generally followed a gendered pattern that might not equip women with the skills required in evolving labour markets.<sup>16</sup> The assumed link between gaps in earned income and women’s access to affordable ICT tools is reflected in data on gender-based earned income in Jordan; thus by 2007 male earned income was over four times that of female earned income (female \$1,543; male \$8,065).<sup>17</sup> Currently, the ICT sector in Jordan contributes some 14% to the gross domestic product (GDP) and employs around 15,000 employees, of whom around 24% are female.<sup>18</sup>

*b. Using ICT to Address Poverty and Gender Inequality*

Recognizing the gender-based digital divide as one of the key impediments to the social and economic empowerment of women, UNIFEM/ASRO in 2002 launched the ‘Achieving E-Quality in the ICT Sector Project’ in Jordan. The Project aimed to facilitate the access of women in underprivileged communities to ICT tools through capacity building, to develop the technical and livelihood skills of local communities, and to raise awareness among females on opportunities available for them to join the labour market. The aim is to enable women to join the ICT sector in Jordan by building their computer and technical skills through the Cisco Networking Academy, with graduates to be linked to the job market through coordinated efforts of private and public sector. Among other things, the project developed and disseminated research on Jordanian Women in ICT and trained 1,300 students (55% women) on market-relevant job opportunities through ICT

---

<sup>11</sup> Mofleh et. al., 2008, p. 6.

<sup>12</sup> Tarawneh, no date

<sup>13</sup> Mofleh, et. al., pp. 4, 10-11.

<sup>14</sup> UNDP, 2006, pp. 6-7, 23.

<sup>15</sup> Tadros, 2005, pp. 2, 24.

<sup>16</sup> UNIFEM/ASRO, no date/b. See also UNIFEM/ASRO, 2004, m/1.

<sup>17</sup> UNDP, 2009. Table J: Gender-related development index and its component.

<sup>18</sup> Jordan Times, July 2010.

skills.

The GoJ-UNIFEM/ASRO e-Village Project aimed to tap this experience. It should be noted that the e-Village Project, which seeks to overcome the gender-based digital divide while also targeting poverty, was not the first of its kind. The e-village concept, defined as a physical space with activities and interactions enhanced by electronic access to information and services, appears to have been discussed internationally by the late 1990s, and there were projects in Africa and Asia. For example, the International Development Research Centre covered the ACACIA project which aims to empower communities with the ability to apply ICT to their own social and economic development.<sup>19</sup>

Given that the e-Village Project seeks to overcome the gender-based digital divide while also targeting poverty, it is important to recognize that low-income women with limited skills and capabilities are more likely to be micro-entrepreneurs in the informal sector, rural and urban.<sup>20</sup> Yet, as a 1998 study revealed, the “evidence for the effectiveness of microcredit as a poverty alleviation tool remains inconclusive”; rather, a strategic multi-pronged approach was needed that “includes microcredit as part of a comprehensive gender-sensitive poverty alleviation package”.<sup>21</sup>

A decade later, as pointed out in a EUROMED study, the same challenges still faced micro-entrepreneurs, including in Jordan: lack of awareness and knowledge about market processes; market saturation due to the focus on traditional services and production of goods for which there is low market demand; competition from low cost, higher quality imported goods facilitated by trade agreements; low quality of goods produced; difficulty in identifying and accessing lucrative markets; problems with middlepersons; the cost of transportation; and limited access to credit.<sup>22</sup> The study proposed adopting methodologies such as that developed by Practical Action, which reverses the traditional approach of working with producers to enhance their products and market access. Instead, it starts the analysis at the final sales outlet and works back along the chain from markets to the point of production. While so doing, it establishes linkages all long the market chain between producers and sellers, thus reinforcing sustainability of outreach and sales.

#### **4. The e-Village Project**

A brief discussion of the context of the e-Village Project and its main objectives are presented below as background to the Team’s analysis in Section 5.

---

<sup>19</sup> See [www.idrc.ca/en](http://www.idrc.ca/en) See also the Senegal Acacia Strategy, launched in 1997, which aims to empower communities through ICT [www.commint.com/en/node](http://www.commint.com/en/node) IDRC also has a database on ICT development projects in Africa.

<sup>20</sup> EUROMED Programme on the Role of Women in Economic Life, 2008/c.

<sup>21</sup> UNESCWA, 1998, pp. 81, 85.

<sup>22</sup> EUROMED, 2008/c.

a. *Process of Selecting Libb and Mleih and Needs Assessment*

In order to select the pilot e-village, a National Task Force was established and began by defining key criteria. These included that it be one of the 75 villages with a knowledge station and have at least one e-connected school, the necessary basic infrastructure, minimum required educational level, and not too distant from the capital Amman.<sup>23</sup> The Task Force selected the villages of Mleih and Libb in Madaba Governorate after consideration of various possibilities in several governorates.

UNIFEM/ASRO conducted an assessment of Libb and Mleih in 2003 covering education and literacy levels, economic activity rates and unemployment levels, basic and social services, including ICT.<sup>24</sup> The assessment demonstrated sensitivity to gender equality and other human rights, such as location and poverty.<sup>25</sup> At that time, the population in Mleih and Libb was 5,171 and 4,410 respectively, totalling 1,860 households, and more or less equally divided between male and female. Among other findings, the assessment found high unemployment affecting both male and female villagers, though rates among the latter tended to be higher. It revealed that the decrease in traditional economic activities (such as handicrafts and agriculture) and the increase in service sector jobs had not necessarily opened up employment opportunities for female villagers in spite of their increasing levels of education. Poor and unmarried women in particular were more likely to be confined to traditional female economic activities or low-skill manufacturing jobs.

Mleih and Libb's Knowledge Centre, set up in 2001, offered basic ICT training for a nominal fee. In time, more villagers became familiar with ICT and had access to affordable computers, reducing interest in the Knowledge Centres. Furthermore ICT-related training and services were offered more or less as stand-alone skills, rather than as part of a package linked to entrepreneurial and other employment opportunities. Indeed, the assessment found that lack of marketing, finance and innovation were not, in the villagers' perception, linked to the potential of ICT. The assessment found that female villagers were less able to take advantage of ICT-related services, largely due to constraints on their physical mobility within the village and beyond, for example community attitudes towards females frequenting Internet cafes. Moreover, female villagers had limited purchasing power relative to their male peers, due to traditional dependence on family and household and relatively limited employment opportunities.

The assessment concluded with several recommendations, including a focus on ICT-related job and e-business opportunities to address the relatively high unemployment rates in the villages; make a tangible difference in people's lives through innovative ideas which complement existing traditional economic activities; address the financial obstacles faced by poor villagers; develop a sound communication policy to reach all villagers, in particular women and youth; open up new employment opportunities for

---

<sup>23</sup> UNIFEM/ASRO, 2004/b, pp. 8-10.

<sup>24</sup> UNIFEM/ASRO, 2003, pp. i-vi.

<sup>25</sup> It should be noted that the human-rights based approach (HRBA) was not fully fleshed out as a global concept at the time the needs assessment was conducted.

women through ICT-related skills; and make use of existing village infrastructure and outreach networks, including NGO interventions.

*b. e-Village Project Objectives, Activities, and Partnerships*

The project document starting date was January 2004 for a period of three years. The total budget was \$2.5 million, of which the GoJ contributed \$847,000 in cash and \$1 million in kind; UNIFEM contributed \$73,000 in cash and \$50,000 in kind; and third parties contributed \$330,000 in cash. It was to be a pilot project for Jordan that could serve as a model for others.

According to the project document, the overall Development Objective of the e-Village project was established as follows: *To transform a Jordanian village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life.* The change foreseen in this development objective was to be achieved through three objectives, each with a diverse set of activities:

1) *Raise women and men villagers' awareness on different village initiatives in respect of use of technology and gender-related issues.* It was envisaged that an Information and Awareness Centre would implement these activities: field awareness campaigns; evaluation, counselling and directing services as well as basic ICT assistance; awareness raising workshops; a bulletin board to disseminate information; entertainment activities; and support the transformation of village schools into information hubs.

2) *Build the capacity and professional skills of villagers allowing them to benefit from ICT services through the establishment of an Empowerment Centre.* It was planned that an Empowerment Centre within the village Knowledge Station would undertake activities such as: advanced training courses linked to the requirements of the Marketing and Entrepreneur Centres respectively; self-empowerment courses and tailored training courses; and ICT training courses.

3) *Enhance economic opportunities within the village by creating new job opportunities and providing professional marketing and entrepreneurial services.* Activities would include establishing a marketing centre and an e-services centre providing entrepreneurial services.

Towards the end of the Project Document, these objectives were restated as three levels that were elaborated in the annexes. The three levels were: Level A: Information and Awareness Centre; Level B: the Empowerment Centre; and Level C: Economic Opportunities, in a way that was confusing for the reader. In parallel, the e-Village Project provided for policy advocacy and networking activities, establishing a database and tracking system, as well as making knowledge available through research and documentation. At least half of the beneficiaries were to be women.

Much of the first year was taken up in construction and renovation and only a few activities – such as another needs assessment and awareness raising – were carried out.

By the time of the first annual report (March 2004 – April 2005), the project components had changed somewhat, as is shown in Table 1, from three objective and levels, to three components: awareness raising, capacity building, and economic empowerment.

As Table 1 also shows, the project components were quite significantly changed by the time of the second annual report (April 2005 – March 2006) under a new programme manager. The new Project team decided to put more emphasis on economic activities so as to generate income for the population as well as to cover the educational and social activities being introduced under the Project. The project now consisted of eight programmes, and any reference to components or levels was dropped.

The eight programmes, some of which included several new activities, were: Livelihood Skills Development and Employment, which included a business incubator (soap production - new) and a local village production centre (mosaic - new); Technical Skills Development Programme/Microsoft IT Academy; Extracurricular Education Programme – with a new focus on youth, including through Lego Robotics (building robots that can perform certain tasks using lego blocks) and Intel computer clubhouse; Media Programme – new (film club and radio station); Information and Awareness Programme; Volunteerism Programme – new; Special Needs Programme – new; Technology Programme – new. By the time of the Third Annual Report, the number of programmes had been reduced to six, but no explanation was given as to what happened to the two programmes dropped (special needs and technology).

The Project was originally designed from 2004-6 and went on for an additional year into 2007 (the Team could find no formal documentation regarding this extension). The Project was officially extended as an “expansion” in 2008 according to a signed document to this effect. The project handover process began in 2009 and until the project was operationally closed on March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2010. The phases of the project are set out in Table 4, with explanatory notes based on the documentation.

The 2008 expansion committed the GoJ (MoICT) to an additional contribution of \$108,301 and UNIFEM to \$162,592. The aim was to continue activities underway, fundraise for 2009-10; and introduce new activities. The document reports on 2004-7 activities mentions mosaics and packaging/labelling; no mention is made of the fate of the sewing, cafeteria, bakery, and sweets activities that had been launched during implementation. The document also cites plans to “expand” e-Village activities in some new area, e.g: hubs for e-Government and a technology-driven Health Resource Centre. Although committed funds were only available for 2008, a three-year budget covers 2009-10 on the basis that funding will be sought for the remaining period.

The diversity of project activities – which included income-generating as well as educational activities – is difficult to keep track of. Based on the annual reports, interviews, and diverse notes from the file, the Team constructed a timeline of activities seeking to establish when each activity began, how long it remained operational, and when it stopped – see Table 3.

The Project engaged a wide range of Government, inter-governmental, non-governmental, and private sector partners that were involved at different stages and levels. The numbers changed during the course of the project. The Project Document listed as many as 29 partners (although the roles of only 15 were described in an annex to the document), while the Evaluation Team's TOR in 2010 listed 16 partners.

UNIFEM/ASRO signed memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with several of the partners, which differ regarding expected outputs, activities, obligations and responsibilities. For example, the MOU with INJAZ includes: developing qualitative and quantitative indicators to measure progress. The MOU with the USAID/AMIR Programme mentions specific research activities regarding e-services.<sup>26</sup> UNIFEM/ASRO also signed contractual agreements with various partners and contractors. For example the MOU signed with the Noor Al-Hussain Foundation includes reference to construction and renovation.<sup>27</sup> Another example is the contractual agreement with the CDG Engineering and Management Associates for renovation of old stone houses in which various E-Village project activities would be based.<sup>28</sup>

A National Task Force was to be established whose working groups would play an important part in monitoring and evaluation, but it remains unclear to the Team what formal structures were put in place and how long they lasted.

The project was managed by a project manager supported by a number of staff based in Amman, with the entire project team totalling as many as six during 2006 and 2007. There were several changes in project staff as well as UNIFEM/ASRO senior management during the course of the project, as set out in Table 2. In addition, a number of trainees and "volunteers" from the villages themselves worked for the project, on a *pro bono* basis to begin with and then on the basis of a stipend from UN Volunteers which the villagers treated as a salary.<sup>29</sup> The project manager reported directly to the UNIFEM/ASRO regional programme director.

## **5. Evaluation Observations**

As noted in Section 2.b on constraints, credible data to support findings in the full sense of the word were either unavailable or inaccessible, and there was no trace of a database, which was a particular constraint. Accordingly, the Evaluation Team has used the term "observations" rather than "findings" in the title of this section. It has organized its observations under the five evaluation areas used by the UN Evaluation Group and set out in the Team's TOR: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Some of the same issues emerge in more than one area and in order to avoid repetition the Team analyses the issue in full in the most appropriate area, noting that it is also related to a different area.

---

<sup>26</sup>UNIFEM/ASRO, no date/c.

<sup>27</sup> UNIFEM/ASRO, 2004/i.

<sup>28</sup> CDG, 2004.

<sup>29</sup> This is based on interviews with the villagers as well documentation in the files.

a. Relevance

i. Project concept

At the time that the project was conceived, the use of the Internet was not yet prevalent in Jordan and there were rural-urban as well as gender digital divides (see Section 3 on programme context). The Evaluation Team found that the Project concept of piloting the use of ICT in a Jordanian village to bridge those divides as well as to address the pressing need of rural communities for jobs and incomes was indeed relevant. In addition to the studies cited in the Project Document and its annexes, this was supported by the Team's own research, interviews, and focus group sessions. The Team also found that the project was well situated in national and regional plans, as well as within international conventions and goals. It was also well situated within the UNIFEM/ASRO sub-regional strategy, as discussed in Section 3 above. The issues addressed by the Project remained relevant during implementation, based on the Team's own research, interviews, and focus group sessions.

ii. Positive aspects of project site selection

Based on the Project documentation, the site selection process appeared to have been thorough and transparent. It involved many stakeholders in establishing criteria and in selecting the municipality of Mleih and Libb in Madaba Governorate, which was relevant to the project objectives of bridging the digital divide. However, there were both positive and negative aspects to the site selection.

An important positive aspect demonstrated through the project is that, contrary to the views expressed by some Amman-based interviewees, social mores are not an obstacle to the kind of social, educational, or economic innovation proposed in this project.<sup>30</sup> The Team makes this observation based on its interviews, focus groups, and field visit observations. Several interviewees affirmed that the Mleih community was initially reluctant to allow girls to go to a Computer Clubhouse or Lego Robotics session alongside boys or stay late at a film club activity in Amman. They soon dropped their reservations when they saw how much their children benefited – so much so that some female students were allowed to go on trips to America with male students and the female supervisor. Several interviewees also said the youth were so committed that they often brought the supervisors from home to open the clubs.

The factors for the social changes would need to be identified in a fully-fledged research project. The Team's observations based on interviews and focus group discussions in the e-Village included:

---

<sup>30</sup> During the Team's mission some Amman-based interviewees questioned the site selection on grounds of the "difficult" social mores because the locales were known to be conservative and "rigid". Further, that the agriculturally-based economy led parents to pull children out of school for harvest, indicating a lack of commitment to structured activities such as schooling.



- The effort the two supervisors invested in visiting homes and speaking to parents, particularly in Mleih;
- The fact that the project was supported by the Government and the UN (which was specifically cited by some interviewees as making it respectable and “safe”);
- Families made the effort to visit project sites early on to see the activities and found nothing of concern;
- The clear benefit to their children in school work and expanded horizons;
- Four families of the same tribe made up the bulk of the population so that everyone is related to or has easy access to knowledge of everyone else; and
- Increasing access to and awareness of the importance of ICT, although it is unclear how much the Project contributed to this change.

As regards the activities supported by the project, the population size of 10,000 seemed sufficient for the initiative as regards the educational and social activities, and there appeared to be no major obstacles to economic activity, contrary to the views of some Amman-based interviewees who thought that a greater population density in a semi-urban area might have been more advisable.<sup>31</sup> The considerable problems that emerged in terms of sustaining the economic activities launched were due to other factors, which will be discussed in 5.b and 5.d. The Team’s observations, interviews, and focus groups also revealed that there appeared to be no obstacles to women working in places frequented by men, and most of the project staff and employees were women. In interviews, women workers said their families were happy that their work place was close to their home. At the same time, it was also clear from the interviews that some women were working at places as far away from their homes as Aqaba. There appeared to be a consensus among the interviewees and focus groups that the need for income was driving women to work outside the home, in addition to their traditional home-based work.

### iii. Problematic aspects of project site selection and of needs assessment

The problematic aspects of site selection can to some extent be traced back to the needs assessment undertaken in Libb and Mleih. The needs assessment report appeared to be fairly thorough and identified the pressing need for jobs and incomes, the serious transport issues between Mleih and Libb – they are about four kilometres apart, easy in a car or bus but a difficult walk – as well as the localities’ limited access to the rest of Jordan. However, there were issues that were not flagged in the needs assessment: Libb and Mleih had originally been two separate villages that were combined into one municipality. The needs assessment report downplayed the differences between these two localities, alternately speaking of them as a single village, as a “cluster”, and as two villages, which can be quite confusing to the reader unfamiliar with the e-village project

---

<sup>31</sup> These points were made in focus groups and interviews.

site.<sup>32</sup> During implementation, the documentation referred to the “e-village” even though there were two localities.<sup>33</sup>

The Team’s albeit limited fieldwork tentatively identified the following potentially significant differences between Libb and Mleih:

- Mleih is on the main road to Madaba city while Libb is not, giving Mleih easier access to urban life and new developments and keeping Libb relatively isolated.
- There are spatial differences: Libb’s households are scattered and further apart, while Mleih’s are more closely clustered.
- Mleih has had the advantage of an established community centre for some 20 years – the JOHUD community development centre – whereas Libb has not.<sup>34</sup>
- The women of Mleih appear to have more advanced home- and shop-based income-generating activities and are capable of forming cooperatives whereas the women of Libb appear largely engaged in micro home-based income generation.<sup>35</sup>
- The population still seems to see itself as belonging to two distinct villages.

Even though the differences between the two localities were not analyzed in depth in the needs assessment report, some activities were sited in Libb (all the income generation activities and some educational/social ones) and others in Mleih (educational). The Team’s field questionnaire, field visits, and focus groups revealed that the Project site was in effect in two distinct villages:

- This resulted in duplication of some activities, such as IT training, undermining the potential for economies of scale.
- All the income-generating activities were placed in the more isolated locale that had lesser access to, dealings with, and experience of urban areas/markets, limiting these activities’ success potential.
- The limited access by one village to activities in the other was not bridged.
- The villagers’ ability to learn from experience in the diverse project activities remained limited.

b. Effectiveness

i. Project design

The Project Document signed in 2004 opted for a comprehensive development approach that aimed to address Libb and Mleih’s developmental as well as economic needs. It will be recalled that the project development objective was: “To transform a Jordanian

---

<sup>32</sup> An interviewee who was involved in the project formulation stage noted that one reason the project was not sited in one locality – i.e. either Libb or Mleih – was so as to have a larger population size.

<sup>33</sup> The Evaluation Team found this terminology confusing. In addition, the “e-village” was not the village of Libb or Mleih but rather a specific site within those villages where old stone houses rented from villagers were renovated for the purpose of the project.

<sup>34</sup> Perhaps as a result of these advantages, the people of Mleih appear able to act in a more entrepreneurial way than those of Libb, and the extent of social change since the Project began appeared to be greater in Mleih than in Libb.

<sup>35</sup> One home-based Mleih businesswomen even said she had a request for cloaks from Qatar.

village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life.”<sup>36</sup> This was to be implemented through three objectives that involved 14 activities, some of which included establishing centres, such as a marketing centre, e-services centre, and an entrepreneur office. There was a shift to include more economic activities in early 2005 and the project structure was “narrowed” into eight programmes, which were reduced to six by the time of the Third Annual Report.

The Evaluation Team identified several factors regarding the Project design at the start and as it was amended, with implications for effectiveness and sustainability:

- The proposed structure, multiple levels and activities were complex and difficult to grasp, with implications for implementation, monitoring and evaluation.<sup>37</sup>
- The objectives appeared too extensive and wide-ranging against Libb and Mleih’s limited absorptive capacity, which is indicated by their level of development, poverty, and population size (as discussed in the needs assessment and confirmed by field visit observations and interviews).
- No reference was made in the Project Document and subsequent documentation to other experiences in establishing e-villages.<sup>38</sup>
- This was a pilot – and also the first time that UNIFEM/ASRO had engaged in a project involving implementation at the grassroots level – but the Team did not find references to plans to phase activities and learn from experience before moving on to additional phases.
- According to the Project and interviews, even though this was a pilot, a decision was made to adopt a comprehensive development approach. However, the Team did not find references to research regarding experience in comprehensive development or area development schemes; no regional or international expertise appears to have been tapped.
- Although there were plans to create new job opportunities, the Team did not find references to lessons learned from similar attempts in Jordan or the region, including specifically in micro-enterprise development.<sup>39</sup>

## ii. Project implementation

As noted above, implementation was delayed during 2004 and early 2005 due to the delays in construction of new rooms attached to the JOHUD community development centre (CDC) in Mleih, which were to be used for educational activities, and the renovation of old stone houses rented from villagers in Libb that were to be used for income generating as well as educational and social activities. During this period, staff

---

<sup>36</sup> Although the project objectives and the evolution of activities have been discussed in Section 4, they are being briefly summarized here to support the ensuing discussion.

<sup>37</sup> They were restated again in the First Annual Report - see Table 1(B).

<sup>38</sup> It appears that there was considerable brainstorming within UNIFEM and with partners about the project design and formulation. However the Team could find no information on the extent to which project formulation took e-village experiences in other regions into consideration.

<sup>39</sup> Indeed, an NHF project in Libb predated the UNIFEM project, but the Team did not find a reference to lessons learned from this project. Even though these activities reportedly faced difficulties, they were later taken on by the UNIFEM project, and are marked as “E” in Table 3.

were trained and hired, and went on to carry out an extensive needs assessment that covered the planned project activities listed in Table 1(A).

The process used in hiring staff appeared to be fair and transparent and to take issues such as diversity and poverty into account. The majority of staff in the Libb and Mleih were women, as were almost all the workers in the economic activities. As for Amman-based staff, the UNIFEM/ASRO regional programme directors were female the senior project staff were men; and the junior project staff were women, with a ratio of four men to two women at the height of project activities (see also Table 2). The overall project gender balance in project staff in the field favoured women.

The key evaluation question under implementation is the extent to which the project achieved intended outcomes as outlined in the project logframe. A logframe was attached as an annex to the project document (see Annex 7). The Evaluation Team noted that the logframe often mixed between outputs and outcomes, and that some of the indicators listed could not in fact provide the information necessary to track progress. The Team did not find any updated versions of the logframe that tracked progress against planned outcomes and outputs. Furthermore, as noted earlier, the Project structure changed after April 2005, and the Team did not find a logframe that reflected these changes. It is therefore not able to assess the extent to which the Project achieved its outputs and contributed to stated outcomes as reflected in a logframe.

In order to assess the effectiveness of Project activities, the Evaluation Team constructed a timeline of activities, showing when each was initially conceived or proposed, when it was implemented, and how long it remained active (see Table 3, which is drawn from annual reports and other documentation as well as interviews, and field observations). For the purpose of discussion, and given the changes in Project structure described above, the Team clustered the timeline's activities under three broad areas: economic, educational/skills development, and social.

Basing its analysis on this timeline, the Team found that the Project had achieved good outputs in terms of educational activities. For example, according to the Third Annual Report (April 2006 – December 2007), 240 members registered in the Intel Computer Clubhouse in Mleih and 1,500 students made use of the Robotics lab since it was opened in 2005.<sup>40</sup> The Team's sense of the value of the educational activities in Mleih in particular was reinforced by its field visits and interviews with beneficiaries and other members of the population.<sup>41</sup>

The Project made a particular effort to reach girl students and a Robotics lab was established in each of Mleih and Libb girls' schools. However, the fact that the activity was extra-curricular meant students had difficulty in participating. Teachers initially let their students attend during assigned teaching hours, but both teachers and students

---

<sup>40</sup> Students and children also participated in film club training activities and showings.

<sup>41</sup> Many interviewees gave glowing descriptions of the benefits to the school students, including better class performance, ability to compete and succeed at the national level, enhanced team spirit, broadened horizons, and volunteerism, among others.

became unwilling to do so as they risked falling behind in coursework and putting their examination results at risk. Eventually, the number of students participating was reduced to the dozen or so who were willing to participate during breaks or stay after hours. The students in Libb had a particularly difficult time as the school did not permit students to stay after hours and transport issues made it difficult for them to catch up by going to the Robotics lab hosted by the JOHUD CDC in Mleih.

In a positive partnership contribution, the Ministry of Education (MoE) had supported the initiative by assigning a teacher exclusively to Robotics in each school. However, the Team was told by interviewees that, while welcome, this also proved problematic as it was not appreciated by other teachers with heavier workloads. According to one interviewee, there was no basis on which to assess the initiative's progress and results.

In terms of skills development the Third Annual Report indicates that a "total of 125 villagers", 100 of them women, graduated from the IT Academy in Libb sponsored by Microsoft (24 were trained during the previous reporting period). It was also reported that 19 of the graduates found jobs, four within the e-Village. The Team cannot judge the impact of the training as there is no information on the use the trainees made of their new skills, whether the 19 who found jobs are still employed, and how significant the numbers are vis-à-vis the needs of the population at large.

The Team finds it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the activities it has clustered under the category of Social activities without workshop evaluations and without getting a sense of the numbers that actually participated vis-à-vis potential participants.<sup>42</sup> The Team did not have access to workshop content and so was unable to assess whether these tackled gender relations, and if so, how.

A point flagged by some interviewees and focus group participants was that the Project missed an opportunity to address gender equality as an issue – i.e. to move beyond ensuring that women participated in project activities to systematically promote a better understanding of women and men's roles, rights, and responsibilities. Based on its review of accessible documentation and its interviews, the Team would agree that this appeared to be the case.

The Evaluation Team found that the economic activities were the most challenging ones undertaken by the Project. The Third Annual Report tabulated information for seven activities in terms of women trained, numbers employed, number of products produced, and income generated.<sup>43</sup> Almost all the workers were women. For the mosaic centre, for example, 10 women were trained, 5 employed (presumably from among the trainees), 778 pieces were produced, and total income over two years of operation amounted to JD 7,635.25. Each of the economic activities employed between three and six workers. However, this does not give a sense of how significant the numbers were vis-à-vis population needs as well as the investment made.

---

<sup>42</sup> Workshops and events were organized to promote information and awareness on issues as diverse as pedestrian safety, reproductive health, and bird flu, according to the Third Annual Report

<sup>43</sup> Mosaics, packaging/labelling, embroidery, cafeteria, sweets, organic farming, and call centre.

The Team's interviews and field visits affirmed that the community had highly appreciated and needed the income generating activities when these were active in 2007-8. Beyond the Libb e-Village, there was anecdotal evidence that the training had generated employment. For example, the team was told about women trained for the e-Village who left to find higher paid work elsewhere, but there was no way of tracking these numbers.

Overall, however, the Team could not judge the economic activities as effective even at the height of their functioning, because of the following:

- There appeared to be no cost-benefit analysis in terms of the funds invested vs. the numbers of jobs generated.
- It was unclear whether the activities could eventually take advantage of economies of scale.
- Clients for the products appeared to consist mainly of project partners or their contacts. On the face of it, it is an advantage for Libb, given its isolation, to have its network of contacts broadened, but it was not clear to the Team whether this was done in a way that was sustainable or not.
- The costs of the income-generating activities – including rents, salaries, and utilities – were subsidized by the UNIFEM/ASRO project.
- Interviewees mentioned that feasibility studies had been done before introducing specific income-generating activities, but the Evaluation Team could not find them in the Project files – or any reference to market analysis and strategy reports.

It is worth recalling that the major impetus for the Project and its development objective was “ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life.” The link between these economic activities and ICT was not clear to the Evaluation Team. Some of the economic activities in fact predated the Project and had been initiated by an earlier NHF project in Libb (marked “E” in Table 3) that were later taken over and “re-activated” by the UNIFEM/ASRO Project (the Team did not find an analysis of whether these activities were economically viable or not). Others were similar to income generating or micro-projects elsewhere in Jordan. The argument made in interviews and documentation was that online marketing would be used for the products. However, the Team did not find a sufficiently compelling case was made for the link between ICT and the economic activities.<sup>44</sup>

It is worth noting that, although policy advocacy was a stated objective in the Project Document, the Team found little evidence of attempts to make the link between Project activities with national strategies and policies.

Finally, it should be mentioned that one of the main challenges identified by the needs assessment – the isolation of the villages, particularly Libb, and the difficulty of

---

<sup>44</sup> An interviewee shared the following reflections: “For a period there was separation between the socio-economic projects and the e-Village. Once the cooperative was established there was a parting of the ways with the e-Village because of internal issues and personalities.”

movement from one to the other – seemed unchanged. As noted in Section 5.e below, the villagers from each of Libb and Mleih did not appear to have access to or even be informed about e-Village activities in the other, although the Evaluation Team’s interviews indicated that a few students from Libb were participating in the educational activities in Mleih.

### iii. Project partnerships

Based on its interviews, focus group discussions, and documents review, the Team found that the strategy of involving diverse partners was effective: it leveraged support in both cash and kind, and attracted new partners during the course of implementation. It was also innovative, and several interviewees said that it had not been tried before. A focus group meeting revealed that some partners at the operational level were brought together on occasion and appreciated the interaction because it was the first time they had had such meetings (there may have been a missed opportunity to include e-Village workers in meetings, as relevant, for learning and to expand horizons). However, the Team also found that there had been limited joint planning and knowledge sharing among partners: Some functioned as subcontractors while others remained as donors rather than becoming partners in the full sense of the word. The Team also felt that such a large number of partners involved in diverse areas may have exceeded the capacity of staff to manage and tap their real value-added.

Moreover, the fact that the early success of the project attracted more partners may have expanded the project’s scope, adding to the challenges of implementation and sustainability. It appeared that this was part of the reason for the radio station activity, as well as the film club. At the same time, partnerships did not necessarily prevent duplication, one of the reasons for bringing such a wide range of partners into a comprehensive development activity. For example, a partner carried out a women and technology project in Mleih without apparently linking it to the training available in Libb. In addition, some interviewees reported insufficient linkages between the Knowledge Station and IT activities in Mleih even though they were in the same compound.

Certain issues came up as a result of some of the partnerships. For example, based on its interviews and documents review, the Team found that the use of UNVs to contract village-based project workers proved problematic. The arrangement reportedly began to consolidate staff contracts in one organization.<sup>45</sup> But this skewed the meaning of volunteerism, as the project workers referred to themselves as volunteers but saw what they were paid as a salary and indeed it was a generous stipend by Jordanian standards.<sup>46</sup> There were reportedly some tensions between what was paid to Amman-based volunteers and e-Village-based volunteers. The provision of regular salaries contributed to the villagers’ sense of dependency on the Project rather than on the actual earnings of the income-generating projects. It should however be noted that there were active volunteers among the Mleih youth, especially girls, who contributed their time freely.

---

<sup>45</sup> The First Annual Report cited this as a lesson learned.

<sup>46</sup> According to a report in the file, the “stipends” of three UNV e-Village staff increased to 385 a month in 2007 from JD275 in 2005.

Perhaps most seriously, the Team found that the Project remained identified with UNIFEM from its inception to the end of project activities, as was confirmed by several interviewees and as was conveyed through the Project documentation.<sup>47</sup> This had negative repercussions for the Project's potential for sustainability, as discussed in 5.d.

c. *Efficiency*

i. Monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management

It is widely accepted that sound monitoring systems are essential for the efficient management of all development activities. This is much more so for a pilot project in which considerable investment has been made with a view to possible replication. A database manager and tracking system was envisaged in the Project Document, but as far as the Team can ascertain there was no database manager. There was some reference in the documentation of a database in the e-Village but the Team could not locate this.

The Project Document also stated that a monitoring and evaluation component would be designed, but the Team did not find a monitoring strategy in the documentation to which it had access. Although as previously mentioned a needs assessment was conducted for the design of the Project as well as during the first years of Project implementation, these were not used to construct a Project baseline, judging by available documentation and interviews. Based on interviews and a review of the files, field staff did generate regular reports, but the main use made of the information appears to have been for the purpose of the three annual reports, which were descriptive and short on quantitative information relevant to measuring progress. Nor did the progress reports include a work plan/matrix for the following year. The Team found no indication in the documentation that Project management had carried out the kind of monitoring that would have enabled the timely identification of constraints affecting activities and thus enable course correction. Such monitoring might also have contributed to the sustainability of project activities.

The Team was concerned that an evaluation was not carried out when the Project was extended from 2006 to 2007, or before the agreement on a new Phase in 2008. Project management informed the Team that this was because the agreed Project Document provided that the final evaluation should be part of the final report, and that the report of this Evaluation Team would serve that function. However, the Team believes that the fact that an independent evaluation was not carried out in 2007 did not enable a course correction for 2008 based on capacity, sustainability, and other issues that could have been identified. Indeed, some of these issues were identified in an "Overview Report" – an assessment of Project activities – that the Team found in the Project files and that was commissioned by the new UNIFEM/ASRO senior management in February 2008.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> For example, the Second Annual Report (April 2005 – March 2006) repeatedly gave credit to UNIFEM's role in implementation, even in citing such details as working with local designs and setting up the kitchen in the proposed café.

<sup>48</sup> Even though the version the Team found was incomplete and not finalized, it provided interesting insights into the state of the Project at that time (see Table 4).



As a result, even though there were already several economic, educational/skills development, and social activities in place whose sustainability was not yet guaranteed, the Project was “expanded” in 2008 with additional funds and new activities were proposed such as hubs for e-Government and a technology driven Health Resource Centre with WHO.

The Team found several issues related to knowledge management. It has referred to the gaps in documentation and lack of coherence in Project files, and it should be noted that Government and other partners also faced these problems. The Team did not find a systematic attempt at documentation for the purposes of lessons learned, although this would have been important for a pilot project. In some development projects, it is not possible for project staff to undertake such documentation because they are too close to the project or are over-stretched, and consultants are recruited for this purpose. However, beyond reports of activities in e-Pulse, a newsletter produced by this and the UNIFEM/ASRO e-Quality project, and the short sections in the annual reports on lessons learned, the Team did not find the kind of documentation that would enable replication.<sup>49</sup>

## ii. Project process and oversight

The Team observed that introducing several activities at the same time (see Table 3) – rather than phasing and sequencing of activities – did not enable a more systematic approach to lessons learned and corrective action, which is especially important for a pilot initiative of this size and scope. Phasing might also have enabled some income generating activities to take root before new ones were embarked upon and have allowed issues like economies of scale, the capacity of different beneficiaries, market demand and family and tribal relationships to surface and be dealt with.<sup>50</sup>

In some instances, activities were embarked upon without sufficient study or understanding of the regulatory framework. For example, equipment was purchased for a village radio station and several villagers were trained. However, the license to actually operate the radio station could not be secured, dissipating the investment, energy and enthusiasm that reportedly went into the effort. In another case, investment was made in training villagers to work in a call centre, with the hope that an Amman-based company would outpost a centre in Libb. However, when companies were approached there was no interest, partly due to the fact that the bandwidth was inadequate and it would be too costly to outpost such a call centre.

During the Project period, there were many changes in UNIFEM/ASRO as well as Project staff management at the end of Phase I in 2007 (see Table 2), which affected

---

<sup>49</sup> It should be noted that there was an undated replication proposal in the files, “E-Village Phase II: Replication of the e-Village Project” proposing to replicate the project in Raghdan, a high density population area in the heart of Amman, but it simply listed several of the activities underway in the Mleih/Libb Project without any analysis of constraints, lessons learned, prospects for sustainability, etc.

<sup>50</sup> For example, there was just three months between the time the packaging and labelling activity began and the mosaic activity was introduced, as the Team learned from interviews.

Phase II and the handover process, although it is not possible to speculate on whether things might have gone differently if the same staff had remained in place. From what the Evaluation Team could glean from Project files and interviews, there appeared to be insufficient management guidance for much of 2008. In 2009, as a result of the end of the contract with UNV, workers on different activities in the e-Village remained without income for several months, and some activities were reportedly only sustained as a result of their dedication.

Although efforts were made for a handover during 2008 and early 2009, the handover continued through 2009 and was completed in March 2010. The Team looked into the length of time that the handover took, and learned the following from interviews and project files:

- There was a UNIFEM/ASRO management transition from August 2008 to April 2009 when new senior management was appointed (see Table 2). Although there were officers-in-charge during this period and handover efforts continued, this may have been a fluid period without the kind of substantive knowledge and authoritative direction to close a project of this scope.
- New UNIFEM/ASRO senior management assigned a new Project manager in May 2009, who began to finalize the approach of previous managers to hand over key components to each of JOHUD (Lego Robotics, computer clubhouse, film club), Qanater (income-generating activities), and the NICT (the IT Academy destined to become a Knowledge Station).
- However, management identified the need for a change of direction so as to hand over the project to the Government, as was standard practice both as regards Government and the UN. Meetings were held with Government to discuss modalities, a process delayed by a cabinet change. The process was concluded in March 2010 in a Government-UNIFEM agreement that also identified the best qualified hosts for project components – JOHUD, Qanater and the NICT.

The Team found that, in these circumstances, and given the need to conduct it in line with rules and procedures, the handover process was as efficient as it could have been.

Finally, the Evaluation Team has some observations regarding the role UNIFEM/ASRO assumed as executing agency. UNIFEM/ASRO began as the main actor in the initiation and evolution of the Project and remained the main actor during implementation. Even though UNIFEM/ASRO successfully attracted many partners, it remained in the lead with implications for the sense of ownership by Government and project beneficiaries and for subsequent sustainability. The Team found that the level of detail in which UNIFEM/ASRO Project staff and management were involved, which comes though in the Annual Reports, raised questions whether UNIFEM's comparative advantages as an organization lie at the level of policy and strategy or at the grassroots level, especially since there seemed to be few links between Project development and policy advocacy.

The evolution of this Project from concept and design through implementation and phase out also provokes a question about accountability, which the Team poses but for which it

has no answers, namely: How is it possible to assign accountability for project results in a situation of staff and management turnover in international organizations as well as in their government partners?

*d. Sustainability*

The Evaluation Team noted that the UNIFEM/ASAP Project Action Committee had asked for a sustainability plan when it reviewed the Project Document in 2004, and such a plan was accordingly prepared. However, the Team found no indication that this plan was a “living document”, in other words, that it was updated to reflect realities on the ground, challenges, changes, obstacles and lessons learned.

The Team found that the educational and skills development activities were the most sustainable of all the initiatives attempted by the Project. As Table 3 shows, the Computer Intel Clubhouse, the Lego Robotics, and the Film Club are active until the present time. As recommended by UNIFEM/ASRO, the Government arrived at an agreement with JOHUD, which employed the previous Project workers as JOHUD staff supervisors. The Team was able to see the students working – and enjoying – the facilities and the learning challenges. There are however issues that need to be addressed as regards the robotics labs based in the Libb and Mleih schools, as noted earlier. In addition, JOHUD is reportedly facing a challenge in keeping this afloat because of the cost, according to focus group discussions.

The Team observes that some of the reasons for the sustainability of the computer club and Lego Robotics educational activities included: a partner with a sense of ownership, as the activities were located in the JOHUD CDC space; the longevity of the JOHUD CDC itself, which has been in place for some two decades; the links between these activities and a global organization – the Intel Clubhouse; and the clear value-added that the activities brought the youth and students as well as dedicated supervisory staff.

The IT Academy apparently was sustained until mid-2009 but its status is uncertain at the present time. According to the agreements reached between UNIFEM/ASRO and the Government, it is to become a government Knowledge Station, similar to the one in Mleih but it appears that some issues remain to be ironed out, including the cost of updating equipment and software.

The other educational and skills development activities are inactive or never became operational: Pearson VUE testing centre; Dokkaneh, Community Radio Station, and the technology programme. Similarly the social activities are either not active – information and awareness – or non-operational, such as the special needs programme. However, it is worth noting that the spirit of volunteerism has taken hold among students in Mleih and the commitment of university students and graduates to the computer and Lego Robotics clubs that they were part of as high school students is evident.

By contrast, almost all the economic activities have been unsustainable. The only activity still in evidence during the Evaluation Team’s mission was the packaging and labelling

operation, and there is a question as to how sustainable this can be over time as it currently has only one remaining client (some former clients cited quality control issues in interviews with the Team). In addition, the Team found cause for concern regarding worker health safety issues due to the materials used in this activity. The Team was informed that some of the economic activities – mosaics, sewing, the cafeteria – could become active if commissions were found as the equipment was there and trained workers were available in the community.<sup>51</sup>

The rest of the economic activities were inactive – bakery, sweets, chemical-free farming – or had never become operational, such as the call centre. A number of miscellaneous income generating activities surfaced in the documentation at different times but never became operational (some of these are listed in Table 3). The active income-generating initiatives have been clustered into one building and another is being used as a store house. The remainder of the stone houses renovated by the Project were returned to their owners and are standing empty as there appears to be no demand. The owners reportedly refused to continue to rent the buildings to the Project at a reduced rate as the UNIFEM/ASRO began to phase out its support.

Some of the reasons for the non-sustainability of the income generating activities include the lack of feasibility studies and market analysis; the fact that they were not phased in a way that enabled some to take root before others started; attention was not apparently paid to the issue of economies of scale; transport and transport costs remained an issue between Libb and Mleih, and with the rest of the country; among others.

The Team observed that, although some private sector companies had been involved in the Project as donors of funds, equipment, and material, the private sector was only tangentially involved in the business of income generation, in terms of, for example, undertaking feasibility studies, involvement in marketing, co-ownership of activities, or in other ways that would have brought market realities into the mix.

The Project planned to guarantee the sustainability of the income-generating projects by supporting the establishment of a new cooperative, Qanater. The cooperative was duly registered in June 2007, with the minimum 50 members as required by law and elections were held. The Team observed that, even though several of the key cooperative members had been involved in the Project from the start and had had the benefit of extensive training, the cooperative has not had the time and space to develop as an institution, to fully understand the roles and responsibilities of members and their strengths and weaknesses. Qanater did not appear to be functioning effectively during the Team's visit; among other things most senior management had resigned. The Team also observed that in spite of its brief existence, the cooperative was intended to take on the most challenging initiatives of the Project – its income-generating activities – with limited experience and track record in managing such activities, exploring potential markets and ensuring product quality, and without apparent knowledge of client management.

---

<sup>51</sup> Some interviewees said they had accepted that their daughters work in the cafeteria as it was a government/UN initiative but would not if it was a private sector initiative.

The Team came across references in documentation and through interviews of an earlier attempt by the NHF to set up a cooperative, the Libb Cooperative Society, to manage income-generating activities in the same site, which has since apparently ceased to exist. It could not find indications that lessons had been learned from this attempt in advance of establishing, or during the management of, Qanater.

e. Impact

i. Qualitative observations

The Evaluation Team field visits and interviews revealed that the Project's educational activities has had impact on youth, both male and female, in terms of their personal and scholastic development. The Team was not able to judge the relevance of such impact in terms of the numbers served vis-à-vis the broader population nor how cost-effective it was given the investment made. Similarly, the Team found that the Project had contributed to social change among the people it served and their broader community, including encouraging more women to be active. However, there is no way to judge the extent of its contribution in the absence of a baseline, and given the fact that change is a normal part of social development. The Team also found that the Project had contributed to greater knowledge and use of ICT in education and employment, though it is unable to assess the quantitative significance of this contribution.

As regards the economic activities, the Team's interviews indicated that once the Project subsidy was removed, these activities apparently suffered from the challenges experienced by several income-generating activities for women within Jordan, in the Arab world, and in the world at large; including, for example, quality control; insufficient knowledge of or access to markets; cost of raw materials and product pricing; competition from cheaper (especially Chinese) imports; market glut due to many income-generating projects producing the same products; difficulty of producing quantities relevant to market needs; transportation; among others.

ii. Quantitative observations

As noted above, the Evaluation Team designed a questionnaire to assess the impact of the project on beneficiaries and collect quantitative data to support the above qualitative findings that are based on focus groups, interviews, and field visits. The conditions for a questionnaire initially seemed ideal because there was a well-defined group of respondents (project beneficiaries and their families). However, as mentioned earlier it transpired that there was no database or other information to support either a stratified random sample or a snowball sample and elicit statistically valid data. Moreover, it soon became clear that differences in the spatial setup of the two villages – compared with Mleih, Libb households are more scattered and far apart - and the Team's inability to pilot, supervise, or administer the questionnaire itself due to its time constraints, meant that any inherent sampling bias in the response patterns could not be reliably calculated.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> It should be noted that the Team used the information provided in the annual reports to pull out a full list of e-Village activities for the questionnaire, but its interviews and review of project files when in Amman

Nevertheless, the Team took the opportunity to rely on the female students and volunteers in hopes that some glimpses might be possible.

The volunteers and students administered a total of 80 questionnaires – 40 each in Libb and Mleih (the tabulated questionnaires can be found in Annex 6). The Evaluation Team gave the girls verbal instructions on how to apply a random sampling methodology, specifically by knocking on each first, sixth, twelfth etc. household, and enquiring whether any member of that household had participated in any of the e-Village activities, and, if not, moving to the next neighbouring household.<sup>53</sup> The Team also explained that only those e-Village activities should be ‘ticked’ in which one or more household members had participated.

None of the questionnaires handed in to the Evaluation Team followed the instruction to indicate who in the household was interviewed and to provide information on other household members. Because, in some cases, respondents ticked almost all activities, this appeared to give a view on an e-Village activity rather than indicating that one or more household members actually participated in the named activities. Some responses were deemed inaccurate.<sup>54</sup>

The Evaluation Team therefore deems that the responses it tabulated are of dubious statistical value. However, they do provide some observations of the Libb and Mleih villagers’ views of ICT as a tool for widening knowledge and improving livelihoods.<sup>55</sup> These glimpses are summarized below but must be read with the above caveats in mind.

Question 1 sought to ascertain the way in which ICT training had improved the way of life and livelihood opportunities of members in the household.

- Overall respondents in Libb indicated that household members had benefited from ICT-related skills in terms of job advancement and enlarging existing enterprises. However, such skills had overall not led to creating new job opportunities or an increase in respondent’s income. There appears to be some differentiation between husbands and wives, with the latter appearing to have benefited more in terms of improving production and marketing opportunities. Overall, unmarried adult daughters and sons living in the household indicated they had benefited from ICT-training, though daughters were less likely to have increased their income compared with sons.

---

turned up some issues about the activities, as discussed in earlier sections. This underscores the importance of not only piloting a questionnaire but doing so after a few days of the mission to correct information.

<sup>53</sup> The Team decided on every sixth household by dividing the estimated number of households in each village by the 40 questionnaires it hoped to administer.

<sup>54</sup> For example, indicating that the clubhouse helped increase household income; or that the call centre and radio station helped improve household income when these two e-Village activities did not in fact take off. Where indicators were not ticked, the Team counted this as ‘no answer’; however it may well be that the particular indicator did not apply to the respondent concerned or that the question was not understood.

<sup>55</sup> There were differences in the way Libb and Mleih respondents completed the questionnaires so the Evaluation Team decided to tabulate them separately (see Annex 6).

- In Mleih, overall, more wives than husbands indicated that they were able to increase their ICT-related knowledge and skills, benefit in terms of job advancement, create new job opportunities, and improve production and marketing opportunities. However, neither wives nor husbands indicated that ICT-related skills had increased their income. Few of the Mleih questionnaires provided information on ICT-related skill training in respect of adult daughters and sons.

Question 2 asked respondents to give their view of the benefit to the household of the activities implemented by the e-Village Programme.

- Libb respondents offered a view on each and every e-Village activity listed, thus making it impossible to gauge which of the activities respondents had actually participated in. Overall the livelihood development and employment activities was deemed either somewhat or not very helpful in terms of contributing to the household's income. The technical skills development activities were overall deemed helpful in terms of improving knowledge as well as contributing to household income. The educational activities were overall deemed helpful in improving knowledge, though somewhat less so in terms of improving household income. A majority of respondents found the film club either very helpful or somewhat helpful in increasing knowledge, though less so in terms of increasing household income. Overall respondents found the information and awareness activities helpful in improving their knowledge but not helpful in increasing household income. Few Libb respondents answered the question regarding the volunteerism activities.
- In Mleih, none of the respondents answered questions related to the livelihood skills development and employment activities, and very few did with regard to technical skills development activities. By contrast, most of the respondents answered the educational activity questions, overall finding them helpful in improving knowledge but less so in terms of increasing household income (the one exception was Injaz).<sup>56</sup> Few Mleih respondents answered the questions about the information and awareness activities.

Other general observations:

- As the responses to Question 2 appear to indicate, the villagers from each of Libb and Mleih did not appear to have access to or even be informed about e-Village activities in the other village.
- Beyond the use of email, the questionnaires did not indicate use of the Internet in designing, marketing, advertising or other income-generating fashion.

---

<sup>56</sup> A Jordanian non-profit that provides training on business-related and management skills.

Few respondents in either Libb or Mleih responded to Question 3, regarding other ICT-related activities or no-ICT supported activities they would have found helpful for improving household livelihood.

## **6. Conclusions and Lessons Learned**

In conclusion, the Team briefly reviews the previous discussion against the Development Objective and its three objectives established at the start of the Project. In presenting these conclusions and lessons learned, the Evaluation Team is conscious that looking back with the benefits of hindsight is a much easier position to be in than having the courage and commitment to embark on a new initiative in a challenging setting and states its conclusion with this in mind.

The Team concludes that the overall Development Objective to “transform a Jordanian village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life” is not measurable because no quantitative baseline was established at the start. Nevertheless, based on its observations in Section 5, the Team concludes that the Project overall did not have an effective and sustainable impact on Libb and Mleih.

This is the case even though the Project concept was relevant and was well situated in national, regional plans and international conventions and goals, as well as the UNIFEM/ASRO sub-regional strategy. The process of site selection was thorough and transparent, and the needs assessment correctly identified what were at the time the development needs of Libb and Mleih. However, certain issues were downplayed in the needs assessment such as the socio-economic differences between the two localities and the impact the distance between them would have on project activities, which exacerbated the problems faced by the project.

Most importantly, size and scope of the Project was not commensurate with the level of socio-economic development and capacity of the villages to absorb and sustain activities, or the Project’s capacity for effective and efficient management. Furthermore, the Team does not believe that the Project, as designed, would be relevant to a more populous semi-rural or urban area. It concludes that the simultaneous introduction of a multiplicity of activities in each of three separate spheres – economic, education, and cultural – did not give the time and space necessary for effective implementation overall, although some specific activities succeeded, notably the education-related ones.

In terms of raising women and men villagers’ awareness on different village initiatives in respect of use of technology and gender-related issues (Objective 1), the Project did raise the awareness of some villagers, though there is not enough information to gauge or measure the effectiveness.

The Project does not seem to have directly addressed gender equality as an issue, although it ensured that the majority of beneficiaries were women and girls. Nevertheless, it has shown that traditions – and gender roles – change and evolve in line with needs and opportunities and that social mores and location in a rural area are not obstacles to the



kind of social, educational, and economic activities proposed. Indeed, cultural boundaries are much more flexible than generally assumed.

As for building the capacity and professional skills of some villagers allowing them to benefit from ICT services (Objective 2), the Project did expand the skills and knowledge of some villagers in ICT. The project was most effective and sustainable in educational activities targeted at young girls and boys. The Team believes that the extra-curricular educational activities are worth replicating, if sustainable funding can be secured, but that the educational activities sited in schools pose more of a challenge.

With regard to enhancing economic opportunities within the village by creating new job opportunities and providing professional marketing and entrepreneurial services (Objective 3), the Project cannot be said to have had an effective and sustainable impact. In spite of substantial investment, it did not sustainably address the economic needs, rights and capacities of more than a few women and their families, whether in terms of income, access to finance and markets, or accessible transport, among others.

The Team also concludes that the private sector was not tapped as a potential partner in the economic sphere. This might have helped to identify whether income-generating activities and assumptions of community entrepreneurship were a realistic solution to the economic needs identified, or whether a different type of economic approach and structure might be more relevant.

The Team believes that accessible information indicates that Project staff and management were dedicated to the Project and committed to making it a success. However, it cannot conclude that planning, monitoring, and evaluation supported effective and efficient delivery, or contributed to the prospects for sustainability. The Team concludes that the size and scope of the Project as well as its grassroots development nature, challenged the organization's capacity, experience, and expertise.

Moreover, the Team concluded that UNIFEM/ASRO was unable to transition out of a predominant project management role so as to ensure national ownership of the Project. It could not conclude that the Project contributed to national ICT or gender equality strategies and policies or convincingly demonstrated the value or otherwise of ICT to economic development.

The Team concludes that a more modest project that was directly focused on one or two activities – sited in one location with arrangements made for transport from other locations – might have had a better chance of success in demonstrating the contribution of ICT to income-generation and educational/skills development and contributing to the community's economic empowerment. It might also have later supported additional activities based on lessons learned and the consolidation of outputs.

The Evaluation Team identifies below some of the issues arising from this project that are relevant for future development projects:

- Sufficient space and time is needed for learning and capacity development by the beneficiaries, as well as by Project staff and partners – which is particularly important for a pilot initiative. This is an important lesson for UNIFEM’s implementation of its Strategic Plan.
- Systematic monitoring and documentation by Project management and staff is essential, further supported by independent external evaluation, to allow for course correction. This is the case for all development projects, but particularly so for pilot initiatives that are seeking to innovate and contribute to a new field.
- Time and funds must be factored into project design to enable systematic documentation of lessons learned to enable communication of experience to enrich future development initiatives. Again, this is especially important for pilot projects that aspire to serve as models.
- To maximize the benefits of partnerships, particularly on the extensive scale followed by this project, information must be shared regularly throughout the year and not just in annual reports, and partners need to be brought together to share experiences and learn lessons in a way that will enhance their own work as well as contribute to the country’s store of development experience.
- Activities should be supported by documented feasibility and market analysis, as well as cost-benefit analysis and consideration of economies of scale. This may sound like a statement of the obvious; however, the Team found it was often overlooked.
- The results of activities, particularly income generation activities, should be independently assessed before new ones are introduced. Those involved in a project cannot be expected to assess themselves and there are many instances in this project when independent assessment or evaluation might have helped identify constraints and pinpoint course correction.
- Research is needed into Government administrative and regulatory issues and private sector interest before activities are undertaken.
- Considerable time is needed for the institutional development of new organizations such as cooperatives and the capacity development of their members. This will help, among other things, to identify beneficiary strengths and weaknesses in entrepreneurship, marketing, management, quality control and other areas key to the success of economic activities.
- It is important to factor in previous and ongoing experience in Jordan as well as the Arab and other regions in income-generating and community development.

## 7. Recommendations

### *For UNIFEM HQ and ASRO*

- Large-scale projects that tackle new areas such as the e-Village should be subjected to rigorous assessment at the design stage, including independent expert review, tapping experience in other regions, and ensuring that they are tailored to UNIFEM's mandate, organizational structure, and experience.
- The Project has underscored the need for oversight mechanisms and processes that can flag issues and constraints in a timely manner, and examine the quality and reliability of the evidence that supports claims of progress, including up-to-date logical frameworks and annual workplans.
- The needs assessment data should be used in a baseline that is regularly up-dated to support Project implementation, which must be phased and sequenced to allow for systematic monitoring, evaluation, lessons learned, and course correction.
- The Project has spotlighted the importance of systematic and efficient documentation and knowledge management to disseminate lessons learned in a timely fashion, and to mitigate the impact of staff and management turnover.

### *For Government*

- Government counterparts should play a more effective oversight role, ensuring that they regularly receive project implementation reports that include up-to-date logical frameworks and annual work plans.
- National ownership of projects requires that the role and responsibilities of national partners should be clearly identified and agreed upon in a regularly updated work plan that ensures synergy between partner inputs.
- Government should call for regular joint meetings with implementing and other partners during which work plans, potential constraints and required adjustments are discussed and acted upon in a timely and effective manner.
- Government could consider convening a meeting of partners in the educational sphere, including e-Village partners, to discuss ways of investing in the sustainability of the educational/skills development activities as well as possibilities of replicating these activities, taking into account the issues raised in the evaluation observations.
- Government could also consider engaging private sector partners in reviewing the investment already made in skills development and site development. The aim would be to solicit ideas about ways in which this can be capitalized, including ideas about new structures and management arrangements for economic development, while taking account of community roles, structures, and expectations.

**Table 1 Evolution of Project Objectives and Activities**

<p><b>A. Information from Project Document signed in 2004.</b></p>	<p><b>Pages 16 – 23</b>  <u>Development Objective:</u> To transform a Jordanian village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where ICT is deployed to achieve a better quality of life.</p> <p><u>Objective 1:</u> To raise women and men villagers' awareness on the different initiatives taking place in the village, on the use of technology and on gender-related issues.  <u>Activities,</u> as performed by an Information and Awareness Centre to be created within Mleih's Knowledge Station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Field awareness campaigns</li> <li>- Evaluating, counselling and directing</li> <li>- Providing basic IT assistance</li> <li>- Awareness-raising workshops</li> <li>- Establishing a bulletin board</li> <li>- Offering entertainment activities (on page 25 this was termed e-Edutainment)</li> <li>- Use village schools as information hubs (later termed school activities).</li> </ul> <p><u>Objective 2:</u> To build the capacity and professional skills of the village citizens and allow them to benefit from different IT services through an Empowerment Centre, to undertake these <u>activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advanced training courses</li> <li>- Self-empowerment courses (tapping manuals already created by partners)</li> <li>- Tailored training courses</li> <li>- IT training courses</li> </ul> <p><u>Objective 3:</u> To enhance the economic opportunities within the village through creating new job opportunities and providing professional marketing and entrepreneurial services, through <u>activities</u> at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marketing Centre, to offer one-to-one technical supervision; a show; online marketing; links to hotels and tourism agencies; promoting the e-Village; and linking to UNIFEM's Tourism Sector Project</li> <li>- E-services Centre, to ensure supply of private sector projects and job opportunities; raise awareness of tele-working; offering space, tools, and technical assistance to workers.</li> <li>- Entrepreneurial Services, through an Entrepreneur Office that would: raise awareness of the concept of entrepreneurship and support business start-ups; collaborate with the Empowerment Centre to build business skills; collaborate with Madaba's Enhanced Development Centre to provide assistance and funding; provide villagers with tools and equipment to start businesses.</li> </ul> <p>Other <u>activities</u> in addition to those under the above three objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy Advocacy</li> <li>- Networking with partners as well as between the different project levels A, B, C (see below). A Task Force Committee would ensure regular communication between these three "levels" and four main task forces would address: awareness raising, policy advocacy, capacity building, and economic empowerment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pages 23 – 28:</b> as of p. 23, the above objectives and activities were restated as "levels" and "components" and "services" and further elaborated, and reference was made to more details in annexes. The three levels were: Level A: Information and Awareness Centre; Level B: the Empowerment Centre; and Level C: Economic Opportunities.</p>
--	--

<b>B. Information from First Annual Report March 2004 – April 2005</b>	<p>According to the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Report, the project was divided into three main components, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Awareness raising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information and Awareness Center located in and around the Mleih Knowledge Station (managed by JOHUD)</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Capacity Building: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Edutainment &amp; special needs centre (Microsoft; Intel).</li> <li>- Training centre (Microsoft).</li> <li>- Learning resource centre (Libb girls' school)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Economic empowerment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- e-Services Centre (AMIR)</li> <li>- Entrepreneurship Leader – Marketing Centre, Entrepreneurship Centre, Packaging &amp; Labelling Centre, Village Production Centre, Mleih &amp; Amman showrooms</li> <li>- Tourism &amp; Marketing Leader: reception &amp; village promotion centre</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<b>C. Information from Second Annual Report April 2005 – March 2006</b>	<p>The report notes that the e-Village “narrowed” its activities to eight programmes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Livelihood Skills Development and Employment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Business incubator (soap production - new)</li> <li>- Local village production centre (mosaic - new)</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Technical Skills Development Programme/Microsoft IT Academy</li> <li>3. Extracurricular Education Programme – New focus on youth, including through Lego Robotics and Intel computer clubhouse.</li> <li>4. Media Programme – New (film club and radio station)</li> <li>5. Information and Awareness Programme</li> <li>6. Volunteerism Programme - New</li> <li>7. Special Needs Programme - New</li> <li>8. Technology Programme - New</li> </ol>
<b>D. 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Report April 2006 – December 2007</b>	<p>The report covers the six programmes below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Socio-Economic Development Programme</li> <li>B. Technical Skills Development Programme (Microsoft IT Academy)</li> <li>C. Extracurricular Education Programme</li> <li>D. Media Programme</li> <li>E. Information and Awareness Programme</li> <li>F. Volunteerism Programme</li> </ol>

**Table 2 UNIFEM Staff Timelines<sup>57</sup>**

RPD: regional programme director. OIC officer-in-charge. ai ad interim. PC: project coordinator. PM: project manager. PA: project assistant. F: female. M: male.

	Jan-Jun 04 <sup>58</sup>	Jul-Dec 04	Jan-Jun 05	Jul-Dec 05	Jan-Jun 06	Jul-Dec 06	Jan-Jun 07	Jul-Dec 07	Jan-Jun 08	Jul-Dec 08	Jan-Jun 09	Jul-Dec 09	Jan-Jun 10	Jul-Dec 10
	Phase I								Phase II <sup>59</sup>		Hand-over <sup>60</sup>		Eval. <sup>61</sup>	
RPD 1 (F)														
RPD 2 (F)														
OIC <sup>62</sup> (F)														
RPD ai (F)														
RPD3 (F)														
PC 1 (F)														
PC 2 (M)														
PC 3 (M)														
PC 4 (M)														
PM 1 (M)														
PM 2 (M) <sup>63</sup>														
PA 1 (F)														
PA 2 (F)														

<sup>57</sup> The information in this table is based on interviews with staff as well as minutes of meetings and other documents from the files.

<sup>58</sup> The design and formulation stage of the project began in late 2002.

<sup>59</sup> A Phase II “Expansion” was signed with MoPIC 7 Feb 2008; the project document was most likely prepared in the last quarter 2007.

<sup>60</sup> This was a no-cost extension to conclude the handover. The project was formally closed March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2010.

<sup>61</sup> This refers to the final external evaluation reported in this document.

<sup>62</sup> The OIC was Programme Specialist for Arab States in UNIFEM/ASAP and was thus main HQ contact and support for UNIFEM/ASRO from Feb 2004 till June 2010.

<sup>63</sup> The Team do not have accurate dates for this project manager but he was there for most of 2007 and 2008.

**Table 3 e-Village Project Activities Timeline**

E: Pre-Existing; P: Proposed; A: Active; NA: Not Active; NO: Not Operational; NI: No Information in source cited; U: unclear information. A distinction is made between NA and NA; the former took off but did not sustain; the latter was planned but never took off, despite investment.

E-Village Project Activity	PHASE I 2004-2007								PHASE II 2008		HANDOVER 2009-2010			
	Jan-Jun 04 <sup>64</sup>	Jul-Dec 04	Jan-Jun 05 <sup>65</sup>	Jul-Dec 05	Jan-Jun 06 <sup>66</sup>	Jul-Dec 06	Jan-Jun 07	Jul-Dec 07 <sup>67</sup>	Jan-Jun 08 <sup>68</sup>	Jul-Dec 08 <sup>69</sup>	Jan-Jun 09	Jul-Dec 09	Jan-Jun 10	Jul-Dec 10 <sup>70</sup>
<b>ECONOMIC (Libb)</b>														
<i>Mosaic</i>					P/A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA
<i>Packaging &amp; Labelling</i> <sup>71</sup>			P	P/A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
<i>Sewing &amp; Embroidery</i>	E	E	E	NI	NI	NA	NA	A	A	NA	NA	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA
<i>Cafeteria (restaurant)(café)</i> <sup>72</sup>	E	NI	NI	NI	NA	A	A	A	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA
<i>Bakery</i>	E	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<i>Sweets</i>	E	NI	NI	NI	NI	A	A	A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<i>Chemical-Free Farming</i>						P	P/A	A	NI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<i>Call Centre</i> <sup>73</sup>						P/A	P/A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<i>Miscellaneous activities</i> <sup>74</sup>									P	P/A	NO	NO	NO	NO

<sup>64</sup> Annex 5 of the earlier version of the project document mentions the NAH pilot project to restore some of Libb's traditional stone houses and to establish the following activities therein: dairy production, Arabic sweets, embroidery, café, bakery, restaurant.

<sup>65</sup> Information from 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Report March 04 - April 05, as well as staff interviews. Most of 2004 and early 2005 dealt with construction and renovation, and hiring and training staff. In addition, an extensive needs assessment (2,000 survey forms administered) was carried out by newly trained e-Village staff covering: awareness raising, capacity building, edutainment, special needs, economic empowerment, e-services, and local village productive centre.

<sup>66</sup> Information from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Report, which covers April 05 – March 06, as well as staff interviews.

<sup>67</sup> Information from 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Report, which covers April 06 to Dec 07, as well as staff interviews.

<sup>68</sup> Information from draft consultant "Overview Report" account of field visit in February 2008, as well as staff interviews.

<sup>69</sup> Information from the Phase Out Strategy Oct- Dec 08 document and staff interviews.

<sup>70</sup> Information based on field visit and interviews. The Team was told that the following activities worked when there was a commission: mosaic; embroidery/sewing.

<sup>71</sup> These were sometimes presented as two activities in project documentation and discussions.

<sup>72</sup> This is listed as A/NA because, although the equipment was there and staff had been trained, it only functioned during UNIFEM-organized meetings.

<sup>73</sup> According to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Report, 75 women were interviewed for employment and 10 selected. However, according to interviews, the private sector companies approached did not come through as the broadband width and other village infrastructure were insufficient to support a call centre.

	PHASE I 2004-2007						PHASE II 2008		HANDOVER 2009-2010					
<b>EDUCATIONAL / SKILLS DEVELOPMENT</b>														
E: Pre-Existing; P: Proposed; A: Active; NA: Not Active; NO: Not Operational; NI: No Information in source cited; U: unclear information.														
<b>E-Village Project Activity</b>	Jan-Jun 04	Jul-Dec 04	Jan-Jun 05	Jul-Dec 05	Jan-Jun 06	Jul-Dec 06	Jan-Jun 07	Jul-Dec 07	Jan-Jun 08	Jul-Dec 08	Jan-Jun 09	Jul-Dec 09	Jan-Jun 10	Jul-Dec 10
<i>MICROSOFT IT Academy</i> <sup>75</sup>		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	U	A	A	U	U	U
<i>Computer (Intel) Clubhouse</i>				P	A	A	A	A	U	A	A	A	A	A
<i>Pearson VUE testing centre</i> <sup>76</sup>				P	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<i>Lego Robotics</i>				P	A	A	A	A	NI	A	A	A	A	A
<i>Dokanneh</i> <sup>77</sup>						P	A/NO	A/NO	NI	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<i>Injaz</i>		A	A	A	A	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<i>Community Radio Station</i> <sup>78</sup>				P	A/NO	A/NO	NO	NO	NI	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
<i>Film Club</i>				P	A	A	A	A	NI	A	A	A	A	A
<i>Technology programme</i> <sup>79</sup>				P	P	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>SOCIAL</b>														
<i>Information &amp; Awareness</i>		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	NI	A	NI	NI	NA	NA
<i>Volunteerism</i> <sup>80</sup>				P	A	A	A	A	NI	NA	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA	A/NA
<i>Special Needs</i>					P	P	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

<sup>74</sup> The following activities were proposed around the time of the Phase II “Expansion” according to some of the documentation in the files: bed and breakfast; recycling; herbs and medicinal herbs; jewellery. Informants said that recycling had worked for a brief period of two months.

<sup>75</sup> The Academy provided training on: MCDST, ICDL, Digital Literacy, and IT Essentials (computer maintenance). It also hosted other training sessions, e.g. Soft Skills through UNIFEM’s Achieving e-Quality Project. According to the handover, it is meant to be transformed into an NITC Knowledge Station.

<sup>76</sup> According to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Report, “UNIFEM applied for and received initial approval for setting up a Pearson VUE Testing Centre. However, due to legal complications, the center has not been set up yet.” VUE is a computer based testing programme used in government and companies.

<sup>77</sup> Dokkaneh.com is listed as A/NO during 2007 because, although students and e-Village staff were trained, the necessary steps for sale of e-Village products in online commerce were not completed.

<sup>78</sup> Equipment and training were made available for the radio station and programmes were developed; however the license to operate it could not be secured. Hence the designation A/NO – it was active in one sense, and yet it never became operational.

<sup>79</sup> According to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Report, the aim to provide new technology – e.g. Wimax solution for affordable broadband & a community portal - and thus increase awareness of ICT.

<sup>80</sup> This is listed as A/NA in 09-10 because volunteers are still active in Mleih (Lego Robotics and Clubhouse) even though there is no longer a formal “programme” as such.





## **Annex 1 Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation**

**1. Title of the evaluation:** Final Evaluation of UNIFEM E-village Project 35578 (2004-2010)

**2. Background:**

The Government of Jordan was one of the first countries in the region to identify ICT as a critical enabler for the social and economic development of the country. In effect, it prepared in 1999 a national ICT strategy that includes specific links to national development agendas. It has outlined a vision in its National ICT Strategy for Jordan to become an IT hub for the region. It has been a rallying call to government ministries and institutions, private sector associations and companies, non-governmental bodies and individuals within the society to pull together to realize His Majesty's vision for the future benefit of all citizens. Many innovative pilot initiatives have emerged due to the great support that government has given to ICT. These initiatives however, need to be brought together in order to prevent duplication and to ensure greatest benefit.

**3. Purpose of the Evaluation:**

The United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) Arab States Regional Office (ASRO) is commissioning a final external evaluation for the E-village Project Pilot Initiative (35578) in Jordan, which was implemented from January 2004 through March 2010—This final evaluation is mandatory in line with UNIFEM's Evaluation Policy and will provide an assessment of the implementation and results achieved during the life span of the project.

The E-village project is aimed at establishing a vibrant and economically independent rural community where information and communications technology is deployed to achieve a better quality of life for all its citizens, particularly women and girls. This was planned to be done by partnering with local, regional and international partners. Based on these partnerships, the local community would be empowered and would have the opportunity to access entrepreneurial services, cutting edge technology, innovative education methods and effective media and communication tools. The E-village model would bridge the digital divide between rural and urban areas, as well as between women and men.

This project contributes to the ASRO's Development Resource Framework (DRF) Outcome 8 of UNIFEM's Sub-Regional Strategic Plan: "Increased number of relevant and effective models of community-level initiatives for advancing women's human rights and eliminating gender inequality". The evaluation's findings will help UNIFEM to gain a better insight on how to implement community-based initiatives for advancing women's human rights through ICT to create job opportunities for better economic conditions and eliminating gender inequality. Moreover, the evaluation will help UNIFEM to determine if this pilot initiative would be replicable model in other rural and semirural areas in Jordan and/or in other countries in the region. In addition, the findings and recommendations of this evaluation would help the community organizations, which will take over the operational responsibility of the E-Village project, to better and more efficiently plan for the sustainability, continuation and improvement of the Centers supported by the project and their activities.

The objectives of the final evaluation are to:

- a. Evaluate the extent to which the project has achieved its planned objectives and contributed to the outcomes as indicated in its Log Frame.

- b. Identify the strength points and challenges that the project has experienced and the good practices in partnering and coordinating with different parties.
- c. Assess the sustainability of each of the economic initiatives of the E-village and their replicability in other national or regional contexts
- d. Provide lessons learned on the use of ICT for the empowerment of women in Jordan and on community based initiatives to improve implementation of future projects and avoid implementation bottlenecks and risks

#### **4. Context of the Project:**

The idea of the E-Village came after the success of UNIFEM ICT project, the “Achieving Equality in ICT Sector” which was launched in 2002 and aimed to empower women to influence and benefit from the ICT sector, through building their technical and soft skills by providing them with cutting-edge IT networking training along with market-required soft skills, linking program graduates to local and regional ICT job markets, ensuring equal opportunities in the ICT sector and creating a positive policy environment that is more aware of the benefits of women’s full inclusion in the ICT sector.

In addition, the idea behind the E-village Project came also from the fact that a significant digital divide among rural and urban communities in Jordan still exists even though the country’s labor pool is well educated and ICT education is a top national priority. The divide is even greater between women and men, a fact which impacts not only women’s economic opportunities but also ultimately Jordan’s economic development.

The E-Village Project was conceptualized under UNIFEM’s Economic Security and Rights Programme which seeks to apply new mechanisms that promote women’s economic security and rights in line with MDG3 of promoting gender equality, with CEDAW to ensure the same rights for men and women in employment - in particular the same employment opportunities, benefits and conditions of service and equal pay for work- and with Beijing Platform for Action which called for facilitating all practices to ensure women’s equal rights and access to economic resources, employment, markets and trade, which goes beyond helping women find jobs. Thus, the Programme targets the power relationships in a woman’s house, in the community and in the marketplace and aims at empowering women to take advantage of the growing opportunities at national, regional and international levels.

#### **5. The subject of the evaluation/ Description of the intervention of the project:**

As a model to bridge the country’s digital divide, the E-village project focuses on increasing the capacities and economic opportunities of rural women in the ICT field within the villages of Lib and Mleih<sup>84</sup> in Madaba Governorate. The project combines several ongoing ICT initiatives into one pilot site, or E-village, so that in addition to benefiting rural communities, partners can work together and share resources, experiences and best practices.

---

<sup>84</sup> The neighbouring villages of Lib and Mleih are located in a rural area of the Governorate of Madaba and have a combined population of about 9,580 people in 1,860 households. The population is young with about half under the age of nineteen. The younger generation is educated, with the majority of men and women between the ages of 15 and 39 having attained at least nine years of schooling. Unemployment is high – around 20.5% of the economically active population – and another 27.5% of the population who are homemakers are considered economically inactive. The average income per person per month is about JD 150, and about 402 households (21.6%) live below the absolute poverty line of JD 313.50 per person per year. For additional information, please see *E-Village General Assessment Study*, conducted by the Government of Jordan.

The E-Village project is using ICTs to empower rural communities by increasing the ICT capacities and related economic opportunities of rural women within the villages of Lib and Mleih, in the Governorate of Madaba, a very pleasant town about 30kms south-west of Amman, with a population of 135,890.

The original project duration was three years and started in January 2004. It was extended for another three years till the end of March 2010 at no additional cost.

UNIFEM started the project after assessing the location of the E-village and its demographic situation in partnership with the Jordanian Government. In terms of social services, both Villages were in need for better management and creative programs that meet the immediate requirements of the communities. The Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD) had the only training center (Social training and capacity building, Mleih's Knowledge Station) which had tremendous impact on Mleih community. This was noticeable in the vibrant social interaction of the community there and in their initiative to have their own businesses. However, these villages needed more attention as indicated from the needs identified by the assessment research done through its outreach to the community. Additionally, both selected villages reported lack of transportation within the village which prevented frequenting community development centers that are far from place of residence. Transportation between the villages themselves is nearly non-existent as well.

The project's initiatives were implemented with different partners that included leading specialized NGOs, international organizations, and private and governmental associations that are interested in the human development such as: the Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD), Al-Qanter Cooperative Association, the Royal Film Commission, Injaz, Netcorps, Microsoft Corporation, Intel, UNESCO, UNV, National Information Technology Center, Madaba Municipality, Noor al-Hussein Foundation, INT@J, Jordanian Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MoICT) who have generously funded the project with UNIFEM.

The project's development objective is "To transform this Jordanian village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where Information and Communication Technology is deployed to achieve a better quality of life", where the project's immediate objectives are:

- Raise women and men villagers' awareness on the different initiatives taking place in the village, on the use of technology and on gender-related issues. This will be achieved through creating an Information and Awareness Centre within Mleih's Knowledge Station, in which awareness-raising campaigns, counseling, information technology and other related services will be offered.
- Build the capacity and professional skills of the village citizens and allow them to benefit from different ICT services through establishing an 'Empowerment Centre' and conducting professional tailored training workshops aiming at providing them with the necessary skills.
- Enhance the economic opportunities within the village through creating new job opportunities and providing professional marketing and entrepreneurial services.

The idea is to create a model development approach that focuses national e-initiatives to integrate their activities to meet the above objective. This model could be potentially replicated in other villages and cities in an attempt to achieve the vision of knowledge based society and economy.

The idea of the project was translated through establishing different ICT initiatives tailored to meet local needs and respond to emerging opportunities, and was inspired by UNIFEM's successful Achieving E-Quality in the ICT Sector (AEQ) Project, a Cisco gender-initiative, which held many studies related to Women and ICT that presented the needs of new initiatives tackling this area that the E-village project attempts to responds to. These E-village initiatives are:

- Information and Awareness.
- ICT Training Opportunities.
- Extracurricular Education.
- Media.
- Volunteerism.
- Livelihood Skills and Employment Development.

Matching and promoting these initiatives reflects the innovative utilization of interactive ICT tools that have been integrated into the E-village activities. These include a Lego robotics laboratory, a computer clubhouse, a mosaic workshop, a printing and packaging centre, a Microsoft information technology academy, a film club, a local community radio station, an E-village community portal, and the integration of wireless technology in the E-village location.

These project's initiatives attempt to promote local women's economic participation in the society and contribute to eliminate gender inequality in the rural area of Lib and Mleih through empowering them to start production projects that make use of their talents and are unique to the area they are living at.

The E-village project management staff worked under the direct supervision of the Regional Programme Director of UNIFEM Arab States Regional Office based in Amman. The national activities were conducted by national and international counterparts who coordinated their work with UNIFEM, which in turn supported them and provided them with the technical support they needed. The project team consisted of the project manager and project assistants who monitored the evolvement of the project's implementation through regular visits to the E-village.

The monitoring that actually took place during the life span of the project was made of regular field visits to the location of the project by UNIFEM staff working on it who would then prepare field reports on their visits. On the other hand, the same staff received monthly reports on progress from the staff working locally in the E-village. This monitoring mechanism had many strong points that included continuous oversight over what is really taking place in the E-village. It also motivated the staff there to be more productive in order to be able to report more in the coming reports. In addition, bi annual progress reports are available, as well as a bi annual ePulse newsletter which gathered all activities related to the period it covered.

The project budget is as follows:

Total Project Budget	Cash and In-Kind	USD 2, 500,000.00
----------------------	------------------	-------------------

## **6.Scope of the evaluation:**

The final external evaluation is intended to cover the entire period of the project (January 2004-March 2010), in Lib and Mleih villages of Madaba Governorate. The duration of the evaluation is four months starting from August 2010.

The evaluation should cover all the initiatives of the project in Lib and Mleih villages, and determine its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. It should measure the extent to which the project achieved its objectives of increasing women participation in the local community of the E-villages in specific, as well as integrate the use of ICT for development in the villages in general. Based on the results of this final evaluation, the project model might be replicated in other rural areas in Jordan and in the region. Therefore, the evaluation is required to provide an assessment on the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation phase of the project in order to have a better understanding of any challenges that were faced or design flaws identified, and how to take them into consideration to avoid bottlenecks in future similar UNIFEM projects under Economic Security and Rights Programme. This evaluation is specifically important as it is considered the first community based evaluation for UNIFEM ASRO. In addition, the results, findings and lessons learned of the evaluation will be presented to the government and the community organizations, which will take over the operational responsibility after handing it over. It is therefore expected to assist them in better and more efficient planning to guarantee and sustain the operation of the centers and activities.

### **7. Evaluation Questions: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact:**

The evaluation should address questions related to the project's effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Some of the key questions in each area are set out below. These questions should be reviewed and finalized in the evaluation team's inception report, in collaboration with the evaluation task manager and UNIFEM ASRO reference group and an external reference group constituted for this evaluation.

#### **Relevance:**

- 1- Did the project correctly identify the rights and needs of women in Lib and Mleih given the local, national and regional context and UNIFEM's comparative advantage to address the issues?
- 2- Did the activities designed and implemented in the E-village project sufficiently address the problems identified, such as reducing the digital divide and the IT gender gap?
- 3- Did the project adapt and respond to changing contextual requirements?
- 4- Was the project coherent with national and regional development plans and does it target the advancement of rights under CEDAW, the Millennium Development Goals and other international conventions Jordan has ratified?
- 5- Is the project design articulated in a coherent way with clear definition of goal, outcomes and outputs and within the framework of UNIFEM ASRO Sub-Regional Strategy?

#### **Effectiveness**

1. To what extent did the project achieve its intended outputs and contribute to intended outcomes as outlined in the project logframe? What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of outputs and outcomes?
2. Did the project contribute to shaping local women beneficiaries' economic rights and priorities?
3. What role did partnerships with national partners play in achieving progress towards results of the project?
4. Was the theory of change elaborated by the project a sufficient model to achieve the desired change?
5. To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of national and regional gender equality policies and the Jordan National ICT Strategy?

6. To what extent have the capacities of rights holder and duty bearers involved in the project been strengthened?
7. To what extent have partners and beneficiaries have been satisfied with the results? How do they consider the project to have strengthened their capacities to promote or call for women's economic rights and security through ICTs?
8. Was ICT an effective tool for building local women capacities and contribution to community development?
9. How effective were project monitoring mechanisms in measuring progress towards results and providing information for mid-course project improvements?

**Efficiency:**

- 1- Were the outputs achieved in the best value of money and in a timely manner with resources used to the best effect? Could the same activities and outputs have been delivered using fewer resources?
- 2- Have UNIFEM ASRO organizational structure, managerial support, planning and coordination mechanisms and monitoring effectively supported the delivery of the project and efficient use of resources?
- 3- Have project resources been equally distributed to different groups of women in the two villages with sensitivity to race, ethnicity, economic status, disability, and other potential sources of discrimination?

**Sustainability:**

1. Are the E-village initiatives, networks and results supported and owned by national partners?
2. Did the project build the capacity of national partners to enable them to maintain, expand and/or replicate the project initiatives, specifically with regards to resource mobilization and financial capacity, ICT technical capacity and adaptive and management capacities (e.g. learning, leadership, commitment, project management, networking/linkages)?
3. To what extent the E.Village project is based on the expressed needs and priorities of the community? Has it focused on building local ownership and for achievement?

**Impact:**

1. Was there an increase in women's participation in the local labor market in Lib and Mileih that can be attributed to the implementation of this project?
2. Was there any change in gender relations and roles in Lib and Mileih villages with regards to economic participation and other areas as a result of the implementation of the project?
3. What impact did the project have on gender equality in Lib and Mileih?
4. What are some of the intended and unintended, positive and negative changes produced directly or indirectly by the project on the opportunities of different groups of women in Lib and Mileih, and on the overall socioeconomic conditions of these villages?

**8. Existing Information Sources/ such as previous evaluation reports and monitoring reports and system:**

The information sources available to the evaluators include the baseline assessment, project document, annual, biannual progress and field visits reports and number of monitoring reports, publications for the ICT programme, concept papers and minutes of meetings. In addition, previous evaluation reports for other thematic areas are available.

All these documents will be shared with the evaluators once starting the evaluation process in order to ensure better understanding through building a comprehensive inception report that covers all initiative's aspects.

### **9. Evaluation Approach and Process :**

Evaluation approach: This evaluation will be conducted through a mixed- method approach relying on both quantitative and qualitative data and involve all the project partners and beneficiaries. Please see section 9 below.

In order to apply the principles of participation and consultation, transparency and accountability, key partners will be part of a reference group during the evaluation processes. The main role of the reference group is to become the consultative body that serve as sounding boards for feedback and decisions on the evaluation, to participate in different stages of the evaluation process and to enhance learning and ownership of the evaluation partners.

#### **Evaluation Process:**

The evaluation consultants will produce a detailed methodology for the evaluation that adheres to UNIFEM Evaluation Policy and UNEG Norms and Standards and that is responsive to human rights and gender equality. The methodology will be set out in the consultants' inception report and should involve the use of mixed methods and ensure triangulation of data from different sources and instruments. The elements below will inform the methodology.

- Desk review of all the relevant documents on the project, i.e. those relating to the project context, the demographic assessment of the two villages, the project document, baseline data logframe, implementation plan, monitoring reports, donor reports, expenditure reports, etc. This would be done prior to the inception report, and any field visit, focus group discussion, or individual interviews. The findings from this stage would be represented in the Inception Report.
- A questionnaire to be prepared for the stakeholders groups of the project that would include tailored questions to each group based on its contribution to the project to get in-depth information about the project, and to assess their response to the project's activities, processes and results. These stakeholders include the government of Jordan, the project's partners, the beneficiaries of the project specifically the local women, and the staff of the E-village.
- Field visits to the location of the project to collect qualitative and quantitative data to better understand the community of the villages of Lib and Mleih, and to be able to see how the activities were implemented. During the field visits, the evaluation consultants could meet and interview staff who are working on the various activities of the project as well as samples from the community there (specifically local women) to get their perception about how the project has affected their lives.
- A power point presentation is to be prepared to present the findings of the field visits and the results of the questionnaires filled by the stakeholders. The stakeholders are to comment on the content of this presentation in order to be reflected on the formulation of the recommendations of the draft evaluation report submitted by the evaluation consultants.



- A final evaluation report is to be submitted after having all the stakeholders comment on the recommendations in the draft evaluation report.

### **10. Stakeholder Participation:**

The E-Village project is a national initiative conducted in partnership with the Government of Jordan, led by the Ministry of Information and Communications Technology (MoICT), in collaboration with UNIFEM. The Jordanian Government is committed to bringing computer skills and ICT access to local communities, enabling them to participate in the ICT revolution. To this end, the E-village project used ICT to empower rural communities by increasing the ICT capacities and related economic opportunities of rural women within the villages of Lib and Mleih, in the Governorate of Madaba.

Accordingly based on the fact that the Government of Jordan is the donor of the project, the contribution of the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation and the Ministry of Information and Communications Technology to the final evaluation is very important.

Intel and Microsoft cooperation had partnered with UNIFEM to establish the Clubhouse and the IT Academy in the E-village respectively. The Royal Film Commission had established the Film Club component and had also trained number of the E-village staff. Therefore, these partners also should be interviewed in order to know their perception about the project.

Al-Qanater Cooperative Association participated from the beginning of the project in the implementation of its activities especially in operating the income generating centers, and many of its members are very active and had gained a good experience in handling the challenges that the project had faced, as a result their involvement in the project evaluation would enrich the findings.

Therefore, an external reference committee is to be formulated from the key partners of the project, including government side, donors and CSOs that will be taking over the operational responsibility after handing over the centers. The main purpose of the committee is to enhance learning and ownership of the evaluation findings, review and comment on the evaluation output and reports and to enhance the credibility of the evaluation findings and therefore their use.

### **11. Expected Products from the Evaluation:**

The evaluation will be expected to produce the following products:

- Inception teleconferences/meetings where evaluation team can meet programme staff to discuss and share the evaluation stages.
- An inception report which contains evaluation objectives and scope, description of evaluation methodology, data collection tools, data analysis methods, key project's stakeholders and their role in the evaluation process, general evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan and reporting requirements. It should include a clear evaluation matrix relating all these aspects as well as an outline for the overall evaluation report. This will be produced at the end of the desk review.

- A power point presentation of preliminary findings of the field visits and the questionnaires filled by the stakeholders. The comments made by key stakeholders should inform the draft evaluation report.
- Draft evaluation report which should be delivered with adequate time to allow stakeholder discussion of the findings and recommendations.
- Final evaluation report which should be structured as follows:

Executive Summary (maximum five pages)

Programme Description

Evaluation Purpose

Evaluation Methodology

Findings

Lessons learnt

Recommendations

Annexes (including Interview List and dates- without identifying names for sake of confidentiality/ anonymity, Data Collection Instruments, Key Documents Consulted, Terms of References, etc)

The key evaluation activities and products are set out below. Hence, all the evaluation products should be submitted in English.

<b>Evaluation Activity/Product</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Following Action</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
Submitting Work plan with specific dates	Evaluation Team	Home Base	Discussion and agreeing with evaluation task manager	Wk 1
Inception Report – Preparation and Submission	Evaluation Team	Home Base/Amman - Jordan	Review and receive comments by the Reference group	Wk 2-3-4
Field visits and stakeholders meetings	Evaluation Team	Amman - Jordan		Wk 5-6
Presentation of preliminary findings including the questionnaires results.	Evaluation Team –	Amman/Home Base	Review and receive comments by the Reference group	Wk 7
Comments by reference group	ASRO/Reference group		1 <sup>st</sup> draft of evaluation report	Wk-8
Draft Report of the Evaluation	Evaluation Team	Home Base	Review and comments by the Reference group	Wk 9 & 10
ASRO review and comments	ASRO		Collect comments from reference group members	Wk 11-12-13
Final Report of the Evaluation	Evaluation Team	Home Base		Wk 14-15

## **12. Composition, Skills and Experience of the Evaluation Team:**

Two international consultants should conduct the evaluation. They should not have had any involvement in the formulation and the implementation of the project.

The **team leader** should have the following qualifications:

- A master degree in social sciences is a must.
- At least 10 years of evaluation experience, of which 4 years in evaluating development projects with a good knowledge of participatory methods.
- Thorough understanding of gender equality, human rights and development issues.
- Knowledge and experience around the thematic area under review (Women Economic Security and Rights); experience in ICT for development initiatives; experience in managing community-based economic activities essential.
- Previous experience in leading an evaluation and managing an evaluation team.
- An experience in evaluating UN development projects is an asset.
- Excellent communication skills and demonstrated ability to facilitate group discussions.
- Demonstrated ability to produce high quality evaluation reports, including recommendations for future work.
- Experience and understanding of the regional, sub- regional and country context is essential.
- Fluent in English, a good working knowledge of Arabic is an asset.
- Ability to work with the Evaluation Manager to ensure that a high quality evaluation report is produced.

The **team member** should have the following qualification:

- A master degree in social sciences is a must.
- At least 5 years of evaluation experience.
- Thorough understanding of gender equality, human rights and development issues.
- Knowledge and experience around the thematic area under review (Women Economic Security and Rights).
- Excellent communication skills and demonstrated ability to facilitate group discussions.
- Demonstrated ability to contribute to high quality evaluation reports, including recommendations for future work.
- An experience in evaluating UN development projects is an asset.
- Experience and understanding of the regional sub regional and country context is essential.
- Fluent in English with an excellent command/fluency in Arabic.
- Ability to work with the team leader to ensure that a high quality evaluation report is produced.

The team leader will have the overall responsibility for the quality and timeliness of the products including and up to the final integrated report. He/she will be the point person for ASRO and the Evaluation task manager. He/she will divide the tasks so that each member of the team carries a fair load and produces a quality product. The team member will have primary responsibility, in collaboration with the team leader, for designing and administering the stakeholders' survey, and for tabulating the results in a Power Point presentation. He/she will participate in other tasks as specified in the methodology and agreed with the team leader, including interviews, focus groups, analysis of results and the write up of the draft and the final integrated reports.

### **13. Management of Evaluation/ key responsibilities of UNIFEM in the process of the evaluation (logistical support: material and office space):**

The evaluation is expected to start in August 2010. UNIFEM ASRO will manage the evaluation and will designate an Evaluation Task Manager to directly manage the evaluation process.

UNIFEM reference group will follow up with the evaluation team to facilitate the tasks of the team within the scope of the evaluation. In addition, an external reference group will be established that brings together main partners to review and comment on submitted reports and output.

UNIFEM ASRO and Evaluation Task Manager will provide the evaluation team with the following:

- Provide the evaluation consultants with an office space in UNIFEM ASRO premises as needed.
- Organize and make available the set of documents to be reviewed by the evaluation consultants.
- Provide a list of project's partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders in order to enable the evaluation consultant to select particular individuals for meetings.
- Arrange the meetings with the selected partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries.
- Organize necessary logistics for the evaluation consultants.
- Develop a dissemination strategy to ensure that the final evaluation report reaches its target audience.

The management response to the recommendations of evaluation will be issued within six weeks after the finalization of the evaluation.

### **14. Ethical Code of Conduct:**

It is expected that the evaluators will respect the ethical code of conduct of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). These are:

- **Independence:** Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgment is maintained and the evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- **Impartiality:** Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organization unit being evaluated.
- **Conflict of Interest:** Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise.
- **Honesty and Integrity:** Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behavior, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.
- **Competence:** Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experiences to complete successfully.
- **Accountability:** Evaluators are accountable for the completion the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost effective manner.
- **Obligations to Participants:** Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and

- other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring the relatively powerless are represented.
- **Confidentiality:** Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and the limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its sources.
  - **Avoidance of Harm:** Evaluators shall act to minimize risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.
  - **Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability:** Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgments, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are in a position to assess them.
  - **Transparency:** Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.
  - **Omissions and Wrongdoing:** Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

**Annexes:**

- [UNIFEM Evaluation Policy](#)
- [UNEG Norms and Standards](#)
- E-village Project Document (available on request)
- UNIFEM RBM manual (available on request)

## Annex 2 Agenda and List of People Met

**Tuesday, Oct. 19** Arrival in Jordan

**Wednesday, Oct. 20**

UN Women E-Village Project Coordinator/ Task Manager for this evaluation<sup>85</sup>  
UN Women Programme Coordinator  
UN Women Project Assistant

UN Women Arab States Regional Office SRO, Regional Programme Director  
UN Women E-Village Project Coordinator/ and task manager for this evaluation<sup>86</sup>

**Title?** Director Q Perspective

UN Women E-Village Project Coordinator/ task manager for this evaluation<sup>87</sup>

Al-Qanater President

UN Women E-Village Project Coordinator/ task manager for this evaluation<sup>88</sup>

**Thursday, Oct. 21**

Reference Group (meeting organized as focus group)

UNICEF (Former UNESCO employee), Communication Specialist

Head of the Evaluation Division (M&E Department)

MoPIC, Technical Advisor

MoE, Head of Technology Maintenance Department

MoICT, Director of e-Initiatives

MoICT, E-Initiatives Department

UNV, Program Officer

AED/CSP Jordan (Former JOHUD Director), Consultant

JOHUD, Monitoring and Evaluation Manager

Partners (meeting organized as focus group)

NITC National Information Center for Technology , Program and Training Director

INJAZ, Operations Unit Director

INJAZ, Manager

Center For Excellency, Director

JOHUD manager, Intel Clubhouse & Legorobotics, and Al-Qanater member

JOHUD manager, Intel Clubhouse, and Al-Qanater member

---

<sup>85</sup> Although the Evaluation Task Manager sat in on some of the meetings in the first few days, he did not intervene in the interview process and only added any comments he might have had afterwards. In addition, interviewees spoke freely and without constraints judging from the strength of views expressed.

<sup>86</sup> Although the Evaluation Task Manager sat in on some of the meetings in the first few days, he did not intervene in the interview process and only added any comments he might have had afterwards. In addition, interviewees spoke freely and without constraints judging from the strength of views expressed.

<sup>87</sup> Although the Evaluation Task Manager sat in on some of the meetings in the first few days, he did not intervene in the interview process and only added any comments he might have had afterwards. In addition, interviewees spoke freely and without constraints judging from the strength of views expressed.

<sup>88</sup> Although the Evaluation Task Manager sat in on some of the meetings in the first few days, he did not intervene in the interview process and only added any comments he might have had afterwards. In addition, interviewees spoke freely and without constraints judging from the strength of views expressed.

NHF, Program Manager Assistant  
 JOHUD, Internal Monitoring officer  
 Zenid, Computer Clubhouse Coordinator

**Saturday, Oct. 23**

Visit to Libb e-Village sites with -Qanater President and UN Women E-Village Project Coordinator/task manager for this evaluation

, President, Libb and Mleih Municipality , with Qanater President and UN Women E-Village Project Coordinator/ task manager for this evaluation

Visit to Mleih e-Village sites with E.Village Centers' Coordinators

Focus group discussion with 5 female volunteers of the E-Village project

Focus group discussion with 6 male volunteers of the E-Village project

5 female volunteers (meeting organized as focus group)

6 male volunteers (meeting organized as focus group)

**Sunday, Oct. 24**

Mleih Centre for Development, Manager  
 JOHUD Mleih, Trainer, Knowledge Station

Owner, Sewing workshop (Former trainer at E-village sewing workshop)

seamstress, Former e-Village beneficiary

Women's Cooperative (meeting organized as focus group)

, President

3 members

Jameed shop owner

Jameed shop owner

Women's Cooperative, Member

**Monday, Oct. 25**

Mleih School for Girls, Principal

Mleih School for Girls, Legorobotics Lab Supervisor

Focus group discussion with nine female students from the Mleih School for Girls

Mleih students (meeting organized as focus group)

nine students

Lib School for Girls, Principal

Lib School for Girls, Robotics Lab Supervisor

Focus group discussion with six female students from the Lib School for Girls

Libb students (meeting organized as focus group)

6 students

Al-Qanater, three employees from Packaging and Labeling

Al-Qanater member  
 Al-Qanater, former human resources staff  
 Al-Qanater member, former guard

Mleih Centre for Development, former manager

**Wednesday, Oct. 27**

RSCN, former e-village project implementer

Microsoft, Office Manager

oPIC, International Cooperation Department  
 MoPIC, International Cooperation Department,  
 MoPIC, Head of the Evaluation Department

**Thursday, Oct. 28**

NITC, Director General  
 NITC, Program and Training Director

MoICT, Director of e-Initiatives  
 MoICT, Operations Manager  
 MoICT, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

AED/CSP Jordan, former JOHUD Director

**Friday, Oct. 29**

UN Women ASRO, E-Village Project Coordinator  
 UN Women ASRO Financial Associate

**Saturday, Oct. 30**

Libb, Al-Qanater former accountant

Libb dairy products maker  
 Libb home-based seamstress

Libb, teacher, former e-Village cafeteria manager

**Sunday Oct. 31st**

Reference Group

UN Women ASRO Regional Programme Director  
 UN WOMEN E-village Project Coordinator  
 MoPIC Evaluation Unit Head  
 MoPIC Researcher at the International Cooperation Department



MoICT Researcher, E-Initiatives Unit

**Monday Nov. 1<sup>st</sup> departure from Jordan**

**Nov. 3, 2010**

former UNIFEM E-Village programme coordinator (phone interview)

**Nov. 4 and 5**

Programme Specialist for Asia, Pacific and Arab States Geographic Section at HQ email exchanges in response to questions submitted by the Evaluation Team

**Nov. 8, 2010**

Former UNIFEM E-Village programme coordinator (phone interview)

### **Annex 3 List of documents reviewed**

- ‘Activities of E-Village Centers in (no date) (author unknown).
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (no date/a). ‘Statute’ (Arabic).
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (no date/b). ‘Statute’ (English).
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (no date/c). ‘Registration with Ministry of Interior Arabic’.
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (no date/d). ‘Note to UNIFEM: Minutes of Meeting (Arabic)’.
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (2007). ‘Certificate of Registration: Jordanian Cooperative Organization’. June.
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (2008/a). ‘Feasibility Study Organic Farming’ (Arabic).
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (2008/b). ‘Feasibility Study Embroidery Centre’ (Arabic).
- Al-Qanater Cooperative Society (2009). ‘E-Village Al-Qanater Association: Actio Plan and Budget/ 2009’.
- Arabian Business. <http://arabianbusiness.com>
- CDG Engineering & Management Associates/Community Development Group (2004). ‘Centre Renovation Agreement with Noor I-Hussain Foundation’.
- Center for Excellence in Education (CCE) (2005). ‘Proposal for LEGO Mindstorms for Schools (Robotics Lab), submitted to UNUIFEM/Jordan, September’.
- Estarta Solutions (2005). ‘Concept Document for the Project, SM Game. Client: UNIFEM’.
- EUROMED (2008/a). Role of Women in Economic Life: Comparative Analysis of the Economic Situation of Women in 10 South Mediterranean Countries. By Camillia Fawzi El-Solh.
- EUROMED (2008/b). Role of Women in Economic Life: Women’s Economic Rights in the South Mediterranean Region. A Comparative Analysis of Law, Regulations and Practice. By Camillia Fawzi El-solh and Nadia Hijab.
- EUROMED (2008/c). ‘Profile of Women Entrepreneurs and NGO Partners in the MEDA Region’. Paper presented at the EUROMED Regional Workshop on Gender, Marketing and Trade in the MEDA Region. Istanbul/Turkey, 16-18 April 2008. By Nadia Hijab.
- Government of Jordan (GoJ) (2007). ‘National ICT Strategy of Jordan 2007-2011’.
- Information Technology Association (int@j) (no date). ‘“Village Net”. A Proposal for an Internet Café at an E-Village by UNIFEM’.
- INJAZ (no date). ‘E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative: INJAZ Proposal’.
- INTEL (no date). ‘INTEL Teach to the Future Programme’.
- INTEL (2005). ‘INTEL Computer Clubhouse Network, Museum of Science/Boston. License Agreement’.
- International Finance Corporation/Centre for Arab Women Training and Research (IFC/CAWTAR) (2004). ‘Women Entrepreneurs in the Middle East and North Africa: Characteristics, Contributions and Challenges’.

Jordan ICT Forum. <http://www.jordanictforum.com>

Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD) (2010/a) . ‘Agreement with UNIFEM 8-31 March 2010: Project Objectives’.

Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD) (2010/b). ‘E-Village Mleiha: Action Plan January-March 2010’.

Jordanian National Commission for Women (JNCW) (2006). ‘National Strategy for Jordanian Women 2006-2010’.

Jordan Times, 21 July 2010.

Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MICT) (no date). ‘Jordan E-Government Initiative’.

Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MICT) (2004). ‘Digital Collection Concept Paper’.

Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MICT) (2009/a). ‘Knowledge Station in Irbid/Madaba Governorate (Arabic).’

Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MICT) (2009/b). ‘E-Village project. No-Cost Extension Through 31 March 2010’.

Ministry of Interior (MOI) (2007). ‘Agreement to Establish Cooperative Society in Irbid and Mleiha’ (Arabic).

Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) (2008). Note from Minister of MoPIC to UNIFEM, dated 7 Febr. 2008, confirming commitment of MoICT to fund e-village extension’.

Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) (2009). ‘Letter from MOPIC to UNIFEM, E-Village Handover, 11 October (Arabic).

Mofleh, Samer, Mohammed Wanous and Peter Strachan (2008). ‘Developing Countries and ICT Initiatives: Lessons Learnt from Jordan’s Experience’. The Electronic Journal on Information Systems in Developing Countries, 34(5).

NETCORPS/Jordan (no date). ‘Programme Summary’.

NETCORPS/Jordan (2003). ‘UNIFEM E-Village Proposal’.

Noor Al-Hussain Foundation (no date/a). ‘E-Village Activities’.

Noor Al-Hussain Foundation (no date/b). ‘E-Village Suggested Business Training Activity’.

Noor Al-Hussain Foundation (no date/c). ‘Livelihood Improvement Project (Arabic).

Noor Al-Hussain Foundation (2005). ‘E-Village Project, Agreement on Renovation between Nour Al-Hussain Foundation and Nibo Engineering Company’ (Arabic).

‘Overview Report: UNIFEM’s E-Village Project’ (no date). (Author Unknown/ assume 2008).

Tadros, Marlyn (2005). ‘Arab Women, the Internet and the Public Sphere’. Presented to the Mediterranean Social and Political Meeting, Florence/Italy, March.

Tarawneh, Zaid (no date). 'The Landscape of IT in Jordan.'  
<http://www1.american.edu/initeb>

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2006). 'A Primer on Gender Responsive E-Government: Exploring the Transformative Potential' By Nadia Hijab & Suad Dajani.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2009). Human Development Report 2009. Overcoming Barriers: Human Mobility and Development.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UNESCWA) (1998). Feasibility and Operationalization of Micro-Credit Finance Facilities Targeting Poor Women in Urban and Rural Areas in Selected Arab Countries: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Considerations. By Camillia Fawzi El-Solh.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) (2009). 'Impact of ICT on Community Development in ESCWA Member Countries'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRo) (date unclear/a). 'E-Village IT Workplan June-August' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRo) (date unclear/b). 'E-Village Marketing Workplan June-August' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRo) (date unclear/c). 'E-Village Film Club: Training of Trainers'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/a). 'E-Village Phase II. Replication of the E-Village Project.'

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/b). 'Study on Tracking the Progress of Jordanian Women in ICT Space'. By Al-Jidara.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/c). 'Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and USAID Amir Programme'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/d). 'Terms of Reference for ICT Facilitator'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/e). 'E-Village Exit Strategy'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/f). 'E-Village Film Club Workplan' (Arabic) (scanned, unreadable).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/g). 'E-Village Draft Sustainability Plan, UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/h). 'UNIFEM ICT Programme: Terms of Reference for UNV'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/i). 'E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative: Logframe Report (Monthly)'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/j). 'Annex I. Format for UNIFEM Programme Documents'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/k). 'Memorandum of Understanding between MICROSOFT Jordan Representative Office ("Microsoft") and UNIFEM'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/l). 'Annex VI: Terms of Reference E-Village Staff'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/m). 'E-Village Report' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/n). 'E-Village Transportation Study'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/o). 'E-Village Project: Plan for Handover and Sustainability of Project Activities'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/p). 'UNIFEM/ASRO website: Economic Security and Rights Programme'.  
<http://www.unifem.org.jo/Pages/programinformation>

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/q). 'E-Village UNIFEM/GoJ Initiative: Concept Paper

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/r). 'Names of E-Village Project Beneficiaries' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/s). 'E-Village Phase II: Expansion of the E-Village Project I Lib and Mleih'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no date/t). 'UNIFEM E-Village: Unofficial Report'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2003). 'Annex II: Assessment on the Selected Village. Lubb and Mleih Research. September, Amman, Jordan'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/a). 'Agreement between UNIFEM and the Government of Jordan JOR/03/W01 -E-Village Initiative'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/b). 'Project Document: E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/c). Draft PAC Minutes- The Asia-Pacific and Arab States Section'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO)

(2004/d). 'E-Village Outline/Workplan of Information and Awareness Programme Component' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/e). 'E-Village IT Component: Weekly Report December' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/f). 'UNIFEM Agreement with INJAZ, 30 June'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/g). 'Amended Terms of Reference Between UNIFEM and The Queen Zein Al-Sharaf Institute for Development (ZENID).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/h). 'E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative. Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and the Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD), 12 October'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/i). 'E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative. Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and Noor Al-Hussain Foundation'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/j). 'E-Village Initiative UNIFEM/Government of Jordan. Steering Committee Workshop 7 January'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/k). 'Lease Agreements in Libb and Mleih' (Arabic)'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/l). 'E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative: National Task Force'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/m). 'Annexes to Project Document: E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative'.

m/1: Annex I: ICT Sector in Jordan

m/2: Annex II: UNIFEM ASRO IT Programme

m/3: Annex III: E-Village Task Force List

m/4: Annex IV: Assessment of the Selected Village (see also UNIFEM/ASRO, 2003)

m/5: Annex V: Description of Key Components

m/5a: Level A

m/5b: Level B

m/5c: Level C

m/6: Annex VI: Project Staff Terms of Reference

m/7: Annex VII: Project Partners' Profile

m/8: Annex VIII: Project Budget

m/9: Project Workplan

m/10: Logical Framework Analysis

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2004/n). 'E-Initiatives Taskforce Meeting February 2004, Amman'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2005/a). Annual report April 2004-March 2005. Prepared for Ministry of Information and Communications Technology (MOICT).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2005/b). E-Village Project: Monthly Workplan May' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2005/c). 'E-Village Staff Meeting, 12 July' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2005/d). 'E-Village Weekly Report, 11 August' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2005/e). 'E-Village Weekly Report Leadership, 3 October'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2005/f). 'E-Village Monthly Logframe June' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no 2005/g). 'E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative: Terms of Reference Between UNIFEM and INJAZ'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2005/h). 'In-Kind Agreement Between UNIFEM and Jordan Telecom & Wanadoo Jordan (The Donor)'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no 2005/i). 'UNIFEM and the Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD) e-village correspondence, 5 May'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no 2005/j). 'E-Village Workshop. Local Community Leaders' Meeting, 16 May' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no 2005/k). 'E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative. Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and The Center for Excellence in Education'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no 2005/l). 'E-Village Project; Report on Reproductive Health Project' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no 2005/m). 'E-Village Entrepreneurial Component Report' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (no 2005/n). 'E-Village Expenditure Report April 2004-March 2005'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/a). 'E-Village. Report to Ministry of Education and Communications Technology. April 2005-March 2006'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/b). 'E-Village Film Club: Monthly Report, 9 March' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/c). 'E-Village Film Club Workshop Report, 9 March' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/d). 'E-Village Film Club Monthly Report June' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/e). 'E-Village Film Club: Film Script 'My Hero' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/f). 'E-Village UNIFEM/Government of Jordan Initiative. Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and the Royal Film Commission Jordan'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/g). Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and UNESCO, April 2006'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2006/h). 'Final ASRO Sub-Regional Strategy 2006-2007'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/a). 'E-Village Initiative. Project Outcome from 2004-2007'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/b). 'E-Village. Report to Ministry of Information and Communications Technology. April 2006-December 2007'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/c). '(e) pulse June 2006-March 2007' (Arabic/English).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/d). ‘((e)) pulse April 2007-June 2007’. Economic Security & ICT Programme’ (Arabic/English).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/e). ‘((e)) pulse July 2007-Septmebr 2007’ (Arabic/English).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/f). ‘E-Village Budget’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/g). ‘E-Village Media Programme Film Club: Results-Based Plan, 1 March’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2007/h). ‘Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and Municipal Council Lib and Mleih, Creation of Radio Station (Arabic)’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/a). E-Village. Phase II Proposal.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/b). ‘E-Village Pilot Project Initiative Phase-Out Strategy, October-December 2008’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/c). ‘Institutional Contract UNIFEM and Al-Qanater’. November.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/d). ‘Handover Notes’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/e). ‘Handover Notes Financial.’

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/f). ‘Miscellaneous Emails’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/g). ‘Meeting Agenda UNIFEM ADRO and Al-Qanater Association: Sharing Phase Out Plan and Future Activities, 20 October’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2008/h). ‘Economic Security and Rights Programme. E-Village Project Donor Report January –December 2008’.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/a). ‘((e)) pulse January 2009’ (Arabic/English).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/b). ‘Meeting UNIFEM and Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, 27 October’

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/c). ‘Correspondence UNIFEM and Al-Qanater Cooperative Society’ (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/d). ‘Assessment of NGO Implementing Partners of UNIFEM: Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD)’. September.



United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/e). 'Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and JOHUD': Phase Out Strategy for INTEL Clubhouse and Film Club Hosting Organization'. July.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/f). 'Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and Al-Qanater and Lib and Mleih Municipality; Phase Out Strategy for Livelihood Skills Development and Employment Programme'. July.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/g). 'Memorandum of Understanding UNIFEM and National Information Technology Center and Libb and Mleih Municipality: Phase Out Strategy for Technical Skills Development Programme'. July.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/h). 'Formal Letter 2 April 2009 from UNIFEM to Minister of MoICT: Handover IT Academy to NICT/Knowledge Center' (Arabic). Confirmation from MoICT August 2009' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/i). 'Correspondence UNFEM and UNESCO reg. E-Village Radio Station'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/j). 'E-Village No Cost Extension Through 31 March 2010'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/k). 'UNIFEM Letter to Minister of MOPIC: Handover, 29 September'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2009/l). 'UNIFEM and MoICT: Minutes of Meeting on E-Village, 19 March'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2010/a). 'E-Village Handover Note for Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation: Plan for Handover and Closure, 3 May' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2010/b). 'E-Village Handover Note for Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation: Plan for Sustainability of Project Activities, 3 May' (Arabic).

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2010/c). 'E-Village Handover to Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation: Ownership Transfer Form'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2010/d). 'Final External Evaluation TORs. E-Village Project: UNIFEM-Government of Jordan Gender Initiative'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2010/e). 'E-Village Reference Group Meeting: Names and Emails of Participants'.

United Nations Fund for Women/Arab States Regional Bureau (UNIFEM/ASRO) (2010/f). 'E-Village Mleih: Action Plan January-March 2010'.

United Nations Information Technology Service (UNITS) (no date). 'Partnership with Universities'.

United Nations Volunteers (UNV) (no date). 'UNV Partnership Strategy for JITCC Network'.

Westrup, Christopher & Sahera Al-Jaghoub (2008). 'Nation States, Networks of Flows and ICT-Enabled Development: *Learning from Jordan*'. Development Informatics, Working Paper Series, Paper No. 33.

### **Annex 4 Evaluation Questions as Amended after the Desk Review**

*It should be noted that, although all the questions below have been addressed in the Final Report, some turned out to be more appropriately discussed under a different category than the one under which they were initially proposed.*

#### **Relevance**

1. Did the project correctly identify the rights and needs of women in Lib and Mleih given the local, national and regional context.
2. Did the activities designed and implemented in the E-village project sufficiently address the problems identified, such as reducing the digital divide, the IT gender gap, transport, markets, and access to finance?
3. Did the project adapt and respond to changing contextual requirements?
4. Was the project coherent with national and regional development plans and does it target the advancement of rights under CEDAW, the Millennium Development Goals and other international conventions Jordan has ratified?
5. Is the project design articulated in a coherent way with clear definition of goals, outcomes and outputs and within the framework of UNIFEM ASRO Sub-Regional Strategy?

#### **Effectiveness**

1. To what extent did the project achieve its intended outputs and contribute to intended outcomes as outlined in the project logframe? What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of outputs and outcomes?
2. Did the project contribute to shaping local women beneficiaries' economic rights and priorities?
3. What role did partnerships with national partners play in achieving progress towards results of the project?
4. Was the strategy of change elaborated by the project a sufficient model to achieve the desired change?
5. To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of national and regional gender equality policies and the Jordan National ICT Strategy?
6. To what extent have the capacities of rights holder and duty bearers involved in the project been strengthened?
7. To what extent have partners and beneficiaries have been satisfied with the results? How do they consider the project to have strengthened their capacities to promote or call for women's economic rights and security through ICTs?
8. Was ICT an effective tool for building local women's capacities and contribution to

community development?

9. How effective were project monitoring mechanisms in measuring progress towards results and providing information for mid-course project improvements?

### **Efficiency**

1. Were the outputs achieved in the best value of money and in a timely manner with resources used to the best effect? Could the same activities and outputs have been delivered using fewer resources?
2. Have UNIFEM ASRO organizational structure, managerial support, planning and coordination mechanisms and monitoring effectively supported the delivery of the project and efficient use of resources?
3. Have project resources been equally distributed to different groups of women in the two villages with sensitivity to race, ethnicity, economic status, disability, and other potential sources of discrimination?

### **Sustainability**

1. Are the E-village initiatives, networks and results supported and owned by national partners?
2. Did the project build the capacity of national partners to enable them to maintain, expand and/or replicate the project initiatives, specifically with regards to resource mobilization and financial capacity, ICT technical capacity and adaptive and management capacities (e.g. learning, leadership, commitment, project management, networking/linkages)?
3. To what extent the E.Village project is based on the expressed needs and priorities of the community? Has it focused on building local ownership and for achievement?

### **Impact**

1. Was there an increase in women's participation in the local labor market in Lib and Mileih that can be attributed to the implementation of this project?
2. Was there any change in gender relations and roles in Lib and Mileih villages with regards to economic participation and other areas as a result of the implementation of the project?
3. What impact did the project have on gender equality in Lib and Mileih?
4. What are some of the intended and unintended, positive and negative changes produced directly or indirectly by the project on the opportunities of different groups of women in Lib and Mileih, and on the overall socioeconomic conditions of these villages?

## **Annex 5 Questions for e-Village Partners and Stakeholders**

*The questions have been edited and consolidated.*

### 1. Questions for Partner and Stakeholder Focus Group Sessions

*Questions were selected from this basic set depending on the group.*

1. What are the positive social and economic changes in the villages of Libb and Mleih as a result of implementation of the e-Village Project?
2. Addressing gender gaps and contributing to women's empowerment are stated objectives of the e-Village Project. To what extent has this been achieved? In what ways?
3. How has the e-Village Project contributed to the community ownership of ICT-related infrastructure, centres, networks etc?
4. How relevant were e-Village Project activities given the objective of providing the villagers of Mleih and Libb with opportunities to improve their knowledge, skills and livelihoods? Which were the most relevant and which were the least relevant?
5. How satisfied are you with the outputs of the E-Village Project? What in your view could have been more effectively implemented, and why?
6. Has UNIFEM ASRO provided the required organizational structure and management support for the cost-effective implementation of the E-Village Project?
7. How often were joint meetings with partners and stakeholders organized during Phase I (2004 – 2007)? During Phase II (2008 – March 2010)? Were minutes of the meetings efficiently distributed?
8. How often did you receive UNIFEM reports? Did you write your own reports on the project, or include it in reports on other activities you may have in Madaba Governorate?
9. Overall, have available resources – human and financial – been efficiently utilized in the implementation of the e-Village Project?
10. How has the Ee-Village Project contributed to your capacity as national partners and stakeholders to maintain, expand and replicate the project activities?
11. What are the less positive effects instigated in the villages of Libb and Mleih through implementation of the E-Village Project?
12. If the E-Village Project were to be replicated in other governorates in Jordan, what are the three key lessons learnt that need to be taken into account?

### 2. Questions for Partner Interviews

*Questions were selected from this basic set depending on the organization.*

1. What was the role and contribution of your organization?
2. How regularly were you kept informed of project implementation progress and problems?
3. How often were you able to visit the village and when was the last visit?
4. How does this compare to other community development projects in Jordan?
5. What was the link between the e-Village Project and your organization's other activities?
6. From 2004 – 2007 there were three annual reports produced by the E-Village Project: Were there any comments from your side? What about reports for 2008 and 2009?
7. The partnership arrangements for the E-Village Project were wide-ranging and brought partners together in a way that is not often done for development projects in Jordan, i.e. government counterparts, private sector, UN system, NGOs. How do you feel this worked? What are the lessons learnt for other projects?
8. The project objectives included bridging the gender digital divide and the rural urban digital divide – what is your assessment of progress made in this area?

9. Is this divide now being bridged through school programmes such as MIS?
10. In hindsight what would you have wanted to see done differently? For example, might the e-Village Project have been focused on IT related educational activities? Or IT related income generating activities? Or IT related social – awareness, health, etc – activities?

3. Questions for Focus Groups and/or Individual Beneficiaries in Libb and Mleih

*Some of these questions were also asked of individual interviewees, and a selection was made based on whether interviews were adults or youth.*

1. Do you now know how to use IT in an entrepreneurial manner?
2. Are cost issues – PCs, Internet – still a deterrent?
3. Are there Internet cafes for women?
4. Has there been a change in social (gender) relations in the village?
5. What e-Village activities existed before the project? Did they grow as a result of the e-Village Project?
6. Did you feel you had enough information about the Project and its activities?
7. What were your sources of information about the Project? Bulletin board, e-Pulse newsletters, neighbours, family, other?
8. Did you get any information about job opportunities through the Project?
9. Did you get a job through the Project? In which field?
10. Did you get access to finance through the project? What did you use it for?
12. Are you using the computer to work from home?
13. Were your products marketed on e-commerce websites? With what results?
14. What is the effect of such participation the e-Village on your schoolwork, friendships, home life? Other? (Same question asked to parents about their children who are students)
15. What is the effect of e-Village activities carried out in the schools?
16. Are there ICT-related educational activities that are not linked to the e-Village? How are these supported by the Ministry of Education?

4. Questions for Non-Beneficiaries in Libb and Mleih:

1. What do you know about the E-Village Project?
2. If you have not yourself participated in/benefited from the various e-Village project activities, has anyone in your household done so?
3. Do you have ICT skills? If yes, where did you acquire such skills? And what do you use these skills for?
4. What type of income generation activities do women in Libb and Mleih carry out?
5. Is there a women's cooperative in your village? Any other type of network which women in your village can benefit from financially?
6. What kind of job opportunities are accessible for young women in your village?
7. Has there been a change in social (gender) relations in the village?

5. Questions for Qanater Cooperative Society Members

1. When and how did Qanater get involved in the e-Village Project?
2. What was the impact of activities established in the e-Village and during which periods?
2. Which activities are currently operational in Libb? How sustainable are these activities?
3. Which activities are currently not operational? Why?
4. What is the relevance of ICT to past and ongoing activities?
5. What is the source of Qanater's budget?

6. Describe Qanater's management of past and currently operational e-Village activities.
7. What constraints does Qanater face in fulfilling its role and mandate?
8. Has there been a change in social (gender) relations in the village?

6. Questions for Head of Libb & Mleih Municipality:

1. What was your role and contribution to the e-Village Project at the start and during implementation?
2. Did you feel you were kept well-informed about project development and implementation?
3. What in your view was the contribution of the e-Village to Libb and Mleih?
4. Do you have a sense of how much the e-Village contributed to employment creation or income generation?
5. What is the role of the Municipality to ensure sustainability?
6. What advice would you offer for similar future projects?

7. Questions for UNIFEM ASRO senior management

*The selection of questions depended on the period of service (2004-7, 2008, 2009-on)*

1. How was the e-Village project document for the Project developed and what was the extent of the input at the UNIFEM regional and global levels into this country project?
2. The programme structure and components were changed during the course of 2004 and 2005. What was the rationale for the changes?
3. The project was originally intended to run from 2004 – 2006, and was extended to 2007. What was the rationale? Was there an opportunity to undertake an evaluation at this stage?
4. Was there an opportunity to undertake an evaluation at the end of Phase I in the 2007 so as to prepare for Phase II in 2008?
5. A project review appears to have been undertaken in February – March 2008. Did you commission this review? Did you commission such a review of all UNIFEM ASRO projects or just this one? How were the recommendations of this review addressed, including the recommendation to undertake an immediate evaluation?
6. According to the project extension agreement signed in February 2008, there were plans to seek funding for 2009-10? Did UNIFEM ASRO senior management follow this up?
7. This was recognized as a flagship project by UNIFEM for the organization as a whole. How engaged was UNIFEM HQ during the implementation 2004 – 2007? For example, how often did they visit? Did they request additional reports beyond the three annual reports?
8. How engaged was UNIFEM ASRO senior management during the implementation?
9. What was the situation of the e-Village Project when you began your term?
10. What was your assessment of the capacity of the newly formed Qanater Cooperative? Were they equipped enough to take over?
11. The project began with several income-generating centers. What was UNIFEM ASRO senior management's assessment of the viability of each? Which had the most potential?
12. What steps had been taken to close the project and to hand over project activities and assets to the designated parties by the time you took office? What steps did UNIFEM/ASRO senior management and staff take to complete the handover process? In what way were the government of Jordan and other partners engaged in the handover process?
13. The handover was extended to March 2010. What were the reasons? In what way did this impact on project activities?
14. In hindsight what would you have wanted to see done differently?

## 8. Questions for UNIFEM Headquarters/NY

1. During what period/s did you oversee and/or backstop the E-Village Project?
2. How was the project document for the E-Village developed? What was the extent of the input at the UNIFEM regional and global levels into this country project?
3. The HQ Project Assessment Committee reviewed the Project Document in some detail. Were there issues not raised then that, with the benefit of hindsight, you would raise now?
4. The programme structure and components were changed during the course of 2004 and 2005. What rationale was given to UNIFEM HQ for the changes?
5. The project was originally intended to run from 2004-2006 and was extended to 2007. What rationale was given to UNIFEM HQ for the additional year?
6. Was there an opportunity to undertake an evaluation in 2006, and if yes, why was this not pursued? If no, why not?
7. Was there an opportunity to undertake an evaluation at the end of Phase I in 2007 so as to prepare for Phase II in 2008, and if yes, why was this not pursued? If no, why not?
8. This was recognized as a flagship project by UNIFEM for the organization as a whole. How engaged was UNIFEM HQ during the implementation 2004-2007? For example, how often did HQ visit? Did HQ request additional reports beyond the annual reports for each of 2004, 2005 and 2006/7? Any other ways in which HQ was engaged?
9. Did UNIFEM HQ form an opinion of the capacity of the newly formed Qanater cooperative as an organization and of the capacity of its staff to take over?
10. The project began with several income-generating centers. Did UNIFEM HQ form an opinion of the viability of each? Which had the most potential?
11. What activities were ongoing the last time you visited the E-Village project? Which seemed to have the most potential and which seemed to be facing the greatest challenges? How many people appeared to be involved?
12. In hindsight what would you have wanted to see done differently?

## 9. Questions for Discussion with UNIFEM Staff

*The selection of questions depended on the period of service (2004-7, 2008, 2009-on).  
Some of the details have been reduced.*

1. What was the period you worked on the E-Village Project? What were your role and responsibilities? Who did you report to?
2. Who formulated the e-Village Project? Did project formulation take into account other global experience/lessons learnt?
3. Construction and renovation activities took longer than anticipated: Could any activities have been started in existing structures? What percentage of the e-Village Project budget was spent on construction?
4. How often did you refer back to the logical framework? Was a work plan developed for each e-Village activity?
5. Were any changes made after the needs assessment carried out at different stages? Was a baseline developed?
6. What was the monitoring system in place? The knowledge management system in place?
7. Did turnover of managers and staff affect knowledge management? Project delivery?
8. Did you find it possible to link IT training to job opportunities? Give examples. Were villagers' products marketed on e-commerce websites?
9. What was the nature of UNIFEM HQ engagement with the e-Village Project?
10. What progress reports were sent to government counterparts and when? Other partners?
11. How easy was it to manage the broad and diverse group of partners?

12. Could you provide more information on the constraints affecting the radio station and the call centre?
13. Was the e-Village Project able to contribute to the policy level as regards ICT policy? As regards gender and ICT? To gender relations? To other UNIFEM programmes?
14. What is your assessment of the viability of each income-generating/production centers? Were feasibility studies carried out beforehand? What marketing strategies were developed? What role did the e-Village staff/Qanater play in developing market strategies?
15. What was your assessment of the capacity of Qanater Cooperative Society as an organization and of its staff? Were they equipped to take over by the time you left?
16. What efforts did UNIFEM make for sustainability at different stages?
17. Why was the hand-over process delayed? How did the handover actually take place?
18. What are the other existing and planned UNIFEM ASRO e-initiatives?
19. In hindsight what would you have wanted to see done differently? Should the E-Village Project have been focused on IT-related educational activities? Or IT-related income -generating activities? Or IT related social – awareness, health, etc – activities?
20. In hindsight would it have been better to focus on one village rather than two that appear to have a somewhat different economic base and social dynamics?



### **Annex 6 Results of Questionnaire for Project Beneficiaries**

*A copy of the uncompleted questionnaire is available in the Evaluation Team's Inception Report. For background on and analysis of the questionnaire – and the very serious caveats regarding the responses below – please refer to Section 5.e.ii in the main report.*

#### **Notes regarding responses**

##### *Libb*

Of the 40 questionnaires administered in Libb, 30 filled in questionnaires that were handed in, of which eight were identified as female-headed households (FHH). However, since information on the husband was also indicated in questions, the Evaluation Team found the proportion of FHH in Libb to be questionable. The number of household members in Libb varied between two and eight adults, and averaged around four children of school age.

##### *Mleih*

Of the 40 questionnaires administered in Mleih, 36 filled in questionnaires that were handed in, all of which were identified as male-headed households. The majority of Mleih households were reported as having two adult members, and also averaged around 4 children of school age. There were relatively more 'no answer' recorded in the case of Libb compared with Mleih.

**Question 1** How has training in ICT improved the way of life and livelihood opportunities of members in your household.

##### *Libb: 30 questionnaires/responses*

<i>Household Member</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Daughter(s)</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Son(s)</i>	<i>Other Household Members (specify relationship)</i>
<i>Effect of E-Village Programme</i>					
<b>Were you able to increase your ICT- related knowledge and skills?</b>	Yes (14) No (5) Somewhat (4) No answer (7) Total: 30	Yes (16) No (4) Somewhat (3) No answer (7) Total: 30	Yes (19) No (3) Somewhat (3) No answer (5) Total: 30	Yes (16) No (2) Somewhat (4) No answer (8) Total: 30	Yes (11) No (3) Somewhat (3) No answer (13) Total: 30

<i>Household Member</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Daughter(s)</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Son(s)</i>	<i>Other Household Members (specify relationship)</i>
<i>Effect of E-Village Programme</i>					
<b>Did ICT training help your job advancement?</b>	Yes ( 15 ) No ( 8 ) No answer ( 7 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 16 ) No ( 8 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 16 ) No ( 6 ) No answer ( 8 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 18 ) No ( 3 ) No answer ( 9 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 11 ) No ( 6 ) No answer ( 13 ) Total: 30
<b>Did ICT training create a new job opportunity?</b>	Yes ( 9 ) No ( 15 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 13 ) No ( 10 ) No answer ( 7 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 10 ) No ( 14 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 7 ) No ( 13 ) No answer ( 10 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 5 ) No ( 10 ) No answer ( 15 ) Total: 30
<b>Did ICT training help you enlarge an existing enterprise?</b>	Yes ( 15 ) No ( 10 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 9 ) No ( 16 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 12 ) No ( 11 ) No answer ( 7 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 15 ) No ( 7 ) No answer ( 8 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 7 ) No ( 10 ) No answer ( 13 ) Total: 30
<b>Did ICT training help you establish a new enterprise?</b>	Yes ( 6 ) No ( 20 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 5 ) No ( 20 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 7 ) No ( 17 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 9 ) No ( 15 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 5 ) No ( 14 ) No answer ( 11 ) Total: 30
<b>Did ICT training help you improve production?</b>	Yes ( 7 ) No ( 9 ) Somewhat ( 6 ) No answer ( 8 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 17 ) No ( 7 ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 16 ) No ( 8 ) Somewhat ( 1 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 14 ) No ( 7 ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 75 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 6 ) No ( 5 ) Somewhat ( 4 ) No answer ( 15 ) Total: 30
<b>Did ICT training help you to improve marketing opportunities?</b>	Yes ( 8 ) No ( 17 ) Somewhat ( 1 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 15 ) No ( 11 ) Somewhat ( 0 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 9 ) No ( 7 ) Somewhat ( 3 ) No answer ( 11 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 18 ) No ( 5 ) Somewhat ( 1 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 8 ) No ( 4 ) Somewhat ( 1 ) No answer ( 17 ) Total: 30

<i>Household Member</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Daughter(s)</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Son(s)</i>	<i>Other Household Members (specify relationship)</i>
<i>Effect of E-Village Programme</i>					
<b>Did ICT training help you to increase your income?</b>	Yes ( 7 ) No ( 17 ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 9 ) No ( 17 ) Somewhat ( 0 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 7 ) No ( 14 ) Somewhat ( 3 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 9 ) No ( 8 ) Somewhat ( 1 ) No answer ( 12 ) Total: 30	Yes ( 6 ) No ( 5 ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 17 ) Total: 30

**Question 1:** How has training in ICT improved the way of life and livelihood opportunities of members in your household.

*Mleih: 36 questionnaires/response*

<i>Household Member</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Daughter(s)</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Son(s)</i>	<i>Other Household Members (specify relationship)</i>
<i>Effect of E-Village Programme</i>					
<b>Were you able to increase your ICT-related knowledge and skills?</b>	Yes ( 13 ) No ( 16 ) Somewhat ( 3 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 25 ) No ( 7 ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 2 ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( 1 ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 1 ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 35 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>Did ICT training help your job advancement?</b>	Yes ( 13 ) No ( 18 ) No answer ( 5 )	Yes ( 21 ) No ( 13 ) No answer	Yes ( 2 ) No ( 1 ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 1 ) No ( - ) No answer ( 35 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36

<i>Household Member</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Daughter(s)</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Son(s)</i>	<i>Other Household Members (specify relationship)</i>
<i>Effect of E-Village Programme</i>					
	Total: 36	( 2 ) Total: 36			
<b>Did ICT training create a new job opportunity?</b>	Yes ( 8 ) No ( 23 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 15 ) No ( 19 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 1 ) No ( 2 ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 1 ) No ( - ) No answer ( 35 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>Did ICT training help you enlarge an existing enterprise?</b>	Yes ( 3 ) No ( 28 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 4 ) No ( 30 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( 3 ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( 1 ) No answer ( 35 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>Did ICT training help you establish a new enterprise?</b>	Yes ( 2 ) No ( 30 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 4 ) No ( 30 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( 5 ) No answer ( 31 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( 3 ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( 1 ) No answer ( 35 ) Total: 36
<b>Did ICT training help you improve production?</b>	Yes ( 11 ) No ( 20 ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 3 )	Yes ( 14 ) No ( 16 ) Somewhat ( 4 ) No answer ( 2 )	Yes ( 3 ) No ( 2 ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 31 )	Yes ( 3 ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 33 )	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 36 )

<i>Household Member</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Daughter(s)</i>	<i>Unmarried Adult Son(s)</i>	<i>Other Household Members (specify relationship)</i>
<i>Effect of E-Village Programme</i>					
	Total: 36	Total: 36	Total: 36	Total: 36	Total: 36
<b>Did ICT training help you to improve marketing opportunities?</b>	Yes ( 8 ) No ( 20 ) Somewhat ( 3 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 10 ) No ( 16 ) Somewhat ( 6 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 1 ) No ( 3 ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 32 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 34 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>Did ICT training help you to increase your income?</b>	Yes ( 8 ) No ( 0 ) Somewhat ( 4 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 36	Yes ( 7 ) No ( 23 ) Somewhat ( 3 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( 4 ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 32 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( 2 ) No answer ( 34 ) Total: 36	Yes ( - ) No ( - ) Somewhat ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36

**Question 2:** Please indicate your view of the benefit to your household of the activities implemented by the E-Village Programme.

*Libb: 30 questionnaires/responses*

<i>E-Village Programme Activity</i>	<i>Improving knowledge</i>	<i>Improving household income</i>
<b>A. Livelihood Skills Development and</b>		

<i>E-Village Programme Activity</i>	<i>Improving knowledge</i>	<i>Improving household income</i>
<b>Employment Programme</b>		
<i>*Mosaic Centre</i>	Very helpful ( 11 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 ) Not helpful ( 7 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 7 ) Somewhat helpful ( 9 ) Not helpful ( 12 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30
<i>*Packaging Centre</i>	Very helpful ( 6 ) Somewhat helpful ( 14 ) Not helpful ( 7 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 5 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 11 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30
<i>*Labelling Centre</i>	Very helpful ( 6 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 ) Not helpful ( 13 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 4 ) Somewhat helpful ( 7 ) Not helpful ( 17 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30
<i>*Embroidery Workshop</i>	Very helpful ( 12 ) Somewhat helpful ( 6 ) Not helpful ( 5 ) No answer ( 7 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 11 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 10 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30
<i>*Cafeteria</i>	Very helpful ( 10 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 ) Not helpful ( 10 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 7 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 9 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30
<i>*Organic Farming</i>	Very helpful ( 10 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 9 ) No answer ( 1 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 13 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 ) Not helpful ( 6 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30
<i>*Call Centre</i>	Very helpful ( 18 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 ) Not helpful ( 2 )	Very helpful ( 14 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 4 )

<b><i>E-Village Programme Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Improving knowledge</i></b>	<b><i>Improving household income</i></b>
	No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30	No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30
<b>B. Technical Skills Development Programme/Microsoft IT Academy</b>		
<b><i>*Training on MCDST</i></b>	Very helpful ( 17 ) Somewhat helpful ( 7 ) Not helpful ( 5 ) No answer ( 1 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 13 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 11 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Training on Internet</i></b>	Very helpful ( 23 ) Somewhat helpful ( 3 ) Not helpful ( 2 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 15 ) Somewhat helpful ( 6 ) Not helpful ( 6 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Training on Digital Literacy</i></b>	Very helpful ( 17 ) Somewhat helpful ( 9 ) Not helpful ( 2 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 13 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 8 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Soft Skills Training</i></b>	Very helpful ( 21 ) Somewhat helpful ( 3 ) Not helpful ( 2 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 16 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 3 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Training on Business Management and Entrepreneurship</i></b>	Very helpful ( 14 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 4 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 12 ) Somewhat helpful ( 13 ) Not helpful ( 3 ) No answer ( 2 ) Total: 30
<b>C. Extracurricular Education Programme</b>		
<b><i>*E-Village Computer</i></b>	Very helpful ( 17 )	Very helpful ( 9 )

<b><i>E-Village Programme Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Improving knowledge</i></b>	<b><i>Improving household income</i></b>
<b><i>Clubhouse</i></b>	Somewhat helpful ( 7 ) Not helpful ( 3 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30	Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 12 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Lego Robotics Lab</i></b>	Very helpful ( 18 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 ) Not helpful ( 1 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 10 ) Somewhat helpful ( 7 ) Not helpful ( 10 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Dokanneh</i></b>	Very helpful ( 16 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 6 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 14 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 8 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30
<b><i>INJAZ Programme</i></b>	Very helpful ( 14 ) Somewhat helpful ( 11 ) Not helpful ( 2 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 4 ) Somewhat helpful ( 7 ) Not helpful ( 16 ) No answer ( 3 ) Total: 30
<b><i>D. Media Programme</i></b>		
<b><i>*Community Radio Station</i></b>	Very helpful ( 13 ) Somewhat helpful ( 6 ) Not helpful ( 7 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 4 ) Somewhat helpful ( 6 ) Not helpful ( 16 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Film Club</i></b>	Very helpful ( 12 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 4 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 7 ) Somewhat helpful ( 7 ) Not helpful ( 12 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30
<b><i>E. Information and Awareness Programme</i></b>		
<b><i>*Pedestrian safety workshop</i></b>	Very helpful ( 11 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 )	Very helpful ( 3 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 )



<b><i>E-Village Programme Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Improving knowledge</i></b>	<b><i>Improving household income</i></b>
	Not helpful ( 4 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30	Not helpful ( 15 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Career Guidance Workshop</i></b>	Very helpful ( 11 ) Somewhat helpful ( 8 ) Not helpful ( 5 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 5 ) Somewhat helpful ( 6 ) Not helpful ( 12 ) No answer ( 7 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Reproductive Health Workshop</i></b>	Very helpful ( 10 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 6 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 7 ) Somewhat helpful ( 10 ) Not helpful ( 8 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Bird Flu Workshop</i></b>	Very helpful ( 13 ) Somewhat helpful ( 6 ) Not helpful ( 5 ) No answer ( 6 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 3 ) Somewhat helpful ( 7 ) Not helpful ( 15 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30
<b><i>*Awareness Workshop on E-Village Programme</i></b>	Very helpful ( 16 ) Somewhat helpful ( 6 ) Not helpful ( 4 ) No answer ( 4 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 5 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 15 ) No answer ( 5 ) Total: 30
<b><i>F. Volunteerism Programme</i></b>	Very helpful ( 6 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( 1 ) No answer ( 18 ) Total: 30	Very helpful ( 3 ) Somewhat helpful ( 3 ) Not helpful ( 5 ) No answer ( 19 ) Total: 30

**Question 2:** Please indicate your view of the benefit to your household of the activities implemented by the E-Village Programme

*Mleih: 36 questionnaires/responses*

<b><i>E-Village Programme Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Improving knowledge</i></b>	<b><i>Improving household income</i></b>
<b>A. Livelihood Skills Development and Employment Programme</b>		
<b>*Mosaic Centre</b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Packaging Centre</b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Labelling Centre</b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Embroidery Workshop</b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Cafeteria</b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Organic Farming</b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( 36 ) No answer ( - )	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( 36 ) No answer ( - )

<b><i>E-Village Programme Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Improving knowledge</i></b>	<b><i>Improving household income</i></b>
	Total: 36	Total: 36
<b><i>*Call Centre</i></b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( 36 ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( 36 ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36
<b>B. Technical Skills Development Programme/Microsoft IT Academy</b>		
<b><i>*Training on MCDST</i></b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b><i>*Training on Internet</i></b>	Very helpful ( 2 ) Somewhat helpful ( 1 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( 1 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 35 ) Total: 36
<b><i>*Training on Digital Literacy</i></b>	Very helpful ( 2 ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 34 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b><i>*Soft Skills Training</i></b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36
<b><i>*Training on Business Management and Entrepreneurship</i></b>	Very helpful ( 2 ) Somewhat helpful ( 1 ) Not helpful ( 33 ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( 1 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 35 ) Total: 36

<i>E-Village Programme Activity</i>	<i>Improving knowledge</i>	<i>Improving household income</i>
<b>C. Extracurricular Education Programme</b>		
<i>*E-Village Computer Clubhouse</i>	Very helpful ( 32 ) Somewhat helpful ( 4 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<i>*Lego Robotics Lab</i>	Very helpful ( 31 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<i>*Dokanneh</i>	Very helpful ( 4 ) Somewhat helpful ( 4 ) Not helpful ( 1 ) No answer ( 27 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<i>INJAZ Programme</i>	Very helpful ( 31 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>D. Media Programme</b>		
<i>*Community Radio Station</i>	Very helpful ( 3 ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<i>*Film Club</i>	Very helpful ( 7 ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 29 )	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 )

<b><i>E-Village Programme Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Improving knowledge</i></b>	<b><i>Improving household income</i></b>
	Total: 36	Total: 36
<b>E. Information and Awareness Programme</b>		
<b>*Pedestrian safety workshop</b>	Very helpful ( 4 ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 32 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Career Guidance Workshop</b>	Very helpful ( 3 ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Reproductive Health Workshop</b>	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( - ) Total: 36
<b>*Bird Flu Workshop</b>	Very helpful ( 3 ) Somewhat helpful ( 1 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 32 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>*Awareness Workshop on E-Village Programme</b>	Very helpful ( 2 ) Somewhat helpful ( 1 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 33 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36
<b>F. Volunteerism Programme</b>	Very helpful ( 7 ) Somewhat helpful ( 5 ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 24 ) Total: 36	Very helpful ( - ) Somewhat helpful ( - ) Not helpful ( - ) No answer ( 36 ) Total: 36

**Annex 7: Logical Framework Analysis – e-Village Initiative**

*The original project logframe is pasted below. However, it should be noted that the Team had no access to information that the project was being managed according to the logframe and its indicators, or that this was updated to reflect implementation and changes in project activities.*

Development Objective / Goal	Impact	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions/ Risks
<p>“To transform a Jordanian village into a gender-sensitive vibrant community where Information and Communications Technology is deployed to achieve a better quality of life”.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved quality of life of rural women through the use of ICTs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased employment of rural women.</li> <li>• Reduced poverty levels among rural women.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual assessment of project.</li> <li>• Department of Statistics.</li> <li>• Villagers’ feedback.</li> </ul>	<p>Rural women are employed inside the village.</p> <p>ICT sector continues to grow win Jordan.</p> <p>Government priorities of ICT development in rural areas does not change.</p> <p>Tourism sector is still a rising sector in Jordan.</p>

<b>Programme Objective #1 (Level A)</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	
<p>To raise women and men villagers' awareness on the different initiatives taking place in the village, on the use of technology, on gender-related issues, and on other essential issues such as family planning and hygiene (This will be achieved through creating an Information and Awareness Center within Mleih's Knowledge Station and extending its activities to cover the village's schools).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More rural women utilizing ICTs in their daily lives.</li> <li>- Improved awareness on gender issues surrounding rural women's role in the marketplace.</li> <li>- Improved awareness on family planning, hygiene and other essential issues.</li> <li>- Increased awareness among female students on essential issues.</li> </ul>	<p>Number of rural women participating in the Information and Awareness Center.</p> <p>Number of women requesting counseling services from the Information and Awareness Center.</p> <p>Number of children and mothers participating in the program.</p> <p>Number of school students, teachers and parents participating in school's activities.</p> <p>Number of men villagers.</p>	<p>Database. Assessment. Reports. Villagers' feedback.</p>	

Activities	Outputs	Indicators	Means of Verification
1. Field awareness campaign	Increased No of visitors to the Information and Awareness Center.	Number of women and men visiting the center. No. of request for e-Village services.	<b>Visitor log sheet.</b>
2. Evaluation, counseling and directing	Women and men villager's needs are addressed.	Number of villagers evaluated and counseled.	<b>Evaluation sheets.</b>
3. Basic IT services	Women and men villagers are more IT literate and use IT in their daily lives.	Number of women and men who receive IT-related services at the center and schools.	<b>Log sheet.</b>
4. Awareness raising workshops	Increased awareness on gender related issues, women's rights, hygiene and family planning.	Number of women and men participating in the awareness lectures conducted.	<b>Reports.</b>
5. Bulletin Board	Improved communication of village activities within and outside the village.	Number of newsletters sent. Number of villagers requesting information. on Bulletin Board.	<b>Log sheet.</b> <b>Number of project participants.</b>
6. Edutainment Center	Children are more aware of & familiar with IT and its uses.	Number of children in the Edutainment Center.	<b>Log sheets.</b>



Activities	Outputs	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions/ Risks
7. School Activities	<p>Increased awareness in gender issues and ICT among students, teachers and parents</p> <p>Increased awareness of career opportunities among rural students</p> <p>Building capacity of teachers to become more innovative &amp; gender sensitized educators</p> <p>Increased awareness on activities and learning opportunities available in and outside the village</p>	<p>Number of students, teachers and parents attending workshops and lectures</p> <p>Changes in stereotypes related to the role of women</p> <p>Increased usage of new methods of teaching among rural educators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop reports</li> <li>• Assessment</li> <li>• Schools' reports</li> <li>• Students, teachers and parents feedback.</li> </ul>	

Programme Objective #2 (LEVEL B)	Outcome	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions/ Risks
To build the capacity and professional skills of the villagers and allow them to benefit from different IT services through establishing an 'Empowerment Center' and conducting professional tailored training workshops aiming at providing them with necessary skills.	<p>Village women empowered and capable of finding jobs, establishing their own businesses, marketing their own products and promoting their village.</p> <p>School students and teachers enhanced their IT and soft skills.</p>	<p>Number of rural women participating in the Empowerment Center.</p> <p>Number of training courses and workshops conducted.</p> <p>Topics covered in the training courses.</p> <p>Increased number of rural women with marketable professional skills.</p> <p>Number of students and teachers participating in the schools' training courses and workshops.</p> <p>Number of women with new jobs.</p>	<p>Reports.</p> <p>Assessments.</p> <p>Classes and workshops conducted.</p> <p>Database.</p>	

Activities	Outputs	Indicators	Means of Verification
<p>1. Tailored IT-related training courses</p>	<p>Village women are equipped with IT skills tailored according to the requirements of jobs available in Level C. Greater opportunity for village women to obtain quality job positions.</p>	<p>Increased number of qualified and/ or certified rural women participating in Level C. Number of rural women employed at the eServices Center.</p>	<p>Level B reports List of participants Assessments Training Manuals Database Level C reports</p>
<p>2. Empowerment training workshops</p>	<p>Rural women trained on business-related and entrepreneurial skills.</p> <p>Enhanced career development skills among village participants.</p> <p>Greater motivation among village women.</p>	<p>Increased number of qualified business women. Increased number of startup businesses owned by women villagers. Increased number of women villagers attending the Empowerment Training Workshops. Increased number of women participants in the e-Marketing Center.</p>	

Activities	Outputs	Indicators	Means of Verification	
3. Tourism Training	<p>Village women empowered in non-conventional and tourism specific skills.</p> <p>More qualified village women employed in tourism-related sectors.</p> <p>Decrease in unemployment in the village cluster</p>	<p>Increased number of village women with qualified skills in non-conventional and tourism specific skills.</p> <p>Increased number of village women participating in the Tourism Sector.</p> <p>Increase in the number of innovative businesses developed related to tourism.</p>	<p>Assessments</p> <p>Training manuals</p> <p>Lists of participants</p> <p>Database</p>	

<b>Programme Objective #3 (LEVEL C)</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>
To enhance the economic opportunities within the village through creating new job opportunities and providing professional marketing and entrepreneurial services.	<p>Rural women become qualified income generators.</p> <p>Rural women are employed in IT-related jobs.</p> <p>Rural women can better market and sell their products in and outside the village.</p> <p>Village becomes a more popular tourist area.</p> <p>Increase in income for rural women in the village cluster</p> <p>More women employed in the village cluster.</p>	<p>Increase in demand for e-village's products and services.</p> <p>Decrease in unemployment rate in the e-village.</p> <p>Number of villagers' products/ services sold in and outside the village (online and offline).</p> <p>Estimated income per household in the e-village.</p> <p>Increase in the number of women working in non-conventional sectors (tourism and ICT).</p>	<p>EServices Center reports</p> <p>e-Marketing Center reports</p> <p>Entrepreneur Services reports</p> <p>Show room activities</p> <p>Orders (number of hits) through e-Commerce sites.</p> <p>Unemployment statistics (DOS)</p> <p>Village Municipality</p>
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>

<p>1. Establishing a Marketing Center</p>	<p>Development of marketable village products and services. Greater demand of villagers' products and services. e-Village becomes a popular tourist stop. Enhanced awareness on marketing one's own products and services (online and offline). Increased villagers' use of the internet to promote and sell their products and services. More jobs created.</p>	<p>Number of products and services sold. Increase in the number of participants in the Empowerment Center's Marketing workshops. Increase in the number of products and services purchased online. Increase in the number of tourists visiting the e-village.</p>	<p>e-Marketing reports. e-Commerce site reports. Tour agencies. Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities. Villagers' feedback.</p>	
<p>2. Establishing an e-Services Center</p>	<p>Teleworking used as a means to generate more income for rural women. More women working in ICT-related jobs in and outside the e-village. More awareness on teleworking and e-services. Increase income for women villagers.</p>	<p>Number of rural women employed in the e-Services Center. Number of rural women working in teleworking services. Number of rural women employed in ICT-related jobs inside and outside the e-village. Increase in average income per household.</p>	<p>EServices center reports. Database. Assessments. Department of Statistics. Municipality. Villagers' feedback.</p>	

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	
<p>3. Establishing an Entrepreneurial Center</p>	<p>Village women and men receiving services from the Enhanced Productivity Center (EPC) in Madaba and the Nour al-Hussein Foundation (NHF). Grants offered by the Nour al-Hussein Foundation. More women village entrepreneurs establishing their own businesses.</p>	<p>Number of villagers visiting the Entrepreneurial Center. Number of villagers linked to NHF and the EPC. Number of villagers improving and enhancing their businesses. Number of villagers starting up their own businesses. Number of Entrepreneur success stories.</p>	<p>Entrepreneur reports. NHF reports EPC reports Enhanced business activities in the village.</p>	