



Department
for International
Development

Operational Plan 2011-2016

Jordan

December 2014

Contents

Introduction	2
Context	3
Vision	4
Results 2015/16	5
Delivery and Resources	7
Delivering Value for Money	10
Monitoring and Evaluation	11
Transparency	12
Annex A: Changes to Operational Plan	13
Annex B: Human Rights Assessment	14

Introduction

In 2013 the UK became the first G7 country to meet the United Nations target of spending 0.7% of gross national income on international development. The Department for International Development (DFID) uses that investment to help countries to lift themselves out of poverty and leave poverty behind. Operational plans set out to the public how we plan to deliver results across policy areas and for every country we work in. These plans clearly explain why, and how, DFID is targeting its resources and what we expect to achieve; covering the period up until March 2016.

DFID is focused on spending in the right ways, on the right things, in the right places. The portfolio of our projects is already shifting to deliver a more coherent, focused and ambitious approach to economic development. We are helping to build strong and investable business environments in developing countries and improving access to finance for entrepreneurs.

Improving the prospects for girls and women in developing countries is a priority. Investing in girls and women is the smart thing to do, as well as the right thing to do. By unleashing their potential, we see returns for girls and women themselves, their families and communities, and for their economies and countries. No country can successfully develop if it leaves half its population behind.

Life-saving humanitarian assistance remains one of DFID's most fundamental responsibilities. When disaster strikes or conflict erupts we are first on the ground to support the most vulnerable people. We are also increasing our efforts to help those countries that are at higher risk of natural disasters to become more resilient in the first place.

DFID continues to drive value for money in everything we do on behalf of the British taxpayer. We have improved our procurement and programme management, increased our internal audit oversight and we are ensuring that staff have the skills to deliver the Department's priorities.

On the international stage we are working hard to agree a new set of global development goals to replace the Millennium Development Goals when they expire next year. We are determined to secure a clear and inspiring set of goals for the post 2015 development framework that leave no one behind.

Increasingly we will take new and innovative approaches and we will work with new partners. This will include businesses who are increasingly major development players. During Secretary of State's time as co-chair of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, DFID played a key role in encouraging different development actors to work together and use internationally agreed principles for aid and development effectiveness.

As our operational plans set out, our approach to international development is ambitious and innovative. We are determined to ensure that every pound DFID spends has the biggest possible impact on the ground. Ultimately by investing in developing countries, we can end aid dependency for good and build a better, more prosperous world for us all.

Context

The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region has experienced unprecedented change since the start of the Arab Spring in 2010. The vision of political and economic reform held out by the Arab revolutions flared briefly but was quickly followed by widespread instability and conflict, and the rise of violent extremism particularly in the Syria-Iraq neighbourhood. Several countries in MENA remain at severe risk of instability and in danger of moving into deeper crisis. The immense costs of growing instability in the region, and increased risks to the UK of further deterioration, justify upfront engagement by the UK and international partners with MENA countries, focussed on dealing with ongoing crises, addressing the drivers of conflict, and tackling longer-term causes of poverty.

Jordan, a country of 6.5 million people (World Bank), occupies a central position in the Middle East region. It is an Upper Middle Income Country with a GDP per capita of \$5,200 (World Bank). Modern Jordan came into being in the aftermath of the First World War under the leadership of the Hashemite Dynasty – who still rule today. Jordan has accepted several waves of refugees over the course of its history, the largest of which are of Palestinian origin. Jordan occupies a strategic position as a stable, moderate force in a volatile region and plays a constructive and responsible role across a range of political and diplomatic issues. The UK has a historical relationship and now a strong partnership in multiple fields; defence, diplomacy, education and trade. DFID's work is linked to the humanitarian and stability consequences of the Syria crisis and the recent advances of violent and extremist groups in the region.

Since the start of the Syria crisis 620,000 refugees from Syria have entered and been registered in Jordan. Most are women and children who are now living in, and alongside, host communities, primarily in the north of the country. Only a minority of refugees (around 15%) live in large camps such as at Zaatari or Azraq. They are able to subsist, drawing on a mixture of their own resources, donor and nationally funded services, informal work, debt and other coping mechanisms - some of which are harmful (e.g. early marriage). There has not been a humanitarian 'crisis' in Jordan; core humanitarian indicators are stable. However, there is no room for complacency; in the absence of employment options, coping mechanisms and levels of resilience are being eroded. Furthermore, in an environment of declining donor financing for supporting refugees, finding a more self-sustaining and cost-effective approach to managing the refugee caseload is an imperative.

The influx of refugees from Syria exacerbates some of Jordan's existing vulnerabilities. Jordan's natural resource base is limited and it has a high level of dependency on external concessional finance of which aid is a significant component. Government resources are channelled towards public spending which focuses on providing salaries, subsidies and services. Growth and employment are public sector-led: private sector-led growth and investment is curtailed due to relatively low investment in infrastructure, a rigid labour market and public sector crowding out. The government raises very little income itself (e.g. very few Jordanians pay tax). The need to address these structural issues has arguably been made more urgent by the Syria crisis.

Although there are tensions reported between Syrian refugees and Jordanian host communities, these have not deteriorated into significant outbreaks of disorder or violence. Some areas in the north of Jordan have seen their populations more than double and the impacts are real. The government has increased spending to support the provision of public services for the new population. Syrian refugees are not allowed to work in Jordan, however in reality many are and compete against poorer Jordanians, other Syrians who lived in Jordan prior to the crisis and other immigrant workers (e.g. Egyptians) for low paid, unskilled jobs in the informal sector. The influx of refugees has also had a localised, inflationary impact on housing rental costs, but a limited one on inflation overall.

Refugee numbers are unlikely to change significantly in the near future, though occasional spikes in influx may occur in response to local conflict dynamics in Syria and Iraq. The government is regulating the flow of refugees, not least because of security concerns. The conflict in Syria is not likely to be solved in the immediate future. It is therefore likely that Jordan faces a protracted refugee scenario: there will continue to be several hundred thousand Syrian refugees in Jordan for the foreseeable future. There is also a risk that the lack of economic opportunities, inequality and marginalisation could create an enabling environment for radicalisation and violent extremism. Finding a means by which refugees can live in Jordan with their rights safeguarded, sufficient economic security and access to services, and able to co-exist peacefully with host communities, will therefore be a guiding principle for DFID's work in Jordan.

Vision

Overview

The UK government's long-term vision for MENA is a prosperous, stable region based on open, democratic societies with greater social, economic and political participation of its people. In support of this goal over the short to medium term, DFID is working to promote regional stability in line with the UK government's Building Stability Overseas Strategy. Across the region DFID is supporting countries to manage current conflict and crises, tackling the drivers of instability and conflict, and where possible, supporting political and economic reform alongside longer term development.

In line with this, the UK's vision is for a Jordan that is stable, prosperous and pursuing reform, which continues to contribute positively to regional crises and security, and is increasingly resilient to the threat of violent extremism.

In support of this vision, DFID's objective in Jordan is to preserve or strengthen stability and social cohesion, with refugees and host communities increasingly integrated and able to co-exist peacefully, with their resilience to extremism and radicalisation strengthened. The rationale for our presence is the effects of the Syrian crisis. Increasingly this has to be placed in the context of stability for Jordan and the region.

In the medium term DFID will support Jordan in exiting from its reliance on international donor support and transitioning to a national-led response to the Syria crisis supported by increased economic growth and drawing on more sustainable sources of finance and investment. In a shorter timeframe we will use our influence and funding to support a prioritised government and UN response to the crisis as well as promoting effective Jordanian policy change overall.

DFID will deliver this by concentrating on 3 main areas of work, allocating our financial and staffing resources accordingly:

- Providing humanitarian assistance that over time strengthens refugee resilience on a sustainable basis. Our humanitarian programme will continue with a protection-led strategy, targeting the poorest and most vulnerable members of refugee and host communities, and will also provide proportionate support to agencies delivering essential functions such as shelter, water and sanitation, and food security;
- Supporting improved government-led public service delivery in the areas most affected by the influx of refugees in a way that supports the integration of different communities – focused on local, municipal services and supporting the increased integration of refugees and host communities in education under the umbrella of the No Lost Generation Initiative;
- Mitigating the risks of conflict and violent extremism by addressing local grievances and tackling Jordan's underlying fragility – focused on addressing drivers of potential conflict at the community level and supporting Jordan to manage conflict and change peacefully, and provide social and economic opportunities to all. Some of our humanitarian and service delivery programmes will contribute to this, and we will work closely with other UK government departments to ensure that the new cross-government Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) is used effectively in support of UK objectives.

What we will not be doing

Given the relatively large amounts of external finance that Jordan receives from a range of traditional and Gulf donors and the International Financial Institutions (and its Upper Middle Income status), DFID will focus its non-humanitarian resources on key sectors, such as education and the No Lost Generation Initiative, as well as municipal level service provision, where we can have an impact and leverage policy change. We will not provide financial aid directly to the central government or support large-scale, direct service provision.

Alignment to DFID and wider UK Government priorities

DFID's approach to Jordan is aligned with the Building Stability Overseas Strategy, the Humanitarian Emergency Response Review and the UK government's Humanitarian Policy. Our work will be taken forward as part of the National Security Council strategy for addressing the Syria crisis and the recent advances of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in the region and we will play an active role in delivery of the CSSF.

Results 2015/16

Headline results (Those with a * are directly attributed to DFID. In all other cases DFID is contributing to the results.)

Pillar / Strategic Priority	Indicator	Baseline	Expected Results (end year included)
Humanitarian – Poverty, hunger & vulnerability	Number of monthly food rations received*	460,000	N/A
Humanitarian – Poverty, hunger & vulnerability	Number of individuals benefiting from the distribution of relief packages*	150,000	N/A
Humanitarian – Poverty, hunger & vulnerability	Number of children supported by psycho-social interventions*	26,000	N/A
Humanitarian – Water, sanitation & hygiene	Number of people with access to clean water sources per month (peak month)*	27,000	N/A
Humanitarian – Health	Number of medical consultations for emergency trauma and primary healthcare cases*	50,000	N/A
Education**	Number of children benefitting from improved quality of education*	1,000	100,000 2014/15 100,000 2015/16
Governance and Security	Number of beneficiaries of improved municipality services*	0	284,000 2014/15 450,000 2015/16

We do not forecast results for humanitarian indicators, in line with DFID guidance.

The baseline shows the results of DFID funded programmes delivered in 2013.

Results for food include cash and vouchers which are provided for the purchase of food.

** Attributable to DFID (2014/15 education result subject to USAID programme starting before March 2015 and based on 1/3 attribution)

Headline results

The Jordan programme has shifted away from a focus on economic reform alone in 2011, pre-Syria crisis, to a focus on stability post-Syria crisis. There are no milestones or targets for the humanitarian indicators as it is not possible to comprehensively anticipate needs. This is in line with established DFID practice. The education results are for a new programme which has recently started to provide education for Jordanian and Syrian children, aged five to eight, in 3,000 public schools. The municipalities' indicator covers work in the twelve municipalities with the highest refugee populations. As this is a new Operational Plan progress against results will only be reported from 2014/15 onwards.

Evidence supporting results

There is a mixed range of supporting evidence for this operational plan on which our core assumptions are based. Our understanding of humanitarian needs is based primarily on the UN Regional Response Plan 2014 (RRP 6), and supplemented by agencies' assessments and analysis. The RRP is based on forecasted increase from 550,000 refugees at the end of 2013 to 800,000 by the end of 2014, and includes both humanitarian and development programming needs. The information on longer term needs is patchy; we are working across Whitehall and with partners to strengthen our knowledge. For 2015 the RRP will be replaced by the Regional Response and Resilience Plan (3RP) which aims to link the humanitarian response into activities which boost the ability of both refugees and host communities to deal with the impact of the crisis in the medium to long term.

There is a strong evidence base for the humanitarian interventions themselves which are primarily standard humanitarian programmes delivering food, shelter, water and sanitation as well as medical interventions. DFID's partner agencies engaging in Protection programming are doing so in a holistic way, with their interventions drawing upon best practice in psycho-social support and cash transfer programming, as well as the core protection support and referrals to other service providers.

We have used the Government of Jordan's national plans (specifically the National Resilience Plan and the Jordan Response Plan), which are currently being drafted and seek to provide a co-ordinated approach to all forms of support for 2015/16; other reports such as those provided by humanitarian agencies and International Financial Institutions; and our own analysis as evidence to support programming that addresses broader stability issues. This analysis shows that pressures on local and community services and community level tensions vary based on localised contexts. Furthermore, the factors which are sources of tension – in particular the competition for services, resources and jobs – are also parameters which, for those people (both refugee and Jordanian) who cannot secure them, increase vulnerability. Therefore the linkage between inter-community tension and vulnerability of refugees and host communities can be demonstrated.

Information on the fiscal impact of the Syrian crisis in Jordan is limited. Various studies have been undertaken but there is no one definitive product which sets out the benefits as well as the cost of the Syrian refugee influx. Additionally there has been no recent census published.

Evidence supporting work on countering violent extremism is also limited. There is a highly complex picture of 'push' and 'pull' factors that interact with each other in context specific ways. It is possible to identify statistically significant links between certain factors but these do not amount to causal relationships.

While a sound hypothesis can be set out that our humanitarian and additional support promotes stability, it is too early to identify a sound basis of evidence to back this up. During the life of this plan we will work with partners to build up the evidence required to show the impact of our interventions. Any programmes without a strong evidence base will be designed to ensure that they contribute to building an evidence base for future interventions.

Delivery and Resources

Instruments of delivery

The relatively sudden influx of refugees into Jordan brought with it the need to address specific vulnerabilities amongst the refugee population. Humanitarian agencies were and still are best placed to deliver these services. We are pushing them to plan and implement more efficient and more narrowly targeted approaches to service delivery.

We will channel the majority of our humanitarian support in line with RRP6 through:

- **UN agencies** such as the World Food Programme (WFP) and Unicef, informed by the 2013 Multilateral Aid Review Update and our own 2014 Annual Review. Where organisational weaknesses have been identified, we will seek to mitigate these through programme design and influence our partners to address these weaknesses. We will push UN agencies to take a longer term approach, less based on emergency provision and more on promoting coping mechanisms.
- **International non-governmental organisations (INGOs)**, who are able to deliver results in Jordan. We are moving from short term emergency support to longer term multi-year funding. We currently support 8 INGOs.
- **The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (RCRC)**, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) scores highly in the 2013 Multilateral Aid Review and its mandate in protection and assistance are relevant to the programme in Jordan. RCRC operates outside the UN-led RRP mechanism, though its aims are consistent with RRP.

For programming that targets broader stability objectives we will work mainly with:

- **The government of Jordan**, in areas where our relatively small but flexible and grant-based resources can have an impact in helping to build service capacity or leverage policy reform, such as municipal authorities.
- **Other donors**, such as the US or EU and the **International Financial Institutions** who are providing larger scale support and who we can partner with to channel targeted resources to meet the particular needs of refugees and host communities as part of bigger, more sustainable interventions.
- **International and national non-governmental organisations (NGOs)**, with a proven track record of operating successfully in Jordan.

Other regional activity

We are at the forefront of the international community's response to the Syria crisis in Jordan. We are pushing the government to help refugees to integrate into the economy and society as much as possible, and managing the impacts on host communities. We are supporting and shaping the government's efforts to co-ordinate aid in order to help ensure that government plans are clear and prioritised and include our key NGO and UN delivery partners. We are working with the UN to make sure that they have a consistent approach to supporting national leadership and not one based on individual UN agency priorities. We are working closely across Whitehall to ensure we have a joined up coherent response to the Syria crisis in Jordan.

Maximising the impact of our people

To ensure we can continue to deliver a high quality programme our staff will need strong programme management skills with a focus on risk management and risk mitigation. We will make sure that one person is clearly responsible for delivery for each individual intervention which will strengthen oversight for all programmes. As staff will also travel frequently around Jordan and the wider region it is critical that all our staff are appropriately trained in personal security and safety, which we will continue to prioritise.

Planned Programme Spend

Pillar/Strategic	2014/15		2015/16 (provisional*)
	Resource £'000	Capital £'000	Total Resource and Capital £'000
Humanitarian	30,000	0	
Education	3,000	0	
Governance and Security	6,100	0	
Total	39,100	0	37,000

*Expenditure figures for 2015/16 are indicative. DFID works in a variety of challenging environments, including fragile and conflict affected areas. Humanitarian work is often reactive and can be scaled up or down. An element of flexibility within funding allocations is necessary to ensure that we can balance the need for long term planning alongside the ability to respond where necessary to changing requirements

2015/16 planned programme spend for Jordan and Lebanon have been drawn from both MENA Regional and Syria allocations for 2015/16, which leaves the latter teams with reduced spending plans when compared to 2014/15. However this is a structural change only and there is no net change in the agreed allocations.

The 2014/15 figures are presented here to show programme spend over time but are also included in the Middle East and North Africa Development (MENAD) Regional and Syria Operational Plans.

Planned Operating Costs

	2014/15	2015/16 (provisional*)
	£'000	£'000
Frontline Delivery Costs – Pay	1,679	
Frontline Delivery Costs – Non Pay	888	
Administrative costs - Pay	688	
Administrative costs – Non Pay	321	
Total	3,576	3,576

*Expenditure figures for 2015/16 are indicative. DFID works in a variety of challenging environments, including fragile and conflict affected areas. Humanitarian work is often reactive and can be scaled up or down. An element of flexibility within funding allocations is necessary to ensure that we can balance the need for long term planning alongside the ability to respond where necessary to changing requirements

These figures represent total operating costs for delivery of the MENAD Regional, Lebanon and Jordan Operational Plans.

Delivering Value for Money

DFID Jordan is maximising the impact of every pound that is spent on poor people's lives.

There is a compelling argument for making targeted interventions now, both to support people in need, as well as to prevent greater instability in Jordan. DFID in Jordan is committed to delivering Value for Money (VfM) in all aspects of its work. Careful selection of partners is a key part of our approach to ensuring VfM. We will also maximise the impact of our programming while minimising the financial cost to the UK taxpayer, using the UK government 3E framework of effectiveness, efficiency and economy, in line with NAO guidance. Key to this will be ensuring that our partners provide VfM in their operations and consistently demonstrate what they are doing to improve VfM.

The Multilateral Aid Review (MAR) identifies areas where each UN agency needs to improve its VfM. We have developed priority areas for action based on performance. These areas will provide the basis for our institutional engagement with each UN agency.

For NGO partners we will continue to agree VfM improvements as part of assessing proposals and monitoring programmes. On our support to municipalities and on education, we are ensuring value for money by making smart choices on our delivery partners (World Bank Multi-Donor Trust Fund and USAID respectively) based on capacity, national reach/scale, political will and where we can have most impact with limited finance and staff.

We have made good progress in ensuring VfM throughout the programme by:

- Developing a VfM approach paper for our overall Syria and neighbouring countries response;
- Ensuring agreement letters to UN agencies include MAR recommendations as well as priority performance targets;
- Providing guidance to partners on DFID's expectations on VfM in programmes, covering all 3 dimensions of VfM based on the 3 Es;
- Embedding analysis of VfM in the programme approval processes;
- Monitoring VfM regularly as part of assessing programme performance;
- Building on evidence where it exists and where it does not have process in place to generate high quality evidence;
- Supporting reform of the Conflict Pool which links into our wider stability work, to ensure a more rigorous approach to allocation and results monitoring.

We will continue to improve VfM as well as our risk management and financial performance by:

- Embedding VfM at key steps in our project cycle management processes and ensuring that appropriate tools are used;
- Ensuring all staff make VfM considerations a priority in programme management;
- Monitoring and ensuring VfM through our implementing partners' systems, making sure that the benefits are captured and estimated in monetary terms in a cost effective way;
- Comparing the administrative and unit costs of our partners in order to identify best practice;
- Overcoming the scarcity of good quality data and evidence to assess VfM;
- Generating evidence on best practice in VfM work in fragile and conflict affected states;
- Ensuring all staff understand the latest corporate guidance on VfM, including through induction training;
- Improving risk management of financial performance and increased quality of forecasting and variance analysis through improved usage of systems;
- Using our quarterly risks and results portfolio review to ensure programme quality.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring

MENAD will carry out on-going monitoring to assess progress against this Operational Plan and the Results Framework. Due to the nature of the environment in which we work, it is also important that we focus on monitoring and managing risks as well as results, and we take appropriate action to review results anticipated as the context evolves:

How: We will make sure all of our programmes have a monitoring framework, which will track progress in delivering outputs. All programmes scoring consecutive 'B's or a 'C' in their annual review, or which cause concern for other reasons, will have a detailed Performance Improvement Plan. We will continue to develop a programme level results database to capture a single set of verified information for forecasting and recording actual results and other key project level data. At Operational Plan level we will maintain risk frameworks as well as results frameworks, and monitor both together.

Who: DFID staff will assess performance in relation to the overall Operational Plan and make sure that all programmes deliver the information required for monitoring the indicators in the results framework. We will work closely with partners, who will be responsible for the actual monitoring of progress in programmes, assessing their monitoring systems. In areas where access is highly constrained due to security concerns we will set up independent monitoring.

When: Each programme will develop its own reporting timetable but at a minimum each programme will be monitored annually. Risks will be monitored quarterly and progress towards Operational Plan objectives will be reviewed every 6 months and recommendations will be made to the team leader where performance needs to improve.

What: Monitoring information will be used to influence the future direction of the programme and to reconsider approaches where necessary. At an Operational Plan level, the information will be used to determine areas of strong and weaker progress, so that remedial action can be taken where progress is slow.

Evaluation

The MENAD Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy¹ is the framework for our approach to evaluation during implementation of this Operational Plan. It sets out guidance for which programmes to evaluate, and how to plan, manage and communicate findings from evaluations.

Projects operating in Jordan often do so with innovative approaches and in a high risk context. Consequently high level of evaluation is required. For all programmes with a budget of £5 million and over, an independent evaluation will be considered at the programme design stage, where possible in conjunction jointly with partners. We are, for example, planning a joint evaluation of the Emirati Syrian refugee camp with the UAE government and the Emirati Red Crescent. We will strive to ensure that lessons from these evaluation studies (as well as any from other donors and agencies) feed into DFID's broader knowledge base.

Building capacity of partners

As well as building the monitoring and evaluation skills of its own staff, DFID works with a range of partners in the MENA region, some of which are non-traditional partners for DFID. It is part of MENAD work to engage them on the importance of solid monitoring and evaluation in joint programmes, and of building a solid evidence base for working in the region. For example, through partnering on education with USAID, the largest and most influential donor in Jordan, on an education programme with a strong focus on data collection. We will seek to use the evidence to influence Government education policy and ensure that Syrian children do not receive a substandard and lesser education through the Jordanian public school system.

¹ This strategy is kept under reviewed to ensure it is still appropriate for MENAD's rapidly evolving environment.

Transparency

Transparency is one of the top priorities for the UK government. It helps people see where money is going and for what purpose. It helps improve value for money and makes governments everywhere more accountable to their citizens. DFID is a world leader in aid transparency and has an ambitious vision for both DFID and its partners. We will ensure that we play our part in continuing to work towards that vision – set out in a suite of commitments such as the Aid Transparency Guarantee (ATG), Aid Transparency Challenge (ATC) and DFID's Open Data Strategy.

Actions to ensure DFID meets its commitments in the UK Aid Transparency Guarantee

We are committed to being transparent about our work, except in circumstances where release of information could put DFID staff or others at risk. We will support DFID's transparency commitments by:

- Ensuring that all information in the public domain is comprehensive, accessible, accurate, timely and written in plain English.
- Publishing a summary of this Operational Plan in English and Arabic on the DFID website.
- Ensuring the UN's Financial Tracking Service and DFID's Development Tracker are kept up to date.
- Continuing our efforts, in liaison with the DFID Press Office, to keep international and local journalists informed of our activity and results achieved.

Supporting transparency in our work

- We will increase opportunities for those directly affected by our projects to provide feedback on project performance.
- We will seek similar levels of transparency from our partners
- We will push other donors for transparency in their funding allocations towards the Syria crisis, in coordination with the UN as well as for their Jordan specific non-humanitarian funding.
- We will also work with others to push for improvements in UN reporting on needs, gaps and the response.

Annex A: Changes to Operational Plan

N/A – This is a new Operational Plan

Annex B: Human Rights Assessment

Economic and social rights

- **Human Development Index** (2013): 0.745 (77 out of 187).

IHDI value (<i>Inequality-Adjusted HDI</i>)	Overall loss (%)	Human inequality coefficient (%)	Inequality in life expectancy at birth (%)	Inequality in education (%)	Inequality in income (%)
0.607	18.6	18.5	11.9	22.4	21.1

Non-discrimination

- **Gender:** Gender Inequality Index (2013): 0.488 (101 out of 149); 12% of parliamentary seats are held by women; 69.5% of adult women have achieved secondary education (78.5% for men); 15.3% of women participate in the labour market (66.2% for men).
- **LGBT:** homosexuality is legal, provided that it occurs in private, does not involve prostitution, and only involves consenting adults. Sexual orientation and gender identity issues remain taboo and the government does not recognize same-sex civil unions or marriages.

Civil and political rights

- **Freedom House ranking:** 155 out of 197 (2013)
- **Key areas of concern:** political participation; limited freedoms of speech and press; access to justice.
- **International Criminal Court:** Jordan is the only nation in the Middle East and North Africa that is a member of the ICC.

Universal Periodic Review (2013)

- Jordan **adopted** 133 recommendations, including prevention of the marriage of a rape victim to the offender.
- But **rejected** 22 of the other recommendations, including the ability for women to be able to pass on citizenship to their children.

Direction of travel

Indicator	2012 score	2013 score
Human Development Index	0.7	0.74
% of women participating in labour market	15	15.3
Freedom House Freedom rating (1=best, 7=worst)	5.5	5.5

UK approach and focus

- UK priorities include freedom of expression, political rights and participation and access to justice. The 2013 Universal Periodic Review (UPR) will act as a baseline for progress in Jordan.

© Crown copyright 2014
Produced by the Department for International Development

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v.2. To view this licence visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/2/ or email PSI@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.