

Report  
External Final Evaluation

“Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning  
(SLCAL)”

Commissioned by:



Submitted by:

**Milestone Consultants**



April, 2018

## Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION.....	7
1.2	BACKGROUNDS .....	7
1.3	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY .....	7
1.4	EVALUATION’S OBJECTIVES:.....	8
1.5	CONCLUSIONS .....	8
1.6	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
<b>2.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION: .....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	BACKGROUND.....	11
2.2	PROJECT’S EXPECTED RESULT .....	12
<b>3.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY: .....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	LITERATURE REVIEW: .....	13
3.2	SAMPLING STRATEGY AND SIZE: .....	13
3.3	FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS (FGM):.....	13
3.4	SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	14
3.5	KEY INFORMANTS MEETINGS .....	15
3.6	DATA ANALYSIS.....	15
3.7	REPORTING .....	15
<b>4.</b>	<b>THE EVALUATION FINDINGS:.....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	RELEVANCE .....	15
4.2	EFFECTIVENESS: .....	20
4.3	EFFICIENCY.....	29
4.4	SUSTAINABILITY.....	31
4.5	GENDER .....	32
4.6	IMPACT .....	33
4.7	COHERENCE, COMPLEMENTARITY, AND COORDINATION .....	33
4.8	MONITORING AND LEARNING .....	33
4.9	CHALLENGES: .....	34
<b>5.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1	RELEVANCE .....	35
5.2	EFFECTIVENESS .....	35
5.3	EFFICIENCY .....	35
5.4	SUSTAINABILITY.....	36
5.5	GENDER .....	36
5.6	IMPACT .....	36
5.7	COHERENCE, COMPLEMENTARITY, AND COORDINATION .....	36
5.8	MONITORING AND LEARNING .....	36
5.9	CHALLENGES: .....	37
<b>6.</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>37</b>
	<b>ANNEXES.....</b>	<b>39</b>

ANNEX1 TOR .....	40
ANNEX 2 EVALUATION SURVEY .....	56
ANNEX 3 59 FOCUS GROUP LEADING QUESTIONS .....	59
ANNEX 4 FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS .....	60
ANNEX 5 KEY INFORMANTS INTERVIEWS .....	61
ANNEX 6 SURVEY RESULTS.....	62

**i. Acronyms**

AI	Appreciative Inquiry
ARIJ	The Applied Research Institute - Jerusalem
CWR	Crop Water Requirements
DAC	International Development Evaluations
FFS	The Farmers Field Schools
FGM	Focus Group Meetings
LF	Logical Framework
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
SLCAL	Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning
TOC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
WB	West Bank

## ii. Acknowledgements

Milestone consultants are grateful for the enthusiastic and professional support and facilitation of the evaluation provided by CARE International in West Bank/Gaza and ARIJ.

We also would especially like to thank the project stakeholders who participated in the evaluation by taking part in the focus group discussions and taking part in the survey questionnaires.

Milestone Consultants



Evaluation	“RFQ: BMZ-WB-18-SA0037 Consultancy Services – Final Evaluation for SLCAL project”
Project	“Strengthening Livelihoods Through Community Adaptation and Learning” (SLCAL) – BMZ PN: 2013.9844.5
Project Goal	“Strengthening the livelihood and security of vulnerable, food insecure and exposed to multiple risks Palestinian communities by building their capacity to adapt to climate variability and longer term of change.”
Target Group	26 communities and 1,300 farming households (50% male and 50% female) from West Bank and Gaza strip
Implementing Partners	A consortium led and managed by CARE International in West Bank/Gaza (CARE WBG) partnering with The Applied Research Institute - Jerusalem (ARIJ).
Implementing Period	Four years – 01/01/2014 – 31/12/2017
Launching date	January 1, 2014
The project’s main programs:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Field Crops Program,</li> <li>2. Rangelands Improvement Program,</li> <li>3. Irrigation Techniques Program,</li> <li>4. Agro Practices Program.</li> </ol>
Project’s Expected result	<p>ER1: To create innovative, stable, diverse and sustainable natural resource management. To develop adaptive farming systems and improve livelihoods on an individual and community level in response to climate change</p> <p>ER2: Influence national and regional policies and action plans to ensure the incorporation of successful adaptation methods and risk mitigation mechanisms, with the main focus on food and water security.</p> <p>ER3: Empower local communities to have a voice in decision making processes on climate change adaptation and risk mitigation with an increase in participation of marginalized groups such as women, youth, and poor families.</p>

## 1. Executive Summary

### 1.1 Overview of the evaluation

This document presents the evaluation findings of the project “Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning” (SLCAL), funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The project was implemented by CARE International West Bank & Gaza (CARE WBG) and The Applied Research Institute - Jerusalem (ARIJ).

The evaluation report assesses the overall achievement of the project objectives and intended goals. It covers the entire duration of the project from January 2014 to its completion in December 2017.

SLCAL overall objective is to strengthen the livelihood of vulnerable Palestinian communities in the agricultural production sector and to adapt their livelihoods to longer term climate changes for 26 vulnerable locations in West Bank and Gaza Strip.

### 1.2 Backgrounds

The impacts of climate change are likely negatively to affect progress toward development in Palestine territories in a number of key areas including agriculture and food security, water resources, coastal zones, public health, climate-related disaster risk management as well as natural resource management.

Against this background, the project titled “Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning (SLCAL)” aimed at strengthening the livelihood and security of vulnerable, food insecure Palestinian communities which are exposed to multiple risks.

The project targeted 26 communities and 1,300 farming households from West Bank and Gaza strip during an implementation period of four years.

### 1.3 Evaluation methodology

The methodology used throughout this evaluation was a participatory one based on:

- a- The OECD-DAC methodology.
- b- The impact as well as gender, challenges, coherence, complementary, and coordination in addition to learnings.

The evaluation steps are summarized in:

- Desk review of project documents and materials
- 16 focus group meetings (232 participants) in the West Bank and Gaza (for details refer to table 1)
- Survey questionnaire (annex 2) filled by 210 respondents
- Key informant's meetings with the MoA (annex 6)

#### **1.4 Evaluation's Objectives:**

The overall objectives of the evaluation are:

- a. To assess the project's achievements and performance against the project targets.
- b. To identify lessons learned and recommendations to improve future programming as well as opportunities for scale-up or replication.

#### **1.5 Conclusions**

##### *Relevance:*

- The implemented activities of the four programs are relevant to the farmers' needs and the national priorities.
- The objective of the project addressed the identified problems of the farmers.
- The identification of beneficiary target groups proved to be of good quality.
- The stakeholders have been highly engaged in the project design and management of the project.

##### *Effectiveness:*

- Project partners have applauded the project team for adopting interactive engaging approaches.
- The three expected results of the project were achieved to varying degrees. The first expected result was achieved and results exceeded plans. The second and third expected results were partially achieved.
- The project partially influenced national policies including the National Adaptation Plans (NAP), and the National Determined Contributions (NDC)

##### *Efficiency:*

- The relationship between ARIJ and the MoA allowed for maximizing the results of the project.
- The project activities were mainly conducted on time. Minor adjustment to the timeframe were introduced to react to the external factors.

- Efficient utilization of allocated budget lead to increase in the number of beneficiaries.

*Sustainability:*

Several benefits of the project are likely to continue after concluding the project like:

- Seeds utilization, irrigation and water harvesting techniques.
- Public private partnership in the rangeland program which will sustain the grazing areas for several years
- Capacity building for the MoA extension agents in addition to the farmers.
- The exit strategy that ARIJ employed within each program which allowed for networking between suppliers and the beneficiaries in adopting the new technologies and best price offers.
- Leaflets as a knowledge to be shared and sustain among stakeholders.

*Impact:*

SLCAL and other initiatives positively contribute to the impact of climate change adaptation. However, no attribution to a single project can be made, rather each had a certain contribution. GIZ, FAO, ICARDA, CIDA are also major implementers in the field.

*Gender:*

- The project was designed to target 50% female beneficiaries. The experience showed that this percentage doesn't reflect the reality where women own less than 3% of the land.
- The Project team had clarified that the project targeted the households which have both males and females. However, 20% would be a more realistic percentage of females to be targeted.

*Coherence, complementarity, and coordination:*

The project had established an advisory committee at an early stage to harmonize the project activities. In a later stage, specialized committees were established. The findings and recommendations of the committees were shared with national and international bodies like the EU, FAO, and the Green Fund committee.

*Monitoring:*

The Monitoring and Evaluation Department at ARIJ was supervising all relevant interventions, starting from the rapid assessment, community committee formulation, and field evaluation. The progress of activities

was monitored through several field visits. Several forms were distributed to the targeted beneficiaries to monitor the productivity and observing the growth stages of the plants to be compared with the growth witnessed.

Additional monitoring and follow-up can further enhance the commitment of the farmers and hence the project's results. A cooperation agreement (memorandum of understanding) with the agricultural universities can allow for additional follow-up visits to be conducted by the students.

#### *Challenges:*

- The Israeli occupation remains the major challenge as it limits the freedom of movement, especially, to Gaza and within the West Bank. 170 danums of field crops out of 850 danum in Gaza were damaged as a result of the Israeli aircrafts spraying in the border lands with herbicides (Oxygal).
- The limited access to the targeted rangelands imposed by the Israeli occupation. The project had to change/ replace originally selected locations with safer areas in coordination with MoA.
- The limited number of the project team constituted a key challenge as the project's activities were expanded to cover more than 60 communities while the project was initially planned to target only 26.
- The social norms in reaching out for women as main beneficiaries. To overcome this challenge, selected activities, timing, locations and settings were all gender sensitive. In addition; community committees' formation was conditional to female farmers' representation.
- Rainfall distribution and low precipitation, affected the growth of the planted field crops and forages. The project had to select crop varieties that are more adapted to drought.

#### *Learnings:*

- Maintaining partnership relationship with the stakeholders greatly contributed in the success of the SLCAL. The professional relationship with the MOA and the farmers marked a major success of the project. The coordination took place on different level; the field, middle management, and leadership.
- The beneficiary selection criteria and process has been critical in ensuring high degree of programs achievements as the maintaining beneficiaries' commitments along the project.
- Cooperation with the agricultural faculties leverage the project's impact. The project contributed in shaping the theoretical knowledge of the

agricultural students from the one hand, and provide the farmers with additional follow-up and coaching.

- Considering the households as beneficiary units overcome the complexity of fixing a separate percentage for gender participation as almost 50% of the households are made of females.
- Community committees are among the successful tools which facilitated reaching out for small scale and vulnerable farmers; including women.
- The economic aspect is an influential entry point. Impact on net income was a key in driving farmers' adoption.
- Balance drip irrigation system was praised by the farmers proving to be a valuable tool.
- Private rangelands proved to be effective in enhancing the pastures through the land ownership;

## **1.6 Recommendations**

1. The project team is invited to continue working with their commended approach adopting interactive and engaging methodology.
2. The project team is recommended to capitalize on the success of the four programs to clarify the logical relation between the programs and the overall expected results of the project.
3. The project team can integrate a clear Theory of Change in the project design along with the logical framework approach to describe the targeted behavioral change at the farmers and decision making levels.
4. The project team is invited to expand their cooperation with the agricultural faculties to supply additional follow up and monitoring of the project activities in the field to further provide coaching and advice to the farmers.
5. The project team is recommended to further encourage communal cooperation (cooperatives) between the beneficiary groups by introducing a governance system to sustain the different project components (the four programs).
6. The project managed to share the results of the researches with students and farmers. It is recommended to institutionalize the knowledge sharing providing special focus to university students who can coach the farmers in their communities.

## **2. Introduction:**

### **2.1 Background**

Global warming is already altering the world's climate, its impacts are felt in all sectors of society, through changes in temperature and precipitation as well as through changes in the frequency and intensity of climatic extreme events.

The impacts of climate change are likely negatively to affect progress toward development in Palestine in a number of key areas including agriculture and food security, water resources, coastal zones, public health, climate-related disaster risk management and natural resource management.

Climate change constrains the ability of the Palestinian Authority (PA) to reach poverty reduction and sustainable development objectives.

The project titled "Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning (SLCAL)" aimed at "Strengthening the livelihood and security of vulnerable, food insecure and exposed to multiple risks Palestinian communities by building their capacity to adapt to climate variability and longer term of change". The project targeted 26 communities and 1,300 farming households from West Bank and Gaza strip over an implementation period of four years.

The project is built upon four main programs:

- Field Crops Program
- Rangelands Improvement Program
- Irrigation Techniques Program
- Agro Practices Program

## **2.2 Project's Expected result**

The project's three expected results are:

ER1: To create innovative, stable, diverse and sustainable natural resource management. To develop adaptive farming systems and improve livelihoods on an individual and community level in response to climate change.

ER2: Influence national and regional policies and action plans to ensure the incorporation of successful adaptation methods and risk mitigation mechanisms, with the main focus on food and water security.

ER3: Empower local communities to have a voice in decision making processes on climate change adaptation and risk mitigation with an

increase in participation of marginalized groups such as women, youth, and poor families.

### 3. Methodology:

Participatory methodology based on OECD-DAC<sup>1</sup> methodology in addition to impact, coherence, complementary, and coordination as per the terms of reference (annex 1).

The evaluation steps are summarized in the following:

**3.1 Literature Review:**

Literature review included the following documents (Terms of Reference, Technical Application, Activities Report, Project’s Logical Framework LF, Quarterly Reports, and Annual Reports).

**3.2 Sampling Strategy and Size:**

The sampling strategy used by the evaluator purposefully selected a) locations from different geographical areas in the West Bank and Gaza strip which covered at least one of the four programs (Field Crops Program, Rangelands Improvement Program, Irrigation Techniques Program and Agro Practices Program); b) The highest level of participation in the project.

In coordination with CARE WBG and ARIJ, a random sample of 300 beneficiaries was drawn from the beneficiaries’ population. The selected sample filled the evaluation survey or participated in the focus group meetings or both.

**3.3 Focus Group Meetings (FGM):**

Sixteen Focus Group Meetings (FGM) with the project beneficiaries (farmers) were organized (8 in the West Bank and 8 in Gaza).

The following table shows the conducted FGM and number of participants.

**Table 1: FG Participants**

Program	Region	Focus Group	Participants
Irrigation techniques	West Bank	Jordan Valley	16
		Arroub community	17
Agro-practices		Deir Ghusun -(Tulkarem)	18

<sup>1</sup> OECD/DAC Criteria for International Development Evaluations. The five **DAC** evaluation **criteria** are based on the conception that evaluation is an assessment “to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability” of efforts supported by aid agencies (OECD).

		Kufr Ra’I (Jenin)	15
Field Crops		Al Seila Harithiya -(Jenin)	15
		Beit Al Rush – (Hebron)	20
Range Land		Shyoukh– (Hebron)	17
		Qishda (Tubas)	7
<b>Total West Bank</b>			125
	Gaza Strip	Karara-Eastern area	16
		Abasan	11
		Shouka-Rafah	15
		Abasan	18
		Khuzaa	11
		Karara	18
		Shouka-Rafah	18
<b>Total Gaza</b>			107
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>232</b>

Total participants reached 232 farmers (125 participants from the West Bank and 107 from Gaza). The survey questionnaires were filled by 210 beneficiaries (117 in the West Bank and 103 in Gaza).

The evaluator aimed at having a gender-balanced sample. However, the focus group meetings and interviews were dominantly attended by men due to cultural reasons. Female participation reached almost 20% in the West Bank.

A research conducted by CARE in the year 2012 titled *“Gender Analysis of Assistance to Small Farmers, Breeders and Households in West Bank and Gaza”* showed that women cannot increase their decision-making power unless reproductive and household labor is shared equitably between men and women.

The sample included, besides the project beneficiaries, the project staff at CARE and ARIJ in addition to key informant interviews with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC).

### **3.4 Survey questionnaire**

Survey questions were divided into four sections representing the different programs (annex 2). 210 respondents filled in the questionnaires (Annex 6).

### **3.5 Key Informants meetings**

The following key informants were interviewed in person and/or Skype calls.

- CARE's project team in the West Bank (May Abdel Hadi)
- CARE's project team in Gaza (Saed Almadhoun)
- ARIJ's Project team and coordinators in the West Bank (Nader Hrimat, Fadi Dwaik)
- ARIJ's partner in Gaza (Abdella Al Omari) from the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA)
- MOA (Isam Nofal, Mahmoud Bisharat, Najeh Bani Odeh, Baha Khader, Ibtisam abu Heja, Safinaz Badr)
- Project Advisory Committee (Isam Nofal, Abdallah Omari)

### **3.6 Data analysis**

Data was analyzed utilizing the triangulation technique to facilitate validation of data through cross verification from two or more sources.

Once preliminary data was gathered, the evaluation team exchanged views to better understand the outputs.

### **3.7 Reporting**

- a. Inception Report
- b. Final report

## **4. The Evaluation Findings:**

The project titled "Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning (SLCAL)" aims at "Strengthening the livelihood and security of vulnerable, food insecure and exposed to multiple risks Palestinian communities by building their capacity to adapt to climate variability and longer term of change".

The findings are organized according to the DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact coherence, complementarity, and coordination in addition to the learnings) followed by the conclusions and recommendations.

### **4.1 Relevance**

This section focuses on the extent to which the objectives of the project (the four programs) are consistent with the beneficiaries' requirements, needs, global priorities and partners' and BMZ's policies.

- *To what extent the activities implemented are relevant for achieving the objectives defined by the Project?*

The project was designed to achieve three expected results through implementing four programs (Field Crops Program, Rangelands Improvement Program, Irrigation Techniques Program, and Agro Practices Program). In general, the implemented activities of the four programs are relevant to the farmers' needs and the national priorities. Relevance between the project's three expected results and the four programs' activities differ for each result.

The three expected results/objectives address to a high degree the challenges faced by the Palestinian farmers in the West Bank and Gaza in the course of the climate change. Relevant project studies show that "adaptation to climate change is necessary for the Palestinian population to secure their livelihoods". This is especially relevant for rural communities whose income depends on agriculture.

High relevance is reported between the first expected result (*To create innovative, stable, diverse and sustainable natural resource management*) and the activities of the four programs. The project targeted an area of 1394 hectares of field crops and forages in the West Bank and Gaza. The activities are found by the farmers very relevant to their needs "due to the good quality of seeds provided, and the agricultural practices introduced".

The activities of the four programs are designed in attain the expected results of the project. To avoid potential confusion in the relevance of the second and third project results, the project may define clearly which program addresses which expected result.

The project included conducting applied research on climate change impact on Crop Water Requirements (CWR), water stress in soil and plants, water usage, and water availability, vegetation and crop suitability. The project partners from the Ministry of Agriculture considered "the research areas relevant to the farmers needs and to the ministries plan", reported MOA official.

- *To what extent the objectives particularly address the identified problems and needs of the target groups/beneficiaries?*

SLCAL overall objective is to strengthen the livelihood of vulnerable Palestinian communities in the agricultural production sector and to adapt their livelihoods to longer term climate changes. The objective of the project had addressed the identified problems of the farmers resulting from climate change including water scarcity, irrigation limitations, productivity degradation and limited farmers' capacities. Indeed, Palestine is extremely prone to the negative effects of climate change and the resulting risks. The climate in the Middle East is getting hotter and dryer according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (Elasha, 2010). Increased temperature and decreased rainfall can result in more frequent and more dramatic droughts within the region.

Agriculture is among the sectors that needs high support in order to regain its role in the Palestinian economy when it used to generate over 22% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the West Bank and Gaza. It used to provide employment to over 15% of the population (Butterfield et al., 2000). Due to water scarcity, these figures have recently dropped: agriculture now contributes to only 5.3 % of the GDP (PCB 2016). Which lead to higher dependency on Israel to provide basic vegetables and fruits to the West Bank and Gaza. The population growth of 3% per year also puts pressure on working opportunities in the agricultural sector.

Positive remarks about the four programs (Field Crops Program, Rangelands Improvement Program, Irrigation Techniques Program, and Agro Practices Program) were expressed by the beneficiaries as well as the partners. 87% of the beneficiaries expressed their high satisfaction with the project implementation and the positive influence on the farmers' ability to adapt to global warming. 90% of the respondents indicated that the project's activities responded to the identified problems. Kufr Ra'l (West Bank) farmer reported that "the project positively influenced my olive production. It tackled our problems and improved my knowledge in rain harvesting. Farmers always need to update their knowledge acquiring new agricultural techniques".

- *To what extent the nature of the problems originally identified have changed? Was there adequate assessment of local implementation capacity?*

The nature of the problems and challenges originally identified remain of high priority to the farmers. The local implementation capacities proved to be of high quality. MOA indicated that "the project is a model to be replicated". The professional relations and coordination between ARIJ and

CARE on the one hand and the MOA on the other “contributed to the success of the project”, MOA official reported.

ARIJ has been collecting climatic and agricultural data to identify specific existing problems and needs that will be targeted by the project activities towards effective implementation.

The global warming and the Israeli occupation increase the complexity of resource management in Palestine territories. 85% of the 150,000 hectares of grazing land in the West Bank are not accessible for Palestinians due to Israeli settlements and military security zones. Israel controls 82% of the groundwater of the West Bank leaving only 12% to the Palestinians for all sectors. This has caused farmers to switch from irrigated to rain-fed agriculture which is more vulnerable to drought, more exposed to natural crises and to the effects of climate change.

- *The quality of the identification of key stakeholders and target groups (including analysis of vulnerable groups)?*

The project has conducted desk research in order to review the suitable vulnerability assessment tools. The purpose of the assessment phase was to collect good quality information to help establishing a clear baseline of the social, economic, ecological and technical conditions of the system and to create common-base information that should be fully accessible to all stakeholders and facilitate the stakeholder’s identification.

SLCAL project targeted 26 communities affected by climate change within the five agro-ecological zones in Palestine. Two integrated methodologies (phases) were utilized to select the targeted communities:

- Phase I: Selection Spatial Statistical Model
- Phase II: Field Work Verification and Assessment

The identification of beneficiary target groups proved to be of good quality. Most beneficiaries remained engaged till the very end of the project. Only few farmers did not show enough commitment as they preferred to receive additional irrigation tools and seeds. The project reports revealed that “the beneficiary selection was based on socio-economic and agricultural conditions, field surveys and investigations” to ensure the selection of the suitable persons who have “the capacity and willingness” to adapt the new practices to mitigate the impact of climate variation.

The project created community committees to select the beneficiaries. A primary list of the target areas of the project was prepared and discussed with the technical committees of the four component programs of the project. Participatory rapid assessment visits were conducted by the

project team along with members of the technical committees in order to verify the situation at each selected area for final approval. The selected villages were further visited for community committees' formulation and beneficiaries' selection.

The project aimed to have 50% female beneficiaries, however this could not be reached for practical reasons where less than 3% of land owners are women. It is unclear how the percentage was determined in the project design and under which assumptions. However the project team had clarified that "the project targeted families not individuals".

- *The level of local ownership, "stakeholder participation" in the design and in the management/ implementation of the project?*

The stakeholders have been highly engaged in the project design and management of the project. The MOA had reported its high satisfaction as the project had engaged the ministry in the different stages. According to MOA official, "the project team ensured harmonized relationship with the ministry of agriculture and the farmers".

The projects main stakeholders in the West Bank and Gaza explained that they had been interviewed by the project team to inquire about the current climate change adaptation strategies and plans. The project reports state that "the interviews were quite informative and were harmonized, analyzed and used as a guide in designing the project activities and finalizing the current indicators of selection".

- *Have the monitoring and evaluation arrangements been appropriate?*

The project had followed the Monitoring and Evaluation procedures of ARIJ. According to the fourth annual project report, the project team has been regularly monitored and followed up on the progress of the activities at each program through field visits, phone calls, specialized forms and photos. Field visits were conducted along with the community committees and Agricultural Directorates representatives to follow up on receiving the materials, implementing best practices, monitoring progress in implementation and production, and for support and advice.

Monitoring forms for tracking results were distributed to the beneficiaries. Photos of production and cultivates lands is regularly taken to track the changes occurring to the area through the project life.

The farmers expressed their satisfaction calling for additional follow up and monitoring of the activities implementation. According to a farmer from the Jenin Governorate “additional follow up will help farmers to better comply with the directions and maintain high momentum and motivation.

#### **Key Findings**

- The implemented activities of the four programs are relevant to the farmers’ needs and the national priorities.
- High relevance is reported between the first expected result and its activities.
- The project built on CARE’s and ARIJ’s previous work, experience and research.
- The project partners from the Ministry of Agriculture find the research areas relevant to the farmers needs and to the ministry’s plan.
- The objective of the project addressed the identified problems of the farmers.
- Stakeholders expressed their high satisfaction of the project implementation and the positive influence on the farmers’ ability to adapt to global warming.
- The nature of the problems and challenges originally identified remain of high priority to the farmers.
- The global warming and the Israeli occupation increase the complexity of resource management in the Palestine territories.
- The identification of beneficiary target groups proved to be of good quality.
- A primary list of the target areas of the project was prepared and discussed with the technical committees of the four component programs of the project.
- The stakeholders have been highly engaged in the project design and management of the project.
- The project had followed the Monitoring and Evaluation procedures of ARIJ.
- The farmers expressed their satisfaction calling for additional follow up and monitoring of the implemented activities.

#### **4.2 Effectiveness:**

The effectiveness criterion considers how far the project’s results were attained, and the project’s specific objective(s) achieved.

- *To what extent SLCAL systemic methodology, introducing innovative approaches, working with key actors and governmental bodies was effective in achieving expected objectives?*

Project partners have applauded the project team for adopting interactive engaging approaches to achieve the objectives of the project. The national and governmental stakeholders were involved in the project's different activities to enrich their awareness about the impact of climate change and suitable mechanisms to combat it. 74% of the farmers who participated in the evaluation's focus group meetings indicated that the project enhanced their ability to adapt to climate change.

The beneficiaries were required to contribute financially in certain project activities to assure their commitment. "We are ready to contribute more to show our commitment, if the project was renewed", a farmer from Tulkarm governorate commented. According to a beneficiary from Rafah, the project was highly effective as it introduced the farmers to new seeds and herbicides which eventually saved the farmers time and produced better crops.

The project had involved up to 505 governmental and local stakeholders who supported the project team on the technical level in each program. The Agricultural Directorates of the MoA were actively engaged in the project decision-making and activities. The Project Advisory Committee provided the project teams in the West Bank and Gaza with advice and strategic direction decisions. "The project is based on learning by doing", a project team member indicated.

The project had reached to international audience through participating in international gatherings. The project reports indicate that the project team has been active in taking part in conferences and making the project interventions widely visible to the decision-makers and to the community through social media newspapers and TV.

- *To what extent the expected results have been achieved?*

The three expected results of the project were achieved to varying degrees. The first expected result was achieved and results exceeded plans. The second and third expected results were partially achieved.

With regard to result one, the projects accomplishments exceed the planned, however, the required behavioral change in adapting to climate change and sustain the learning introduced by the project at the farmers' level is yet to be observed.

The project targeted an area of 1394 hectares of field crops and forages in the West Bank and Gaza. The results are found by the farmers very encouraging “due to the good quality of seeds provided, and the agricultural practices introduced”.

The annual reports show examples of the exceeded achievements. They indicate that instead of the planned 20 hectares of vegetables under irrigation targeting 69 hectares were achieved. Instead of producing 400 tons, 458 were actually achieved. The rain fed products show similar increase. 10 planned hectares were almost doubled reaching 19.8 hectares.

The project conducted beneficial applied research on “Crop Water Requirements (CWR)”, water stress in soil and plants, water usage, and water availability, vegetation, and crop suitability. Research areas are relevant to the farmers needs and results were disseminated in leaflets, brochures, scientific papers and dissemination workshops.

The second and third expected results are relevant to the farmers’ needs however their activities do not necessarily lead to the expected results. The expected result 2 was partially achieved through the involvement of national, international and governmental stakeholders via attending awareness workshops on climate change”.

It is difficult to trace the effect of the project on influencing national and regional policies and action plans relevant to climate change adaptation. No specific project activities were conducted to influence national polices and plans. The project makes a linear assumption that increasing the awareness of national, international and governmental stakeholders will influence national policies. The linearity of the cause and effect can be replaced by specifying behavioral change of different stakeholder. This will require adapting outcome mapping and introducing a specific theory of change. It is noted that the project design did not include advocacy component which can be of value to lobby the farmers to advocate for their interests.

The project reports indicate that, the targeted 26 communities have hosted awareness workshops to sensitize existing community-based organizations (CBOs) to the effects of climate change. Capacity building workshops were conducted for the field crops beneficiaries and olives intervention beneficiaries on land management, drought mitigation, and disease control. The opinions of the farmers were reported to other stakeholders and decision-makers on the different occasions. The decision-makers were provided with material, data and recommendations to improve their policies.

Direct interactions between farmers and policy-makers were limited and no specific cause was advocated for. It is difficult to determine how participating in the project activities have led local communities to have a voice in decision-making on climate change. 47% of the evaluation survey respondents agreed that their voice is heard more after the project, while another 47% disagreed.

A theory of change ToC will be helpful to ensure relevance of activities and expected results towards having a voice in decision-making. The ToC will introduce progress markers describing the farmers' behavior at each stage leading to influencing climate change policy making.

- *Do the actual and expected results match the performance targets set out initially?*

The actual result of the four programs exceeded the expected results, however, this doesn't apply on the achievements of the three main project expected results which were partially achieved.

Expected result 1: *To create innovative, stable, diverse and sustainable natural resource management. To develop adaptive farming systems and improve livelihoods on an individual and community level in response to climate change.*

The following table shows the planned versus achieved indicators:

Indicator (Planned)	Indicator (Achieved)
A minimum of 4 studies (aridity index, meteorological information, crop/vegetation cover suitability index, water stress model etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieved</li> <li>• Meteorological data was collected and documented</li> <li>• Several researches were conducted including "Aridity index, climate change, research on vegetation", etc."</li> </ul>
Measure the effects of climate change on the respective agro-ecological zones in the Palestinian territories.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieved</li> <li>• Impact on crop water requirements (CWR)</li> <li>• Map for Both West bank and Gaza Strip,</li> </ul>
75% of the 1,300 vulnerable farmers became aware of the impact of climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2,003 farmers have attended awareness workshops about the impact, mitigating procedure to</li> </ul>

change and adapted and improved agricultural methods for cultivation.	combat climate change, and started adopting these procedures in their cultivations
800 hectares of field crops and forages produced 600 tons of seeds, 30 tons of hay and 2,400 tons of green forages.	• 1394 hectares produced 901.015 tons of seeds, 1209.718 tons of hay and 603.975 tons of green forages.
The biomass of 200 hectares increased by 30% (grazing capacity increased by 30%)	The biomass of 221.5 hectares increased by 70%
20 hectares of vegetables under irrigation produced 400 tons of vegetables.	69 hectares produced 458.6 tons of vegetables.
10 hectares of vegetables under Rain-fed produced 120 tons of vegetables.	19.8 hectares of vegetables under rain-fed produced 124.63 tons of vegetables.
The productivity of olive increased by 25% due to the improved water catchment areas.	Preliminary results showed that olive production under supplementary irrigation and the improved water catchment areas were increased by (20% to 30%)
The productivity of olive trees under supplementary irrigation increased by 50%	It is difficult to determine accurate figures of productivity increase, however, farmers indicated that their harvest increased from 25-30%.

*Expected result 2: Influence national and regional policies and action plans to ensure the incorporation of successful adaptation methods and risk mitigation mechanisms, with the main focus on food and water security.*

The expected result 2 was “partially achieved through the involvement of national, international and governmental stakeholders” in attending awareness workshops on the climate change. Project team showed that the project’s learnings are incorporated in the National Adaptation Plan NAP.

Yet, it is difficult to trace the effect of the project in influencing national and regional policies. The project team clarified that the MoA had considered the findings of the project when developing their policies, however, no specific project activities were conducted to influence national polices or plans.

The project makes a linear assumption that increasing the awareness of national, international and governmental stakeholders will influence national policies. The linearity of the cause and effect can be replaced by specifying behavioral change of different stakeholder. This will require adapting outcome mapping and

introducing a specific theory of change. It is noted that the project design did not include an advocacy component which can be of value. The project team denoted that the advocacy component is embedded in the project as it lead to development of new initiatives and projects in climate change adaptation.

The project reports indicate that the collected data, resulted research, studies, and recommendations were disseminated to the decision-makers through specialized leaflets and brochures for each program, in addition, to the specialized workshops such as university awareness workshops, exit strategy workshops, and the project final workshop. However, not sharing the findings with the farmers can be a wasted opportunity as they are the concerned party of the results. It is not clear if dissemination covered also the grassroots level and if they should need to benefit from the gained knowhow.

Indicator (Planned)	Indicator (Achieved)
<p>National policies and action plans for the adaptation to climate change were revised in a participatory approach and presented to all stakeholders. The different stakeholders and decision makers have started adapting and responding to these recommendations on their action plans and policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has involved up to 505 local and international stakeholders on the technical level.</li> <li>• The project interventions were visible to the decision-makers and to the communities using social media through ARIJ’s Facebook page and website, leaflets, Ma’an TV and local newspapers.</li> <li>• Disseminating the project’s findings is an important step towards influencing policy making, however, grass root advocacy campaigns were not utilized.</li> </ul>

*Expected Result 3: Empower local communities to have a voice in decision-making processes on climate change adaptation and risk mitigation with an increase in participation of marginalized groups such as women, youth, and poor families.*

The project reports show that “through presentations on climate change adaption communities became aware of the impact of climate change on their livelihoods and contacted NGOs, donors and authorities to protect their fragile environment and vulnerable livelihood”.

The targeted 26 communities have hosted awareness workshops to sensitize existing community-based organizations (CBOs) to the effects of climate change. Capacity building workshops were conducted for the field crops beneficiaries and olives intervention beneficiaries on land management, drought mitigation, and disease control. The opinions of the farmers were reported to other stakeholders

and decision-makers on the different occasions. The decision-makers were provided with material, data and recommendations to improve their policies.

Direct interactions between farmers and policy-makers were limited and no specific cause was advocated for. It is difficult to determine how participating in the project activities have led local communities to have a voice in decision-making on climate change.

A theory of change ToC will be helpful to clarify the road map towards having a voice in decision-making. The ToC will introduce progress markers describing the farmers' behavior at each stage leading to influencing climate change policy making.

The following table shows the planned versus achieved indicators according to the project's annual reports:

<b>Indicator (Planned)</b>	<b>Indicator (Achieved)</b>
1300 farmers became aware about the impact, mitigating procedure to combat climate change, and start adopting these procedures in their cultivations.	2,003 farmers became aware about the impact, mitigating procedure to combat climate change, and started adopting these procedures in their cultivations
Up to 500 stakeholders of national, governmental and international specialists and decision-makers become aware about the actual impact of climate change and the suitable mechanizes to combat it.	Up to 505 stakeholders of national, governmental and international specialists and decision makers became aware about the impact of climate change and means to combat it.
The gained and exchanged experiences through the attended international workshops documented and transferred to the related stakeholders.	The gained and exchanged experiences through the attended international workshops were being documented and transferred to the related stakeholders.
The decision-makers and the planners provided with valuable material, data and recommendations to improve their policies	The CVCA assessment is completed, documented and compared with actual data research results. Recommendations were shared with the MOA and disseminated

	through specialized reports to other stakeholders
The existing CBOs in the targeted 26 communities became aware about the impact of the climate change	The assessment of climate change was accomplished and disseminated.

- *Were intended beneficiaries participating in the intervention?*

The project team and reports show that beneficiaries were selected in the first year of the project for the four component programs. The beneficiary selection was based on socio-economic and agricultural conditions and field surveys.

The beneficiaries expressed their satisfaction as they were highly engaged in the four programs. The farmers and shepherds indicated that they were highly involved and committed during the different programs. They called for additional coaching on agricultural know how and development.

The following table compares between the planned and achieved progress in target areas and number of beneficiaries for the four programs:

*Table2 Planned vs. achieved project areas and beneficiaries by program*

Program	Area in Hectares		No. of Beneficiaries	
	Planned	Achieved	Planned	Achieved
1. Field Crops Program	1200	1394	800	950
2. Rangeland Improvement Program	200	221.5	200	216
3. Irrigation Techniques Program	45	69	150	419
4. Agro Practices Program	45	135.5	191	418

- *How flexibly management has adapted to ensure the results would achieve the purpose? Was the balance of responsibilities between various stakeholders appropriate?*

Both, the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and the farmers view the project team as flexible and open-minded to discuss options. MoA official indicated, “*We like the project because it did not try to dictate an activity. All levels of stakeholders were involved in decision-making*”.

The different stakeholders recognized that the division of roles and responsibilities was balanced and clear. Different parties performed their tasks as planned. The main request by the beneficiaries was to increase the size of targeted land per farmer. The Jordan valley farmers who benefited from the Irrigation Techniques Program recommended increasing the targeted land to a minimum of five donams<sup>2</sup> in order to feel the impact and achieve tangible results. The reports

<sup>2</sup> Donam is a measurement unit equivalent to 1000 m<sup>2</sup>

revealed that through the course of implementation of the project's four programs, the role of MoA representatives and directorates was remarkable.

- *To what extent the intended results could have been achieved at a higher level of quantity / quality?*
  - a) Responsiveness and flexibility of project management;  
The project team is invited to continue their commended inclusive management approach by which they showed high degree of flexibility, responsiveness and engagement.
  - b) Monitoring of risks and external factors;  
Additional cooperation with the agricultural faculties would provide additional follow up and monitoring of the project activities. This will lead to decreasing external threats. 48% of the evaluation survey respondents agreed that “the project provided full technical support to farmers”, while 45% disagreed as they required additional support and follow up.
  - c) Some materials could be replaced by those with a higher quality like the valves and tubes. The pools were leaking and the plastic used in the pools was damaged in less than 6 months.

Additional capacity building is needed on spraying herbicides A farmer from Shuka indicated that during the first year, specialist helped in spraying the plants while we observed. “We need to spray ourselves while the specialists observe”.

#### **Key Findings**

- Project partners have applauded the project team for adopting interactive engaging approaches.
- The three expected results of the project were achieved to varying degrees. The first expected result was achieved and results exceeded plans. The second and third expected results were partially achieved.
- The beneficiary selection was based on socio-economic and agricultural conditions, and field surveys.
- The beneficiaries expressed their satisfaction as they were highly engaged in the four programs.
- The different stakeholders recognized that the division of roles and responsibilities was balanced and clear.
- Additional cooperation with the agricultural faculties would provide additional follow-up and monitoring of the project activities.

### 4.3 Efficiency

The efficiency criterion examines how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.

Positive remarks about the four programs were expressed by the beneficiaries as well as the partners. Stakeholders expressed their high satisfaction with the project implementation and the positive influence on the farmers' ability to adapt to global warming. Kufra Ra'i (West Bank) farmer reported that "the project positively influenced my olive production. It improved my knowledge in rain harvesting. Farmers always need to update their knowledge acquiring new agricultural techniques".

- *Was the project implemented efficiently?*

The project seems to be managed (economically) getting value for money. Communication with MoA was described as one of the reasons for success. The project reports and team indicate that the major challenges faced were related to the lack of freedom of movement to Gaza which included the challenges to provide the drip irrigation and seeds.

The good relationship with the MoA allowed for maximizing the results of the project as the ministry provided plants while the project expanded the beneficiaries' pool.

The project activities were mainly conducted on time with minor exceptions like the delay for handing the seeds to the farmers or due to external factors like the Israeli occupation and freedom of movement to Gaza and within the West Bank. According to farmers from Shuka/Rafah, "there was a delay for more than 10 days after the planting season to receive the seeds"

- *Is the relationship between the devoted resources and results appropriate and justifiable?*

The relationship between devoted resources and achieved results proved to be appropriate and justifiable. The end line survey conducted by ARIJ shows that 66.5% of the farmers reported that applying the herbicides had reduced the required activities for weed control. The resulted healthier crops required less procedure to control the pests and diseases. 90% of the farmers indicated that the project interventions had led to the growth of strong and healthy crops. Up to 76% of the farmers had indicated that the amount of the produced seeds per area increased due to the project interventions the purity increased as well (88% of the farmers).

- *Operational work and management of the budget?*

The reports indicated that BMZ showed flexibility to increase the number of beneficiaries and redirect project resources and funds. This led to the exceeding the planned results.

- *The quality of information management and reporting and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project activities (including beneficiaries/target groups)*

ARIJ produced quality user-friendly reports during the lifespan of the project. CARE staff explained that CARE had been kept adequately informed about project activities.

While describing the project as highly efficient, the beneficiaries called for additional involvement with regard to the overall project findings and especially the research findings. A farmer from Rafah stated, "I am sure I had benefited indirectly from the research results, however, sharing the findings with the farmers in a more structured manner like distributing leaflets and presentations is required". According to the evaluation survey findings, 55% of the respondents agreed that the findings of the research were sufficiently shared with the farmers while 42% disagreed.

- *Technical assistance: How well did the project help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?*

Additional technical assistance would be appreciated by the beneficiary farmers. According to the fourth annual report, when the farmers were asked about their needs, 83.3% of the farmers said that the project had increased their knowledge and awareness about the climate change. The focus group participants in most of the communities indicated that additional and continuous technical assistance is needed.

#### **Key Findings**

- The effective and friendly relationship with the MoA allowed for maximizing the results of the project.
- The project activities were conducted on time. Minor adjustments to the timeframe were introduced to cope with the external factors like the Israeli occupation and freedom of movement.

- The relationship between devoted resources and achieved results appeared to be appropriate and justifiable.
- The increased number of beneficiaries using the same allocated resources and funds was encouraged by the donor.
- ARIJ produced quality user-friendly reports.
- Despite the provided technical support by the project team and the MoA, additional assistance would be appreciated by the beneficiaries.

#### **4.4 Sustainability**

The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends or non-funding support interventions (such as: policy dialogue, coordination).

- *The ownership of objectives and achievements: e.g. how far were all stakeholders consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and continue to remain in agreement?*

The beneficiary farmers indicated that they were involved in the project since the beginning which enhanced the feeling of ownership and commitment. The first annual project report indicated that communication with project stakeholders and partners including the MoA and the farmers was on-going.

The MoA nominated a co-chair to the project and four members in the technical committees. Coordination with the representatives of the agricultural directorates at each target area was on-going through the implementation of the activities.

The project reports showed that dissemination workshops were held targeting the agricultural universities in the West Bank and Gaza to disseminate the project results and to introduce new agricultural techniques to adapt to the climate changes. Field visits were conducted for the students to monitor the impact of such technologies on water consumption and production.

Additional dissemination workshops with the farmers would culminate and validate the learnings of the primary target group.

- *To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after donor (BMZ) funding ceased?*

Several benefits of the project are likely to continue after the project closure. The evaluation survey asked the farmers what activities they will continue doing after the project ended. The beneficiaries will continue utilizing the seeds, irrigation techniques and the gained knowledge and skills that were introduced during the project. 71% of the respondents to the evaluation survey indicated that they will continue using the herbicides after the project.

The sustainability of this type of projects can be achieved through the change in behaviour of the farmers, grass root organizations, civil society and policy-makers. The project design can further describe what changes in behaviour of stakeholders would lead to the achievements and sustainability of results.

<b>Key Findings</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The beneficiary farmers were involved in the project from the beginning.</li> <li>• Communication with project stakeholders and partners including the MoA and the farmers was on-going.</li> <li>• Several benefits of the project are likely to continue after concluding the project like utilizing the seeds, irrigation techniques, water harvesting techniques, rangeland development and management and the gained knowledge and skills.</li> </ul>

#### **4.5 Gender**

The project aimed and succeeded in targeting households where 50% are females. However, if individual farmers not within households were targeted, the results show that 3% of the contracted households' heads were women. According to the end line survey conducted by ARIJ for the field crops beneficiaries in the West Bank 2017-2018, the type of ownership for the cultivated lands showed that males are dominating the ownership 65.8%, followed by the family owned lands 28.9%, then by women 2.6%.

The limited female ownership explains the limited female engagement in the project.

**Table 3 Type of land ownership**

Land ownership	%
----------------	---

owned by the man	65.8
owned by the woman	2.6
Owned by the family	28.9
leased land	2.7

#### **4.6 Impact**

- *To what extent was the impact of the project influenced by other policy areas/donors?*

This project and other initiatives positively contribute to the impact of climate change adaptation. However, no attribution to a single project can be made, rather each had a certain contribution. GIZ, FAO, ICARDA, CIDA are also major implementers in the field.

#### **4.7 Coherence, complementarity, and coordination**

- *To what extent were the objectives and activities of the project coordinated and harmonized with other bi- and multilateral donors and organizations?*

The project had established an advisory committee at an early stage to harmonize the project activities. In a later stage, specialized committees were established. The findings and recommendations of the committees were shared with national and international bodies like the EU, FAO, and the Green Fund committee.

#### **4.8 Monitoring and learning**

- *Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information*

The project reports revealed the fact that the Monitoring and Evaluation Department at ARIJ was supervising all activities related to this intervention, starting from the rapid assessment, community committee formulation, and field evaluation, ending with the delivery of the balanced pressure irrigation system with the water meters.

The progress of activities was monitored through several field visits for the targeted agricultural communities in the West Bank and Gaza strip. Several forms were distributed to the targeted beneficiaries to monitor the productivity and observing the growth stages of the plants to be compared with the growth witnessed.

Additional monitoring and follow-up can further enhance the commitment of the farmers and hence the project's results. A cooperation agreement (memorandum of understanding) with the agricultural universities can allow for additional follow-up visits to be conducted by the students.

- *What are the main learnings of the Project?*
  - Maintaining partnership relationship with the stakeholders greatly contributed in the success of the SLCAL. The professional relationship with the MOA and the farmers marked a major success of the project.
  - The beneficiary selection criteria and process has been critical in ensuring high degree of programs achievements as the maintaining beneficiaries' commitments along the project.
  - Cooperation with the agricultural faculties leverage the project's impact. The project contributed in shaping the theoretical knowledge of the agricultural students from the one hand, and provide the farmers with additional additional follow-up and coaching.
  - Considering the households as beneficiary units overcome the complexity of fixing a separate percentage for gender participation as almost 50% of the households are made of females.

#### **4.9 Challenges:**

The major challenges the project faced were caused by the Israeli occupation and the limited freedom of movement, especially, to Gaza and within the West Bank.

During the follow-up visits on the cultivations of the growing season 2016/2017, the project team found out that 170 danum of field crops out of 850 danum damaged as a result of the Israeli aircrafts spraying in the border lands with herbicides (Oxygal).

The female participation was and still a major challenge to be considered in future potential project design.

The limited number of the project team constituted a key challenge as the project's activities were expanded to cover more than 60 communities while the project was initially planned to target only 26. The expansion in the communities was not accompanied with increase in the project team.

## **5. Conclusions**

The conclusions are logically linked to the key findings (relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, sustainability, monitoring and learning).

### **5.1 Relevance**

- The implemented activities of the four programs are relevant to the farmers' needs and the national priorities.
- The project partners from the Ministry of Agriculture find the research areas relevant to the farmers needs and to the ministry's plan.
- The objective of the project addressed the identified problems of the farmers.
- The identification of beneficiary target groups proved to be of good quality.
- The stakeholders have been highly engaged in the project design and management of the project.
- The farmers expressed their satisfaction calling for additional follow up and monitoring of the activities implementation.

### **5.2 Effectiveness**

- Project partners have applauded the project team for adopting interactive engaging approaches.
- The three expected results of the project were achieved to varying degrees. The first expected result was achieved and results exceeded plans. The second and third expected results were partially achieved.
- It is difficult to trace the effect of the project on influencing national and regional policies and action plans.
- Further cooperation with the agricultural faculties would supply additional follow up and monitoring of the project activities enhancing its effectiveness.

### **5.3 Efficiency**

- The good relationship between ARIJ and the MoA allowed for maximizing the results of the project.
- The project activities were conducted on time. Minor adjustment to the timeframe were introduced to adjust with the external factors.

- The relationship between devoted resources and achieved results appear to be appropriate and justifiable.
- BMZ showed flexibility to increase number of beneficiaries and redirect project resources and funds.
- ARIJ produced quality user-friendly reports.

#### **5.4 Sustainability**

- The beneficiary farmers were involved in the project since early stage.
- Several benefits of the project are likely to continue after concluding the project like utilizing the seeds, irrigation techniques and the gained knowledge and skills.

#### **5.5 Gender**

- Targeting households as a unit (opposed to individual farmers) facilitates reaching out for a normal gender distribution within the target groups.

#### **5.6 Impact**

SLCAL positively contribute to the impact of climate change adaptation. The project partially influenced national policies including the National Adaptation Plans (NAP), and the National Determined Contributions (NDC).

No attribution to a single project can be made, rather each had a certain contribution. GIZ, FAO, ICARDA, CIDA are also major implementers in the field.

#### **5.7 Coherence, complementarity, and coordination**

The project maintained clear consistency when selecting the beneficiaries as well as implementing the interventions. The established advisory committee helped in harmonizing the project activities. In a later stage, specialized committees were established.

The project maintained healthy coordination's with other relevant national and international bodies. The findings and recommendations of the advisory committees were shared with bodies like the MOA, EU, FAO, and the Green Fund committee.

#### **5.8 Monitoring and learning**

ARIJ was supervising all M&E activities including the rapid assessment, community committee formulation, and field evaluation. The progress of activities was monitored through several field, forms were distributed to monitor the productivity and to observe the growth stages of the plants. Additional monitoring and follow-up can further enhance the commitment of the farmers.

The professional relationship with the MOA and the farmers marked a major success of the project. The beneficiary selection criteria and process has been critical in ensuring high degree of programs achievements as the maintaining beneficiaries' commitments along the project.

Considering the households as beneficiary units overcome the complexity of fixing a separate percentage for gender participation as almost 50% of the households are made of females.

### **5.9 Challenges:**

The Israeli occupation is the major challenge to climate change adaptation as it limits the freedom of movement and access to resources. In addition the occupation causes direct damage as 170 danums of field crops out of 850 danums were damaged as the Israeli occupation army sprayed the land with herbicides (Oxygal).

The limited number of the project team constituted a key challenge as the project's activities.

## **6. Recommendations**

The following recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions:

1. The project team is invited to continue working with their commended approach adopting interactive and engaging methodology.
2. The project team is recommended to capitalize on the success of the four programs to clarify the logical relation between the programs and the overall expected results of the project.

3. The project team can integrate a clear Theory of Change in the project design along with the logical framework approach to describe the targeted behavioral change at the farmers and decision making levels.
4. The project team is invited to expand their cooperation with the agricultural faculties to supply additional follow up and monitoring of the project activities in the field to further provide coaching and advice to the farmers.
5. The project team is recommended to further encourage communal cooperation (cooperatives) between the beneficiary groups by introducing a governance system to sustain the different project components (the four programs).
6. The project managed to share the results of the researches with students and farmers. It is recommended to institutionalize the knowledge sharing providing special focus to university students who can coach the farmers in their communities.

## Annexes

Annex 1	ToR
Annex 2	Survey Questionnaire
Annex 3	Leading Focus group questions
Annex 4	Focus group schedule
Annex 5	Key informants interviews
Annex 6	Survey Findings

## Annex1



Request for Quotation **“RFQ: BMZ-WB-18-SA0037 Consultancy Services – Final Evaluation for SLCAL project”**

### **Project Introduction:**

The project titled “Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning (SLCAL)” aims at “Strengthening the livelihood and security of vulnerable, food insecure and exposed to multiple risks Palestinian communities by building their capacity to adapt to climate variability and longer term of change”. The project targets 26 communities and 1,300 farming households (50% individual male and 50% individual female) from West Bank and Gaza strip on an implementation period of four years.

SLCAL project implemented by a consortium of two organizations mainly led and managed by Care International West Bank & Gaza. Partner organizations are The Applied Research Institute - Jerusalem (ARIJ).

Subject: Request for Quotation **“RFQ: BMZ-WB-18-SA0037 Consultancy Services – Final Evaluation for SLCAL project”**

Date of issuance: **14<sup>th</sup> of December, 2017**

Due Date for Quotations: **30<sup>th</sup> of December, 2017**

### **1.0 Request for Quotation (RFQ):**

The overall objectives of the evaluation are:

- 2.0 To assess the project’s achievements and performance against the below criteria for standard evaluations.
- 3.0 To identify lessons learned and recommendations to improve future programming as well as opportunities for scale-up or replication.

### **4.0 Specification:**

Please refer to the attached Terms of Reference

Quotation content and conditions:

Vendors responding to the solicitation should submit the following:

- 4.1.1 Price Quotations
- 4.1.2 Proposed Delivery schedule.
- 4.1.3 Provide CARE, with a clearance certificate in the form issued by the competent tax authority “Deduction at source”- for companies.
- 4.1.4 Company registration certificate.

### **5.0 Quotation Pricing Conditions:**

- 5.1.1 Vendor should specify prices (USD) per the list in Annex I.
- 5.1.2 The prices should include all associated costs; e.g. transportation costs.
- 5.1.3 Prices should exclude VAT
- 5.1.4 The offers must be valid for 90 calendar days starting from the date of proposal.

**6.0 Submitting the Quotation:**

- 6.1.1 Deadline for submittal of quotations is December, 30<sup>th</sup> 2017
- 6.1.2 Information Requested should be submitted in electronic form to [alaa.abunasrah@care.org](mailto:alaa.abunasrah@care.org)  
Enter the following in subject line item:  
**“RFQ: BMZ-WB-18-SA0037 Consultancy Services – Final Evaluation for SLCAL project”**

**7.0 Evaluation Criteria;**

The Vendors will be evaluated based on the following:

- 7.1 Quality of work and time: based on the provided delivery time and how it contributes to the quality of the overall work.
- 7.2 Cost: while the selection may not necessarily be based on cost per item, CARE, will assess the prices proposed, as compared with the demonstration experience and quality, to ensure that the prices are reasonable.

**8.0 Payment:**

- 30% of the payment will be paid upon the delivery of the approved inception report
- 70% of the payment will be paid upon the delivery of the final report.
- The Payment will be in USD after 10 working days from receiving the approved payment request for each phase.

**9.0 Note**

- 9.1 Vendors may be asked by CARE to submit additional information during the quotation evaluation.
- 9.2 CARE has the right to reject all offers.
- 9.3 CARE has the right to negotiate the offers received.
- 9.4 CARE has the right to adjust (fairly and reasonably) requested deliverables under this offer in 90 calendar days from the date of signing the Contract, without changing in the offered price.

# **Strengthening Livelihood through Community Adaptation & Learning (SLCAL)**

Funded by

The German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation  
and Development (BMZ)

**Term of Reference  
For  
Final Evaluation Assessment**

**December 2017**

## I. Background

Strengthening Livelihood through Community Adaptation & Learning (SLCAL) is funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The project was launched on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014 aiming at strengthening the livelihood of vulnerable Palestinian communities in the agricultural production sector and to adapt their livelihoods to longer term climate changes.

ARIJ and CARE seek a qualified evaluation team (consultants/company) with the required technical skills and experience to conduct an end of project evaluation of the SLCAL project in its targeted areas.

The results of the evaluation will be reported to ARIJ and CARE, project participants and partners, relevant Palestinian Ministries, ECD, other development partners. The findings will be used to assess the achievements of the project against project objectives, and the efficiency of piloted models, project approaches and design. This will require a dual focus on results and process, with a particular focus on lessons learned and success factors for possible replication of models at scale.

The evaluation will analyze the processes, dynamics and linkages behind the success/setbacks of the project to better understand the lessons learned and good practices to inform future programming.

## II. Project Overview

The project titled “Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning (SLCAL)” aims at “Strengthening the livelihood and security of vulnerable, food insecure and exposed to multiple risks Palestinian communities by building their capacity to adapt to climate variability and longer term of change”. The project targets 26 communities and 1,300 farming households (50% individual male and 50% individual female) from West Bank and Gaza strip on an implementation period of four years.

SLCAL project is the culmination of activities that extend as far of 4 years (January 2014 – December 2017).

As a project planned over 4 years, the achievement of the main objectives of the project is a cumulative process spread over the life span of the project.

SLCAL overall objective is to strengthen the livelihood of vulnerable Palestinian communities in the agricultural production sector and to adapt their livelihoods to longer term climate changes for 26 vulnerable locations in West Bank and Gaza Strip attached is Annex 1 for the list of communities. The project is built upon four main programs:

1. Field Crops Program,
2. Rangelands Improvement Program,
3. Irrigation Techniques Program,
4. Agro Practices Program.

The uniqueness of this project is that it goes beyond the livelihood development and includes huge components on research areas and intensive work with governmental bodies, influencing policies and action plans, working with CBOs as well to improve the community engagement as shown in the expected results below:

Expected result 1: To create innovative, stable, diverse and sustainable natural resource management. To develop adaptive farming systems and improve livelihoods on an individual and community level in response to climate change

Based on intensive research about sustainable resource management, communities develop agricultural farming systems adapted to climate change to improve their livelihoods.

- Data collection, harmonisation and analysis.
- Conducting research studies on aridity index, water stress models and crop sustainability index.
- Surveying the existing agro-production practices by eco system.
- Identifying the project targeted pilot areas per activity jointly with the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) through utilisation of specialised tools, e.g. CVCA tools.
- Research on existing crops and proposing suitable crops/varieties resistant to drought/flood to be introduced in the project target areas.
- Developing of methodologies to improve existing cropping systems/practices under irrigated and rain fed conditions (e.g. minimal tillage, water shed management, crop rotations, mixed farming systems, etc.).
- Creating action plan to promote the preservation of indigenous, valuable plants and increasing rangeland grazing capacity, and enhancing their biodiversity and natural vegetation cover.
- Exploring and piloting of the new agricultural techniques to optimise the utilisation of irrigation water in irrigated agriculture systems.
- Suitable/ succeeding agro-practices to be up-scaled on the farmers' lands.
- Selecting the project beneficiaries based on the project interventions and the available resources with the participation of the PCC (at least 50% of the 1,300 direct beneficiaries are women).
- Developing the technical specifications and conducting the procurement procedures to guarantee (purchase) agro-production materials and tools for rain fed and irrigated agriculture and rangelands.
- Following up and monitoring the planted crops and technologies introduced by the project team.
- Providing the required technical and management support for the beneficiaries by the project team.
- Selecting succeeding and feasible applications and inputs (water, crops, and resources). Preparing the most suitable recommendations to improve the climate adaptation policies in different strategies.

Expected result 2: Influence national and regional policies and action plans to ensure the incorporation of successful adaptation methods and risk mitigation mechanisms, with the main focus on food and water security.

The current national and regional policies and action plans for the adaptation of climate change are completed by successfully tested adaptation methods in the sectors of food and water security.

- Conducting 20 brainstorming sessions with all stakeholders and decision makers to present the project succeeding practices and discuss the existing plans and strategies to adapt them to the project findings.
- Preparing an improved overview of existing related policies and presenting it to decision makers with main focus on risk assessment and mitigation.

Expected Result 3: Empower local communities to have a voice in decision making processes on climate change adaptation and risk mitigation with an increase in participation of marginalized groups such as women, youth, and poor families.

Local communities have a voice in political decision making processes on climate change adaption and risk mitigation. With an increase in participation of marginalized groups such as women, youths and small hold farmers through a participatory and gender-sensitive research approach.

- Conducting specialized training workshops for benefitting farmers with a main focus on project interventions and means of adaptation to climate change.
- Conducting specialized training workshops and roundtable meetings for existing CBOS in targeted communities to activate their role in reducing the impact of climate change.
- Participating in the activities of adaptation to climate change and risk management.

The project is reporting against the below table of indicators:

Expected Results	Indicator (Planned)
<p><b>R1:</b> To create innovative, stable, diverse and sustainable natural resource management. To develop adaptive farming systems and improve livelihoods on an individual and community level in response to climate change.</p>	<p>I1: A minimum of 4 studies (aridity index, meteorological information, crop/vegetation cover suitability index, water stress model etc.) measure and prove the effects of climate change on the respective agro-ecological zones in the Palestinian territories.</p> <p>I2: 75% of the 26 vulnerable rural communities adapted their resource management through improved farming methods and increased their food security by the end of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 800 hectares of land produced 600 tons of seeds,</li> <li>- 30 tons of hay and 2.400 tons of green forages;</li> <li>- biomass production is increased by 30% through an increase of the grazing capacity by 30%;</li> <li>-20 hectares of vegetable cultivation on irrigated land produced 400 tons of vegetables;</li> <li>-10 hectares of vegetable cultivation on rain fed land produced 120 tons of vegetables;</li> <li>-the productivity of olive trees increased by 30% through supplementary irrigation.</li> </ul> <p>I3: 75% of the 1,300 vulnerable farmers and their families (7,800 individuals) became aware of the impact of climate change and adapted and improved agricultural methods for cultivation.</p>
<p><b>R2:</b> Influence national and regional policies and action plans to ensure the incorporation of successful adaptation methods and risk mitigation mechanisms, with the main focus on food and water security.</p>	<p>I1: Up to 500 stakeholders of national, governmental and international specialists and decision makers become aware about the actual impact of climate change and the suitable mechanizes to combat it.</p> <p>I2: The gained and exchanged experiences through the attended international workshops documented and transferred to the related stakeholders.</p> <p>I3: The decision makers and the planners provided with valuable material, data and recommendations to improve their policies and action plans to mitigate the impact of climate change. (The resulted actions and decision by decision makers documented)</p>

<p><b>R3:</b> Empower local communities to have a voice in decision making processes on climate change adaptation and risk mitigation with an increase in participation of marginalized groups such as women, youth, and poor families.</p>	<p><b>I1:</b> One sanitation workshop has been conducted in all 26 communities with already existing CBOs.</p> <p><b>I2:</b> 75% of the 26 rural communities and CBOs are enabled (through awareness raising and capacity building workshops) to stronger advocate for their interests (e.g. reduction of the consequences of climate change on livelihoods).</p> <p><b>I3:</b> The beneficiaries had the chance to meet with political decision-makers to explain the negative consequences on food security and to discuss how the government can support in reducing the effects of climate change.</p>
---	--

### III. Final Evaluation Objectives

The overall objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To assess the project's achievements and performance against the below criteria for standard evaluations.
2. To identify lessons learned and recommendations to improve future programming as well as opportunities for scale-up or replication.

The criteria for this evaluation are based on the OECD DAC criteria:

#### 1. Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency

- **Relevance:** the extent to which the project objectives are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partner' and donors' (BMZ) policies.
  - To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
  - Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
  - Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the project achieved or is expected to achieve its objectives, taking into account its relative importance.
  - To what extent were the objectives achieved/likely to be achieved?
  - What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- **Efficiency:** the extent to which the project was managed (economically) to get value for money from inputs of funds, expertise, time and other resources.
  - Were activities cost-effective?
  - Were objectives achieved on time?
  - Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

#### 2. Higher level changes (Impact): the positive and negatives, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended effects, for women and men and for the most vulnerable.

- To what extent were the overall objectives realistic and to what extent do they correspond to the current situation and level of knowledge?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- To what extent was the project model-like, structure-forming and/or widespread?
- Which additional impacts (also negative ones) can be found?
- What would be the situation be without the project being implemented?

#### 3. Sustainability: to assess whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after the project ends (probability of continued long-term benefits).

- To what extent did the benefits of the project continue after donor (BMZ) funding ceased?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- How stable is the current situation regarding social equity, economic performance, political stability, and ecological balance?

4. **Coherence, complementarity, and coordination:**
  - To what extent was the impact of the project influenced by other policy areas/donors?
  - To what extent were the objectives and activities of the project coordinated and harmonized with other bi- and multilateral donors and organizations?
5. **Monitoring and learning:** the effectiveness of project monitoring and learning processes.

Criteria should be assessed with reference to gendered benefits, and a focus on analyzing lessons learned. In addition, criteria should be analyzed with reference to adaptation to a changing climate/environment, disaster risk reduction, and political context.

The evaluation will pursue the following specific objectives:

1. To determine the extent to which the project has achieved its overall goal and specific objectives.
2. To determine the extent to which each outcome was achieved.
3. To assess the intended and unintended impacts of the project.
4. To assess the impact of the project on farmers:
  - Impact of the project interventions on developing adaptive farming systems responding to climate change as a result of SLCAL project, as well as the effect of the effects on the national policies and supporting systems to incorporate risk mitigation plans for the different stakeholder, in addition to the impact on local communities participation and voice in decision making processes. Document key challenges faced by farmers, other actors and assess how these affect their participation at community level, the operationalization of actions plans, etc.
  - Identify and document key lessons and strategies that will inform CARE's future farmer related programming as well as gender mainstreaming in other interventions.
5. To provide recommendations to inform ARIJ and CARE partners' programming to improve quality and impact. To identify and document key lessons and strategies that will inform partners similar projects, particularly 'economic empowerment programs, livelihood development, climate change, resilience, influencing policies programming as well as community engagement and CBO capacity building as advocate and socio-economic hubs.

The evaluation will make reference to baseline data, capture lessons learned, and provide practical recommendations for future programming. The evaluation should include the different actors involved in the project through which the results of the evaluation will be disseminated widely to stakeholders in English, Arabic and in formats for different audiences.

The evaluation team is responsible for designing end term evaluation tools, planning and leading data collection through interviews with project beneficiaries, partners, and stakeholders, and writing the comprehensive evaluation report with informed findings and recommendations. The evaluation team will provide guidance and leadership for these tasks. The evaluation team is responsible for the production of a quality output, including where project staff or others contribute to the process.

Project staff, will support the design of evaluation tools and facilitate in organizing the data collection process, meetings with project partners and key stakeholders to ensure smooth implementation.

#### IV. Scope of the Assignment

The Evaluation Team will review activities undertaken and outputs and outcomes achieved during project implementation.

The criteria for the evaluation are the DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coherence, complementarity, and coordination.

The below areas are intended to guide thinking throughout the evaluation and formation of recommendations.

These categories and points for consideration should not limit the scope as they are neither exhaustive nor definitive; they should shape thinking around the linkages and processes within the project and assist analysis of

outcomes.

#### **I. PROBLEMS AND NEEDS (RELEVANCE)**

This section shall build on the results of the project internal M&E & reviews and will focus on the extent to which the objectives of the development intervention (projects/ programme) are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and BMZ's policies.

The analysis of relevance will focus on the following questions in relation to the design of the project:

- The extent to which the activities implemented in the given period relevant for achieving the objectives defined by the Project;
- the extent to which stated objectives correctly address the identified problems and needs of the target groups/beneficiaries;
- the extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed
- adequate assessment of local implementation capacity;
- the quality of the identification of key stakeholders and target groups (including analysis of vulnerable groups);
- stakeholder participation in the design and in the management/implementation of the project, the level of local ownership, and issues of absorption capacity;
- the analysis of assumptions and risks has been valid;
- the monitoring and evaluation arrangements have been appropriate.

Quality of design (relevance, but also a precondition for most other evaluation criteria)

- Clarity and internal consistency of the stated objectives;
- appropriateness of the objectively-verifiable indicators of achievement (OVIs) as in the logical framework;
- realism in the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and administrative resources);
- innovation/ evidence based approaches/resilient agricultural approaches in terms of: effectiveness/ scalability/ adaptability/ reliability (from Climate change perspective) .

#### **II. ACHIEVEMENTS OF PURPOSE (EFFECTIVENESS)**

The effectiveness criterion, concerns how far the project's results were attained, and the project's specific objective(s) achieved, or are expected to be achieved.

The analysis of Effectiveness will therefore focus on such issues as:

- The extent to which SLCAL systemic methodology, introducing innovative approaches, working with key actors and governmental bodies to influence policies, community engagement and empowerment in general (researches and evidence based innovative approaches, addressing main gaps at different governmental actors, /networking and advocating , etc.) was effective in achieving expected objectives and impact;
- the extent, to which the planned benefits and results have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including women and men and specific vulnerable groups);
- whether actual and expected results match the performance targets set out initially (as far as it is feasible in this stage);
- whether intended beneficiaries participated in the intervention;
- if the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the results would still achieve the purpose; and how well has it been supported in this by key stakeholders including Government, Commission (HQ and locally), etc.;
- whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate;

- the extent to which the intended results could have been achieved at a higher level of quantity / quality by changing for example:
  - a) Responsiveness and flexibility of project management;
  - b) Monitoring of risks and external factors;
  - c) Balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders;
  - d) Accompanying measures taken or to be taken by the partner authorities.

### III. SOUND MANAGEMENT AND VALUE FOR MONEY (EFFICIENCY)

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (sometimes referred to as outputs), in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned.

The assessment of efficiency will therefore focus on such issues as:

- The quality of day-to-day management, for example in:
  - a. Is the relationship between the devoted resources and results appropriate and justifiable?
  - b. assess operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs), and management of the budget (including cost control and whether an inadequate budget was a factor);
  - c. verify the use by both projects of proper criteria in selecting the most appropriate beneficiaries;
  - d. whether risk management has been adequate, i.e. whether flexibility has been demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances;
  - e. Relations/coordination with local/ national authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors;
  - f. the quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project activities (including beneficiaries/target groups);
  - g. technical assistance: how well did it help to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results?

### IV. LIKELY CONTINUATION OF ACHIEVED RESULTS (SUSTAINABILITY)

The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends or non-funding support interventions (such as: policy dialogue, coordination).

The final evaluation will make an assessment of the prospects for the sustainability of benefits on basis of the following issues:

- The ownership of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far all stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset, and whether they agreed with them and continue to remain in agreement;
- The adequacy, accuracy consistency of the project budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;
- Socio-cultural factors, e.g. whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power- structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it is based on an analysis of such factors, including target group/ beneficiary participation in design and implementation; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities.

**V. COHERECE, COMPLEMENTARITY, AND COORDINATION**

- To what extent was the impact of the project influences by other policy areas/donors?
- To what extent were the objectives and activities of the project coordinated and harmonized with other bi- and multilateral donors and organizations?

**VI. MONITORING AND LEARNING**

- Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information

**V. Methodology**

The evaluation team will be required to further design the detailed methodology for the evaluation in the first phase of the consultancy, in consultation with SLCAL project staff. A mix of quantitative and qualitative instruments and methods will be used, and a participatory approach should be adopted, capturing the perspectives of key stakeholders. The methodology, tools and scheduling used must be gender and target group sensitive.

The methodology will include a phase of documentation review. Key documents will be provided by ARIJ & CARE and include:

- Project documents, including baseline, and interim (annual) reports
- Results of project monitoring, reviews, reflection processes, and main assessments & researches)
- Donor evaluation guidelines

The evaluation team are also expected to use interviews, field surveys or any other relevant quantitative and qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the assessment. All collected data should be disaggregated by sex, age and locality. The Evaluation team will make sure that the priorities, opinions and information of targeted CBOs, AIRJ, CARE, ICARDA as a consulting partner and other stakeholders as the MoA are taken into account. Below is a summary of different phases of project review:

**I. DESK REVIEW PHASE**

Based on the systemic review of relevant available documents (including the Project Design Document; relevant CARE International program and policy documents DECD policies and guidelines) the evaluation team shall be able to provide the following:

- Further design of the overall methodological approach to serve the overall evaluation purpose, and to assess project impact, sustainability and identify critical success factors across project components. The list of research tools to be applied in the field phase, together with all preparatory steps already taken.
- Provide details of evaluation tasks and key evaluation questions, and consultation with key project stakeholders and staff.
- A detailed work plan should be submitted with an indicative list of people to be interviewed, surveys to be undertaken, dates of visit, and name of team members. The evaluation team will take necessary measures to ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of, the different stakeholders.
- Development of qualitative interview questions for key stakeholders and informants, which address the key evaluation questions

At the end of the desk-based phase a detailed evaluation plan shall be prepared. At the end of the desk phase an inception report shall be submitted (detailed evaluation plan); providing further data on the different tools/interviewees/ etc. mentioned above.

## II. FIELD & DATA COLLECTION/ ANALYSIS PHASE

The field phase should start upon approval of the first phase report (inception report) by the evaluation committee (composed of representatives of SLCAL consortium). The evaluation team should submit its work plan with an indicative list of people to be interviewed, surveys to be undertaken, dates of visit, and name of team members in charge. The evaluation team has to hold a briefing meeting with the project team before the field phase.

The evaluation team will take necessary measures to ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of, the different stakeholders.

The work plan has to be applied in a way that is flexible enough to accommodate for any last-minute difficulties in the field. If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation, these should be immediately discussed with the project team.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team has to summarize its field works, discuss the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present its preliminary findings in a meeting with the project team.

## III. SYNTHESIS PHASE

This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the draft final report by the evaluation team with support from the project team. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the project's area(s) of intervention is required (to be attached as Annex). The evaluation team will make sure that their assessments are objective and balanced, affirmations accurate and verifiable, and recommendations realistic.

On the basis of comments of the project team, the evaluation team has to write a new version of the report. Comments requesting methodological quality improvements should be taken into account, except where there is a demonstrated impossibility, in which case full justification should be provided by the evaluation team. Comments on the substance of the report may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team is to explain the reasons in writing.

## IV. RESULTS' PRESENTATION

The evaluation team has to present the revised draft final report at the evaluation committee along with the projects' steering committee (PSC). The purpose of the presentation is to present the draft final report to the main stakeholders (PSC), to check the factual basis of the evaluation, and to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations.

On the basis of comments made by the project team, the evaluation team has to draft the final version of the report, in which the rules applying to the integration of comments are those stated in the previous section. (Please refer to annex 1- for layout and structure of the final report).

## VI. **Deliverables**

The evaluation team will be responsible to provide the following outputs:

- a. An inception report/detailed evaluation plan within ten days after signing the contract. Next steps of the evaluation shall be concluded based on the approval of the inception report;
- b. A comprehensive presentation at the end of the field phase, to summarize its field works, discuss the quality, reliability and coverage of data collection;

- c. A draft final report summarizing the findings and including main comments and suggestions received from evaluation committee. The report will adhere to the format template of Annex 1 (provided at the start of the assignment) and will include recommendations for the successful completion of the project;
- d. A presentation of the findings for the PSC; and MOA, other actors to validate the findings
- e. A final report that shall include all comments and feedback received from PSC members.
- f. **Submission of final evaluation report by 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018-**
- g. *All deliverables to be submitted in English (three hard copies) & Arabic (two hard copies) as well as two CDs in MS office format (per each Action)*

#### VII. Timeframe

The tentative date of engagement will be in the period of 30<sup>th</sup> December 2018- 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018; please submit your plan (time frame for each of the expected deliverables) including at least the below milestones:

- Inception report submission.
- End of field phase.
- Comprehensive presentation to evaluation committee.
- Draft final report.
- Presentation for steering committee.
- Final draft of the evaluation report.

#### VIII. Competencies, Qualification and Experience

##### COMPETENCIES

- Excellent interpersonal skills;
- Ability to lead a comprehensive evaluation of projects with results-based management and reporting;
- Very good knowledge of Palestinian cultural and socio-economic context
- Research and analytical skills; and
- Excellent oral and written communication skills in English and Arabic.

##### QUALIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE

- A solid and diversified experience in the specific fields of expertise, including experience in evaluation of projects, agricultural sector and climate change.
- Excellent in communication, coordination, planning and team work
- Previous experiences in monitoring and evaluating food security and livelihood projects
- Experience in working with BMZ funded projects, government institutions, and international organizations

#### IX. Offers Evaluation Criteria

The received offers will be evaluated technically and financially. Where **60%** of the final score will be for the technical part of the applied offer, **20%** will be for the qualification and experience, and **20%** will be for the financial part.

The evaluation will be carried according to the following grid:

No.	Criteria	Points
1.	<b>Consultant/ Firm's scientific qualification, background, and experience as well as the Consultant ( at least three relevant or similar assignments that have been conducted by the consulting firm in the last five years)</b>	20
2.	<b>Technical proposal</b> <u>Proposed Methodology</u> <u>Timetable of activities – Work plan</u>	60

	<u>Level of effort division</u>  <u>Key expert's CVs:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Qualifications and skills</li> <li>- General professional experience</li> <li>- Specific and related experience</li> </ul>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Financial proposal.</b>	<b>20</b>

#### ANNEX I: layout, structure of the Final Report

The final report should not be longer than approximately 50 pages per Action. Additional information on overall context, project or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

*The cover page of the report shall carry the following text:*

*"This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of < Name of the consulting firm > and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the Donors."*

*The main sections of the evaluation report are as follows:*

#### **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than three pages. It should focus mainly on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows.

#### **2. INTRODUCTION**

A description of the Action and the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

#### **3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS**

#### **4. EVALUATION PURPOSE & SCOPE**

#### **5. KEY OBJECTIVES AND FINDINGS**

The report should mirror the expected outcomes and results that are laid down in the intervention logic of the actions (log frame), thus presenting the findings along the main objectives/outcomes to be achieved.

A chapter presenting the evaluation questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence and reasoning shall be included).

The organization of the report should be made around the responses to the Evaluation questions which are systematically covering the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, plus visibility (as per previous sections of this ToR). In such an approach, the criteria will be translated into specific questions. These questions are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the evaluation criteria and to

articulate the key issues of concern to stakeholders, thus optimizing the focus and utility of the evaluation.

A separate chapter should be reserved for the assessment of the coordination mechanism established in the framework of the field project and different national plans and actions, the related synergies and challenges for the here presented projects.

## **6. OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

A chapter synthesising all answers to evaluation questions into an overall assessment of the action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading.

## **7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Conclusions**

- This chapter introduces the conclusions relative to each question. The conclusions should be organized in programs in the chapter in order to provide an overview of the assessed subject;
- It should feature references to the findings (responses to the evaluation questions) or to annexes showing how the conclusions derive from data, interpretations, and analysis and judgment criteria;
- The conclusion chapter features not only the successes observed but also the issues requiring further thought on modifications or a different course of action;
- The evaluation team presents its conclusions in a balanced way, without systematically favoring the negative or the positive conclusions; and
- A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organized by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

### **Recommendations**

- The ultimate value of an evaluation depends on the quality and credibility of the recommendations offered. Recommendations should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the action, and of the resources available to implement them.
- Recommended corrective actions for the logical frameworks, action plans, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.
- Recommendations must be clustered and prioritized, carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels. The recommendations presented shall mirror the log frame, wherever feasible.

## **3. ANNEXES TO THE REPORT**

The report should include the following annexes:

- Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- Names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarized and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation method including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.
- Logical Framework matrices (original and improved/updated)

- Map of project area, if relevant
- List of persons/organizations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures)
- Other relevant documents

## Annex 2

### EVALUATION SURVEY



## “Strengthening Livelihoods through Community Adaptation and Learning (SLCAL)”

Name:	Address:
-------	----------

Please express your opinion on the way the project was implemented describing the achieved results.

<b>1. Rangelands Improvement Program</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The new rangelands are with high quality				
Utilized seeds is with high quality				
I will continue planting the rangeland after the project				
I will continue planting new rangelands				
The project provided the needed technical assistance				
The conditions of the signed agreement between farmers and ARIJ is clear and balanced				
I know the results of the agricultural researches conducted by ARIJ				
The project helped me to understand the effects of climate change				
Describe how the project contributed in changing the attitude of the farmer in response to the climate change:				

<b>2. Field Crops Program</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------------------	----------------	-------	----------	-------------------

The utilized pesticides are effective and meets the environmental standards				
I will continue utilizing the same pesticides				
The project provided the needed technical assistance				
The conditions of the signed agreement between farmers and ARIJ is clear and balanced				
I know the results of the agricultural researches conducted by ARIJ				
The project helped me to understand the effects of climate change				
Describe how the project contributed in changing the attitude of the farmer in response to the climate change:				

<b>3. Irrigation Techniques Program,</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The irrigation tools are appropriate to my needs				
I was trained on how to utilize the irrigation tools				
I will continue utilizing the irrigation tools after the project				
My profit increased as a result of irrigation program				
The project provided the needed technical assistance				
The conditions of the signed agreement between farmers and ARIJ is clear and balanced				
I know the results of the agricultural researches conducted by ARIJ				
The project helped me to understand the effects of climate change				
Describe how the project contributed in changing the attitude of the farmer in response to the climate change:				

<b>4. Agro Practices Program.</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The project introduced new water harvesting practices				

I will continue utilizing the harvesting practices after the project				
My profit increased as a result of water harvesting practice				
The project provided the needed technical assistance				
The conditions of the signed agreement between farmers and ARIJ is clear and balanced				
I know the results of the agricultural researches conducted by ARIJ				
The project helped me to understand the effects of climate change				
Describe how the project contributed in changing the attitude of the farmer in response to the climate change:				

**Additional Comments:**


### Annex 3

#### Focus Group Leading Questions

اسئلة ورشة مجموعات العمل

برايكم، ما هي نجاحات المشروع؟
<b>What are the main success of the project?</b>
كيف استفدت بشكل محدد من المشروع؟
<b>How you benefited from the project?</b>
ما النشاط الذي ستستمر بتنفيذه بعد انتهاء تمويل المشروع؟
<b>What practices you will continue doing after the end of the project?</b>
ما اهم مشاكل/محددات المشروع؟
<b>What were the main challenges that faced the project?</b>
ما النشاطات التي تقترح عملها بشكل مختلف؟ كيف؟
<b>What activates you suggest doing differently? How?</b>
ما هي اقتراحاتك لتحسين المشاريع المشابهة؟
<b>What are your recommendation for similar projects?</b>

## Annex 4

### Focus Group Meetings

#### West Bank

Date	Program	Location
Tuesday (6/2/2018) : <b>9:30-11:00</b>	Irrigation rangeland in Hebron Governorate	Arroub Training Center
<b>11:00-12:30</b>	Field Crops	Arroub Training Center
Wednesday (7/2/2018): <b>9:30-11:00</b>	Agro practice program	Deir Ghusun (Tulkarem)
<b>11:30-13:00</b>		Kufr Ra'I (Jenin)
Thursday (8/2/2018): <b>9:30-11:00</b>	Field crops	Qishda
<b>11:30-13:00</b>	Irrigation	(Kardala, Bardala, Ein Beida)
Saturday (10/2/2018): <b>9:30-11:00</b>	Field Crops Jenin	Al Seila Al Harithiya

#### Dates and locations

#### Gaza

Date	Program	Focus Group
Wed (7/2/2018) : <b>9:30-11:00</b>	Irrigation techniques	Karara-Eastern area
<b>11:30-13:00</b>		Abasan
Thursday (8/2/2018): <b>9:30-11:00</b>	Agro-practices	Shouka-Rafah
<b>11:30-13:00</b>	Field Crops	Khuzaa
Sat (10/2/2018): <b>9:30-11:00</b>	Field Crops	Karara
<b>11:30-13:00</b>		Shouka-Rafah

## Annex 5

### Key Informants Interviews

May Abdel Hadi	CARE West Bank
Saed Almadhoun	Care Gaza
Dr. Mohammed Al Raie	ICARDA Gaza
Nader Hrimat	ARIJ
Fadi Dweik	ARIJ
Isam Nofal	MOA
Mahmoud Bisharat	MOA
Najeh Bani Odeh	MOA
Baha Khader	MOA
Ibtisam Abu Elheija	MOA
Safinaz Badr	MOA

## Annex 6

### Survey Results

Table4 evaluation survey findings

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Field Crops Program</b>				
• The utilized herbicides respect the environmental standards	23%	77%		
• I will continue using the herbicides after the project	29%	71%		
• The project enhanced my ability to adapt to climate change	26%	74%		
• The utilized seeds of high quality	29%	61%	10%	
• Will continue using the irrigation system	26%	65%	10%	
• The project provided full technical support to farmers		48%	45%	6.5%
• The findings of research were shared with the farmers		55%	42%	3.2%
• I benefited from the research findings on the ground		55%	42%	
<b>Range Land</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The planted rangeland area was of high quality	33%	67%		
The utilized seeds of high quality	33%	67%		
Will continue using the irrigation system	33%	50%	17%	
will replant the rangeland after the project	33%	50%	17%	
The project provided full technical support to farmers	33%	50%	17%	
Agreement with Arij is fare and clear		100%		
I know the findings of rage land research		17%	83%	
The project helped me to adapt to the climate change		67%	33%	
<b>Irrigation techniques Program</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Irrigation tools are suitable to my need	18%	82%		
I was trained on how to install the tools	45%	55%		
I will continue utilizing the irrigation tools after the project	45%	53%	3%	
I previously knew the utilized irrigation techniques	39%	47%	11%	
The findings of irrigation techniques research were shared with the farmers	8%	29%	39%	24%

I benefited practically from the research findings	8%	42%	26%	24%
The return from utilizing the irrigation tools is conducive	32%	47%	24%	
the project improved my ability to adapt to climate change	21%	37%	45%	
My voice is heard more after the project	3%	47%	47%	3%
<b>Agro-practices</b>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I learnt new rain harvesting techniques	58%	42%		
I learnt the result of rain harvesting research	8%	83%	8%	
I benefited practically from the research findings	25%	67%	8%	
I will continue utilizing the rain harvesting techniques	50%	50%		
Distributed irrigation network were of good quality	8%	75%	17%	
Distributed seeds were of good quality	8%	92%		
The project helped me to adapt to global warming	25%	67%	8%	