مركز العالم العربي للبحوث والتنمية
Arab World for Research & Development

Quality Research… Matters

GVH AH 23 Final Evaluation

Localised Nexus Strategy for the integrated protection of the rights and dignity of the Palestinian population under occupation in accordance with International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law, with special emphasis on gender equity, child protection and Disaster Risk Reduction

February 7, 2026
Revision 1: February 12, 2026
Revision 2: Feb 26, 2026

Submitted to:
Asamblea de Cooperación por la Paz (hereinafter ACPP)

Arab World for Research and Development (AWRAD)
Al-Masayef., Kamal Nasser St., Building # 43. P.O. Box: 2238, Ramallah – Palestine

Contents

Contents 2
List of Acronyms 4
Executive Summary 5
Key Evaluation Findings 5
Introduction 6
Evaluation Scope and Objectives 7
Project Background 9
Local Context 9
Methodology and Approach 11
Evaluation Findings against Evaluation Questions 12
Section 1: Relevance 12
Conclusions 14
Recommendations 14
Section 2: Effectiveness 14
Conclusions 17
Recommendations 17
Section 3: Efficiency 18
Conclusions 19
Recommendations 19
Section 4: Impact 19
Conclusion 23
Recommendations 23
Section 5: Sustainability and Connectivity 23
Conclusion 26
Recommendations 26
Section 6: Participation and Stakeholder Engagement 26
Conclusion 28
Section 7: Coordination and Harmonization 28
Conclusions 30
Recommendations 30
Section 8: Cross-Cutting Priorities 31

Conclusions 32
Recommendation 32
Section 9: Communication and Dissemination 32
Evaluation Dissemination Actions 32
Dissemination Channels and Activities 32
Community Feedback and Validation 32
Recommendations organized by entity 34
Recommendations for ACPP 34
Recommendations for Implementing Partners 34
Recommendations for Community / Local Institutions 34
Annexes 35
Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix 35
Annex 2: Detailed Methodology 39
Desk Review 39
Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) 39
In-depth Interviews with Beneficiaries 39
Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) 40
Survey 40
Annex 3: Results Achievement 40
PSCCW –Results Achievement 40
PARC – Results Achievement 43
Annex 4: Field Documentation – FGDs 44
Annex 5: References 46
Annex 6: Arabic Executive Summary (for sharing) 47

List of Acronyms

GVA	Regional Government of Valencia
ACPP	Asamblea de Cooperación por la Paz
AWRAD	Arab World for Research and Development
IHRL	International Human Rights Law
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
PARC	Agricultural Development Association
PSCCW	Psychosocial Counselling Centre for Women
CPC	Community Protection Committee
AG	Action Group
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
GBV	Gender-Based Violence

Executive Summary

This final evaluation assesses the project "Localized Nexus Strategy for the Integrated Protection of the Rights and Dignity of the Palestinian Population under Occupation," implemented by ACPP in partnership with PARC and PSCCW in Qusra and Jurish (Nablus Governorate), and funded by the Generalitat Valenciana under the 2023 Humanitarian Aid call. The 12-month intervention (August 2024–August 2025), with a total budget of €400,000, targeted 1,252 direct participants and 7,735 indirect beneficiaries. It aimed to protect rights and dignity in line with IHL and IHRL, with emphasis on gender equality, child protection, and DRR. The evaluation applied a mixed-methods approach and examined the intervention across relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and connectivity, participation, coordination and harmonization, cross-cutting priorities, and communication and dissemination.

Key Evaluation Findings

Relevance

The intervention was strongly aligned with priority needs in both communities, responding to interconnected vulnerabilities related to land access and livelihood insecurity, protection risks, and psychosocial distress. The rights-based framing and the focus on dignity, protection, and non-discrimination are consistent with humanitarian principles and the Strategy's IHL/IHRL mandate.

Effectiveness

The project achieved its objectives and expected results to a high extent. PARC delivered the core livelihood, land-rehabilitation, and community protection outputs, while PSCCW met or exceeded targets for women's protection and MHPSS and achieved planned child protection outcomes. Beneficiary evidence indicates tangible benefits in land use, short-term income relief, psychosocial coping, and community protection functioning, despite significant access and security constraints.

Efficiency

Resources were used efficiently overall. PARC's integration of Cash-for-Work with land rehabilitation maximized the utility of resources by combining short-term income support with productive asset rehabilitation. PSCCW achieved substantial output delivery, including over-achievement on several indicators, without additional budget allocations, supported by delivery through existing schools, community centers, and women CBOs. Efficiency at beneficiary level was, however, weakened by targeting and verification gaps in some activities, including reliance on landowners for worker selection and limited follow-up verification of actual participation and use of support.

Impact

Beneficiaries reported improved psychosocial well-being, perceived safety, dignity, coping capacity, and short-term livelihood support. At the same time, impact was constrained by external factors, notably settler violence, access restrictions, and occasional damage to rehabilitated assets, meaning effects should be understood primarily as risk mitigation and resilience strengthening rather than durable protection.

Sustainability and connectivity

Sustainability potential is stronger for community-based mechanisms and psychosocial outcomes that can continue through local structures. Skills and awareness were embedded within existing community spaces and practices, increasing the likelihood that benefits will persist beyond the project period. In addition,

land rehabilitation, improved access to agricultural areas, and the use of locally appropriate techniques created assets that beneficiaries can continue to maintain and use with their own knowledge and labor.

At the same time, the sustainability of land and livelihood gains remain partly conditional on the broader protection environment. Continued access to land, the ability to safely cultivate it, and the physical integrity of rehabilitated assets depend on external conditions beyond the project's control. The project nevertheless demonstrates good connectivity through cumulative engagement and complementary sequencing across livelihood, protection, and psychosocial components.

Participation and coordination

Participation was strongest during implementation, with community actors influencing site selection, activity adaptation, and session content, while participation in initial design and modality choice was more limited. Coordination was strong at the community and sectoral levels through local structures and PARC's engagement with the Ministry of Agriculture, with practical complementarity between PARC and PSCCW activities in the same communities; broader systemic coordination with humanitarian platforms was less evident.

Coordination and harmonization

The intervention strengthened practical coordination at community level through day-to-day collaboration with village councils, committees, schools, and women's associations, improving operational coherence and trust. Broader system-level coordination beyond these localized interfaces was less evidenced.

Cross-cutting priorities

Evidence indicates integration of cross-cutting concerns, particularly gender responsiveness through PSCCW's women- and child-focused services and protection-oriented delivery modalities.

Communication and dissemination

Reporting supported routine accountability and implementation tracking. At community level, knowledge was shared through participatory dissemination of DRR. However, dissemination of broader project learning, lessons learned, and evaluative insights between partners and beyond formal reporting channels was less systematic.

Introduction

The project "Protection of the Rights and Dignity of the Palestinian Population Under Occupation, with Special Emphasis on Gender-Based Violence, Child Protection, and Disaster Risk Reduction" was implemented by ACPP in partnership with PARC and PSCCW in the communities of Qusra and Jurish in southeast Nablus. The intervention forms part of ACPP's longer-term engagement in Area C of the West Bank, where protracted occupation, settler violence, land confiscation, and movement restrictions continue to undermine livelihoods, psychosocial well-being, and the enjoyment of fundamental rights.

Building on previous protection- and resilience-oriented interventions in the same communities, the project combined land rehabilitation and livelihood support, community-based protection and disaster risk reduction, and psychosocial and rights-based services for women and children. Its objective was not only to mitigate immediate economic and protection risks, but also to strengthen community presence on the land, enhance psychosocial resilience, and reinforce local capacities to cope with, document, and respond to violations of rights and dignity.

The intervention was implemented in a highly volatile and restrictive environment characterized by insecurity, access constraints, and institutional fragility. Within this context, the project sought to apply an integrated, community-based and rights-oriented approach, reflecting ACPP's broader humanitarian strategy in the West Bank and the Action Group's commitment to linking livelihood, protection, and psychosocial responses in contexts of prolonged occupation and coercion.

Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The evaluation aims to generate evidence and learning on the implementation and results of a protection- and resilience-focused humanitarian intervention implemented by ACPP in partnership with PARC and PSCCW in Qusra and Jurish, in southeast Nablus. It applies a human rights–based and gender-sensitive perspective and serves both as a learning tool and as an accountability mechanism toward affected communities, implementing partners, and donors.

Focusing on Qusra and Jurish, the evaluation examines the project from inception through completion and the fieldwork period. It assesses the extent to which the intervention contributed to the protection of rights and dignity under occupation, improved access to land and livelihoods, strengthened community-based protection and disaster risk reduction mechanisms, and enhanced the psychosocial well-being and rights awareness of women and children.

The evaluation is structured around internationally recognized evaluation criteria, including Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability and Connectivity, Participation, Coordination and Harmonization, Cross-Cutting Priorities (gender, child protection, disaster risk reduction, and conflict sensitivity), and Communication and Dissemination. It was conducted in accordance with core ethical principles, including "do no harm," informed consent, confidentiality, and the meaningful participation of women and other vulnerable groups.

Table 1 Evaluation Questions

Criteria	Evaluation Question
Relevance	To what extent is the intervention aligned with the needs of the target population?
	How well does the project align with humanitarian principles and international human rights law (IHL, IHRL)?
	Was the context adequate to inform the project design?
Effectiveness	To what extent has the project achieved its objectives and expected results?
	What factors facilitated or hindered the achievement of results?
	How effective and reliable were the mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating progress?
Efficiency	Were project resources (financial, human, logistical) used efficiently to achieve results?
	Was the intervention implemented in a timely manner?
	Were project resources adequate to achieve the results?

Impact	What positive or negative, intended, or unintended effects has the project had on beneficiaries?
	How has the intervention strengthened coordination and working relationships between local organizations and public institutions?
	How has the intervention contributed to the protection of rights and dignity of Palestinian people under occupation?
Sustainability and Connectivity	To what extent does the intervention consider the long-term sustainability of the results?
	How well does the intervention integrate local structures and capacities for continuity?
	Has the project established mechanisms to ensure its continuation beyond the funding period?
Participation and Stakeholder Engagement	To what extent were local communities, beneficiaries, and stakeholders involved in project design, planning, and implementation?
Coordination and Harmonization	How effective was internal coordination among ACPP, PARC, and PSCCW, as AG members, in ensuring coherent planning and complementary implementation? Is the intervention consistent with other projects in the sector and the region? How well was the intervention coordinated with other humanitarian and development initiatives in the region? To what extent does this project align with and contribute to the AG's area-based strategy in Southeast Nablus?
Cross-Cutting Priorities	To what extent did the intervention integrate environmental protection and disaster risk reduction (DRR)?
	How well did the intervention incorporate cultural diversity and local knowledge?
	How well did the intervention promote women's empowerment and gender equality?
Communication and Dissemination	Have project progress reports and lessons learned been effectively shared among stakeholders?

Project Background

The project was developed in response to the persistent and structural protection, livelihood, and psychosocial vulnerabilities affecting Palestinian communities in Area C of the West Bank, particularly in the villages of Qusra and Jurish in southeast Nablus. These communities are exposed to chronic pressures linked to the Israeli occupation, including settler violence, land confiscation, movement restrictions, and limited access to basic services and economic opportunities. As a result, farming households face growing risks of land abandonment and livelihood erosion, while women, children, and caregivers experience elevated levels of stress, insecurity, and psychosocial distress.

The intervention sought to address these interconnected risks through an integrated protection, livelihoods, and psychosocial approach. On the one hand, it focused on safeguarding access to agricultural land and supported livelihood and reduced land abandonment. On the other hand, it aimed to strengthen community-based protection and disaster risk reduction mechanisms, while providing psychosocial support, legal awareness, and child-focused activities to mitigate the emotional and social consequences of prolonged exposure to violence, uncertainty, and economic strain.

The project was implemented by PARC and PSCCW in partnership with ACPP, building on their long-standing presence and accumulated experience in South-East Nablus. PARC led agricultural, livelihood,and land-protection activities in coordination with village councils, protection committees, and relevant agricultural authorities, while PSCCW delivered psychosocial, legal, and awareness interventions through schools, women's associations, and community-based structures. This operational model enabled activities to be embedded in locally recognized institutions and supported community participation, access, and continuity.

Aligned with ACPP's broader humanitarian and rights-based strategy, the project was designed to go beyond short-term service delivery by reinforcing the protection of rights and dignity under occupation. By combining land and livelihood support with psychosocial support, legal awareness, and community-based protection mechanisms, the intervention aimed to reduce harmful coping strategies, strengthen community resilience, and support the continued presence and agency of Palestinians in high-risk areas of Area C.

Local Context

This project benefited two villages in the Nablus Governorate: **Jurish** and **Qusra**. Below is a brief profile of Qusra.

1. Jurish

Location: Nablus Governorate of the northern West Bank, east of Qusra and south-east of Nablus city.

Overview: Jurish is an agricultural Palestinian village known for its extensive olive cultivation and rural heritage. The local economy is primarily based on farming and livestock. The community experiences significant challenges related to restricted access to agricultural land and movement due to nearby Israeli roads and occupation-related infrastructure. [1]

Demographic Profile: [2]

Indicator	Data

[1] Village Profile: Jurish | Applied Research Institute – Jerusalem (ARIJ), Nablus Governorate, latest available profile.
https://www.palestineremembered.com/images/V2/Books/Arij/Nablus/Jurish/en/Jurish-vp-en.pdf

[2] *Population estimates 2023 | Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS). Pcbs.gov.ps.* https://www.pcbs.gov.ps/statisticsIndicatorsTables.aspx?lang=en&table_id=698

Population (2025)	1,777 residents
Access to Water	Connected to the public water network
Access to Electricity	Connected to the public electricity grid
Agriculture	Olives, cereals, fodder crops, livestock

Settler Activities (2023–2025)

Settlement activity in Jurish has intensified in recent years, particularly through attempts to establish new outposts within village lands. One reported incident involved settlers installing several mobile homes (caravans) on the agricultural hill located deep inside lands belonging to Jurish residents and near the settlement of Migdalim. The move led to direct confrontations with villagers and injuries among residents, and local officials warned that such actions posed a serious threat to privately owned land and agricultural resources while aiming to impose a new spatial reality on the area. These developments reflect the growing vulnerability of rural communities located in proximity to expanding settlement zones (Al-Quds, 2023).

These dynamics have also been accompanied by repeated incursions and acts of violence in the areas surrounding Jurish. Human rights documentation reports organized night-time attacks in which settlers threw stones at village homes, creating fear and instability among residents. Additional reports indicate assaults on Palestinians in nearby agricultural corridors between Jurish and Aqraba, involving physical violence and intimidation. Together, these incidents illustrate how settlement expansion is often intertwined with direct pressure on local populations, affecting safety, mobility, and access to land (B'Tselem, 2025).

2. Qusra

Location:

Nablus Governorate, northern West Bank, located east of the central Nablus urban area and adjacent to Jurish, with agricultural lands extending into surrounding hills and valleys.

Overview:

Qusra is an agricultural Palestinian village with a long tradition of farming olives, cereals, and other field crops. The local economy is heavily reliant on land-based livelihoods, livestock rearing, and seasonal agricultural labour. The community faces persistent challenges linked to occupation-related restrictions, including limited access to family lands located in Area C, daily movement constraints, and recurring incidents of settler harassment or violence, particularly during planting and harvest seasons. These challenges undermine agricultural productivity, constrain economic opportunities, and heighten protection concerns for farming families.

Demographic Profile: [3]

Indicator	Data
Population (2025)	6359 residents
Access to Water	Connected to the public water network
Access to Electricity	Connected to the public electricity grid
Agriculture	Olives, cereals, fodder crops, livestock

Settler Activities (2023-2025)

[3] *Population estimates 2023 | Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS). Pcbs.gov.ps.* https://www.pcbs.gov.ps/statisticsIndicatorsTables.aspx?lang=en&table_id=698

Settlement-related violence in Qusra has taken recurrent and often organized forms, particularly in agricultural and residential areas at the edges of the village. Documented incidents indicate that settlers have repeatedly entered areas south of the village, confronting farmers and attacking residents while they were working on their land. In one such episode, several villagers were injured during clashes after settlers attacked farmers, including injuries from stones and rubber-coated bullets. These attacks occurred in spaces central to local livelihoods, reinforcing the vulnerability of agricultural activity and limiting safe access to farmland (WAFA News Agency, 2023).

Human rights documentation and video evidence further show that settler incursions into Qusra have included direct assaults on homes and populated areas, sometimes involving coordinated group entry and violent confrontation with residents. Reports describe settlers entering the vicinity of the village, attacking civilians and property, and creating a sustained atmosphere of intimidation. When viewed alongside recorded footage of confrontations and testimonies collected by rights organizations, these incidents suggest a persistent pattern of pressure associated with settlement expansion, where violence, land access restrictions, and physical intimidation intersect to reshape the security environment in and around the village (B'Tselem, 2024; WAFA News Agency, 2023).

Methodology and Approach

Given the integrated nature of the intervention, which combined land and livelihood protection (agricultural rehabilitation, fencing, and Cash-for-Work), community-based protection and disaster risk reduction, and psychosocial, legal, and child-focused support, the evaluation methodology was designed to capture both material and social dimensions of change. Data collection tools were therefore selected and adapted to:

- Assess changes in access to land, livelihood assets, and short-term economic security
- Examine community-level protection practices, risk awareness, and coordination mechanisms
- Capture changes in psychosocial well-being, resistance capacity, and legal awareness among women and children
- Document institutional, governance, and coordination dynamics shaping implementation
- Explore cross-cutting effects related to gender, child protection, participation, and dignity

The evaluation applied a **mixed-methods approach**, using a purposive and stratified sampling strategy to capture both quantitative perceptions at beneficiary level and in-depth qualitative insights from key stakeholders, service providers, and community actors. Quantitative data were used to support and validate qualitative findings rather than as a standalone measure of impact, in recognition of the complexity and contextual sensitivity of protection and psychosocial outcomes.

Data Collection Methods

The evaluation methodology included the following components:

- Review of project documents, Logical Frameworks, technical and narrative reports, and MEAL documentation
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with implementing partners, local authorities, protection committee members, school staff, and service providers
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with farmers, women beneficiaries, caregivers, and community members in Qusra and Jurish
- Beneficiary questionnaire covering relevance, timeliness, satisfaction, perceived outcomes, and protection and livelihood effects

An analytical framework in the form of an **evaluation matrix** guided data collection and analysis, linking evaluation questions, indicators, data sources, and methods. Findings were analyzed thematically and triangulated across data sources, components, and locations to strengthen the robustness and credibility of evaluation judgments (see Annex 1).

Annex 2 contains the data collection tools and the lists of interviewees and focus group participants.

Limitations

- The data collection process was affected by the very slow issuance of formal authorization from the Ministry of Education, which was required to allow researchers to conduct interviews with school counsellors, teachers, and students.
- In some cases, project beneficiary lists were found to be inaccurate, which limited the ability to conduct systematic beneficiary verification and cross-checking between project records and survey or interview responses.
- PSCCW did not provide the evaluation team with the names of beneficiaries who participated in certain psychosocial support sessions, in order to protect the privacy and confidentiality of beneficiaries. While this approach is ethically justified, it limited the evaluators' ability to independently verify participation, follow up with specific individuals, or link monitoring data to survey and interview responses.
- Families did not cooperate in arranging a focus group discussion with beneficiary students, which restricted direct qualitative input from students and required greater reliance on counsellors' perspectives.

Evaluation Findings against Evaluation Questions

Section 1: Relevance

To what extent is the intervention aligned with the needs of the target population?

The intervention is highly aligned with the priority needs of the target population in Jurish and Qusra. Its design closely reflects the needs identified in the Updated South-East Nablus Assessment and the AWRAD Humanitarian Needs Assessment, which highlight interconnected livelihood insecurity, land-related protection risks, psychosocial distress, and restricted access to rights.

The PARC component addresses land and livelihood vulnerabilities through land rehabilitation, access improvement, fencing, and cash-for-work linked to productive assets, while the PSCCW component responds to psychosocial, gender, and child-protection needs through MHPSS, legal awareness, and community- and school-based activities. The complementarity between the two components enables an integrated, multi-sectoral response aligned with beneficiaries lived realities.

This strong design alignment is confirmed by primary data: 76% of respondents rated the intervention as a high priority for them, and perceptions of timeliness were similarly positive. Qualitative evidence further indicates broad consensus among beneficiaries and local stakeholders that the intervention addressed urgent needs.

"The project came to me at a time when I was going through a very difficult period; I was broke, and thank God it came at a time when I needed it." (Questionnaire, Qusra)

"The psychological, security, and economic pressures that families are experiencing have directly affected students. Since the outbreak of the war, levels of violence in schools in the area have increased noticeably, which underscores the need for interventions of this kind." (Psychosocial Counselor, Qusra)

How well does the project align with humanitarian principles and international human rights law (IHL, IHRL)?

The intervention is broadly consistent with humanitarian principles and reflects a rights-based protection orientation in its design and delivery (OCHA, 2022). In line with the principle of humanity, activities prioritized reducing harm and safeguarding dignity by supporting psychosocial well-being and enabling continued access to livelihoods under coercive conditions. Impartiality was operationalised through needs-based targeting and vulnerability criteria, including prioritisation of threatened lands and economically vulnerable households, rather than social or political status (OCHA, 2022). Risk-mitigation practices consistent with a do-no-harm approach were evident in adaptive implementation in higher-risk areas and the use of locally trusted community structures to deliver services in accessible and socially accepted settings.

The intervention's objectives and modalities are consistent with protections and rights reflected in relevant international humanitarian and human rights frameworks for civilians living under occupation. The land rehabilitation, fencing, and livelihood-support activities are consistent with the protection of civilian property and the welfare of the occupied population under international humanitarian law (ICRC, 1949). They also relate to the right to an adequate standard of living and the means of subsistence, including through access to productive resources, as reflected in international human rights law (United Nations, 1966; CESCR, 1999). The PSCCW component further aligns in intent with international standards on gender equality and protection from discrimination (United Nations, 1979) and with child rights obligations to protect children from physical and psychological harm (United Nations, 1989).

Was the context adequate to inform the project design?

The project design was adequately and appropriately informed by the operating context, as reflected in the internal coherence of the Logical Framework and its systematic translation of contextual risks, vulnerabilities, and legal realities into objectives, results, indicators, and assumptions. The design demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the occupation-related environment in Qusra and Jurish, including land confiscation risks, settler violence, restricted access to resources, psychosocial distress, and weak protection mechanisms. These contextual factors are clearly embedded in the results framework, which links land and livelihood protection, community protection and disaster risk reduction, and the psychosocial well-being of women and children to the lived realities of the target population.

The assumptions and risk hypotheses further show that key contextual constraints—such as political instability, movement restrictions, gender norms, and institutional barriers—were identified at the design stage and explicitly incorporated into the project logic. At the same time, while the logical framework demonstrates strong contextual awareness, several assumptions—particularly those related to stability, access, absence of land confiscation of targeted plots—reflect the inherent difficulty of fully anticipating the intensity and volatility of the operating environment.

> *"Everything here can change suddenly. One day the land is accessible, the next day it is closed or attacked. You cannot plan for this fully." (KII – Local council representative, Qusra)*

At the level of design articulation, while the project was grounded in a strong contextual analysis, the Logical Framework does not always present a sufficiently explicit causal pathway linking activities, results, and the Specific Objective. In particular, some indicators under the Specific Objective describe broad intended end-states rather than measurable signs of progress that can be credibly attributed to the project within its timeframe. This creates partial overlap between outcome-level change and longer-term impact ambitions, which weakens the clarity of the results chain.

For example, the indicator "The process of transforming the policies and practices of Occupying Powers that allow ongoing violations of IHL/IHRL against the Palestinian population under occupation is promoted by month 12" expresses a high-level ambition but is difficult to operationalize and measure as a project-level indicator. A more suitable formulation would focus on observable contribution signals, such as documented protection cases submitted through formal channels, advocacy outputs produced and shared with duty-bearers, and evidence of institutional engagement or follow-up. This would strengthen the logical alignment between project outputs, intermediate outcomes, and the Specific Objective without altering the project's strategic intent.

Conclusions

- The intervention is highly relevant to the priority needs of communities in Jurish and Qusra.
- The project demonstrates strong alignment with humanitarian principles and with IHL and IHRL, particularly in relation to dignity, protection of livelihoods, and legal awareness.
- The design was informed by a robust contextual analysis that explicitly recognized occupation-related risks.
- Several Logical Framework assumptions did not hold consistently during implementation, reflecting contextual volatility rather than design shortcomings.

Recommendations

- Explicitly plan for assumption failure by embedding adaptive pathways and contingency scenarios in project design for contexts affected by settler violence and military restrictions.
- Strengthen Logical Framework design by clearly distinguishing outputs, outcomes, and objectives and by using indicators that track progress toward higher-level change.

Section 2: Effectiveness

To what extent has the project achieved its objectives and expected results?

The project has achieved its objectives and expected results to a high extent, with strong delivery of planned outputs and immediate outcomes across both components.

Under the PARC component, all core livelihood, land-protection, and community-protection outputs were delivered as planned, including land rehabilitation, access improvement, fencing, agricultural inputs, Cash-for-Work, and the establishment and operation of the Community Protection Committee and DRR mechanisms. While some protection-related activities, particularly formal documentation and dissemination of IHL and IHRL violations (A11 in the ToR), qualitative evidence confirms that risk monitoring and information-sharing nevertheless took place through community networks, supporting awareness and response at local level.

Under the PSCCW component, results were achieved at or above planned targets, with women's protection and psychosocial support activities substantially exceeding output targets and full achievement of child protection and psychosocial objectives.

Implementation-level achievements are broadly supported by primary data. Survey results show that 67% of respondents assessed the project as highly successful in achieving its objectives, and a further 20% rated achievement as moderate.

"The land was exposed and neglected. After the project, it became cultivated and protected. Even if it is not yet productive, it is no longer abandoned." (KII – Farmer, Qusra)

"The activities succeeded in reaching the students at a deep level." (Psychosocial Counsellor, Jurish)

"The school was previously classified as having a high rate of violent behavior, but during the semester in which the project was implemented, no disciplinary councils were recorded." (Psychosocial Supervisor, Qusra)

What factors facilitated or hindered the achievement of results?

The achievement of results was facilitated by effective coordination with local actors, which enhanced acceptance and trust. As one Protection Committee member noted: *"Because the committee is from the village, people listen and cooperate."*

"Because the sessions were held through the association and linked with the school and counsellors, participation was easier and more accepted." (FGD, Women Beneficiaries, Qusra)

Key enablers included the involvement of local councils and community structures, the integration of Cash-for-Work with productive land rehabilitation, all of which supported timely and effective delivery under constrained conditions.

At the same time, results were constrained by structural political and security conditions in Area C, including settler violence and limited access. In response, implementation required geographic adjustments. While the intervention was designed to prioritize agricultural lands in Area C, survey data indicate that only 62% of supported lands were reported by beneficiaries to be located in Area C.

The limited duration and scale of support, particularly Cash-for-Work, effectively delivered short-term income relief in line with its intended purpose; however, beneficiaries indicated that its economic benefit was very limited and did not result in a meaningful change in their overall situation.

"The opportunity helped me meet my family's basic needs, but only for a short time—just four days. There was no real change in my situation." (KII – Cash-for-Work beneficiary, Qusra)

For psychosocial and education-related activities, access restrictions and institutional limitations affected scheduling and delivery modalities, while uneven parental participation and operational challenges moderated the depth of engagement.

How effective and reliable were the mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating progress?

Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were moderately effective and partially reliable. They were sufficient for tracking implementation progress and aggregate outputs, but less robust at the beneficiary level and for assessing outcome quality, compliance, and sustainability.

Under the PARC component, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were generally effective in tracking implementation progress through regular technical reporting and systematic monitoring of planned activities. Quantitative data on land rehabilitation, access roads, fencing, agricultural inputs, and Cash-for-

Work were consistently reported and, in many cases, could be physically verified at field level, which strengthened the overall reliability of output reporting.

At the same time, evidence from beneficiary lists and follow-up notes highlights important limitations in monitoring depth and control. Several cases point to limitations in post-distribution follow-up, including reports that some agricultural inputs were not fully used as intended. The selection of Cash-for-Work participants was largely delegated to landowners on whose plots the activities were implemented. This approach had a practical rationale, as landowners are typically familiar with local labor availability and skill levels and could facilitate rapid mobilization and shared responsibility for implementation. However, there was limited evidence of a systematic mechanism to verify that selected workers consistently belonged to the intended target group of individuals most in need of employment opportunities.

Findings also indicate discrepancies between project records and beneficiary self-reporting in a few Cash-for-Work cases. In some accounts, individuals were listed as participants even though they did not report having participated, while others confirmed participation but indicated that the number of workdays completed was fewer than those recorded in project documentation. These issues suggest that while the modality supported efficient implementation at field level, beneficiary-level verification and follow-up mechanisms could be further strengthened.

Under the PSCCW component, monitoring mechanisms were more developed at the level of immediate outcomes, particularly for child-focused psychosocial interventions. The use of standardized pre- and post-assessment tools, complemented by facilitator observation and qualitative feedback from children, parents, and teachers, enabled measurement of short-term changes in psychosocial well-being. Reliability was further strengthened through triangulation across multiple data sources and the use of a standardized intervention framework. At the same time, monitoring data were collected entirely by implementing staff, with no indication of independent verification, and focused on changes measured immediately after intervention delivery. The absence of longitudinal follow-up limits the ability to assess the sustainability of observed psychosocial changes, and findings are reliable for participating groups but not intended to be generalizable. For activities involving direct psychosocial support, particularly the students' group therapy sessions, monitoring and evaluation were more robust and reliable. These activities were supported by standardized pre- and post-evaluation tools, facilitator observations, and qualitative feedback from children, parents, and teachers, allowing for internal triangulation and assessment of short-term outcome-level change. By contrast, for advocacy-oriented activities, monitoring mechanisms were primarily output- and process-focused. In these cases, monitoring reliably confirmed that planned activities were implemented and outputs delivered, but did not include clearly defined outcome-level. As a result, the reliability of monitoring data for assessing effectiveness and change beyond completion is more limited for these activities.

To what extent have lessons learned and recommendations from previous GVA-funded projects have been incorporated into implementation?

This assessment is based on a comparison between key recommendations and lessons documented in previous GVAS-funded projects and the actual implementation practices observed in the current intervention. Overall, incorporation was moderate and mainly through implementation practices rather than through formal learning or documentation mechanisms.

Both PARC and PSCCW built on accumulated operational experience from earlier GVA-funded and similar interventions in South-East Nablus. This is reflected in the continued use of community-based mechanisms and trusted local institutions—such as village councils, women's associations, schools, and protection committees—as primary entry points during implementation.

In particular, PSCCW applied lessons related to integrating psychosocial support with protection and rights-based approaches, implementing activities through combined group sessions, individual follow-up, awareness-raising on rights, and referrals, rather than stand-alone counselling.

Overall, incorporation was uneven: practice-oriented lessons were more consistently applied, while institutional, procedural, and monitoring-related recommendations were only partially addressed.

Participatory practices were incorporated during implementation through ongoing consultations with landowners, women's groups, schools, and local committees. Beneficiaries reported involvement in adjusting activity modalities, identifying priority lands, and shaping session topics and schedules.

Legal awareness was successfully expanded beyond women. Of the 34 participants in legal awareness sessions, 13 were men, reflecting deliberate outreach to broader community groups during implementation.

Gender-sensitive implementation practices—such as holding sessions within villages, agreeing on suitable timing, and using female facilitators—supported participation. However, additional logistical measures (e.g. childcare) were not systematically applied, limiting deeper inclusion of more vulnerable women.

Monitoring and data continuity lessons were weakly incorporated. While activity-level monitoring occurred, tools were not standardised across components, and staff transitions constrained systematic learning.

Conflict sensitivity and environmental considerations were implicitly incorporated through implementation practices, including prioritizing threatened lands, adapting activities in high-risk areas, and coordinating with protection actors, despite the absence of formal assessments.

Post-implementation reflection mechanisms were limited or absent, with no structured youth pathways or documented community reflection meetings following implementation.

Conclusions

- The project achieved its expected results to a high extent at the level of planned outputs and immediate outcomes across both PARC and PSCCW components.
- Primary data confirm tangible improvements, including improved land access and use, reduced land abandonment, short-term income relief, enhanced psychosocial coping, and strengthened community protection practices.
- Effectiveness was facilitated by coordination with local councils and community structures, adaptive delivery modalities, and integration of Cash-for-Work with productive land rehabilitation. While political and security conditions in Area C were the main hindering factors.
- Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were moderately effective and partially reliable.
- Lessons from previous GVS-funded projects informed implementation practices and community engagement, but institutionalized learning, standardized monitoring tools, and data continuity were only partially addressed.

Recommendations

- Systematize learning from previous project cycles by documenting lessons learned and explicitly linking them to design, targeting, and monitoring decisions.
- Strengthening safeguards against role overlap and conflicts of interest through clearer separation of oversight, decision-making, and beneficiary roles.
- Improve beneficiary-level monitoring and verification through clearer documentation, cross-checks, and limited follow-up.
- Strengthen outcome and sustainability monitoring by complementing output tracking with simple outcome indicators and light post-intervention follow-up.
- Adopt a shared monitoring framework across partners, including light but structured tracking mechanisms for advocacy, response, and awareness activities, using simple tools to document actions undertaken, reach and participation (who was engaged, how often, and through which channels), and immediate effects in a manner feasible under access and security constraints.

Section 3: Efficiency

Were project resources (financial, human, logistical) used efficiently to achieve results?

Project resources were used efficiently to achieve the planned results, with a strong alignment between financial, human, and logistical inputs and the outputs delivered across both project components, despite implementation in a highly restrictive and volatile context.

Under the PARC component, the integration of Cash-for-Work with land rehabilitation activities constituted a cost-efficient design and implementation choice. This approach reduced the need for parallel livelihood assistance mechanisms while simultaneously providing short-term income support and contributing to the rehabilitation and protection of productive land assets, thereby maximizing the utility of resources. While the design choice was cost-efficient at an aggregate level, implementation-level targeting and verification gaps reduce confidence in beneficiary-level efficiency and highlight the need for strengthened controls in future cycles.

Under the PSCCW component, most core outputs exceeded targets without budget increases or reprogramming. This suggests a strong conversion of inputs into delivered outputs under the reporting framework used.

Efficiency was further enhanced through the use of existing local infrastructure, including schools, community centers, and women's associations, which enabled the delivery of psychosocial support and awareness activities without incurring additional infrastructure or logistical costs. The reliance on locally based facilitators and established community venues also reduced operational overheads and supported timely implementation.

Overall, available evidence from project documentation, beneficiary assessments, and qualitative findings suggests that resources were used in a cost-conscious and results-oriented manner, achieving planned outputs with limited waste and reasonable operational trade-offs given the external constraints.

Was the intervention implemented in a timely manner?

The intervention was implemented in a timely manner, with activities delivered largely in accordance with the planned implementation schedule and within the agreed timeframe, despite significant contextual disruptions.

Under the PARC component, implementation broadly adhered to the timeline set out in the project design. Activities were implemented within their foreseen periods. Following the deterioration of the operating context after October 2023, certain activities were adaptively re-sequenced, as documented in the approved communication of non-substantial change. These adjustments were introduced to address constraints and did not result in extensions to the project duration, budget overruns, or cancellation of planned outputs.

Similarly, under the PSCCW component, planned activities were implemented and completed within the original project timeframe. While reports document scheduling disruptions due to movement restrictions and security incidents, and limitations on access to schools, these delays were managed through rescheduling, relocation of sessions, or implementation outside regular school hours.

Were project resources adequate to achieve the results?

Project resources were adequate for achieving immediate and short-term results, particularly under the PSCCW component, where beneficiaries reported high satisfaction with the organisation, timing, and delivery of psychosocial, legal, and awareness-raising activities. Both quantitative and qualitative evidence indicate that resources were sufficient to support meaningful engagement and immediate psychosocial outcomes. Perceptions of session duration and frequency were positive, with 36% rating adequacy to a large extent and 55% to a moderate extent. Across indicators related to clarity of procedures, timing, and location, negative assessments consistently remained below 10%.

"The sessions were well organised, the timing was suitable, and the place was close to our homes. Everything was clear and easy to follow." (FGD, women beneficiaries, Qusra)

"The facilitator explained things calmly, and the group size was appropriate. We were able to benefit fully from the sessions." (KII, woman participant, Jurish)

In contrast, resources allocated to agricultural and livelihood activities under the PARC component were perceived as only partially adequate. While inputs provided valuable support, beneficiaries reported that they covered only part of actual needs.

"The project helped, but I had to complete most of the work at my own expense." (KII, farmer, Qusra)

"The work helped us for a few days, but after that the situation went back to how it was." (KII, worker, Jurish)

Conclusions

- Project resources were used efficiently, with strong alignment between inputs and delivered outputs across both components despite severe constraints.
- Cost-efficient design choices maximized resource utility under the PARC component.
- PSCCW achieved high efficiency, with outputs meeting or exceeding targets without additional budget allocations.
- Use of existing local infrastructure and facilitators reduced logistical costs and supported timely delivery.
- Aggregate efficiency exceeded beneficiary-level efficiency, particularly under PARC, due to targeting and verification gaps.
- Timely, adaptive implementation helped avoid cost overruns and output losses.
- Resource adequacy varied: sufficient for psychosocial activities, but only partially adequate for livelihood and land-based needs.

Recommendations

- Strengthen beneficiary-level targeting and verification, especially for Cash-for-Work and agricultural support.
- Maintain cost-efficient delivery models, including linking short-term support to productive assets and using existing community infrastructure.
- Improve post-activity verification to confirm appropriate use of resources.

Section 4: Impact

What positive or negative, intended, or unintended effects has the project had on beneficiaries?

The project generated clear positive intended effects for beneficiaries, particularly in improved psychosocial well-being, perceived safety, dignity, and short-term livelihood support. Survey results show that 60–75% of beneficiaries reported positive changes across key impact indicators, with negative perceptions remaining below 10%. Qualitative evidence confirms reduced stress, greater emotional stability, enhanced agency, and partial restoration of land use and livelihood activities.

"Before the fencing, the land was exposed. Now I feel more reassured, even if the risk has not disappeared completely." (KII, farmer, Qusra)

"When the land is cultivated and fenced, you feel more attached to it and more responsible for protecting it." (FGD, farmers, Qusra)

"After the land was rehabilitated, it became an almost permanent presence for us" (KII, farmer, Jurish)

"After the sessions, I became calmer. I learned how to control my reactions and reduce tension inside the house." (FGD, women beneficiaries, Qusra)

"The sessions helped us release pressure. Just sitting together and talking made a difference." (KII, woman beneficiary, Jurish)

"The project's effect is clear: levels of violence and bullying inside the school have decreased." (Psychosocial Supervisor, Qusra)

An intended, secondary effect of the intervention, arising from its group-based and community-centered design, was the strengthening of community interaction and mutual support.

"The meetings and activities brought people together and strengthened relationships in the village." (FGD, Jurish)

At the same time, the durability of some outcomes was shaped by the broader protection environment, including incidents affecting access to land and the safety of rehabilitated assets. In some cases, these conditions limit beneficiaries' ability to maintain or benefit from project-supported improvements over time, despite the adequacy of implementation and resource use.

"We did not benefit because settlers removed the fencing and destroyed the trees." (Open-ended survey response, farmer, Qusra)

"After rehabilitation, the land was taken by settlers, despite the goal of protecting it." (Open-ended survey response, farmer, Jurish)

How has the intervention strengthened coordination and working relationships between local organizations and public institutions?

The intervention strengthened practical, community-level coordination between local civil society organizations and public or semi-public institutions, particularly municipalities, village councils, schools, and women's associations. Activities were implemented through existing public and community structures, reinforcing day-to-day collaboration and mutual trust.

Municipalities and village councils and women's associations played active roles in identifying priorities, verifying beneficiaries, facilitating access to public spaces, and coordinating with protection committees, which enhanced operational coherence.

"The project did not work separately from the council. Activities were coordinated with us, and this strengthened cooperation between the municipality, the committees, and the implementing organizations." (KII, municipal representative, Jurish)

"The council and the protection committee became one body in practice. Coordination improved because everyone had a role." (KII, Protection Committee member, Jurish)

"We now communicate regularly with the Civil Liaison Office and the Military Liaison Office and send them the violations that we document. Previously, I did not even know that a Military Liaison Office existed." (KII, CPC member, Jurish)

Within the psychosocial and awareness components, coordination with schools, women's associations, and local service providers improved participation and acceptance, as sessions were hosted in recognized institutions and aligned with existing counseling and community services.

"Because the sessions were held through the association and linked with the school and counsellors, participation was easier and more accepted." (FGD, women beneficiaries, Qusra)

How has the intervention contributed to the protection of the rights and dignity of the Palestinian people under occupation?

The intervention contributed to the protection of the rights and dignity of the Palestinian people under occupation primarily by reducing exposure to harm, reinforcing presence on land, strengthening psychosocial resilience, and supporting awareness of rights and collective coping mechanisms, in ways consistent with protection-oriented humanitarian principles.

Through agricultural rehabilitation, fencing, and land-use activities, the project supported beneficiaries' ability to remain present on and connected to their land, reinforcing rights related to livelihood, property, and family survival. In a context where abandonment of land increases the risk of dispossession, continued cultivation was repeatedly described by beneficiaries and local authorities as an act of dignity and non-violent resilience, even where external violations constrained outcomes.

"The project encouraged farmers to return to their land and not abandon it, even under threat."
(KII, municipal representative, Jurish)

While land-related gains were in some cases undermined by settler-related interference beyond the project's control, the intervention nonetheless contributed to dignity by enabling beneficiaries to exercise agency and maintain presence, rather than withdrawing in response to coercive conditions.

"Some beneficiaries had neglected their land, believing it would be confiscated sooner or later, but the project motivated them to re-engage with their land and strengthen their presence on it."
(KII, CPC member, Jurish)

Psychosocial support and awareness activities further strengthened dignity and agency, particularly among women, caregivers, and children, by reducing psychological distress, improving emotional stability, and enabling participants to express needs, concerns, and rights within their families and communities. Survey findings indicate that approximately 60–75% of respondents reported improved feelings of safety, coping capacity, or resilience, reflecting perceived contributions to psychosocial well-being and protection.

Finally, the intervention contributed to rights protection by enhancing awareness of legal rights, reporting pathways, and non-violent protective responses, and by supporting community-level mechanisms that promote mutual support and collective action. These elements strengthened beneficiaries' capacity to understand and assert their rights, even within a highly constrained protection environment.

"After the sessions, I became calmer, more confident, and able to speak about my rights."
(FGD, women beneficiaries, Qusra)

Has the project led to any structural or long-term changes in the community?

Yes, to a limited but meaningful extent, the project has led to emerging structural and longer-term changes at the community level. These changes are most evident in the institutionalization of community-based protection mechanisms, strengthened coordination between local actors and public institutions, and gradual shifts in social norms—particularly among women—related to confidence, communication, and rights awareness. While these changes go beyond short-term service delivery and show potential to persist beyond the project period, their consolidation and sustainability remain constrained by the broader protection environment and ongoing access and security risks.

"It was not socially acceptable in the village for women to participate in activities held at the village council. Now, this has become socially accepted." (KII, Feminist Association representative, Jurish)

"I was a psychosocial counsellor during the project, and now I am a supervisor. I work to transfer the experience and skills I gained through the project to the counsellors I supervise

in 21 schools."
(Psychosocial counsellor, Jurish)

What broader strategic impacts has the project generated within the AG framework?

Within the AG framework, the project's broader strategic impact was to strengthen and operationalise the consortium's integrated, rights-based approach by translating the Strategy's protection mandate into a coherent package that combined land and livelihood support, community protection and DRR functions, and psychosocial and rights-awareness interventions. This reinforced the practical value of the AG model through complementarity and sequencing across partners, in line with the Overall Programmatic Evaluation Report's emphasis on identifying intersections between partners' activities and delivering complementary interventions for the same beneficiary groups. The project also contributed to an AG-wide shift toward a more shared strategic logic and more consistent performance management, aligning with the report's call to adopt or refine a common Theory of Change and logical framework that links all Strategy components. Finally, implementation under severe access and security constraints highlighted the strategic importance of further consolidating the consortium and strengthening coordination between the Palestinian partners and ACPP at all levels, consistent with the recommendations of the Overall Programmatic Evaluation Report (AWRAD, 2022).

Conclusion

- The intervention produced positive effects in psychosocial well-being, dignity, and short-term livelihoods.
- The intervention strengthened practical coordination by operating through existing local institutions and improving day-to-day collaboration at the community level.
- It strengthened practical coordination by operating through existing local institutions and improving day-to-day collaboration at the community level.
- It contributed to limited but meaningful longer-term changes, particularly in community protection practices and acceptance of women's participation.

Recommendations

- Build on shifts in social norms—especially regarding women's participation—through targeted leadership, advocacy, and community dialogue initiatives.
- Extend psychosocial and caregiver support beyond short project cycles, with follow-up sessions to consolidate behavioral and emotional improvements.
- Strengthen institutional linkages to connect psychosocial support and rights-based activities with national social protection and gender equality frameworks, including referral pathways for vulnerable households, women, and children, and mechanisms to sustain and scale gender-responsive community practices beyond the project lifecycle.

Section 5: Sustainability and Connectivity

To what extent does the intervention consider the long-term sustainability of the results?

The intervention demonstrates moderate and uneven consideration of long-term sustainability, with clearer sustainability pathways for community-based protection and psychosocial outcomes than for land-based and livelihood interventions, which remain highly dependent on external protection conditions.

On the one hand, the project incorporated community-level mechanisms intended to support continuity, including rehabilitated infrastructure (agricultural roads) and the establishment of Protection Committee. Qualitative evidence indicates that some of these mechanisms continue to function beyond the project period through ongoing coordination with village councils and informal early-warning and referral

practices. As one committee member noted: *"The Protection Committee is still active. People know who to contact, and coordination with the council continues." (KII, Protection Committee member, Jurish).* However, survey data suggest that awareness and connectivity to these mechanisms were not universal, indicating uneven reach within target communities. In the questionnaire, only **41%** of respondents reported that they had heard about the CPC formed in the Jurish. Awareness was even lower regarding the DRR plan, with only **32%** stating that they had heard about it.

Sustainability related to land and livelihood interventions was consistently described as fragile and conditional. Beneficiaries reported that that continuity of results depends heavily on the broader protection context, including movement restrictions and risks affecting access to and use of land, which are beyond the project's scope and control. These structural conditions limit the ability to maintain gains over time, even where rehabilitation was successfully completed.

"After rehabilitation, settlers came and destroyed everything. We could not protect what was done." (KII, farmer, Qusra).

The PSCCW component shows comparatively stronger sustainability potential, as it focused on building skills, coping strategies, and social practices that require minimal material inputs to continue. Women reported ongoing use of techniques learned during sessions, such as self-regulation and communication skills.

"The most important technique I learned was to take a deep breath before speaking in difficult situations."

"The skill I learned was to count to ten before responding." (KIIs, women beneficiaries, Jurish).

Sustainability was further supported by anchoring activities in trusted community spaces and by strengthened rights awareness and help-seeking behaviors:

"After the sessions, we became confident in our knowledge about our rights and how to claim them." (KII, woman beneficiary, Jurish).

"The project helped identify cases of female students who need care and follow-up. The school and the Directorate continue to follow up on these cases even after the project has ended."
(Psychosocial Counsellor, Jurish)

How well does the intervention integrate local structures and capacities for continuity?

Local structures and community-based capacities were meaningfully integrated into the implementation of the intervention, providing a foundation for continuity beyond the project period, albeit with varying depth across components.

At the local governance level, village councils and municipalities in both Qusra and Jurish were actively engaged throughout implementation. Their roles included supporting beneficiary identification and verification, facilitating access to public and community spaces (such as municipal halls, schools, and women's associations), and coordinating outreach at the village level.

Protection Committees were trained and integrated into the broader community response structure, with members taking active roles in risk monitoring and information dissemination.

Within the psychosocial support and awareness component, local community and institutional structures were integrated through partnerships with women's associations and schools. Sessions were delivered in locally recognised institutions, and coordination with school counsellors, association staff, and community leaders enhanced acceptance, accessibility, and follow-up.

"The committee is still working until today." (KII, Protection Committee Member, Jurish)

"The association is like a second home for women in the village. Holding the sessions there made it easier for women to attend and continue." (FGD, Women Beneficiaries, Jurish)

Has the project established mechanisms to ensure its continuation beyond the funding period?

The project established several practical, community-embedded mechanisms that can support continuation beyond the funding period, though these remain uneven across components and depend on the strength of local structures. At the community level, CPC continues to function through organized volunteer night-watch rotations, WhatsApp-based early-warning and information-sharing channels, and incident documentation practices with an established reporting chain through the village council focal point to relevant public bodies and protection-related entities (e.g. the Military Liaison Office and the colonization and wall resistance commission). These practices provide an operational foundation for continuity by sustaining local monitoring, coordination, and response capacity.

Within the psychosocial and awareness component, women's associations and other trusted community spaces continue to serve as platforms for informal follow-up, peer support, and the ongoing use of coping and communication skills acquired during the sessions. This form of "continuation by practice" does not rely on additional material inputs and is therefore more likely to persist over time.

"Even after the sessions ended, we kept meeting in the association and using what we learned at home." (FGD, women beneficiaries, Qusra)

For land-based activities, continuation mechanisms exist mainly at the level of beneficiary ownership, as rehabilitated plots and agricultural practices are maintained through local labor, knowledge, and household investment. However, the sustainability of these outcomes is partly influenced by access conditions and the broader protection environment, which can affect the ability of beneficiaries to maintain and use the rehabilitated assets consistently.

"The committee is still there, and the coordination with the council continues as before." (KII, CPC member, Jurish)

Overall, the project supported continuity by embedding activities within existing local structures and everyday practices rather than creating parallel systems, but the depth and durability of these mechanisms vary across intervention areas.

How will the outcomes of this project inform future strategic planning with the AG?

The project's outcomes can inform future AG strategic planning in several concrete ways:

- Rebalance the portfolio toward "protection-enabled livelihoods." Evidence that land-based gains are often reversible under settler violence and access restrictions implies that future AG strategies should systematically pair rehabilitation and agricultural inputs with protection mechanisms.
- Institutionalize community protection architecture as a core delivery channel. The continued functioning of the CPC and its coordination role suggests AG should mainstream CPC-like structures (with clear mandates, training, and linkages to councils and relevant bodies) as a sustainability pathway.
- Scale low-cost, high-retention psychosocial and rights-based modalities. PSCCW-type outcomes (coping skills, reduced household tension, increased confidence and help-seeking) are comparatively durable and can be scaled as a "minimum package" across AG programming, including through schools and women's associations.
- Prioritize "cumulative programming" in the same geographies. The added value came from iterative cycles in the same communities (learning, adaptation, sequencing). AG planning should adopt multi-cycle area-based frameworks.
- Strengthen outcome-level integration and joint measurement across partners. Practical complementarity existed, but joint outcome tracking was limited. Future AG planning should include shared indicators and a light joint learning agenda to evidence cross-partner effects.
- Clarify sustainability assumptions and plan for follow-up. Given the volatility, AG strategies should define sustainability as "maintained capacity and mechanisms" rather than guaranteed asset preservation.

Conclusion

- The intervention demonstrates moderate and uneven sustainability, with strong prospects for psychosocial and community-based protection outcomes, and positive but more context-dependent sustainability for land-based interventions, which are supported by beneficiaries' continued maintenance, improved land use practices, and local ownership, even as their long-term continuity remains influenced by external access and protection conditions
- Local structures were effectively integrated, supporting continuity at the community level.

Recommendations

- Organize regular, structured workshops for teachers and school management, linked to school action plans and counseling systems; to embed psychosocial and child-protection approaches into school operations.

Section 6: Participation and Stakeholder Engagement

To what extent were local communities, beneficiaries, and stakeholders involved in project design, planning, and implementation?

Local communities, beneficiaries, and stakeholders were meaningfully involved during implementation and adaptive planning, while their involvement in initial project design and selection of intervention modalities

was more limited. Participation was therefore strongest at the implementation level, moderate during activity-level planning, and weaker at the design stage.

Participation during implementation (strong involvement)

Qualitative evidence indicates that beneficiaries and local stakeholders were actively involved in shaping how activities were implemented, particularly under land-based and psychosocial components.

"The protection committee and the council were involved from the beginning, especially in deciding locations and responding to risks." (KII, Protection Committee Member, Jurish)

"We were involved in choosing the type of crops and how the land would be worked." (KII, Farmer, Jurish)

Similarly, within the PSCCW component, women beneficiaries reported a high degree of participation in shaping session content, discussion themes, and delivery modalities. Facilitators actively solicited feedback and adapted sessions based on participants lived experiences:

"They always asked us what topics we wanted to discuss, and we suggested issues that concern us." (FGD, Women Beneficiaries, Qusra)

"The sessions were built on our experiences. Women talked about their lives, and the discussion followed that." (FGD, Women Beneficiaries, Jurish)

This indicates strong participatory practice at the activity level, particularly in psychosocial and awareness interventions.

Participation in design and planning (more limited involvement)

At the same time, beneficiaries consistently noted that core intervention modalities were largely predefined, with limited scope to influence overall project design or the type of assistance offered. While beneficiaries could influence *how* activities were implemented, they had less influence over *what* activities were selected:

"I was not consulted on whether my land needed fencing or retaining walls. The announcement was only for fencing, and I had no option to choose."(KII, Farmer, Qusra)

"The project was already designed. We participated in how to implement it, not in deciding what the project would be." (KII, Farmer, Jurish)

These statements reflect a consultative rather than co-design approach. However, concerns were raised regarding transparency in land selection, with some respondents expressing perceptions of favoritism.

This suggests that participatory mechanisms were not always perceived as sufficiently inclusive or accountable at the decision-making level.

"It is necessary to have transparency, especially in selecting the lands that will be supported and go through screening, because although there is funding and support, sometimes it goes through favoritism." (Questionnaire respondent, Qusra)

"It targeted specific individuals, and the selection of workers was not fair; there was neither transparency nor equity in the process." (Questionnaire respondent, Qusra)

"Look at the family names of the beneficiaries and you will see favoritism." (KII, Farmer, Qusra)

Conclusion

Local communities, beneficiaries, and stakeholders were strongly engaged during implementation and activity-level adaptation, particularly in land-use modalities and psychosocial session content. Participation was uneven, with limited influence over initial project design and predefined intervention choices.

Recommendations

- Move beyond consultative participation by creating structured feedback loops that allow communities and committees to influence adjustments to intervention modalities during implementation.
- Strengthen participatory governance during implementation by formalizing transparent criteria and community validation mechanisms

Section 7: Coordination and Harmonization

How effective was internal coordination among ACPP, PARC, and PSCCW, as AG members, in ensuring coherent planning and complementary implementation?

Internal coordination among ACPP, PARC, and PSCCW was effective and characterized by complementary planning, shared community entry points, and aligned implementation in the same locations. Coordination practices included joint identification of target areas, discussion of needs prior to implementation, and engagement with overlapping beneficiary groups and local structures, particularly women's groups and CPS.

"We work in integrated coordination; not each organization works alone… we go together to identify needs, and when selecting locations under a project or funding, we discuss together which sites to choose and who we will work with." (PSCCW representative, KII)

Coordination occurred through shared activities and beneficiary engagement, especially in relation to women-focused workshops and rights awareness sessions implemented in parallel.

"Coordination happens between us and them… beneficiaries or the CPC were shared between us… the workshops related to women or human rights were coordinated with them because they formed a women's group for the project… they support us in these workshops and trainings, and vice versa." (PARC representative, KII)

While no formal case referrals between partners were activated during this specific project, existing referral practices were reported to be used in other projects when relevant, indicating an operational relationship that extends beyond a single project.

Overall, coordination was primarily practical and implementation-oriented, rooted in shared planning discussions, co-location, and complementary engagement with the same communities.

Is the intervention consistent with other projects in the sector and the region?

The intervention is broadly consistent with prevailing approaches in the West Bank, particularly Area C, where livelihood responses frequently combine short-term relief modalities with measures intended to protect or restore productive assets under access and protection constraints (OCHA, 2023). The intervention is also consistent with West Bank protection practice, where actors increasingly rely on remote or adapted modalities, integrating MHPSS, case management, and protection risk-mitigation messaging to remain operational amid movement and access constraints (Protection Cluster, 2025).

How well was the intervention coordinated with other humanitarian and development initiatives in the region?

The intervention was well coordinated with other humanitarian and development initiatives at the operational and community levels, and strongly aligned with parallel sectoral and programmatic efforts in the same locations, even though it was not embedded in formal inter-agency coordination platforms.

The intervention implemented through existing local structures, including village councils, schools, women's associations, and protection committees. These structures often served as shared platforms through which multiple actors operated in parallel or sequentially.

Both implementing partners have been working continuously in the same communities since 2023, addressing different but interrelated dimensions of vulnerability.

Under the PARC component, engagement with the ministry of Agriculture supported alignment with sectoral priorities and existing agricultural initiatives.

As evidence of coordination, the PSCCW component was implemented in the same communities and during the same period as a women-focused agricultural and livelihood initiative supported by PARC under a parallel project. The geographic overlap and sequencing created practical complementarity, whereby psychosocial support and awareness activities helped address social and psychological barriers that affect women's participation in livelihood and community-based interventions. However, there was little evidence of systemic collaboration with broader humanitarian coordination platforms.

How effectively does the project promote synergies among ACPP, PHG, PARC, PSCCW, and other AG partners?

The project demonstrated moderately effective inter-partner synergy, characterized by functional coordination and practical complementarity between PARC and PSCCW, primarily through shared management structures and co-located implementation. However, this synergy occurred with limited formal integration and no systematic joint outcome tracking across partners. Overall, synergies remained largely operational and informal, with limited evidence of joint planning beyond Project Management

Committee coordination, the use of shared outcome indicators to capture cross-partner effects, or the systematic documentation and consolidation of inter-partner learning.

To what extent does this project align with and contribute to the AG's area-based strategy in Southeast Nablus?

The project shows a strong level of alignment with, and a meaningful contribution to, the Action Group's area-based strategy in Southeast Nablus, both geographically and sectorally, and through its use of community-based protection and partnership approaches.

Geographically, the intervention is fully embedded within the AG's strategic shift toward southeast Nablus, where work has progressively expanded from initial assessments to sustained engagement in a defined cluster of communities, including Qusra and Jurish. By operating in two of the core target localities identified through the AG's needs assessment process, the project reinforces continuity and depth of presence in the same territory, which is a central pillar of the area-based model.

Sectorally, the project contributes directly to the AG's multi-sector strategy by addressing complementary dimensions of vulnerability. Land rehabilitation, agricultural support, and Cash-for-Work activities support agricultural livelihoods, food security, and protection of productive assets. In parallel, psychosocial support, rights awareness, and community-based protection mechanisms contribute to gender-sensitive protection, child and family well-being, and community resilience. Together, these elements reflect the AG's integrated focus on livelihoods, protection, and social support rather than isolated sectoral interventions.

The project also reinforces the AG's transversal approach centered on localization and institutional linkages. Implementation relied on partnerships between Palestinian CSOs and local public institutions, as well as on strengthening community-based protection structures. The continued functioning of CPCs, collaboration with village councils, and engagement with women's associations are consistent with the AG's strategy of building local capacities to identify risks, respond to threats, and participate in decision-making processes affecting their communities.

In addition, the project reflects the AG's Triple Nexus orientation by combining short-term humanitarian support with elements that contribute to resilience and longer-term stability. Livelihood and land-related support helped sustain access to resources under pressure, while psychosocial and protection components addressed underlying social stressors and strengthened coping capacities. The inclusion of women-focused activities and community dialogue spaces further aligns with the strategy's emphasis on strengthening the role of women and local actors in social cohesion and community-level peacebuilding processes.

Conclusions

- The intervention was largely consistent with sectoral approaches in the West Bank.
- Coordination with other initiatives was effective at the community and sectoral levels and alignment with public institutions.
- Synergies between PARC and PSCCW were moderately effective, reflected in co-location, sequencing of activities, and shared management through the Project Management Committee. However, synergies were largely operational, with limited formal integration or shared outcome tracking across partners.

The project was well aligned with the AG's area-based strategy in Southeast Nablus, reinforcing its geographic focus, multi-sector approach, and emphasis on community-based protection and localization.

Recommendations

- Build on existing practical coordination by documenting coordination arrangements, complementarities, and sequencing logic across partners to strengthen coherence and institutional memory.

- Introduce clear joint planning elements (e.g. shared outcome statements or cross-cutting indicators) to better capture and manage complementarities between agricultural, protection, and psychosocial components.
- Increase engagement with broader humanitarian coordination platforms at governorate or sector level to strengthen collective advocacy and learning.

Section 8: Cross-Cutting Priorities

To what extent did the intervention integrate environmental protection and disaster risk reduction (DRR)?

The intervention integrated environmental protection and disaster risk reduction (DRR) to a moderate and largely implicit extent, primarily through implementation practices rather than through formal frameworks or dedicated assessments.

On the environmental side, land-based activities implemented by PARC directly contributed to soil conservation, erosion reduction, and the protection of productive land from degradation. These measures supported more sustainable land use and reduced environmental vulnerability. Beneficiaries emphasized that rehabilitated lands were more resilient to environmental stressors, even where broader protection risks remained.

From a DRR perspective, the project applied context-sensitive and risk-aware implementation practice. These practices reduced exposure to harm and mitigated immediate risks for beneficiaries. Psychosocial support activities also contributed indirectly to DRR by strengthening individual and community preparedness to respond to shocks.

However, the integration of environmental protection and DRR was not formalized through documented environmental impact assessments, disaster risk analyses, or dedicated DRR indicators. As a result, while risk-sensitive and environmentally relevant actions were clearly present in implementation, they were applied pragmatically rather than within a structured environmental or DRR framework.

How well did the intervention incorporate cultural diversity and local knowledge?

The intervention incorporated cultural diversity and local knowledge to a strong extent.

Under the PSCCW component, cultural sensitivity was intentionally embedded in facilitation approaches. Implementation teams demonstrated high contextual awareness by avoiding culturally sensitive terminology, selecting socially acceptable entry points (such as family wellbeing, parenting, and stress), and simplifying rights-based concepts without compromising their substance.

Under the PARC component, local knowledge was incorporated through engagement with farmers, village councils, and protection committee in identifying feasible work modalities. Agricultural interventions reflected local environmental conditions and community risk perceptions.

Across both components, activities were delivered through locally trusted structures, reinforcing cultural legitimacy and acceptance.

How well did the intervention promote women's empowerment and gender equality?

Under PSCCW, women's empowerment was a central and explicit objective. Psychosocial support, awareness sessions, and rights-based discussions contributed to strengthening women's self-confidence, voice, and agency within the household and community. FGDs with women in Qusra and Qusra consistently highlight improvements in women's ability to express opinions, manage stress, engage in dialogue rather than conflict, and seek support when needed. Several participants reported increased mobility and participation in community spaces, as well as greater willingness to claim rights related to education, protection, and family decision-making.

"We became more confident and stronger. Before, women were shy and afraid, but after the sessions, women started demanding their rights in many issues." (FGD, women beneficiaries, Qusra)

Conclusions

- The intervention integrated environmental protection and DRR to a moderate and largely implicit extent, mainly through practical and risk-aware implementation, rather than through formal environmental or DRR frameworks or indicators.
- Cultural diversity and local knowledge were strongly incorporated across both components.
- The intervention effectively promoted women's empowerment, especially through the PSCCW component.

Recommendation

- Build on psychosocial and awareness gains by linking women more systematically to livelihood opportunities, local institutions, and advocacy mechanisms that can translate empowerment into longer-term socio-economic change.

Section 9: Communication and Dissemination

Have project progress reports and lessons learned been effectively shared among stakeholders?

No, sharing of project progress reports and lessons learned among stakeholders was limited.

Progress reports were prepared and submitted exclusively to the funder. However, these reports and documented lessons learned were not systematically shared with other stakeholders.

While informal information exchange occurred during implementation, this exchange focused primarily on operational coordination rather than structured reflection, documentation of lessons learned, or collective learning. However, some forms of knowledge sharing did take place during implementation. For example, DRR plan were prepared in a participatory manner and shared locally.

Evaluation Dissemination Actions

In line with the Terms of Reference and AWRAD's commitment to accountability, learning, and transparency, this evaluation includes dedicated dissemination actions to ensure findings are accessible to stakeholders at the community, institutional, and donor levels.

Dissemination Channels and Activities

Dissemination of evaluation findings has been undertaken and/or planned through the following channels: direct sharing of executive summaries with ACPP and implementing partners via email and messaging platforms (e.g., WhatsApp); small-group feedback discussions with project staff and local stakeholders during or following data collection visits, where feasible; and planned sharing of evaluation outputs through organizational channels such as the AWRAD website or partner platforms.

Community Feedback and Validation

Consistent with participatory and human-rights-based evaluation principles, community feedback was integrated throughout the data collection process. During FGDs and KIIs, facilitators routinely

summarized key points and invited participants to confirm or clarify interpretations, ensuring accurate representation of community perspectives.

Due to time, access, and security constraints, formal community-level validation workshops were not systematically conducted. However, preliminary insights were informally discussed with local stakeholders and community representatives during field visits, contributing to the refinement of findings. To strengthen accountability and learning, evaluation findings — particularly the Arabic executive summary (See Annex 6) — will be shared with communities, village councils, and local institutions following report finalization, subject to ACPP's dissemination plan and contextual considerations.

Recommendations organized by entity

Recommendations for ACPP

- Adopt a multi-cycle, area-based approach in Qusra and Jurish that explicitly sequences interventions.
- Formalise duty-bearer engagement pathways (at minimum: Ministry of Agriculture; and where relevant Ministry of Social Development / Ministry of Women's Affairs) with clear roles for referrals, technical oversight, and continuity beyond the funding period.
- Standardise consortium M&E and handover protocols (templates, data continuity, roles) to reduce loss of institutional memory between project cycles.

Recommendations for Implementing Partners

- PSCCW: consolidate the most-retained MHPSS practices into a replicable package delivered through local venues, with light follow-up sessions to sustain gains.
- PSCCW: formalise referral pathways for cases needing longer-term support (women/children/high vulnerability) in coordination with councils, schools, and relevant services.
- PARC: Strengthen Cash-for-Work selection and verification processes by applying transparent eligibility criteria adapted to the local context, taking into account community size, availability of workers, nature of activities, and the role of local committees, while maintaining basic safeguards to ensure fairness and accountability.
- PARC: document and manage cases of role overlap (council/CPC members benefiting) through transparency, justification where unavoidable, and independent validation.
- Across partners: improve transparency and accountability in targeting (clear criteria, public announcement channels beyond social media, grievance/feedback mechanism, and documented screening minutes where appropriate).
- Across partners: Systematically document lessons and adaptations and share them through the PMC to enable cross-partner learning.

Recommendations for Community / Local Institutions

- Formalize community consultation procedures, including separate and inclusive spaces for women and youth.
- Establish feedback mechanisms that allow participants to shape and refine ongoing activities.
- Support training and leadership development for women within CPCs and local governance forums to ensure longer-term participation in decision-making.

Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

Criteria	Evaluation Question	Key Indicators	Data Sources	Methods
Relevance	To what extent is the intervention aligned with the needs of the target population?	Perceived priority of support (individual/household); perceived alignment with most urgent needs; perceived appropriateness of activities)	Questionnaire; KIIs (municipalities, CPC, farmers, women); FGDs (women, farmers/workers, students/caregivers); project docs	Quant analysis of survey items; thematic analysis of KIIs/FGDs; triangulation
	How well does the project align with humanitarian principles and international human rights law (IHL, IHRL)?	Perceived dignity/agency; do-no-harm perceptions; safe access and non-discrimination; rights awareness and help-seeking/referrals	KIIs; FGDs; open-ended survey narratives; training documentation	Qualitative thematic analysis; contribution logic
	Was the context adequate to inform the project design?	Evidence that targeting reflected risk/access constraints; appropriateness of target groups and locations; responsiveness to evolving context	KIIs; project docs; FGDs	Document review + KIIs; triangulate with beneficiary perspectives
Effectiveness	To what extent has the project achieved its objectives and expected results?	Self-reported benefits; perceived achievement of outputs/outcomes by component (PARC/PSCCW); target achievement against LF (where available)	Questionnaire; KIIs/FGDs; partner monitoring; progress reports	Survey analysis; results mapping; qualitative confirmation
	What factors facilitated or hindered the achievement of results?	Facilitators (local structures, trust, accessibility, sequencing); constraints (settler interference, access restrictions, resource scale, timing issues)	KIIs/FGDs; open-ended survey; incident narratives	Barrier/facilitator coding; comparative analysis by community/component

	How effective and reliable were the mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating progress?	Availability/consistency of tools; data continuity; feedback loops; use of findings for adaptive management	KIIs (IPs, PMC); doc review (M&E tools, reports)	Document review + KIIs
Efficiency	Were project resources (financial, human, logistical) used efficiently to achieve results?	Perceived organisation and process efficiency; delivery through existing venues; resource-to-output coherence; cost-saving modalities (where evidenced)	Questionnaire (process items); KIIs; partner monitoring/docs	Survey analysis + qualitative triangulation
	Was the intervention implemented in a timely manner?	Perceived timeliness; scheduling alignment with seasonal/protection context; delays in delivery/material collection (if evidenced)	Questionnaire; KIIs/FGDs; open-ended survey	Survey item analysis + qualitative confirmation
	Were project resources adequate to achieve the results?	Perceived adequacy of inputs (coverage vs needs); need for self-financing; adequacy of session duration/frequency; adequacy of staffing/logistics	Questionnaire + open-ended; KIIs/FGDs	Mixed-method synthesis; compare PARC vs PSCCW components
Impact	What positive or negative, intended, or unintended effects has the project had on beneficiaries?	Perceived safety/coping/access improvements; psychosocial changes; livelihood/land use restoration; unintended harms (renewed targeting/risk)	Questionnaire (impact perception items); open-ended narratives; KIIs/FGDs	Quant ranges + qualitative narratives; contribution framing
	How has the intervention strengthened coordination and working relationships between local organizations and public institutions?	Use of councils/schools/associations as delivery platforms; coordination practices; role clarity; trust and continuity	KIIs (municipalities, CPC, schools/associations); FGDs	Qualitative analysis; examples of coordination functions

	How has the intervention contributed to the protection of rights and dignity under occupation?	Maintaining presence on land; improved agency and rights awareness; safer coping/collective protection mechanisms; referrals/reporting pathways	KIIs/FGDs; open-ended survey; activity records	Contribution analysis; rights-based thematic coding
	Has the project led to any structural or long-term changes in the community?	Enduring practices (CPC continuity, norms shift); institutionalization (acceptable women participation, sustained coordination); durability constraints	KIIs; FGDs; observation from narratives	Qualitative analysis; plausibility assessment
Sustainability and Connectivity	To what extent does the intervention consider the long-term sustainability of the results?	Evidence of continuity pathways during implementation (local anchoring, skill-building, maintenance arrangements); beneficiary expectations	KIIs/FGDs; docs (handover/MOUs if any); survey (if items exist)	Qualitative-led synthesis; verify any survey items exactly
	How well does the intervention integrate local structures and capacities for continuity?	Engagement of councils/CPC/women's associations/schools; local volunteerism; embedding services in local venues	KIIs; FGDs; docs	Qualitative analysis with concrete examples
	Has the project established mechanisms to ensure continuation beyond funding?	Existence of CPC practices, referral pathways, maintenance roles; continued use of MHPSS skills; evidence of post-activity continuity	KIIs/FGDs; any follow-up records	Qualitative plausibility assessment
Participation and Stakeholder Engagement	To what extent were communities/beneficiaries involved in design, planning, and implementation?	Degree of consultation during implementation; influence over modalities (crops/lands/session topics); transparency perceptions; inclusion of vulnerable groups	KIIs/FGDs; survey open-ended; stakeholder mapping	Qualitative synthesis; process tracing examples
	Is the intervention consistent with other projects in	Alignment with prevailing sector approaches	KIIs (IPs, local authorities); doc review;	Document review + KIIs

	the sector and the region?	(livelihoods + protection + MHPSS); non-duplication; coherence in Area C	contextual mapping	
Coordination and Harmonization	How well was the intervention coordinated with other humanitarian and development initiatives in the region?	Evidence of sectoral coordination (e.g., MoA); cumulative programming in same communities; referrals/linkages	KIIs; partner docs; contextual evidence	Qualitative analysis; sequencing narrative
Cross-Cutting Priorities	To what extent did the intervention integrate environmental protection and DRR?	Environmental benefits from land works (erosion/soil/water); risk-aware implementation; any DRR-related content in sessions	KIIs/FGDs; doc review (LF, activity plans); survey open-ended	Document review + qualitative confirmation
	How well did the intervention incorporate cultural diversity and local knowledge?	Cultural appropriateness of facilitation; locally acceptable entry points; use of local agricultural knowledge; adaptation to norms	KIIs/FGDs; facilitator accounts	Qualitative analysis
	How well did the intervention promote women's empowerment and gender equality?	Increased confidence/voice; rights awareness; participation in local spaces; constraints (land ownership/decision-making)	Questionnaire (gender-related items if any); FGDs women; KIIs	Mixed-method synthesis
Communication and Dissemination	Have progress reports and lessons learned been effectively shared among stakeholders?	Extent of sharing beyond funder; existence of feedback loops to communities; cross-partner learning documentation	KIIs (IPs, PMC, local stakeholders); document review	Qualitative assessment against accountability/learning norms

Annex 2: Detailed Methodology

AWRAD utilized a mixed-methods approach and a triangulation approach that combined both quantitative (survey questionnaire) and qualitative data collection tools (focus groups, in-depth interviews with beneficiaries, and key informant interviews) in order to achieve the project evaluation objectives. The following section demonstrates in detail the research tools.

Desk Review

AWRAD undertook a comprehensive review of the relevant project documents provided by the implementing partners, including progress reports, Work plans, budgets, Internal monitoring and evaluation reports, Project indicators and log-frame, training reports, and lists of beneficiaries.

Moreover, AWRAD reviewed other external literature and materials, and other relevant reports and statistics, such as the PCBS population, housing, and establishment census, villages profiles and political conditions.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

The team conducted x KIIs with x key informants, including the implementing partners, and local councils who have been involved in the project's implementation and benefited from the project in the targeted regions.

The main purposes of these interviews were to evaluate the impact of the project and its activities on the beneficiaries, alignment and coherence with other interventions, achievement of its objectives, impact, and sustainability.

The following is the list of interviews conducted throughout the evaluation process:

Table 2: List of Interviews Conducted with Implementing Actors

Organization	KIIs
PSCCW focal point	Alaa' Abu Hashish
PARC focal point	Fares Nasasra
Qasra Municipality	Mohammed Abu Mahyoub
Qasra Municipality	Shrouq Abdullah Hassan
Jurish Village Council	Mohammed Al-Hajj Mohammed

In-depth Interviews with Beneficiaries

AWRAD conducted 14 interviews (4 females, 10 males) with beneficiaries from the targeted communities. These interviews aimed at exploring deeply how beneficiaries' and stakeholders benefited from the project's activities, their ability to sustain the level of work done, the impact of the interventions, their additional capacity-building needs, the linkages between beneficiaries and created CPC, the level of women's engagement, their increased access to economic rights, and developing recommendations. The table below describes the interviews conducted:

Table 3: List of Interviews Conducted with Beneficiaries

Type of participant/s	Qusra	Jurish
Farmers (Males)	4	1

cash for work beneficiaries (Males)	1	3
PSS/ protection awareness sessions (Female)	1	0
Childcare awareness sessions (Females)	1	1
CPC members (Female & Male)	-	2
Psychosocial Counselor (Female)	0	1
Psychosocial Supervisor (Male)	1	0

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

The research team conducted 4 focus groups in the targeted communities The sessions evaluated the effects of the activities received, the project's interventions. The participants were chosen from the lists obtained from PARC and PSCCW.

The list of FGDs and participants' numbers is illustrated below:

Table 4: List of FGDs Conducted

Type of participants	Qusra	Jurish
Farmers and cash for work beneficiaries (Males)	1	1
PSS/ protection awareness sessions (Females)	1	1

Survey

Our team collected the data from 138 beneficiaries (101 males, 37 females, and 69 from Qusra, 69 from Jurish) by phone using surveys; each beneficiary category had special questions that were relevant to the activities they received. The following table illustrates the target sample reached:

Table 5: Survey Sample Distribution

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	101	73.2%
	Female	37	26.8%
Place of residence	Jurish	69	50.0%
	Qusra	69	50.0%
Activity	Agriculture (land rehabilitation/support)	61	44.2%
	Cash-for-work	36	26.1%
	PSS/ protection awareness sessions	11	8.0%
	Childcare awareness sessions	5	3.6%
	Legal rights / GBV / protection sessions	25	18.1%

Annex 3: Results Achievement

PSCCW –Results Achievement

Expected Results	Verifiable indicators	Expected value	Value reached	Degree of achievement %

Expected results (women-focused protection/MHPSS/legal/economic participation)	**A12.** Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) group for women affected by GBV and/or other violations of their rights, and/or who present symptoms of psychosocial stress	20	28 women	140%
Expected results (women-focused protection/MHPSS/legal/economic participation)	**A13.** Individual Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) for women	4	4 women	100%
Expected results (women-focused protection/MHPSS/legal/economic participation)	**A14.** Legal assistance for women affected by GBV	10	21	210%
Expected results (women-focused protection/MHPSS/legal/economic participation)	**A15.** Conducting awareness sessions on legal rights and gender-based violence	20	34	170%
Expected results (women-focused protection/MHPSS/legal/economic participation)	**A17.** Cash for work methodology (cash assistance)	8	8 women	100%
Expected results (child protection/psychosocial support and safer learning environment)	**A18.** Psychosocial support for minors with symptoms of trauma and/or psychosocial stress ("Team Up" methodology)	60	60	100%
Expected results (child protection/psychosocial support and safer learning environment)	**A19.** Sessions for teachers to care for students affected by child protection violations	60	60	100%
Expected results (child protection/psychosocial support and safer learning environment)	**A20.** Awareness sessions for parents of minors with symptoms of psychosocial stress	60	64	107%
Expected results (child protection/psychosocial support and safer learning environment)	**A21.** Awareness sessions on protection and	90	90	100%

	defense of rights for students			
Expected results (child protection/psychosocial support and safer learning environment)	**A22.** Implementation of two response initiatives to create a safe environment for the educational community	2	2	100%

PARC – Results Achievement

Expected Results	Objectively verifiable indicators	Expected value	Value reached	Degree of achievement %
Result 1	RE1.IOV1: 1500 m2 agricultural road opened and rehabilitated in Jurish	1500 m2	1900 m2	127%
Result 1	RE1.IOV2: 127 families (including 43 women) supported by agricultural interventions, and feel protected on their land	127 families	Not specified	**100%** (According to PARC reports)
Result 1	RE1.IOV3: 120 dunums of land in Qusra (70 dunums), Jurish (50 dunums) improved and protected by installing 800 metal posts and barbed wire	120 dunums	Metal posts and barbed wire fence installed around 170 dunums in Qusra, Jurish and Qaryut villages	142%
Result 2	RE2.IOV1: functional complaint and suggestion mechanism established and used in Jurish	1	The complaint and suggestion box and complaints system … established in Jurish	100%
Result 2	RE2.IOV2: DRR community plan developed in Jurish	1 plan	DRR community plan developed	100%
Result 2	RE2.IOV3: CPC established in Jurish	1 CPC	CPC established	100%

Annex 4: Field Documentation – FGDs






March
28/12/2025 9:39
REDMI NOTE 12S


28/12/2025 11:31
REDMI NOTE 12S

Annex 5: References

Arab World for Research and Development (AWRAD). (2022). Overall Programmatic Evaluation Report: Humanitarian Strategy "Protection of the Rights and Dignity of the Palestinian Population Under Occupation, in Accordance with IHL and IHRL, with Special Emphasis on the Fight Against Gender-Based Violence and Inequality, Child Protection and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)".

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (1999). General Comment No. 12: The right to adequate food (Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights). United Nations.

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2003). General Comment No. 15: The right to water (Articles 11 and 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights). United Nations.

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2016). General Comment No. 23: The right to just and favourable conditions of work (Article 7 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights). United Nations.

International Committee of the Red Cross. (1949). Geneva Convention (IV) relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war.

International Committee of the Red Cross. (2016). Rule 47: Attacking persons hors de combat. In Customary International Humanitarian Law Database.

International Committee of the Red Cross. (2018). *The roots of restraint in war.*

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. (2022). *Humanitarian principles.*

Protection Cluster. (2025, March). Occupied Palestinian Territory (oPt): West Bank protection analysis update (Protection Analysis Update). Global Protection Cluster.

United Nations. (1966). International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. United Nations General Assembly.

United Nations. (1979). Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

United Nations. (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). (2023). *Humanitarian response plan: Occupied Palestinian territory 2023.* OCHA oPt.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). (2024, September 25). *Movement and access in the West Bank: September 2024.* OCHA oPt.

Al-Quds. (2023). محاولة إقامة بؤرة استيطانية على أراضي جوريش جنوب شرق نابلس. Retrieved from https://alquds.com/ar/posts/45262

B'Tselem. (2025). مستوطنون يهاجمون منازل في قرية جوريش ويرشقونها بالحجارة. Retrieved from https://www.btselem.org/arabic/node/216768

WAFA News Agency. (2023). مستوطنون يعتدون على فلسطينيين في مناطق بين عقربا وجوريش. Retrieved from https://www.wafa.ps/pages/details/63376

B'Tselem. (2024). Settler attacks and assaults in Qusra area. Retrieved from https://www.btselem.org/arabic/node/213482

WAFA News Agency. (2023). Settlers attack farmers south of Qusra, injuring several residents. Retrieved from https://www.wafa.ps/pages/details/77671

YouTube. (2025). Video documentation of settler attack in Qusra. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K6f3njCcdF4

Annex 6: Arabic Executive Summary (for sharing)

ملخص تنفيذي

يُقيّم هذا التقرير النهائي مشروع "**استراتيجية النيكساس المحلية للحماية المتكاملة لحقوق وكرامة السكان الفلسطينيين تحت الاحتلال**"، الذي نفذته منظمة ACPP بالشراكة مع الإغاثة الزراعية ومركز الإرشاد النفسي والاجتماعي للمرأة في قريتي قصرة وجريش (محافظة نابلس)، وبتمويل من *Generalitat Valenciana* ضمن دعوة المساعدة الإنسانية لعام 2023.

استمرت المبادرة اثني عشر شهراً (من أغسطس 2024 إلى أغسطس 2025)، بميزانية إجمالية قدرها 400,000 يورو، واستهدفت 1,252 مشاركاً مباشراً و7,735 مستفيدًا غير مباشر. وهدف المشروع إلى حماية الحقوق والكرامة بما يتوافق مع القانون الدولي الإنساني وقانون حقوق الإنسان، مع التركيز على المساواة بين الجنسين، وحماية الطفل، والحد من مخاطر الكوارث.

اعتمد التقييم منهجيةً مختلطة، ودرس التدخل من حيث الملاءمة والفعالية والكفاءة والأثر والاستدامة، إضافةً إلى جوانب المشاركة والتنسيق والاتساق والتواصل والنشر.

النتائج الرئيسية للتقييم

الأهمية

كان التدخل متوافقاً بدرجة كبيرة مع الاحتياجات ذات الأولوية في كلا المجتمعين، إذ عالج أوجه الضعف المترابطة، بما في ذلك صعوبة الوصول إلى الأراضي، وانعدام الأمن في سبل العيش، ومخاطر الحماية، إلى جانب الضغوط النفسية والاجتماعية.

كما اتسق الإطار القائم على حقوق الإنسان، المرتكز على الكرامة والحماية وعدم التمييز، مع المبادئ الإنسانية ومع أحكام القانون الدولي الإنساني وقانون حقوق الإنسان.

الفعالية

حقق المشروع أهدافه ونتائجه المتوقعة بدرجة كبيرة. فقد نفذت الإغاثة الزراعية المخرجات الأساسية في مجالات سبل العيش، وإعادة تأهيل الأراضي، وحماية المجتمع، في حين حقق مركز الإرشاد النفسي والاجتماعي للمرأة أهداف حماية المرأة وخدمات الصحة النفسية والدعم النفسي والاجتماعي، بل وتجاوز بعض المؤشرات، إضافة إلى تحقيق نتائج حماية الطفل المخطط لها.

وتشير إفادات المستفيدين إلى فوائد ملموسة تمثلت في تحسين استخدام الأراضي، وتخفيف الضغوط الاقتصادية قصيرة الأجل، وتعزيز القدرة على التكيف النفسي والاجتماعي، ودعم آليات الحماية المجتمعية، رغم القيود الكبيرة المتعلقة بالوصول إلى الأراضي والأوضاع الأمنية المعقدة المفروضة على الفلسطينيين.

الكفاءة

استُخدمت الموارد بكفاءة بشكل عام. فقد ساهم دمج الإغاثة الزراعية بين برنامجي "**النقد مقابل العمل**" وإعادة تأهيل الأراضي في تكثيف الاستفادة من الموارد، من خلال الجمع بين دعم الدخل قصير الأجل وإعادة تأهيل الأصول الإنتاجية.

كما حقق مركز الإرشاد النفسي والاجتماعي للمرأة إنجازات ملحوظة، شملت تجاوز عدد من المؤشرات، دون الحاجة إلى مخصصات مالية إضافية، مستفيداً من دعم المدارس والمراكز المجتمعية ومنظمات المجتمع المحلي النسوية القائمة.

ومع ذلك، تأثرت الكفاءة على مستوى المستفيدين بوجود ثغرات في آليات الاستهداف والتحقق في بعض الأنشطة، بما في ذلك الاعتماد على ملاك الأراضي في اختيار العمال، ومحدودية المتابعة للتحقق من المشاركة الفعلية واستخدام الدعم.

الأثر

أفاد المستفيدون بحدوث تحسّن في مستوى رفاههم النفسي والاجتماعي، وتعزّز شعورهم بالأمان والكرامة، وارتفاع قدرتهم على التكيّف، إضافةً إلى دعم سبل عيشهم على المدى القصير.

غير أن حجم الأثر تأثر بعوامل خارجية خارجة عن نطاق سيطرة المشروع، ولا سيما عنف المستوطنين، وقيود الوصول، والأضرار التي لحقت في بعض الحالات بالأصول التي أُعيد تأهيلها. وعليه، ينبغي تفسير الأثر في المقام الأول بوصفه مساهمة في الحد من المخاطر وتعزيز القدرة على الصمود، أكثر من كونه إحداث تغيير هيكلي أو توفير حماية مستدامة طويلة الأمد.

الاستدامة والترابط

تتسم إمكانات الاستدامة بقوة أكبر في ما يتعلق بالآليات المجتمعية والنتائج النفسية والاجتماعية، نظراً لإمكانية استمرارها عبر الهياكل المحلية القائمة. فقد جرى إدماج المهارات والمعرفة والوعي المكتسب ضمن المساحات والممارسات المجتمعية، مما يزيد من احتمالية استمرار الفوائد بعد انتهاء المشروع. كما أسهم إصلاح الأراضي، وتحسين الوصول إلى المناطق الزراعية، واعتماد تقنيات ملائمة محلياً، في إيجاد أصول يمكن للمستفيدين مواصلة صيانتها واستخدامها اعتماداً على خبراتهم وجهودهم الذاتية.

في المقابل، تظل استدامة المكاسب المرتبطة بالأراضي وسبل العيش رهناً بظروف الحماية الأوسع نطاقاً. إذ يعتمد استمرار الوصول إلى الأراضي، والقدرة على زراعتها بأمان، والحفاظ على سلامة الأصول المعاد تأهيلها، على عوامل خارجية تتجاوز نطاق سيطرة المشروع. ومع ذلك، يعكس المشروع درجة جيدة من الترابط الداخلي، من خلال التكامل المرحلي بين مكونات سبل العيش والحماية والدعم النفسي والاجتماعي.

المشاركة والتنسيق

كانت المشاركة أكثر فاعلية خلال مرحلة التنفيذ، حيث أسهمت الجهات الفاعلة في المجتمع المحلي في اختيار المواقع، وتكييف الأنشطة، وتطوير محتوى الجلسات، في حين ظلت مشاركتها في مرحلة التصميم الأولي وتحديد المنهجيات محدودة نسبياً.

وكان التنسيق قوياً على المستوى المجتمعي والقطاعي من خلال الهياكل المحلية وتعاون الإغاثة الزراعية مع وزارة الزراعة، إضافة إلى التكامل العملي بين أنشطة الإغاثة الزراعية ومركز الإرشاد النفسي والاجتماعي للمرأة في المجتمعات ذاتها. أما التنسيق على المستوى الأوسع، ولا سيما مع المنصات الإنسانية، فكان أقل وضوحاً.

التنسيق والمواءمة

أسهم التدخل في تعزيز التنسيق العملي على مستوى المجتمع المحلي من خلال التعاون اليومي مع مجالس القرى واللجان المحلية والمدارس والجمعيات النسوية، مما أسهم في تعزيز التماسك التشغيلي وبناء الثقة. في المقابل، كان التنسيق خارج هذه الأطر المحلية، وعلى المستوى الأوسع، أقل وضوحاً.

الأولويات الشاملة

تشير الأدلة إلى دمج الأولويات الشاملة في تنفيذ التدخل، ولا سيما مراعاة المنظور الجنساني، من خلال تقديم خدمات موجهة للنساء والأطفال عبر لجنة حماية المرأة والطفل، واعتماد نهج قائم على الحماية في آليات تقديم الخدمات.

الاتصال والنشر

دعمت التقارير الدورية آليات المساءلة وتتبع التنفيذ بصورة منتظمة. وعلى مستوى المجتمع المحلي، جرى تبادل المعرفة من خلال أنشطة نشر تشاركية في مجال الحد من مخاطر الكوارث.

في المقابل، ظل نشر الدروس المستفادة والرؤى التقييمية على نطاق أوسع، سواء بين الشركاء أو خارج قنوات الإبلاغ الرسمية، أقل منهجية.