REPORT OF THE FINAL EVALUATION OF THE

Localized Nexus Strategy for the Integrated Protection of the Rights and Dignity of the Population Project

SOLHUM/2024/0030

ASAMBLEA DE COOPERACIÓN POR LA PAZ

Submitted by:
Amer Madi – Team Leader / Senior Evaluator

Satteh Marhaba – Haj Yasin Bldg. #3
Al-Bireh – Palestine
Tel. +972.(0). 2.242.4292/3
Fax. +972.(0).2.242.3257
Mobile. +972.(0).599-875-276
e-mail: amer@alsahelidc.com

Date: 28 June 2024

Contents

List of Acronyms **4**

Executive Summary **5**

1. Introduction, Project Overview and Evaluation Methodology **13**

1.1. Project Context and Rationale 13

1.2. Project Description and Intervention Logic 13

1.3. Purpose, Scope and Evaluation Questions 14

1.4. Evaluation Methodology 15

1.5. Data Analysis and Limitations 15

2. Findings **16**

2.1. EQ1 – Relevance and Appropriateness 16

2.2. EQ2 – Coherence and Complementarity 25

2.3. EQ3 – Effectiveness 29

2.4. EQ4 – Efficiency and Adaptive Management 37

2.5. EQ5 – Impact and Emerging Changes 42

2.5.1. EQ5.1 What changes do beneficiaries report in their livelihoods, well-being, rights awareness or participation? 43

2.5.2. EQ5.2 Are there observable changes in women's confidence, agency, economic participation or access to services? 44

2.5.3. EQ5.3 Are there indications of improved child well-being, school engagement or family support practices? 45

2.5.4. EQ5.4 Did project activities contribute to reducing vulnerability or strengthening resilience in practical ways? 45

2.5.5. EQ5.5 Were there unintended positive or negative effects? 46

2.5.6. EQ5.6 How significant were these changes in light of the wider contextual constraints? 47

2.6. EQ6 – Sustainability and Continuity of Benefits 47

2.6.1. EQ6.1 To what extent are livelihood-related benefits likely to be sustained? 48

2.6.2. EQ6.2 To what extent are psychosocial, legal and educational outcomes likely to continue? 49

2.6.3. EQ6.3 To what extent are community structures and local capacities likely to continue functioning? 49

2.6.4. EQ6.4 To what extent have communities and local actors demonstrated ownership of project outcomes? 50

2.6.5. EQ6.5 What factors support or undermine sustainability? 50

2.6.6. EQ6.6 How likely is it that project benefits will continue after project closure? 51

2.7. EQ7 – Cross-Cutting Issues: Gender, Protection, Participation and Accountability 51
2.8. EQ8 – Complementarity and Nexus Practice 56
3. Conclusions and Lessons Learned 61
3.1. Conclusions 61
3.2. Lessons Learned 63
4. Recommendations 65
Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix 71
Annex 2: Interview and FGD guides 91
Annex 3: List of Interviewees and Participants Consulted 106
Annex 4: Documents Reviewed 109

List of Acronyms

ACPP	Asamblea de Cooperación por la Paz
AG	Action Group
AWRAD	Arab World for Research and Development
CPC	Community Protection Committee
CTP	Palestinian National Cash Transfer Programme
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EQ	Evaluation Question
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
KII	Key Informant Interview
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
MHPSS	Mental Health and Psychosocial Support
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PARC	Palestinian Agricultural Relief Committees
PHG	Palestinian Hydrology Group
PSCCW	Psychosocial Counseling Center for Women
PSS	Psychosocial Support
SOLHUM/2024/0030	Project reference code for the evaluated intervention
TOC	Theory of Change
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Executive Summary

This report presents the final evaluation of the project *Localized Nexus Strategy for the Integrated Protection of the Rights and Dignity of the Population* (SOLHUM/2024/0030), funded by the Generalitat Valenciana and implemented by Asamblea de Cooperación por la Paz (ACPP) in partnership with members of the Action Group, principally the Palestinian Agricultural Relief Committees (PARC) and the Psychosocial Counseling Center for Women (PSCCW). The project was implemented in Southeast Nablus, with activities in Awarta, Duma, Jurish and Qusra, an area facing long-standing and intensifying protection risks, economic vulnerability, restricted access to land and services, settler violence, military restrictions, weakening public services and growing psychosocial stress.

The intervention was designed as a localized nexus response to interlinked livelihood, protection, psychosocial, legal, educational and community resilience needs. It sought to strengthen food security and livelihoods, support community-based protection mechanisms, promote the rights and well-being of women, contribute to child protection and education, and reinforce advocacy, monitoring and citizen engagement. The project operated at several levels: household support through agricultural, cash, psychosocial, legal and educational activities; community-level support through Community Protection Committees, preparedness measures and protective presence; and structural-level engagement through documentation, advocacy and work with Israeli human rights organizations.

The evaluation assessed the project against eight evaluation questions covering relevance and appropriateness, coherence and complementarity, effectiveness, efficiency and adaptive management, emerging impact, sustainability, cross-cutting issues, and nexus practice. It adopted a theory-based, utilization-focused mixed-methods approach. Evidence was drawn from document review, key informant interviews, beneficiary consultations, focus group discussions and direct observation. In total, 60 individuals were consulted, including implementing partners, local authorities, community representatives, CPC members, school representatives, agricultural and livelihood beneficiaries, home garden beneficiaries, voucher recipients, women participating in psychosocial, legal and employment-related activities, and other local stakeholders. Field visits were conducted in three of the four target communities and included observation of agricultural roads, rehabilitated lands, home gardens, community facilities and other supported interventions.

The evaluation was conducted in a constrained and rapidly changing environment. It was not designed as a quantitative impact assessment and therefore does not make statistically representative claims about outcome-level change. The findings are based on triangulated qualitative evidence, project documentation and direct observation, and are framed in terms of plausible contribution rather than attribution. This is particularly important given that many outcomes were shaped by wider conditions beyond the project's control, including access restrictions, settler violence, water scarcity, unemployment, institutional fragility and the continuing deterioration of the humanitarian and protection environment after October 2023.

Overall, the evaluation concludes that the project was a highly relevant, coherent and largely effective localized nexus intervention implemented under exceptionally difficult circumstances. Its principal value was not in generating large-scale material transformation, but in helping targeted individuals, households and communities cope with worsening conditions, maintain access to support, strengthen confidence and agency, preserve ties to land, reinforce local preparedness and uphold dignity under pressure. The project's achievements are therefore best understood as protective, enabling and resilience-oriented rather than transformational.

Relevance and appropriateness: The project was highly relevant to the realities of Southeast Nablus. It addressed a context in which livelihood decline, land access restrictions, protection risks, psychosocial distress, legal vulnerability, educational disruption, women's exclusion from services and opportunities, and weakening local institutions are deeply interconnected. The project's multi-component design was appropriate because the needs of the target population could not realistically be addressed through a narrow or single-sector intervention.

The evaluation found strong alignment between the vulnerabilities identified during project design, those reflected in the broader Action Group strategy, and those confirmed during fieldwork. Communities and beneficiaries consistently described protection risks, unemployment, reduced access to land, psychosocial stress, educational disruption and weakening services as central concerns. The project was therefore responding to real and locally recognized priorities rather than externally imposed assumptions.

At the same time, the relevance of the project must be interpreted in light of the rapid deterioration that occurred during implementation. After October 2023, communities faced heightened violence, further restrictions on movement and land access, rising economic hardship and increased pressure on household and community coping systems. As a result, some needs became more prominent than they had been during design, including household-level protection, emergency preparedness, youth vulnerability, water access and the sustainability of community structures.

The evaluation does not find that the project became less relevant as conditions changed. Rather, the meaning of some interventions evolved. Agricultural roads, land rehabilitation and cultivation support increasingly functioned not only as livelihood inputs but also as means of maintaining presence on land, resisting abandonment and protecting rights. This was especially evident in Qusra, where access to land became increasingly dangerous and uncertain. In Awarta, where rehabilitated lands remained more accessible, agricultural support retained a clearer productive livelihood function. In Duma, the shift away from less viable agricultural activities toward community preparedness and protection measures reflected appropriate adaptation to local realities.

The selected components were particularly appropriate for women and children. Women's psychosocial stress, legal vulnerability, limited public participation, economic exclusion and restricted access to services were addressed through psychosocial support, legal awareness and assistance, employment opportunities and support for collective action. Children's educational and psychosocial needs were addressed through remedial education, Team Up activities and parent-teacher engagement. For agricultural households, the interventions were broadly appropriate but increasingly dependent on access, water and security conditions.

Targeting and selection processes were generally viewed as fair and appropriate. The evaluation found little evidence of dissatisfaction, exclusion, favouritism or manipulation. Local councils and community actors played an important role in identifying and validating beneficiaries, contributing to acceptance and trust. However, transparency could have been strengthened through clearer communication with communities regarding how consultation findings were analysed, how priorities were selected and why some needs were addressed while others were not. The evaluation also found that some participation barriers, particularly women's care responsibilities and mobility constraints, affected equitable access to activities.

Gender and protection were strongly integrated into project design. The intervention treated both as central to the project's logic rather than as peripheral safeguards. Accountability considerations were present through community consultation and local participation, but would have benefitted from stronger documentation, visibility, and better integrated feedback-loops.

Coherence and complementarity: The project demonstrated a moderate to strong level of coherence and complementarity. At design level, the intervention was based on a clear understanding that vulnerabilities in Southeast Nablus are multidimensional. Livelihood support, community protection, psychosocial services, legal assistance, child-focused support, women's participation and advocacy were brought together within a common framework. This helped avoid a fragmented or purely sectoral response.

The project also benefited from its position within the broader Action Group framework. This allowed it to draw on specialized organizations, accumulated community knowledge, existing relationships and previous investments. The Action Group framework appears to have strengthened continuity, reduced duplication and enabled a differentiated response across communities. Duma illustrates the value of this approach, as project support built upon an existing CPC and prior engagement rather than starting from a newly created structure.

At implementation level, however, coherence was less fully developed. Partner roles were clear and largely complementary, and communities did not perceive the activities as contradictory or duplicative. However, beneficiaries often interacted with a specific partner or activity stream rather than with the project as an integrated package. Cross-partner referral, sequencing and joint follow-up mechanisms were limited. As a result, coherence was strongest at the level of design logic, partner specialization and community-level understanding, and weaker at the level of integrated beneficiary pathways.

Effectiveness: The project achieved a moderate to strong level of effectiveness. Planned outputs were largely delivered, and in several areas output delivery was strong. PARC implemented livelihood and protection-related activities, including agricultural roads, land rehabilitation, conditional cash assistance, home gardens, agricultural training, protective presence, CPC and DRR-related work and community protection initiatives. PSCCW implemented psychosocial support, legal awareness and assistance, Team Up activities, teacher and parent engagement, training for women-led community organization, women's paid placements and remedial education.

The strongest effectiveness was observed where change depended on direct service delivery, trusted relationships, human interaction and localized support. Women's psychosocial support, legal assistance, temporary employment, remedial education and some community preparedness activities produced credible and meaningful immediate outcomes. The project was less effective where intended outcomes depended on external conditions outside project control, particularly safe access to land, water availability, absence of violence, functioning public institutions and sustained local structures.

Livelihood-related outcomes were mixed. In Awarta, there was plausible evidence that land rehabilitation and agricultural roads improved access, usability and cultivation of agricultural lands. In Qusra, however, the same types of assets were increasingly difficult to use because of settler violence, access restrictions and insecurity. The project improved the physical usability of land, but did not generate verified sustained income or productivity gains. In Qusra, the main value of land-related interventions shifted toward maintaining presence, asserting rights and refusing abandonment of land. Home gardens produced variable but positive outcomes, especially where households could use tanks, pumps and irrigation systems, but their potential was constrained by water scarcity. Voucher assistance, conditional cash assistance and labour-intensive work contributed mainly to short-term coping and temporary income.

Women's employment activities were effective as short-term economic empowerment and local service support. Women placed in schools, local councils, health facilities and community institutions gained income, work experience, confidence and public visibility. In Duma, placements in local service institutions, including health-related roles, also helped strengthen community services. However, the

placements were temporary, pay levels were limited and longer-term employment opportunities remained scarce.

The psychosocial component generated some of the strongest qualitative outcomes. Women reported improved coping, emotional regulation, confidence, social connection and ability to manage household stress. The legal awareness and assistance component also produced meaningful results for women reached, including increased knowledge of rights, improved confidence to seek support and, in some cases, concrete legal outcomes. The scale of legal support was modest compared to likely need, but its depth and sensitivity made it significant for beneficiaries who accessed it.

Child-related outcomes were positive but modest. Remedial education helped some children improve confidence, engagement and ability to follow classroom material. Team Up and related activities provided structured opportunities for expression, movement, interaction and emotional support. Parent and teacher engagement contributed to a more supportive environment around children. However, the intervention could not address the scale of learning loss and educational disruption caused by systemic constraints, school closures, overcrowding, financial crisis and exposure to violence.

Community protection activities produced uneven results. Duma showed the strongest evidence of functional community preparedness, partly because the CPC was already established and had benefited from previous support. Project inputs such as first aid kits, oxygen cylinders, fire extinguishers, medical centre support and school fencing contributed to local response capacity and protection of public facilities. In Qusra, protective presence and community protection activities were relevant and appreciated, but could not guarantee safety in the face of serious settler violence. Their value lay more in accompaniment, solidarity and visibility than in risk elimination. In Awarta, the CPC was established but did not become sufficiently functional, largely due to limited follow-up, unclear roles, local political dynamics and weak institutional support.

The main factors enabling effectiveness were partner specialization, local implementation mechanisms, community trust, high beneficiary demand and the project's ability to address multiple dimensions of vulnerability. The main constraints were structural and external: occupation-related restrictions, settler attacks, movement barriers, water shortages, weak public services, short implementation duration, limited resources, local politics affecting CPC functionality, and participation barriers affecting some women.

Efficiency and adaptive management: The project demonstrated moderate to strong efficiency. Partner roles were clear, implementation arrangements were broadly appropriate, and activities were delivered despite an exceptionally difficult operating environment. The project's ability to continue implementation under conditions of escalating violence, movement restrictions, shrinking livelihoods and declining public services is itself an important efficiency finding.

Efficiency was strengthened by partner specialization, use of local actors, reliance on existing community relationships and adaptive management. PARC and PSCCW worked in areas where they had technical experience and community credibility. Local councils, local institutions, community committees, teachers and local workers helped make delivery feasible despite mobility and security constraints.

The clearest example of adaptation was in Duma, where PARC did not replicate agricultural rehabilitation activities that had become less viable or had already been supported by other actors. Instead, the project shifted emphasis toward community preparedness, protection and local response capacity. This adaptation was appropriate and responsive.

However, the evaluation also identified missed opportunities. Some outputs required more sustained follow-up to become fully functional, particularly the Awarta CPC and the women-led organizational development initiative. There were also missed opportunities to connect community-level protection work more systematically with legal documentation, referral, media engagement and international advocacy under Result 5. Efficiency was therefore stronger in activity delivery than in converting some outputs into durable institutional or integrated outcomes.

Impact and emerging changes: The project generated meaningful emerging changes, although these were generally incremental rather than transformative. The strongest changes were found in psychosocial well-being, confidence, social connection, legal awareness, access to support, participation and household coping. Livelihood-related changes were more uneven and dependent on local conditions.

For women, the project contributed to greater confidence, coping capacity, awareness of rights, access to legal support, social connection and participation. These changes were important not because they transformed gender relations structurally, but because they created practical shifts in women's daily lives, self-perception and ability to seek support. Paid placements also increased women's visibility in community institutions and provided temporary income and work experience.

For children, the project helped some vulnerable students remain connected to learning and supportive activities. The changes were modest but meaningful in a context where many children receive limited individualized educational or psychosocial support. The child-focused interventions are best understood as protective and enabling rather than transformative.

For agricultural households, impact varied significantly. In Awarta, there was some evidence of improved land use and cultivation. In Qusra, agricultural interventions had limited economic impact because access and security conditions severely constrained use. However, they retained protection and rights-related significance by supporting continued presence on land. Home gardens, vouchers and cash assistance helped households cope, but did not fundamentally change livelihood security.

The project overall contributed more strongly to coping, resilience, agency, participation and continuity than to structural or sustained material change. This does not weaken its importance. In the context of Southeast Nablus, preventing further deterioration, maintaining connection to land, supporting women and children, strengthening local preparedness and helping households manage pressure are meaningful contributions.

Sustainability: Sustainability prospects are moderate and uneven. The most durable benefits are likely to be those embedded in people, relationships and local capacities: coping skills, confidence, legal awareness, practical work experience, social networks, rights knowledge and some forms of community preparedness. These benefits do not depend entirely on continued material inputs and may continue to influence behaviour and decision-making beyond the project period.

Physical assets such as agricultural roads, rehabilitated lands and home garden infrastructure are likely to remain. However, their functional sustainability depends on whether households can safely access, maintain and use them, and whether water is available and affordable. In Awarta, sustainability prospects for agricultural assets are stronger because lands remain more accessible. In Qusra, physical assets may remain but their livelihood value is fragile because access is unsafe and uncertain. In Duma, the project's shift toward preparedness and protection was appropriate, but longer-term livelihood continuity may require alternative modalities less dependent on exposed agricultural access.

Community structures show varied sustainability. Duma's CPC has stronger prospects because it was not created solely by this project and is embedded in a longer process of local engagement. Awarta's CPC has weaker sustainability prospects because it was not sufficiently operationalized. The women-led organization initiative in Awarta also generated interest but requires further accompaniment to become durable. These examples show that community ownership is important but not sufficient; structures need role clarity, facilitation, practice and continued support.

Educational gains may continue for some children in terms of confidence and engagement, but sustained learning progress will depend on school capacity and continued support. Psychosocial and legal-awareness benefits among women have stronger prospects because they are rooted in knowledge, behaviour and relationships.

The main threat to sustainability is the broader context. Insecurity, land access restrictions, water scarcity, unemployment, weak public services and institutional fragility all limit the ability of communities to sustain benefits independently. Sustainability strategies therefore need to distinguish between what communities can maintain themselves and what requires continued support or improved enabling conditions.

Cross-cutting issues: The project performed moderately to strongly on cross-cutting issues. Gender integration was one of its clearest strengths. Women's psychosocial support, legal empowerment, access to services, temporary employment and participation-related activities were central to the project's achievements. Protection was also meaningfully embedded across legal, psychosocial, community, livelihood and advocacy-related components. Participation was generally safe and meaningful for those reached, particularly women and children.

However, some cross-cutting areas require further strengthening. Participation was not equally accessible to all groups. Women's unpaid care responsibilities, household obligations and mobility constraints limited participation for some. Youth vulnerabilities, especially among young men facing unemployment, frustration and psychosocial stress, were not sufficiently addressed. Disability inclusion was not strongly evidenced; the evaluation cannot conclude that persons with disabilities were systematically identified, consulted, accommodated or monitored. Accountability mechanisms existed and partners were generally trusted, but evidence on the use, accessibility and responsiveness of formal feedback systems was limited. The project performed better in practical responsiveness and community acceptance than in documented accountability to affected populations.

Operational nexus practice: The project demonstrated moderate operational nexus practice. It was clearly more than a set of unrelated activities and was grounded in a coherent understanding of interconnected vulnerabilities. Some components reinforced one another, especially within PSCCW's package of psychosocial, legal, employment and child-focused support. Agricultural interventions also carried both livelihood and protection value, especially where continued investment in land was linked to maintaining presence and rights. In Duma, community preparedness, women's employment, school protection and local service support converged around a broader resilience agenda.

Nevertheless,the strong coherence of the project's multi-component architecture did not fully translate into an integrated nexus model at beneficiary or household level. The limitation was not a lack of shared analysis or conceptual coherence, but the absence of sufficiently systematic operational mechanisms. Cross-partner referral, sequencing, joint follow-up, shared beneficiary pathways and use of CPCs as integrated coordination platforms were limited. Beneficiaries often accessed support through a particular partner or activity stream rather than through a deliberately connected package.

The link between community-level protection and Result 5 advocacy, documentation and legal action was also underdeveloped. Stronger operational links with Israeli human rights organizations could have helped translate community-level incidents and protection priorities into more systematic documentation, referral, media engagement or international advocacy.

Conclusions: The evaluation concludes that the project represents a strong example of relevant, localized, protection-sensitive nexus programming under severe constraint. It was well aligned with community needs, coherent in design, largely effective in delivery and meaningful in its contribution to coping, dignity, participation, service access, local preparedness and resilience. Its limitations are real but should be interpreted in context. Many of the project's intended outcomes depended on external conditions that deteriorated sharply during implementation.

The project's central lesson is that localized nexus programming remains highly appropriate in Southeast Nablus, but its effectiveness depends increasingly on operational integration, adaptive management, sustained accompaniment and realistic assumptions about what short-term interventions can achieve in a worsening protection environment. The project's value lies in its ability to help communities absorb pressure, remain connected to land and services, and preserve social and protective capacities, rather than in producing transformational change.

The evaluation generated twelve lessons. These highlight that nexus programming must move beyond multi-sector design toward operational integration; needs assessment must be iterative; agricultural livelihoods in exposed areas require a protection lens; water is a core determinant of livelihood viability; women-focused support can generate durable value but collective empowerment requires follow-up; community structures need accompaniment; partner specialization must be balanced with integration; community ownership cannot substitute for enabling conditions; participation requires attention to practical barriers; youth vulnerability requires more explicit programming; accountability requires closing the feedback loop with communities; and advocacy/documentation components should be more deliberately connected to field-level protection.

Recommendations: The overall recommendation is to continue the broad strategic direction of the project: localized, multi-component, protection-sensitive nexus programming in Southeast Nablus. The model is relevant and appropriate and should not be replaced. However, future programming should strengthen its operational depth, adaptability and durability.

Future interventions should maintain the combination of livelihoods, protection, psychosocial support, legal assistance, education, women's participation, community preparedness and advocacy, while introducing clearer referral, sequencing and joint follow-up mechanisms. Needs assessment should become an iterative process rather than a one-time design input, with periodic reassessment and structured feedback to communities. Agricultural and livelihood interventions should be designed through a combined livelihood, protection and water-security lens, recognizing that land rehabilitation may serve both productive and rights-protection functions.

Future programming should provide stronger accompaniment to community structures, particularly CPCs and emerging women-led organizations. It should continue and deepen women-focused psychosocial, legal and participation support, while addressing practical barriers to women's participation such as care responsibilities, timing, mobility and access. Youth vulnerabilities, especially among young men, require more explicit attention, and disability inclusion should be more systematically integrated into assessment, targeting, monitoring and participation processes.

Accountability should be strengthened by closing the loop with communities: sharing assessment findings, explaining prioritization decisions, managing expectations and documenting feedback and responses. Community-level protection should also be more systematically linked to advocacy, documentation and legal referral pathways under Result 5. Finally, future projects should differentiate approaches by community context: supporting productive agriculture where access remains feasible; emphasizing protection, safe access, household resilience and water feasibility in more exposed areas; and strengthening preparedness, local services and emergency response where conventional livelihood pathways are less viable.

The project has demonstrated that localized nexus programming can be relevant and feasible in Southeast Nablus. Its future effectiveness will depend on making the approach more integrated in practice, more responsive to changing risks, more attentive to inclusion and accountability, and more sustained in its support to community structures and protection pathways.

1. Introduction, Project Overview and Evaluation Methodology

1.1. Project Context and Rationale

The project *Localized Nexus Strategy for the Integrated Protection of the Rights and Dignity of the Population* (SOLHUM/2024/0030) was funded by the Generalitat Valenciana and implemented by Asamblea de Cooperación por la Paz (ACPP) in partnership with members of the Action Group (AG), principally the Palestinian Agricultural Relief Committees (PARC) and the Psychosocial Counseling Center for Women (PSCCW). The intervention was implemented in the communities of Awarta, Duma, Jurish, and Qusra in Southeast Nablus, an area characterized by chronic protection risks, restricted access to land and services, economic vulnerability and increasing exposure to settler violence and military restrictions.

The project was implemented during a period of significant deterioration in the humanitarian, economic and protection environment in the West Bank. Following October 2023, targeted communities experienced increasing restrictions on movement and access, escalating attacks against agricultural lands and property, growing economic hardship, weakening public services and heightened psychosocial stress. These dynamics compounded long-standing vulnerabilities associated with occupation and increasingly undermined households' ability to access livelihoods, services and protection mechanisms.

The four target communities are predominantly rural and remain heavily dependent on agriculture as a source of income, food security and social stability. However, agricultural production increasingly takes place under conditions characterized by restricted access to land, insecurity, water scarcity and recurrent attacks against farmers and agricultural assets. At the same time, declining employment opportunities, rising poverty and weakening public services have intensified pressures on households and communities. Women and children have been particularly affected, facing increasing psychosocial burdens, growing care responsibilities, disruption of education and reduced access to opportunities and support services.

Within this context, vulnerability could not be understood solely through a livelihood, humanitarian or protection lens. Economic insecurity, psychosocial distress, exposure to violence, weakened community structures and reduced access to services were closely interconnected and mutually reinforcing. It was this reality that informed the design of the intervention and its emphasis on integrated and localized protection.

1.2. Project Description and Intervention Logic

The project was designed as a multi-layered intervention operating simultaneously at individual, community and structural levels, with an overall objective of contributing to the protection and promotion of the rights and dignity of vulnerable populations in the targeted communities through a combination of livelihood support, psychosocial and legal assistance, community-based protection mechanisms, educational support and advocacy activities. The intervention was structured around five interconnected results areas: strengthening food security and livelihoods; enhancing community-based protection mechanisms; promoting the rights and well-being of women; supporting child protection and education; and strengthening advocacy, monitoring and citizen engagement. Rather than treating these areas as separate sectors, the intervention sought to address multiple dimensions of vulnerability simultaneously through a localized nexus approach.

At the household level, activities sought to strengthen resilience through livelihood support, psychosocial services, legal assistance and educational support. These included agricultural road rehabilitation, land

development, home gardens, conditional and unconditional cash assistance, psychosocial counselling, legal awareness and legal aid, remedial education and child-focused psychosocial support.

At the community level, the project sought to strengthen local protection capacities through Community Protection Committees (CPCs), community preparedness measures and protective presence activities. These interventions were intended to improve communities' ability to identify, monitor and respond to protection risks affecting vulnerable populations.

At the structural level, and primarily through collabarotion with Israeli Human rights Organisations, the intervention supported monitoring and documentation of violations of International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law, the production of analytical outputs and advocacy efforts intended to increase visibility of protection concerns and contribute to accountability efforts.

Implementation was undertaken through a partnership model involving ACPP and members of the Action Group. ACPP provided overall project coordination, strategic oversight, monitoring and reporting. PARC led livelihood and community protection interventions, including land rehabilitation, agricultural roads, home gardens, cash-for-work activities around land development and protection, Community Protection Committees (CPCs) and protective presence activities. PSCCW led psychosocial, legal, educational and women's empowerment interventions, including psychosocial support, legal counselling, remedial education, child-focused activities and women's employment opportunities.

The intervention was guided by the assumption that the rights and dignity of vulnerable populations can be better protected when multiple dimensions of vulnerability are addressed simultaneously rather than through isolated sectoral interventions. The project's Theory of Change (TOC) assumed that improving livelihood opportunities would strengthen household resilience; that psychosocial and legal support would enhance well-being, agency and protection; that stronger community mechanisms would improve local protection capacities; and that documentation and advocacy would increase visibility of violations and support accountability efforts. Collectively, these pathways were expected to contribute to improved protection, resilience, participation and dignity.

1.3. Purpose, Scope and Evaluation Questions

The purpose of the final evaluation was to provide an independent assessment of the project's performance, results and emerging impacts while generating practical lessons and recommendations for ACPP, its partners and the Generalitat Valenciana. The evaluation was designed to serve both accountability and learning purposes. In addition to assessing achievement of intended results, the evaluation sought to understand how change occurred, how different intervention pathways interacted and how contextual realities shaped implementation and outcomes.

The evaluation covered the entire implementation period of the project and all major intervention components implemented under the Generalitat Valenciana grant in Awarta, Duma and Qusra. While the project formed part of the broader Action Group strategy in Southeast Nablus, the evaluation focused specifically on activities financed under SOLHUM/2024/0030 and did not attribute broader Action Group achievements to the project unless supported by evidence.

The evaluation was structured around eight overarching evaluation questions addressing relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, cross-cutting issues and nexus practice (see evaluation matrix at Annex 1). Together, these questions examined not only whether intended results

were achieved, but also how different components interacted, the extent to which the intervention functioned as an integrated protection system and the factors influencing performance and results.

1.4. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation adopted a theory-based, utilization-focused mixed-methods approach. Given the project's multiple pathways of change, a theory-based approach was considered particularly appropriate. Rather than focusing solely on activities and outputs, the evaluation sought to understand how different intervention pathways contributed to observed outcomes and how contextual factors influenced results. The reconstructed Theory of Change developed during the inception phase therefore served as the principal analytical framework guiding data collection, analysis and interpretation.

Evidence was collected through a combination of document review, key informant interviews, beneficiary consultations and direct observation. The documentary review included project proposals, logframes, progress reports, monitoring data, beneficiary records, CPC documentation, advocacy outputs and relevant contextual materials. This review served both to assess reported achievements and to identify issues requiring further validation during fieldwork. The list of documents reviewed is at Annex 4.

Fieldwork included consultations with implementing partners, local authorities, community representatives, CPC members, school representatives, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. In total, 60 individuals were consulted through interviews and focus group discussions. These consultations included representatives of ACPP, PARC, PSCCW and PHG, local councils, CPC members, agricultural beneficiaries, home garden beneficiaries, voucher recipients, women participating in psychosocial and legal support activities, beneficiaries of employment opportunities and other community stakeholders. A full list of interviewees is provided in Annex 3.

Field visits were conducted in three of the four target communities and included direct observation of agricultural roads, rehabilitated lands, home gardens, community facilities and other project-supported interventions. Observation provided an important means of validating reported achievements and understanding the realities within which interventions operated.

1.5. Data Analysis and Limitations

Findings presented in this report are based on systematic triangulation across documentary evidence, stakeholder consultations and direct observation. The evaluation distinguished between outputs, outcomes and emerging impacts. While outputs could often be directly verified through project records and observation, assessment of outcomes and emerging impacts relied primarily on qualitative evidence and stakeholder perceptions. Consequently, the evaluation focuses on plausible contribution rather than attribution.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the evaluation was conducted in a highly constrained and rapidly evolving environment characterized by access restrictions, security concerns and continuing deterioration in the humanitarian situation. Second, the evaluation was not designed as a quantitative impact assessment and therefore cannot provide statistically representative estimates of outcome-level change. Third, some longer-term effects, particularly regarding livelihoods, resilience and sustainability, may only become visible over a longer timeframe. These limitations were mitigated through extensive triangulation, consultation with diverse stakeholder groups, direct observation and careful interpretation of evidence within its broader contextual setting.

2. Findings

2.1. EQ1 – Relevance and Appropriateness

To what extent was the project relevant and appropriate to the needs, priorities, and rights-related vulnerabilities of the target population in Southeast Nablus?

Overall Findings
The evaluation finds that the project was highly relevant and broadly appropriate to the needs, priorities and rights-related vulnerabilities of the target population. It responded to multiple and interconnected dimensions of vulnerability affecting individuals, households and communities, including protection risks, declining livelihood opportunities, psychosocial distress, restrictions on access to land and services, educational disruption, women's exclusion from opportunities and decision-making spaces, and weakening community resilience.

The strongest evidence of relevance lies in the consistency between the vulnerabilities identified during project design, those reflected in the Action Group strategy, and those subsequently identified through the evaluation's fieldwork. Across all three communities, stakeholders and beneficiaries consistently confirmed that the issues targeted by the intervention reflected genuine and pressing concerns affecting daily life. Protection risks, economic hardship, psychosocial stress, educational disruption and reduced access to livelihoods emerged repeatedly as priority concerns.

At the same time, the evaluation finds that relevance must be understood within the context of a rapidly deteriorating environment. Since October 2023, communities have experienced significant increases in settler violence, access restrictions, economic hardship and pressure on public services. As a result, some needs evolved more rapidly than project design and implementation arrangements could fully accommodate. This was particularly evident in relation to household-level protection measures, youth vulnerabilities, emergency preparedness, water access and the growing challenges associated with sustaining agricultural livelihoods in highly exposed areas.

Importantly, the evaluation does not find that the project became less relevant as conditions changed. Rather, it finds that the nature and meaning of some interventions evolved. Agricultural roads, land rehabilitation and cultivation support increasingly functioned not only as livelihood interventions but also as mechanisms for maintaining presence on land, reinforcing community resilience and asserting rights in the face of growing restrictions and encroachment.

*Overall, the project demonstrated **strong relevance and appropriateness**. Its principal limitation was not a mismatch between interventions and community needs, but rather the speed and severity with which contextual realities evolved during implementation.*

2.1.1. Foundations of Relevance: Needs Assessment, Context Analysis and Project Design

The evaluation finds that the project was grounded in a credible understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities affecting communities in Southeast Nablus. This understanding emerged from two complementary processes. First, the broader Action Group strategy was informed by a substantial needs assessment undertaken by AWRAD in 2022 on behalf of AG partners. Second, implementing partners undertook additional consultations with community stakeholders during project formulation to validate priorities and identify interventions relevant to specific funding opportunities.

The AWRAD assessment provided a credible and participatory foundation for the Action Group strategy and successfully identified many of the vulnerabilities later confirmed by the evaluation. However, the assessment was stronger in identifying and prioritizing community needs than in analysing how vulnerabilities differ across population groups, how protection dynamics shape livelihood opportunities, and how needs may evolve under rapidly changing conditions. "The assessment appears to have placed greater emphasis on consultation and prioritization than on ongoing validation and feedback with participating communities following completion of the assessment process. These limitations do not undermine the relevance of the resulting strategy. Rather, they help explain why certain issues that emerged strongly during implementation and evaluation—including increased household-level protection needs, water as an increasingly binding constraint on agricultural livelihoods, increased youth vulnerabilities, and the sustainability of community-based protection structures—were either reflected less prominently in the original strategic framework or assumed greater importance as contextual conditions deteriorated after October 2023.

The evaluation therefore finds strong evidence that the project was informed by a structured and participatory strategic analysis rather than externally imposed assumptions. Many of the priorities reflected in project design remain highly relevant and were independently validated during fieldwork.

At the same time, the evaluation identified several limitations in the way assessment findings appear to have been carried forward into subsequent planning and project design processes. While the original assessment involved extensive consultation, discussions with stakeholders in the three target communities suggest that neither the assessment findings nor the resulting strategic framework were systematically shared back with many of those who had participated in consultations. Community representatives, beneficiaries and local actors were generally aware of project activities and community priorities but were often less aware of how consultation findings had been synthesized, interpreted, prioritized and translated into strategic and programming decisions.

The evaluation does not consider this a major weakness of the needs assessment itself, nor does it find evidence that priorities identified through consultations were misrepresented. However, it does suggest a relatively weak feedback and validation loop between assessment, strategy development and communities. Stronger feedback processes could have enhanced transparency, strengthened local ownership of identified priorities and provided opportunities for communities to validate, challenge or refine conclusions before they were translated into programming decisions.

The evaluation further found that project-level needs validation processes were less formalized than the original strategic assessment. Partners described consulting community stakeholders during proposal development to identify and validate priorities. "As a result, documentation reviewed did not allow the evaluation to fully reconstruct prioritization processes, including how trade-offs were made between competing priorities, or how consultation findings ultimately informed intervention selection. These consultations appear to have been pragmatic and often conducted under the practical time constraints associated with donor proposal preparation.

This should not be interpreted as a major design weakness. The evaluation found no evidence that project resources were directed toward irrelevant priorities. However, findings suggest that more systematic and continuously updated needs assessment processes may have generated a more nuanced understanding of rapidly evolving vulnerabilities, particularly after October 2023. Issues that emerged strongly during evaluation fieldwork—including household-level protection measures, youth-focused support, water as a critical constraint on agricultural productivity, and the sustainability of community-based structures—were reflected less clearly in project design than in community narratives.

The evaluation therefore concludes that the project was grounded in a sound understanding of needs, but that needs assessment, prioritization and validation processes could be strengthened through more systematic documentation, iterative updating and stronger feedback mechanisms with communities. This is particularly important in highly volatile environments where priorities evolve rapidly and where community ownership and participation in decision-making are important dimensions of localized protection programming and accountability to affected populations.

2.1.2. EQ1.1 To What Extent Did the Project Respond to the Most Pressing Needs Identified in the Target Communities?

The project responded to many of the most pressing needs affecting the target communities and demonstrated a high degree of alignment with both the vulnerabilities identified through the Action Group strategy and those subsequently identified through evaluation fieldwork.

Across all three communities targeted by the evaluation, the evaluation found strong evidence that the intervention addressed needs that were widely recognized by local stakeholders as priorities. Livelihood deterioration, declining employment opportunities, psychosocial distress, restrictions on access to land and services, educational disruption, protection risks and weakening community resilience emerged consistently across interviews, focus group discussions and community consultations. In this regard, the project addressed real and widely shared concerns rather than externally defined priorities.

In Qusra, relevance must be understood against an exceptionally severe protection and economic context. The Chairman of the Village Council estimated that approximately 75 percent of the labour force had become unemployed or severely underemployed. Community representatives reported extensive damage and loss since October 2023, including homes and enterprises being burned or rendered inaccessible, poultry farms destroyed or abandoned, thousands of olive trees uprooted and extensive restrictions imposed on access to agricultural lands. Residents described a situation in which entering approximately 90 percent of village agricultural lands now requires prior coordination with Israeli authorities, which is often denied and, even when granted, does not eliminate the risk of settler attacks.

Within this context, livelihoods, protection and land access have become inseparable. The project's agricultural roads, land rehabilitation and labour-intensive conditional cash assistance activities were therefore highly relevant because they addressed both immediate economic needs and broader concerns regarding access to land and continued presence in threatened areas.

Field visits confirmed that roads and land development works had been completed largely as reported and were generally appreciated by beneficiaries and community members. However, the evaluation also found that the context has significantly constrained the realization of expected livelihood benefits. In several cases, rehabilitated lands and roads have become difficult or dangerous to access because of settler violence and restrictions imposed after October 2023. One resident whose home was attacked and partially destroyed described how he had been forced to relocate temporarily while attempting to fortify his property before returning. Similar accounts were repeatedly heard throughout consultations.

Yet beneficiaries consistently rejected the notion that these interventions had become irrelevant. Across Qusra, Awarta and Duma, the evaluation repeatedly encountered a strong narrative that maintaining and cultivating land remains important even when economic returns are uncertain. Beneficiaries and community representatives emphasized that abandoning land would facilitate further encroachment and undermine long-term rights and claims. As one resident explained, communities cannot simply surrender to the status quo and stop investing in their lands as this would be an exercise of futility. The relevance of

agricultural interventions therefore increasingly derives not only from their economic value but also from their contribution to resilience, presence and rights protection.

Voucher assistance in Qusra was similarly relevant given rising unemployment and household economic stress. Beneficiaries consistently reported that assistance was timely and helped improve food consumption during a period of significant hardship. Home gardens were also appreciated, particularly by households able to sustain cultivation. However, the evaluation found that water scarcity increasingly shapes the practical value of these interventions. Several beneficiaries indicated that water tanks and pumps included within the support package were among the most valued components. In some cases, these assets appeared to contribute as much to household water security as to agricultural production, suggesting that water access has become a critical determinant of livelihood viability.

In Awarta, agricultural interventions demonstrated even stronger practical livelihood relevance. Unlike Qusra, many rehabilitated lands remained accessible and were being actively cultivated at the time of the evaluation. Beneficiaries confirmed that agricultural roads and land development improved access, usability and productivity. At the same time, farmers repeatedly emphasized that water availability remains the principal factor limiting agricultural development and suggested that future interventions should place greater emphasis on water infrastructure, reservoirs and network expansion.

In Duma, relevance is perhaps best illustrated through adaptation. Because access restrictions and protection risks had made conventional agricultural interventions increasingly difficult to justify and implement effectively, PARC did not pursue the same package of agricultural road and land rehabilitation activities implemented elsewhere. Instead, support focused on community protection and preparedness measures. Stakeholders consistently viewed support to the Community Protection Committee, emergency preparedness capacities, the village medical centre and the fencing of the Martyr Ali Dawabsheh School as highly relevant responses to current realities. Duma stakeholders also emphasized the growing importance of supporting household resilience, home-based economic activities and protection of homes and public facilities.

Across all communities, PSCCW interventions were perceived as highly relevant. Women consistently described fear, stress, social isolation, legal vulnerability and limited access to support services. Psychosocial support, legal awareness, legal assistance and employment opportunities therefore responded directly to expressed needs. Likewise, remedial education and child-focused activities addressed learning loss, educational disruption and psychosocial pressures affecting children and families.

The evaluation therefore concludes that the project responded strongly to pressing needs across target communities. However, it also finds that needs increasingly exceeded the scope and resources of the intervention. Stakeholders consistently identified additional priorities relating to household-level protection, youth employment and engagement, emergency preparedness, health services, psychosocial support, water infrastructure and safe spaces for children and youth. These do not undermine the project's relevance. Rather, they illustrate the scale of unmet needs in a context where vulnerabilities continue to deepen.

2.1.3. EQ1.2 Were the Selected Components Appropriate to the Specific Vulnerabilities of Women, Children and Agricultural Households?

The evaluation finds that the selected components were generally well aligned with the specific vulnerabilities facing women, children and agricultural households. The intervention demonstrated a strong understanding that these groups experience vulnerability differently and that a single modality

would not be sufficient to respond to their needs. Overall, the selected components were appropriate, although some vulnerabilities became more prominent during implementation than they appear to have been during project design.

For women, the intervention was particularly appropriate. Across the target communities, women faced overlapping pressures related to psychosocial stress, social isolation, legal vulnerability, limited economic opportunities and restricted participation in public and community life. The combination of psychosocial support, legal awareness, legal assistance, employment opportunities and support for women's collective action responded directly to these needs. Importantly, the project did not treat women only as recipients of assistance, but as individuals requiring access to information, support, confidence-building, services and opportunities for participation.

The appropriateness of the women-focused components was strengthened by the fact that they addressed both practical and less visible dimensions of vulnerability. Psychosocial support responded to stress and isolation; legal support addressed rights-related barriers; employment opportunities responded to economic exclusion and limited public participation; and organizational-development activities attempted to create pathways for more collective engagement. While not all of these pathways were equally developed or sustained, the overall package was well matched to women's expressed priorities.

For children, the selected interventions were also appropriate. Stakeholders consistently identified educational disruption, learning loss, psychosocial distress and limited access to safe and supportive activities as significant concerns. Remedial education, Team Up activities, parent engagement and teacher-related support therefore responded to genuine needs. The intervention was appropriately targeted toward children who were already struggling academically or socially, although its scale and duration meant that it could only provide targeted support rather than address broader systemic weaknesses in the education sector.

For agricultural households, the appropriateness of the selected components was more complex but still broadly positive. Agriculture remains central to livelihoods, food security, identity, resilience and attachment to land in the target communities. Land rehabilitation, agricultural roads, home gardens and labour-intensive conditional cash assistance were therefore appropriate responses to community priorities. However, the operating context increasingly changed the conditions under which these interventions could produce benefits. In communities where land remained accessible, such as parts of Awarta, agricultural support was more clearly aligned with productive livelihood objectives. In more exposed areas, particularly Qusra, the same interventions increasingly carried protection, resilience and rights-related significance because continued investment in land was linked to maintaining presence and resisting abandonment.

Home gardens illustrate both the appropriateness and limits of the agricultural support package. The modality was relevant to household food production and resilience, and the inclusion of tanks, pumps and irrigation systems responded to practical constraints faced by households. However, water scarcity emerged as a central factor affecting the productivity and sustainability of the intervention. This does not mean that home gardens were inappropriate, but it suggests that future agricultural and household resilience interventions should treat water access as a core design consideration rather than a secondary constraint.

The evaluation also finds that some vulnerabilities were less fully addressed. In particular, stakeholders across communities highlighted growing concerns regarding youth unemployment, psychosocial stress and limited opportunities for participation, especially among young men. The project's focus on women

and children was justified and appropriate, but future programming may need to give more explicit attention to youth-specific vulnerabilities within the wider community resilience agenda.

Overall, the selected components were highly appropriate for women and children and broadly appropriate for agricultural households. Their principal limitation was not conceptual misalignment, but the increasingly difficult operating environment in which agricultural livelihoods, community protection and access to services now function. Future programming should preserve the multi-component approach while sharpening the differentiation of support by community context, access conditions, water availability and the specific vulnerabilities of groups that were less directly reached.

2.1.4. EQ1.3 To What Extent Did the Project Design Reflect the Realities of Restricted Access, Settler Violence and Limited Service Availability?

The evaluation finds that project design demonstrated a strong understanding of the structural realities affecting communities in Southeast Nablus and incorporated multiple elements specifically intended to respond to those realities. The intervention recognized that vulnerability in the target communities was not solely a function of poverty or economic hardship but was deeply shaped by occupation-related constraints, protection risks, restricted access to land and services, and institutional weaknesses.

This understanding is evident throughout the intervention design. The inclusion of community protection mechanisms, psychosocial support, legal services, child-focused interventions, protective presence activities, livelihood support in threatened areas, and advocacy components indicates that the project was built around a multidimensional understanding of vulnerability. Rather than treating livelihoods, protection and social well-being as separate sectors, the intervention sought to address their interconnections.

Importantly, the evaluation finds that project design reflected contextual realities as they existed at the time of formulation. However, it is equally important to recognize that the scale and pace of deterioration experienced after October 2023 could not reasonably have been fully anticipated during project design. The distinction between anticipating constraints and anticipating the magnitude of subsequent deterioration is important. The project correctly identified access restrictions, settler violence, declining livelihoods and weak service provision as central challenges. What changed was the gravity and intensity with which these challenges affected communities.

Qusra provides perhaps the clearest example of this dynamic. The project's agricultural interventions were designed around the assumption that rehabilitated lands would remain accessible and usable. While this assumption was reasonable when the project was formulated, subsequent developments increasingly undermined it. Roads and rehabilitated lands continued to exist and remained technically functional, yet access to many of these areas became progressively more dangerous and uncertain. As a result, interventions that were originally expected to generate livelihood outcomes increasingly functioned as mechanisms for maintaining presence, resisting abandonment and asserting rights.

The evaluation does not consider this a design failure. Rather, it illustrates the limits of project design in contexts where political and protection realities evolve rapidly and unpredictably.

The project also demonstrated an ability to adapt. Duma provides the strongest example of adaptive relevance. Recognizing the increasing constraints affecting agricultural interventions, PARC shifted emphasis toward community protection, preparedness and resilience measures. Stakeholders consistently

identified support to the Community Protection Committee, emergency preparedness capacities, the village medical centre and school protection measures as highly relevant responses to evolving needs.

The intervention likewise responded meaningfully to limitations in public services. Psychosocial support, legal assistance, remedial education, employment opportunities and community-based protection mechanisms all addressed gaps that local institutions were often unable to fill. Interviews with local councils, school representatives and community members consistently highlighted the limited capacity of existing institutions to respond adequately to growing needs.

Nevertheless, the evaluation finds that some emerging priorities became more prominent during implementation than they appear to have been during project design. These include household-level protection measures, emergency preparedness, youth-focused interventions, water infrastructure and longer-term support to community-based structures, all necessary elements of responsivenss to the protracted and escalating protection crisis in the West Bank. This finding does not undermine the relevance of project design but does reinforce the importance of continuous reassessment in rapidly evolving environments.

The overall conclusion emerging from the above is that the project design reflected contextual realities well and demonstrated a strong understanding of the structural factors shaping vulnerability in Southeast Nablus. The principal challenge was not insufficient contextual understanding but the unprecedented deterioration of conditions during implementation.

2.1.5. EQ1.4 Were Targeting and Selection Processes Appropriate, Transparent and Perceived as Fair?

The evaluation finds that targeting and beneficiary selection processes were generally appropriate, transparent and broadly perceived as fair by beneficiaries, community representatives and local stakeholders. Across the three target communities vitisted, the evaluation encountered relatively little evidence of dissatisfaction with beneficiary selection decisions and no evidence of systematic exclusion, favouritism or manipulation of beneficiary lists. This is noteworthy given the scale of unmet needs and the fact that project resources were inevitably insufficient to support all vulnerable households.

The relative absence of significant complaints suggests that implementing partners benefited from a reasonable degree of trust and credibility within the target communities. Beneficiaries generally understood that assistance was limited and that selection criteria were necessary. Community representatives frequently acknowledged that while some households remained in need, the households selected were generally deserving of support and criteria used to select them.

At the same time, the evaluation found that perceptions of fairness were influenced by the close involvement of local councils and community actors in the identification and validation of beneficiaries. In all three communities, local authorities and community stakeholders played important roles in facilitating implementation and supporting beneficiary identification processes. This contributed positively to local acceptance and ownership. The strongest evidence regarding targeting fairness emerged in relation to voucher assistance and livelihood interventions. In Qusra, for example, the decision to target households benefiting from the Palestinian National Cash Transfer Programme (CTP) was generally accepted. Some community representatives questioned whether these households should automatically receive priority given that they may also benefit from support provided by other actors. Others argued that these households remained among the most vulnerable, particularly in the context of the fiscal crisis affecting the Palestinian Authority and the resulting interruptions in social assistance

payments. Despite these discussions, the evaluation found little evidence that beneficiaries or community members perceived targeting decisions as fundamentally unfair.

Similarly, beneficiaries of agricultural interventions generally accepted selection criteria and did not raise significant concerns regarding inclusion or exclusion errors. The evaluation found no evidence of disputes or tensions arising from land rehabilitation, agricultural roads or conditional cash assistance activities.

However, the evaluation also identified limitations that point to opportunities for improvement. First, while communities were consulted regarding needs and beneficiary selection, the evaluation found more limited evidence of systematic communication regarding how needs assessments, consultation findings and prioritization decisions were ultimately translated into project design and resource allocation decisions. As discussed earlier, many stakeholders participated in consultations but were less aware of how priorities were subsequently analysed, prioritized and incorporated into programming decisions. This does not appear to have undermined perceptions of fairness. However, stronger feedback mechanisms could have enhanced transparency and accountability by helping communities understand not only who was selected, but also why particular intervention choices were made and why certain needs were prioritized over others.

Second, the evaluation found evidence that some participation barriers limited access to activities for particular groups. Women in Qusra noted that although psychosocial and legal awareness sessions were publicly advertised and generally open to participation, some women were unable to attend because of childcare responsibilities, household obligations or mobility constraints. While this does not indicate inappropriate targeting, it does suggest that eligibility and accessibility are not necessarily synonymous. Future interventions may benefit from placing greater attention on practical barriers to participation.

Third, the evaluation found evidence that some highly vulnerable groups may not have been fully captured through project targeting approaches. Youth vulnerabilities, particularly among young men, emerged repeatedly during fieldwork but were reflected less prominently in project activities. Similarly, field evidence suggests that some households with functioning but highly constrained agricultural assets may have fallen between categories of support. For example, some stakeholders questioned whether households with existing home gardens but significant water constraints were adequately captured by intervention criteria.

The home garden component provides an instructive example. The intervention appropriately targeted households without functioning gardens or with limited productive assets. However, evaluation findings suggest that some households may have benefited more from complementary investments in water access than from standard agricultural packages. This points less to a targeting problem than to the challenges of designing interventions capable of addressing complex and differentiated needs.

Finally, community representatives in Qusra expressed a desire for a stronger role in final beneficiary selection decisions. While they generally viewed project procedures positively, some felt that local committees possessed contextual knowledge that could have been utilized more effectively when making final decisions regarding marginal cases. A similar sentiment was expressed in Duma, while calls for more representative local committees were voiced in Awarta. The evaluation does not find evidence that this materially affected targeting quality but considers it indicative of broader discussions regarding community participation and local ownership and agency.

A related issue emerging from fieldwork concerns the use of exclusion criteria intended to prevent repeated participation in similar interventions. For both women's employment opportunities and land rehabilitation activities, beneficiaries who had received comparable support within a specified period

were generally ineligible for selection. Such criteria are understandable and serve an important purpose in maximizing outreach, promoting equitable distribution of limited resources and reducing the risk that a small number of households repeatedly capture project benefits. However, evaluation findings suggest that in some cases these criteria may warrant greater flexibility. Women who benefited from employment placements frequently expressed interest in further opportunities but remained excluded despite continuing economic vulnerability and limited employment prospects. Similarly, several land rehabilitation beneficiaries noted that initial investments had improved the usability of their land but that additional support—particularly related to water access, storage or complementary infrastructure—would be required to realize the full benefits of those investments. This finding points to a broader tension between maximizing beneficiary coverage and supporting longer-term resilience pathways. While the evaluation does not question the rationale for limiting repeated participation, it suggests that future interventions may benefit from more nuanced approaches that distinguish between repetitive support and sequenced or complementary assistance designed to consolidate and sustain previous investments.

Overall, the evaluation concludes that targeting and selection processes were appropriate and generally perceived as fair. The principal areas for improvement relate not to beneficiary selection itself but rather to strengthening transparency, feedback mechanisms, participation of marginalized groups and communication regarding prioritization decisions.

2.1.6. EQ1.5 How Effectively Were Gender, Protection and Accountability Considerations Integrated into Project Design?

The evaluation finds that gender and protection considerations were strongly integrated into project design, while accountability considerations were present but less systematically articulated and evidenced. The design recognized that vulnerability in the target communities is shaped not only by poverty and service gaps, but also by gendered exclusion, psychosocial stress, legal vulnerability, exposure to violence, restricted access to land and weak local protection capacities.

Gender integration was one of the stronger features of the project design. Women were not treated as a generic beneficiary group, but as a population facing specific and overlapping vulnerabilities. The inclusion of psychosocial support, legal awareness, legal assistance, employment opportunities and support for women's collective action reflected a substantive understanding of women's needs and barriers. These components were appropriate because they addressed practical needs, access to services, confidence, participation and rights awareness.

Protection considerations were also meaningfully embedded in the design. The project recognized that protection in Southeast Nablus extends beyond individual services and includes access to land, community preparedness, legal support, psychosocial well-being, protective presence, child safety and the capacity of communities to respond to incidents. The inclusion of Community Protection Committees, protective presence activities, school-related protection measures, legal assistance and advocacy components reflected a multidimensional protection logic.

At the same time, the design could not fully anticipate the speed and severity with which protection needs would evolve after October 2023. Household-level protection measures, emergency response capacities, water-related resilience, protection of public facilities and youth vulnerabilities became more prominent during implementation than they appear to have been at design stage. This does not indicate weak design, but it reinforces the need for more iterative protection analysis in highly volatile environments.

Accountability considerations were present, particularly through community consultation, involvement of local councils and use of local actors in targeting and implementation. These features contributed to local acceptance and perceived fairness. However, accountability was less strongly articulated as a system of feedback, validation and communication with affected communities. In particular, the design appears to have placed more emphasis on consultation than on closing the loop with communities regarding how their inputs were analysed, prioritized and translated into project decisions.

Overall, the project design integrated gender and protection considerations effectively and treated them as central elements of the intervention rather than as add-ons. Accountability was present but less developed and would have benefited from clearer mechanisms for feedback, validation, communication of decisions and ongoing community-level accountability.

2.2. EQ2 – Coherence and Complementarity

To what extent was the project coherent internally across its components and externally with the broader Action Group approach and other relevant interventions?

Overall Findings:

The evaluation finds that the project demonstrated a ***moderate to strong degree of coherence and complementarity****, both internally across its various components and externally within the broader Action Group framework. The intervention was built upon a clear understanding that vulnerability in Southeast Nablus is multidimensional and cannot be effectively addressed through a single-sector response. Consequently, livelihoods support, community protection, psychosocial services, legal awareness and assistance, remedial education, women's empowerment, and community engagement were brought together within a common intervention framework.*

At the design level, the intervention displayed a high degree of conceptual coherence. The various components addressed interconnected dimensions of vulnerability and collectively reflected the reality that economic hardship, psychosocial distress, educational disruption, weak local services, restricted access to land, and exposure to violence reinforce one another. The project therefore moved beyond a purely sectoral approach and attempted to address vulnerability through multiple pathways.

At implementation level, however, coherence was more uneven. While the different components generally complemented one another and were rarely duplicative, they were not always operationalized through integrated beneficiary pathways or systematic referral mechanisms. Beneficiaries often experienced support through a particular partner or activity stream rather than through a deliberately sequenced package of assistance. As a result, complementarity was strongest at the level of project design and partner specialization, and somewhat weaker at the level of integrated household support.

The Action Group framework appears to have added value by enabling coordination among specialized actors, reducing duplication, and creating opportunities for complementary interventions across communities. However, the evaluation also finds that the practical realization of this added value varied between communities and depended heavily on the strength of local institutions and community structures.

2.2.1. EQ2.1 Were the livelihoods, protection, legal, psychosocial and community engagement components designed and implemented in a complementary manner?

The project components were designed in a broadly complementary manner and reflected a coherent understanding of the interconnected vulnerabilities affecting the target communities. The combination of agricultural livelihoods support, cash assistance, psychosocial services, legal awareness and assistance, child-focused support, women's participation and community protection mechanisms was appropriate to a context where economic hardship, restricted land access, exposure to violence, psychosocial stress and weak services reinforce one another.

At design level, the intervention avoided a narrow sectoral approach. Each component addressed a distinct dimension of vulnerability, while collectively contributing to the wider objective of protecting rights and dignity. Livelihood activities responded to economic insecurity and access to land; psychosocial and legal support addressed well-being, agency and rights-related barriers; child-focused activities responded to educational and psychosocial vulnerabilities; and community protection activities sought to strengthen local preparedness and response capacity.

At implementation level, the components were generally compatible and not duplicative. Communities did not perceive the different activity streams as contradictory or competing. Rather, they tended to understand them as different responses to related needs. This was supported by the clear division of roles among partners and by the fact that each organization worked within areas of established technical expertise.

There were also practical examples of complementarity. Women's psychosocial, legal, employment and participation-related activities reinforced one another within PSCCW's package of support. Child-focused interventions combined direct support to children with engagement of parents and teachers. Agricultural activities, particularly in exposed areas, carried both livelihood and protection significance because continued investment in land was linked to maintaining presence and resisting abandonment.

However, complementarity was stronger at the level of design logic and partner specialization than at the level of integrated beneficiary experience. The components were coherent and mutually relevant, but were not always implemented through deliberately sequenced household pathways or systematic cross-component referral mechanisms. Beneficiaries often engaged with one partner or activity stream rather than with the intervention as a fully integrated package.

Overall, the project demonstrated strong conceptual complementarity and several practical examples of reinforcement between components. The main limitation was not fragmentation or duplication, but the incomplete translation of this complementarity into systematic beneficiary-level integration, an issue examined further under EQ8.

2.2.2. EQ2.2 To what extent did coordination among ACPP, PARC and PSCCW support coherent implementation?

Coordination among ACPP, PARC and PSCCW contributed positively to coherent implementation. Partner roles were generally clear, aligned with organizational mandates and understood by community stakeholders. This reduced duplication, enabled each partner to work within its area of comparative

advantage and allowed the project to address multiple dimensions of vulnerability without creating confusion over responsibilities.

At institutional level, coordination appears to have functioned reasonably well. ACPP provided overall coordination and oversight, while implementing partners delivered activities broadly consistent with their technical strengths. Local stakeholders generally understood which organization was responsible for which type of support, and the evaluation found little evidence of competing mandates or overlapping delivery.

However, coordination was stronger at the level of institutional division of labour than at the level of integrated beneficiary support. The evaluation found limited evidence of formal referral mechanisms or systematic procedures for identifying households or individuals requiring support across multiple components. Where beneficiaries accessed more than one type of support, this appears to have resulted mainly from local circumstances or parallel activity participation rather than from a deliberate cross-partner pathway.

Community-level coordination structures also varied in their contribution to coherence. In Duma, existing local structures and prior engagement helped connect project support to broader community preparedness and response capacities. In Awarta, by contrast, the CPC did not become sufficiently functional to serve as a platform for coordination or follow-up. This limited the extent to which community protection structures could support integration across different activity streams.

Overall, coordination among partners supported coherent implementation and helped avoid fragmentation. Its main limitation was that it did not consistently translate into shared beneficiary pathways, cross-referral or community-level mechanisms for integrated follow-up. This did not prevent delivery, but it reduced the extent to which the project functioned as a fully connected package at beneficiary and household level.

2.2.3. EQ2.3 Did the project benefit from its positioning within the Action Group framework?

The evaluation finds clear evidence that the project benefited from its positioning within the broader Action Group framework. The most significant benefit was the ability to draw upon a network of specialized organizations working within the same geographic and thematic space over an extended period. This enabled the project to combine livelihoods support, psychosocial services, legal assistance, community protection and local institutional strengthening within a broader strategic framework rather than as isolated interventions. The Action Group framework also provided access to established relationships, local knowledge and community trust built through previous interventions, reducing the need to establish new structures and partnerships for each project.

Evidence from Duma illustrates one of the principal advantages of this approach. The Community Protection Committee (CPC) had been established and supported through previous initiatives involving PARC and other actors and therefore entered the project period with a higher level of functionality, experience and community legitimacy than was observed elsewhere. This allowed the project to build upon existing capacities and relationships and contributed to more effective implementation of preparedness and community protection activities. More broadly, stakeholders in Duma frequently described their engagement with PARC and other Action Group members as part of a longer-term presence in the community rather than as a single standalone project. This continuity appears to have strengthened community trust, facilitated implementation and enhanced the project's ability to respond to locally identified priorities.

The Action Group framework also appears to have provided greater flexibility to adapt interventions to differing community realities. In Duma, for example, the project placed greater emphasis on preparedness, community protection and local response capacities than was the case in Awarta and Qusra. While the evaluation cannot conclusively attribute these decisions to Action Group coordination alone, the ability to draw upon complementary expertise, accumulated contextual knowledge and long-standing community engagement appears to have facilitated a more differentiated response tailored to local circumstances.

The project further benefited from wider investments and relationships developed through the broader Action Group ecosystem. Although beneficiaries did not always distinguish between individual projects or initiatives, communities often experienced multiple forms of support delivered over time through different partners operating within a shared strategic vision. In practice, this expanded the range of needs that could be addressed and allowed the project to build on previous investments rather than operating as a completely standalone intervention.

At the same time, the added value of the Action Group was more visible to implementing organizations, local authorities and community leaders than to ordinary beneficiaries. Beneficiaries generally associated support with the specific organization delivering it—most commonly PARC or PSCCW—rather than with the broader Action Group framework. This does not diminish the value of the framework itself. Rather, it suggests that its principal contribution lies in strategic coordination, continuity of engagement, accumulated community trust and complementarity between organizations rather than in public visibility as a distinct identity.

Overall, the evaluation finds strong evidence that the project benefited from its positioning within the Action Group framework. The most significant added value derived not from any single intervention, but from the cumulative effect of long-term engagement, complementary institutional capacities, established community relationships and the ability to build upon previous investments and structures.

2.4 EQ2.4 Were overlaps with other interventions managed effectively to avoid duplication and strengthen complementarity?

The evidence suggests that overlaps were generally managed effectively and that duplication was limited. The strongest evidence comes from Duma, where PARC consciously avoided implementing agricultural rehabilitation and land development activities because similar interventions had already been extensively implemented by multiple actors. Rather than reproducing existing support, the project shifted emphasis toward protection-oriented community initiatives and support to existing community structures. This adaptation reflects active management of overlap rather than passive coexistence.

In Qusra, stakeholders identified the presence of several humanitarian and development organizations. Despite this, beneficiaries and local actors did not report significant duplication of support. Instead, organizations were generally perceived as addressing different needs or different population groups. While communities often remained under-served relative to the scale of need, there was little evidence that multiple actors were repeatedly delivering identical interventions to the same households.

The project's focus on specific niches—such as women's psychosocial support, legal awareness, remedial education, CPC strengthening, and conditional cash assistant to deliver agricultural rehabilitation—further reduced the likelihood of duplication. However, the evaluation notes that overlap management was largely driven by partner knowledge and community-level coordination rather than by formalized inter-agency systems. Given the rapidly changing context and growing humanitarian presence in the area,

stronger documentation and monitoring of overlaps and mapping of other actors' interventions and coordination and complementarity opportunities could further strengthen complementarity and external coherence in future programming.

2.5 EQ2.5 To what extent did community-level implementation reflect a coherent project identity rather than separate partner-led activities?

Community perceptions reveal a nuanced picture. Beneficiaries generally viewed the project as addressing a coherent set of community problems, even if they did not necessarily perceive it as a single integrated intervention. Most beneficiaries identified activities primarily through the implementing organization they interacted with directly. Women tended to associate psychosocial and legal services with PSCCW, while farmers and community actors associated agricultural and CPC-related activities with PARC.

This does not indicate fragmentation. Rather, it reflects the reality that specialized organizations were delivering specialized services. Communities did not perceive the interventions as contradictory or competing. Instead, they generally understood them as different responses to different needs.

The strongest sense of project coherence emerged at community level, where stakeholders recognized that livelihoods, protection, women's empowerment, education and emergency response were all part of a broader effort to support vulnerable communities facing a common set of challenges. In Qusra, discussions repeatedly linked agriculture, protection, education, psychosocial well-being and community resilience as interconnected concerns. Similarly, in Duma, stakeholders discussed women's employment, CPC support, school protection and emergency preparedness as complementary rather than separate interventions.

Nevertheless, the project identity remained stronger at community level than at household level. Beneficiaries often experienced individual components rather than a fully integrated package. This reinforces the broader finding that coherence was strongest at strategic and community levels and less developed through beneficiary-level integration mechanisms.

2.3. EQ3 – Effectiveness

To what extent did the project achieve its intended results, and what factors enabled or constrained achievement?

Overall Findings

The evaluation finds that the project achieved a ***moderate to strong level of effectiveness****, with strong evidence of output delivery across the main activity streams and credible qualitative evidence of meaningful immediate outcomes for women, children, farming households and community structures. However, the degree to which outputs translated into deeper or sustained outcomes varied significantly by component and by community.*

The project was most effective where the intended change depended on direct service delivery, human interaction, psychosocial support, legal accompaniment, temporary employment, remedial education

and community-level solidarity. These areas produced credible and meaningful changes, even where the scale of change remained modest.

The project was less effective where intended outcomes depended on external conditions beyond the control of the project, especially safe access to land, absence of settler violence, availability of water, functioning local institutions and stable public services. This is particularly important for agricultural interventions. Land rehabilitation, agricultural roads and home gardens were implemented and appreciated, but their livelihood potential was constrained by occupation-related risks, settler attacks, access restrictions and water shortages.

*The evaluation therefore distinguishes between **implementation effectiveness**, which was generally strong, and **outcome effectiveness**, which was more uneven. The project delivered a large share of what it planned and, in several areas, produced valued changes. But it could not fully overcome structural and protection-related barriers that shaped whether beneficiaries were able to convert support into sustained improvements in income, productivity, safety or resilience*

2.3.1. EQ3.1 To what extent were planned activities and outputs delivered as intended?

The project shows strong evidence of output delivery. PARC and PSCCW reports document implementation across the main planned components, and fieldwork broadly confirmed the delivery of key activities in Qusra, Awarta and Duma.

PARC reports achievement or overachievement across several livelihood and protection-related outputs, including agricultural roads, land rehabilitation, conditional cash assistance, home gardens, agricultural training, protective presence, Community Protection and DRR Plan updates, and community protection initiatives. Field visits in Qusra and Awarta confirmed that agricultural roads and land development works had been implemented as reported. In Qusra, the evaluation visually observed rehabilitated roads and developed land, while in Awarta it also observed evidence of actual land use and cultivation following rehabilitation.

PSCCW also reports completion of its main activities, including group and individual MHPSS for women, legal awareness sessions, legal consultations and assistance, Team Up psychosocial support for children, teacher and parent capacity-building, training for women-led community organizations, cash-for-work placements for women, and remedial education for children. The report indicates that all activities were implemented as planned and that no formal modifications occurred.

The output delivery picture is therefore generally strong. However, output achievement should not be equated automatically with outcome achievement. In particular, the evaluation found that the functionality and effects of some outputs were uneven. For example, CPC-related activities were stronger in Duma, where the CPC had been established since 2021 and had received support from multiple actors over time, than in Awarta, where the CPC was established but not meaningfully developed or supported to assume an operational role. Similarly, agricultural outputs were physically delivered, but in Qusra many of the expected livelihood outcomes did not materialize because of deteriorating access and security conditions.

Overall, planned outputs were achieved and exceeded for some targets due to unforeseen efficiency gains, but the quality and usefulness of some outputs depended heavily on contextual and institutional conditions as we shall discuss under the effectiveness questions.

2.3.2. EQ3.2 What evidence exists of livelihood, income, productive capacity or household resilience outcomes?

The evidence on livelihood outcomes is mixed and should be interpreted cautiously. The evaluation was qualitative and was not designed to measure income change, productivity gains or food expenditure reductions quantitatively. It therefore cannot claim verified increases in income or production. What it can assess is whether beneficiaries and local actors reported plausible changes in cultivation, land usability, household coping and livelihood resilience, and whether field observations were consistent with these claims.

For land development and agricultural roads, there is credible evidence that the project improved the physical usability of agricultural land. Farmers and local actors in both Qusra and Awarta appreciated the works and saw them as relevant. In Awarta, there is some qualitative evidence of increased cultivation and actual use of rehabilitated land. The location of the rehabilitated lands in Awarta appears to have allowed stronger practical benefits than in Qusra, because these lands are not currently in the most exposed areas of settler or army attacks. Beneficiaries in Awarta confirmed that the interventions helped them cultivate and use their land, and evaluation observations were broadly consistent with this.

In Qusra, however, there is no evaluation evidence that the land rehabilitation and agricultural roads have led to increased income, agricultural investment or productivity gains. On the contrary, the field evidence suggests that much of the rehabilitated area has become inaccessible or risky due to settler attacks, occupation restrictions and access controls. The works were completed and valued, but their livelihood effects were severely constrained. Some beneficiaries even described a painful paradox: roads intended to improve land access for farmers may now be seen by some residents as potentially facilitating settler access, even though they stressed that this was not the project's intention.

This does not mean the land-related interventions were ineffective. Rather, their primary effect in Qusra appears to have shifted from livelihood improvement toward maintaining presence, asserting rights and refusing abandonment of land. Beneficiaries repeatedly emphasized that they cannot surrender to the status quo and that continuing to rehabilitate land remains important because these are their lands and rights. This is a meaningful protection-related and symbolic outcome, even where economic outcomes remain limited.

Home gardens also produced variable but positive outcomes. The evaluation cannot provide a quantitative estimate of the proportion of gardens fully or partially used. However, based on field notes, all home gardens visited or discussed appear to be used productively to varying degrees. Some beneficiaries reported that inputs helped them expand cultivated areas and that irrigation equipment, tanks and pumps improved productivity. At the same time, water scarcity sharply limited the potential of this activity. Beneficiaries in Qusra indicated that they do not plant summer vegetables or crops because water is scarce and expensive. In this sense, home gardens contributed to household food production and water storage capacity, but their full productive potential remains constrained.

Voucher assistance contributed to short-term household coping. Beneficiaries reported that it improved food quantity and quality and reduced stress during a difficult period. The assistance was not designed to create sustained livelihood change, but it was effective as immediate relief.

Conditional cash assistance and labour-intensive land development also provided temporary work and income. This was important in communities where unemployment and underemployment had sharply

increased. However, the employment effects were temporary. The main value was short-term income, community ownership of works, and local circulation of resources.

The paid work opportunities (internships) provided through PSCCW also generated important livelihood-related benefits, particularly for women. Although the placements were temporary and the evaluation cannot determine the degree to which they resulted in sustained employment after completion, beneficiaries consistently described them as a valuable source of income during a period of significant economic hardship. Women placed in local institutions, including schools, health facilities and community organizations, reported that the opportunity enabled them to contribute to household expenses and reduced dependence on other family members. In communities where employment opportunities for women are limited and labour force participation remains low, even temporary access to paid work represented an important economic benefit.

Beyond the immediate income effect, the internships appear to have strengthened dimensions of household resilience linked to employability and labour market attachment. Beneficiaries frequently emphasized that the placements allowed them to gain practical work experience, develop workplace skills and build confidence in their ability to work outside the home. The strong demand expressed by participants for additional internship opportunities is itself indicative of the value attached to the intervention. Many women stated that they would have welcomed further placements but were unable to apply because project selection criteria excluded individuals who had previously benefited from similar support.

While primarily designed as psychosocial and empowerment interventions, PSCCW's group sessions also appear to have contributed to household resilience in less direct ways. Women frequently described acquiring practical coping strategies that helped them manage stress, regulate emotions and navigate tensions within the household during a period of considerable uncertainty and pressure. Several participants gave concrete examples of using techniques learned during the sessions—including breathing exercises, stress-management approaches and personal goal-setting—to reduce conflict, improve communication and strengthen family relationships. Women also emphasized the value of peer support and social connections developed through the groups, which reduced feelings of isolation and expanded informal support networks. Although these outcomes cannot be quantified and are discussed in greater detail below under psychosocial and empowerment outcomes, they nonetheless represent meaningful contributions to household resilience and coping capacity.

Accordingly, the overall finding is the project generated modest but meaningful livelihood and household resilience outcomes. These outcomes varied considerably across intervention types and communities. Agricultural livelihood benefits were strongest where rehabilitated lands remained accessible and usable, as in Awarta, and more constrained where access restrictions, settler violence and water shortages limited productive use, as in Qusra and Duma. At the same time, the paid work opportunities provided through PSCCW generated direct, albeit temporary, income benefits for participating women and strengthened employability, work experience and labour market attachment. The evaluation finds no evidence of sustained income increases or measurable productivity gains, but it does find plausible evidence of increased cultivation in Awarta, productive use of home gardens to varying degrees, temporary income and coping benefits from internships, vouchers and cash assistance, and important resilience and protection value associated with maintaining investment in agricultural land despite increasing constraints. Collectively, these outcomes suggest that the project contributed more strongly to household coping, resilience, employability and maintenance of livelihood assets than to transformational livelihood change or sustained income growth.

2.3.3. EQ3.3 What evidence exists of psychosocial well-being, confidence, coping and protective outcomes for women?

The project generated strong qualitative evidence of positive psychosocial outcomes for women, particularly through PSCCW's group and individual support. The PSCCW report documents increased psychological comfort, improved ability to identify personal priorities, increased awareness of strengths and capabilities, stronger peer relationships, more positive thinking patterns and improved use of relaxation techniques. Field evidence confirms and enriches these findings.

Women provided concrete examples of change. Several said that breathing and relaxation exercises helped them reduce stress and prevent household tensions from escalating. Some women reported that they became better able to manage tension and conflict with their husbands, with positive effects on family dynamics. Others described increased self-confidence after realizing that other women faced similar or even more difficult situations. This comparison helped reduce isolation and self-blame.

The group sessions also strengthened social capital. Women described getting to know other women, building relationships and feeling less alone. In communities where women have few safe public spaces and limited organized opportunities to gather, this is a significant outcome. The psychosocial intervention therefore worked not only at the individual level, but also through peer support and social connectedness.

There is also evidence of more practical self-development effects. One woman described learning to set personal objectives by writing them down and keeping them visible, which helped her focus on achieving them. Such examples show that the sessions were not limited to emotional ventilation; they also provided tools for self-regulation, planning and personal agency.

The individual MHPSS component added further depth. PSCCW reports that 10 women received tailored support over 5–7 sessions, including assessment, individualized plans and follow-up where needed. This indicates a more intensive level of engagement for women with specific psychosocial needs.

The effectiveness of these interventions should be understood in context. Women in Qusra, Awarta and Duma live under conditions of insecurity, restricted mobility, household economic stress and limited access to support services. Against this background, even modest improvements in emotional regulation, self-confidence, peer support and family communication are significant.

Thus, the evidence supports a strong finding that PSCCW's psychosocial activities contributed meaningfully to women's coping, confidence, emotional well-being and sense of support.

2.3.4. EQ3.4 To what extent did legal awareness and legal assistance improve women's access to rights-related support?

The legal awareness component was effective in improving women's access to legal information and, for some women, to concrete legal support. PSCCW reports that 20 women participated in legal awareness sessions in Awarta and Duma and that 24 women received legal consultations or assistance, including cases related to inheritance, labour rights, sexual harassment, maintenance, divorce, property registration, dowry, detention by occupation and household property claims. The report also provides evidence of tangible case-level outcomes. Two women who received legal consultations pursued their cases in court, and one of these cases was corroborated by the evaluation during field consultations. One woman from

Duma was pursuing divorce after being abandoned by her husband, and one woman from Awarta obtained divorce and monthly alimony through support from the PSCCW lawyer.

Field evidence confirms the importance of this support. Women described legal awareness as valuable because many had limited prior exposure to formal rights information and often relied on customary or informal mechanisms. Legal awareness helped them understand available options and increased confidence to seek support. One woman privately explained to the evaluation how PSCCW legal support helped her navigate divorce and protect her rights and dignity.

The legal component was effective because it combined awareness, counselling and practical assistance. It did not only tell women about rights; it introduced them to services and, in some cases, supported action. The integration of psychosocial and legal support also appears important. For women facing family disputes, divorce, violence or rights violations, legal empowerment is rarely only a technical matter. Confidence, emotional support and trust are necessary conditions for women to seek justice.

The limitation is scale. The number of women reached was modest relative to likely need. However, the depth and sensitivity of the legal support means that its significance cannot be judged only by the number of consultations. For women who pursued claims or resolved critical family matters, the outcome was highly meaningful.

Hence, overall, legal awareness and assistance were effective for women reached, with strong evidence of improved knowledge, increased confidence, access to legal support and at least some concrete legal outcomes.

2.3.5. EQ3.5 Are there indications of improved child well-being, school engagement or educational outcomes?

The project generated positive but modest child-related outcomes. This is an area where expectations should be realistic. The intervention was short-term, while learning loss is substantial and rooted in wider systemic factors, including school closures, reduced school days, teacher strikes, overcrowding, financial crisis and exposure to violence. Many targeted students were already behind their peers and academically weak. In this context, large educational gains would not be realistic.

PSCCW reports that 54 students participated in remedial education in Awarta and Duma, with reported improvements in academic performance, self-confidence, motivation and engagement. The report also documents Team Up psychosocial support for 30 children in Awarta, along with teacher and parent sessions aimed at strengthening the protective environment around children.

Field evidence supports modest positive effects. The school principal in Awarta reported improvements in academic performance and classroom discipline among participating children, while also emphasizing that schools lack the resources to build on these achivements and address learning loss at scale. Children interviewed said the remedial sessions helped them understand material they previously struggled with and follow lessons better in class, but also indicated that they need more support.

These improvements should be understood as meaningful but limited. Remedial education seems to have helped some students regain confidence and engage better, but –clearly- it could not close deep learning gaps created by prolonged disruption and structural weaknesses in the education system. Its significance lies partly in rights terms: vulnerable children have a right to educational support, and the project

provided a targeted response to children who would otherwise likely receive little or no remedial assistance.

The Team Up and parent-teacher activities also appear to have contributed positively to child well-being and school engagement, although the evaluation found stronger evidence relating to educational participation and classroom engagement than to broader psychosocial outcomes. Through movement, play, emotional expression and self-regulation activities, Team Up provides children with opportunities to process emotions and develop coping mechanisms in ways that are often more accessible than conventional counselling approaches, particularly for younger children who may struggle to articulate distress verbally.

Teachers, parents and implementing staff generally viewed the approach positively and reported improvements in student participation, engagement and interaction. However, the evaluation found limited evidence regarding the extent to which Team Up methodologies were consistently adopted and sustained beyond the project-supported activities. PSCCW reported that efforts to secure formal institutionalization of the approach through the Ministry of Education were unsuccessful, limiting implementation largely to project-supported settings rather than embedding the methodology within routine school practice. As a result, while the intervention appears to have generated positive results for participating children, its longer-term sustainability and potential for wider replication remain uncertain.

The parent-teacher activities appear to have provided an additional benefit by strengthening communication and engagement between schools and families around children's educational and psychosocial needs. Although the available evidence does not permit strong conclusions regarding longer-term psychosocial outcomes, the reported improvements in student engagement, parent-teacher interaction and children's participation suggest that the intervention contributed positively to the broader protective and supportive environment surrounding vulnerable children.

The overall finding is thus that the project contributed to modest but meaningful improvements in children's educational engagement, confidence and the protective environment surrounding vulnerable children. The strongest evidence relates to improved participation, classroom engagement and the availability of additional educational and psychosocial support for children who were already struggling academically or socially. Evidence of broader psychosocial change and sustained educational gains is more limited, reflecting both the short duration of the intervention and the scale of challenges facing schools and families. Nevertheless, in a context where many vulnerable children receive little individualized support, the project provided an important protective and educational function. Its contribution is therefore best understood not as transformative educational change, but as a targeted effort that helped some of the most vulnerable children remain engaged, supported and connected to learning.

2.3.6. EQ3.6 How effective were women’s employment activities?

Women’s employment activities were effective in generating temporary income, work experience, confidence and support to local services. PSCCW reports that 20 women in Awarta and Duma were placed in paid positions, including in village councils, schools, health facilities and community institutions.

Field evidence confirms that women valued these opportunities highly. In Awarta, women employed as remedial education teachers, teacher assistants, school counsellors, data collectors and local council support staff described the placements as important for income, professional experience and confidence. One female engineer noted that the opportunity allowed her to work locally after movement restrictions

made her previous work in Nablus difficult. The local council later extended her contract temporarily, suggesting that the placement created practical value beyond the initial subsidy.

In Duma, the employment component was particularly significant because women were placed in critical service roles, including the emergency medical centre, village council and schools. According to the PSCCW report and field evidence, the placement of nurses and health-related staff contributed to improved emergency response capacity, with the village council reporting life-saving examples.

The employment activity was therefore effective not only as income support for women but also as temporary strengthening of community services. This dual effect is important: the same intervention contributed to women's economic participation and to institutional service gaps.

However, the effectiveness of this component was limited by short duration, low pay (particularly for full-time placements) and the limited availability of longer-term jobs. Women appreciated the opportunities but also noted that pay levels were below the minimum wage and contracts were too short. The activity therefore contributed to economic participation and confidence, but it did not structurally solve unemployment.

Overall, women's employment activities were effective as short-term economic empowerment and local service support, with some promising continuation effects, but limited sustainability.

2.3.7. EQ3.7 How effective were community protection, CPC and protective presence activities?

Community protection activities produced mixed results, with stronger evidence in Duma and weaker evidence in Qusra and Awarta. In Duma, the CPC was already an existing structure, first established with PARC support in 2021 and subsequently supported by multiple actors. Under this project, support to the CPC and the village medical centre was appreciated. Equipment such as first aid kits, oxygen cylinders, fire extinguishers and medical centre improvements contributed to local emergency response capacity. The school fencing initiative also responded directly to risks facing children and public facilities.

In Qusra, the community protection initiative and protective presence activities were relevant and appreciated, but the severity of settler violence limits what such activities can achieve. Protective presence should not be judged primarily by whether farmers felt "safe." In this context, it is more accurate to understand it as a solidarity mechanism and a collective assertion that farmers should not be left alone when accessing land. The value lies in accompaniment, visibility and moral support, even if it cannot eliminate risk.

PARC's reported incidents during harvest accompaniment, including settler attacks and obstruction, illustrate the limits of protective presence under conditions of coercive violence. These incidents do not mean the activity failed; rather, they show that protective accompaniment operates in a high-risk environment where it may reduce isolation and provide solidarity but cannot guarantee safety.

In Awarta, the CPC was established, but was clearly still in need of additional support as members reported that they were not fully empowered to perform their role, which they also needed to better understand. One member stated that the committee was established by PARC but did not know its responsibilities and did not receive follow-up. PARC attributed this to local politics and weak local council facilitation, but the evaluation concludes that more sustained accompaniment was needed. The CPC in Awarta therefore represents a gap between formal output achievement and functional effectiveness.

Overall, community protection activities were relevant and partially effective. Duma shows stronger evidence of functional local response capacity; Qusra shows meaningful solidarity and protection relevance under severe constraint; Awarta shows weak institutionalization of the CPC.

2.3.8. EQ3.8 What factors enabled or constrained effectiveness?

Several factors enabled effectiveness. First, partner specialization was important. PARC had the technical and community experience to implement land, agriculture, local committee and protection-related activities. PSCCW had the expertise to deliver psychosocial, legal, child-focused and women's empowerment activities. This specialization improved quality and credibility.

Second, local implementation mechanisms improved access and acceptance. The use of local councils, committees, local teachers, local workers and local institutions helped make activities feasible under movement restrictions and security risks.

Third, the project's multi-component design allowed it to respond to different dimensions of vulnerability. Women's activities, remedial education, employment placements and land-related interventions addressed overlapping needs rather than a single problem.

Fourth, beneficiary demand was high. Women valued psychosocial and legal support; farmers valued land rehabilitation; communities valued CPC and protection-related support; schools valued remedial education.

The main constraints were external and structural. Occupation-related restrictions, settler attacks, checkpoint closures and violence limited agricultural access, participation and safe mobility. Water shortages limited the productivity of home gardens and rehabilitated land. Weak public institutions limited continuity of educational, protection and health-related services. Local politics constrained CPC functionality in Awarta. Short project duration and resources limited the depth of educational, psychosocial and employment outcomes. There were also implementation constraints. Some women could not attend activities because of care responsibilities. Agricultural training did not reach all relevant beneficiaries met by the evaluation, and some were unaware of it or found the timing unsuitable.

It can thus be said that the project was effective within its sphere of control, but several intended outcomes depended on conditions outside its control.

2.4. EQ4 – Efficiency and Adaptive Management

To what extent were project resources, coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements used efficiently, and how effectively did partners adapt to contextual constraints?

Overall Findings:

The evaluation finds that the project demonstrated a ***moderate to strong level of efficiency****, particularly in relation to implementation arrangements, partner specialization, use of local delivery systems and adaptation to an exceptionally difficult operating environment. Activities were generally*

implemented as planned, partner roles were clear, delivery mechanisms were broadly appropriate, and resources were translated into a substantial volume of outputs despite severe contextual constraints.

The strongest evidence of efficiency lies in the project's ability to continue operating in communities facing escalating settler violence, movement restrictions, shrinking livelihood opportunities, declining public services and increasing humanitarian needs. Under these conditions, maintaining implementation continuity required considerable flexibility and adaptation. The project was largely successful in doing so.

However, efficiency must be assessed carefully in this context. Several interventions achieved outputs but were prevented from realizing their full intended outcomes because of external factors beyond the control of implementing partners. Agricultural roads and land rehabilitation in Qusra provide the clearest example. The works were implemented efficiently and to a satisfactory standard, but increasing access restrictions and settler attacks prevented beneficiaries from fully utilizing the resulting assets. This represents a limitation in realized value rather than a failure of implementation efficiency.

Additional weaknesses include limited follow-up support to the CPC in Awarta, insufficient accompaniment for emerging women's groups, under-addressed participation barriers affecting some women and youth, and missed opportunities to more systematically connect community-level protection activities with legal documentation, referral, media and international advocacy work under Result 5.

The evaluation therefore concludes that implementation efficiency was generally strong, while the efficiency of converting outputs into longer-term outcomes was more uneven because of contextual deterioration and a small number of design and follow-up weaknesses.

2.4.1. EQ4.1 Were activities implemented within the planned timeframe and budget, and where deviations occurred, were they justified?

Available evidence suggests that activities were implemented largely within the planned timeframe and that deviations were generally justified by contextual realities rather than implementation weaknesses. PSCCW reports indicate that planned activities were implemented as scheduled and that no substantive modifications to planned interventions were required. PARC similarly reports completion of planned activities and achievement of most output targets, including overachievement in some agricultural outputs.

The most significant implementation adjustments occurred in Duma, where PARC did not proceed with originally planned agricultural rehabilitation and infrastructure activities. This decision was not driven by implementation failure, but rather by contextual realities. Agricultural lands in Duma had become largely inaccessible due to settler violence and occupation restrictions, while other actors were already heavily engaged in agricultural support. Rather than investing resources in activities unlikely to generate meaningful benefits, the project redirected efforts toward community protection and DRR initiatives. This adaptation was discussed with and approved by the donor, and represents an example of adaptive efficiency rather than deviation. Resources were reallocated toward interventions more likely to generate value under prevailing conditions.

The evaluation did not identify evidence of major implementation delays that significantly undermined delivery. However, several beneficiaries involved in labour-intensive land development activities reported

delays in receiving payments. While these delays did not appear severe enough to disrupt implementation, they represented a legitimate concern for workers who depended on project income during a period of acute economic hardship.

Overall, implementation appears to have remained broadly on schedule, with adjustments generally reflecting pragmatic responses to contextual constraints.

2.4.2. EQ4.2 Did the division of roles among partners contribute to efficient implementation?

The division of roles among partners contributed significantly to implementation efficiency and represents one of the strongest aspects of the project's operational model.

Responsibilities were largely aligned with organizational expertise. PARC led agricultural livelihoods, land rehabilitation, agricultural roads, home gardens, community protection structures and community-level engagement. PSCCW led psychosocial support, legal assistance, remedial education, women's empowerment and employment-related activities. ACPP provided overall coordination and oversight.

This division minimized duplication and allowed partners to focus on areas where they possessed established technical capacity, local credibility and implementation experience. Rather than requiring a single organization to manage multiple specialized sectors, the project relied on organizations already recognized within their respective fields.

Field evidence supports this conclusion. Beneficiaries consistently described the technical quality of services received as satisfactory. Farmers appreciated PARC's agricultural support and technical visits by agronomists. Women described PSCCW facilitators and legal advisors as responsive and attentive. Schools valued the educational support provided through remedial education and teacher-related activities.

The efficiency gains associated with partner specialization were particularly evident in communities such as Duma, where interventions simultaneously addressed emergency response, women's employment, psychosocial needs and community protection through complementary organizational competencies.

Overall, the division of labour contributed positively to efficiency and allowed the project to address diverse needs without significant overlap.

2.4,3. EQ4.3 Were procurement, selection and delivery mechanisms appropriate and timely?

The evidence suggests that procurement, selection and delivery mechanisms were generally appropriate and fit for purpose, although some operational improvements could have strengthened effectiveness.

Several delivery modalities demonstrated particularly strong efficiency characteristics. The conditional cash assistance model used for land rehabilitation was consistently praised by beneficiaries and local actors. Under this approach, PARC engineers defined the scope of work and maximum work allocations, while landowners directly engaged workers and service providers from their communities. Payments were made following verification of completed works.

Beneficiaries viewed this mechanism positively because it increased ownership, enabled flexibility, and reportedly encouraged additional investment by landowners beyond the minimum project requirements.

Several beneficiaries stated that they completed work exceeding what had originally been specified. The mechanism also injected resources directly into local economies during a period of severe unemployment.

Voucher assistance also appears to have functioned efficiently. Beneficiaries reported few problems with redemption, availability of goods or pricing. Distribution occurred during a period when assistance was particularly needed, increasing the practical value of the support.

The home garden modality was generally well implemented, and beneficiaries expressed satisfaction with the quality of inputs provided. The main exception related to seeds, with a significant proportion of beneficiaries reporting poor germination rates and difficulties establishing some of the crops provided. However, the evaluation identifies a more subtle efficiency issue. In highly water-scarce communities such as Qusra, the productive value of home gardens was constrained by limited water availability. Although the tanks, pumps and irrigation systems provided were appreciated and actively used, some beneficiaries appeared to derive greater value from the water storage function than from the gardening component itself. This does not indicate poor implementation, but it suggests that future interventions could achieve greater efficiency through more explicit integration of water-related investments.

The evaluation also notes that not all intended beneficiaries appear to have participated in agricultural training activities. Several home-garden beneficiaries interviewed were unaware of the training or had not attended. Nevertheless, many reported receiving technical advice through PARC agronomist visits, which partially compensated for this gap.

Overall, delivery mechanisms were appropriate and generally timely, though future programming could strengthen efficiency through greater flexibility around water-related investments and enhanced participation in technical training activities.

2.4.4. EQ4.4 How effectively did partners adapt to access restrictions, security risks, administrative constraints and changing community needs?

The operating environment changed significantly during implementation. Settler violence increased, access restrictions intensified, agricultural livelihoods deteriorated further, public services weakened, and psychosocial distress deepened across communities. In several locations, needs evolved faster than originally anticipated. Adaptation represents one of the project's strongest performance areas.

The response in Duma illustrates effective adaptation. Rather than implementing agricultural activities that were unlikely to succeed under prevailing conditions, PARC shifted toward community protection and emergency preparedness initiatives. This enabled resources to remain relevant despite changing circumstances. The project also adapted employment approaches to mobility constraints affecting women. Rather than requiring beneficiaries to travel to distant locations, PSCCW placed women within local schools, health facilities and community institutions. This increased accessibility and reduced exposure to movement-related risks.

Similarly, psychosocial and legal services addressed emerging stressors associated with insecurity, economic hardship and family pressures. The strong uptake and positive feedback from women suggest that these activities remained aligned with evolving needs.

At the same time, some emerging priorities became more prominent during implementation than they appear to have been at project design stage. Water scarcity, for example, emerged repeatedly during fieldwork as a critical factor affecting the productivity and sustainability of agricultural interventions,

while communities increasingly emphasized household-level protection and risk mitigation measures in response to the deteriorating protection environment. These issues were only partially reflected in project interventions. However, this should be interpreted in light of the project's humanitarian nature, relatively short implementation period and the practical constraints associated with adapting approved activities, budgets and implementation modalities during implementation. The evaluation therefore does not view this as a failure to adapt, but rather as an illustration of the challenges of maintaining responsiveness in a rapidly evolving context where needs can shift faster than project cycles and resources allow

Hence, the evaluation finds that partners demonstrated substantial adaptive capacity, although some emerging needs evolved faster than the project could realistically adjust.

2.4.5. EQ4.5 Did adaptations improve delivery without compromising quality, inclusion or accountability?

The evidence suggests that most adaptations improved delivery while maintaining acceptable standards of quality and inclusion. The Duma reprogramming again is perhaps the strongest example. Rather than persisting with interventions unlikely to generate results, resources were redirected toward activities better aligned with local realities. This increased the practical relevance and likely effectiveness of project investments. Similarly, localized employment placements allowed women to participate despite movement restrictions and insecurity. These adaptations expanded access rather than restricting it.

The evaluation found little evidence that adaptations reduced service quality. Beneficiaries generally expressed satisfaction with support received, and field observations confirmed that infrastructure works, home garden inputs and community initiatives were implemented to an acceptable standard.

However, adaptations did not entirely eliminate inclusion challenges. Women repeatedly noted that care responsibilities prevented some women from participating in psychosocial and legal sessions. This issue was not created by project adaptations, but neither was it fully addressed. Similarly, youth—particularly young men—remained relatively underserved despite growing evidence of psychosocial and economic vulnerability.

Overall, adaptations strengthened delivery and maintained quality, although inclusion challenges affecting caregivers and youth remained only partially addressed.

2.4.6. EQ4.6 Were there missed opportunities to improve efficiency or coordination?

While overall efficiency was satisfactory, several missed opportunities emerged from the evaluation. The most significant concerns relate not to basic implementation delivery, which was generally achieved, but to follow-up, institutional strengthening and stronger integration between community-level protection, legal advocacy and international advocacy components.

The CPC in Awarta provides one example. Although the committee was established, members reported that they did not understand their role and received limited follow-up support. PARC emphasized that local political dynamics constrained CPC development, but the evaluation concludes that more sustained accompaniment may have improved functionality. In this case, resources successfully established a structure, but insufficient investment was made in ensuring that the structure became operational.

A second missed opportunity concerns support to women-led community organization development in Awarta. Women reported that training generated enthusiasm and initial momentum but that progress

stalled once training ended. Participants requested additional support related to mobilization, registration, fundraising and organizational establishment. The training therefore appears effective, but the absence of a second phase limited the return on the initial investment.

A third area concerns coordination between the Palestinian community-based protection components and the Israeli human rights organizations contributing under Result 5, particularly Yesh Din and B'Tselem. The evaluation found that Result 5 generated important advocacy, documentation and outreach outputs. B'Tselem, for example, reported reaching duty bearers, journalists, diplomats and wider public audiences through briefings, digital updates, field visits, media engagement and verified documentation of rights violations. Yesh Din's work similarly focused on documenting settler violence, supporting complaints, providing legal advocacy and engaging Israeli and international channels. These contributions were relevant and potentially complementary to the project's local protection objectives.

However, the linkage between these advocacy/legal documentation activities and the project's community-level protection work appears to have been less systematic than it could have been. In particular, there were missed opportunities to establish clearer referral pathways between affected communities, local protection structures, field focal points and legal advocacy actors; to organize legal awareness workshops in targeted communities; and to use documentation generated by Israeli human rights organizations more strategically in project-level advocacy, including towards Spanish duty bearers. This does not suggest weak delivery by Yesh Din or B'Tselem. Rather, it indicates that the project could have extracted greater value from their specialized roles by connecting them more deliberately with the work of PARC, PSCCW, CPCs and community-level protection actors.

A fourth area concerns the growing importance of water. Across multiple interviews, beneficiaries identified water access as one of the main factors limiting agricultural productivity and home-garden effectiveness. Greater integration of water-related investments may have improved the efficiency of agricultural interventions.

Finally, the project could potentially have benefited from stronger beneficiary-level integration across intervention streams. While partner coordination was generally good at the implementation level, more systematic referrals between livelihoods, psychosocial, legal, documentation and protection activities may have generated additional value without substantially increasing costs. This is particularly important in a context where settler violence, access restrictions and insecurity affect both livelihoods and protection outcomes.

These observations do not fundamentally undermine the project's efficiency. Rather, they highlight opportunities to increase the return on future investments under similar conditions by strengthening follow-up, deepening inter-partner coordination, and creating more intentional linkages between local protection, legal advocacy, documentation and international advocacy.

2.5. EQ5 – Impact and Emerging Changes

What early or emerging changes can be plausibly associated with the project, and how significant are these changes for targeted individuals, households and communities?

Overall Findings:

There is credible evidence of meaningful emerging changes among targeted individuals, households and communities. These changes are strongest in women's psychosocial well-being, confidence, coping

capacity, access to legal support, social connectedness, children's educational engagement, household coping and community preparedness. Livelihood-related changes were more modest and uneven, but the project helped some households maintain productive assets, continue using land and manage immediate pressures during a period of severe deterioration.

The project generated protective, enabling and resilience-oriented outcomes, but could not deliver large-scale structural change with regard to settler violence, access restrictions, economic contraction, weak public services, water scarcity and insecurity of land access. Its impact was instead incremental, protective and enabling. It helped beneficiaries cope, participate, access support, maintain dignity and preserve forms of individual, household and community resilience.

In this context, the significance of change should not be judged only by scale. For women to access safe spaces and legal support, for children to remain connected to learning, for farmers to continue investing in land, and for communities to strengthen preparedness are meaningful outcomes under conditions where many wider systems are weakening.

Overall, the project generated moderate to strong emerging impact in psychosocial, social, legal and participation-related domains, and more modest but meaningful impact in livelihood resilience, household coping and community preparedness.

2.5.1. EQ5.1 What changes do beneficiaries report in their livelihoods, well-being, rights awareness or participation?

Beneficiaries reported changes across several domains, but the significance of these changes varied by intervention type, community context and the extent to which external conditions allowed benefits to materialize. At impact level, the most important finding is that the project contributed less to large-scale material transformation and more to the preservation and strengthening of capacities under pressure. Reported changes were strongest in psychosocial well-being, rights awareness, social connection, participation and household coping. Livelihood-related changes were more uneven and more dependent on access, water and security conditions.

For agricultural beneficiaries, the reported change was not simply increased production or income. In Awarta, where rehabilitated land remained more accessible, beneficiaries reported more direct changes in land use, cultivation and access to agricultural plots. In Qusra, the meaning of change was different. Because settler violence and access restrictions limited the practical use of rehabilitated land and roads, beneficiaries placed greater emphasis on the value of maintaining presence on land and resisting abandonment. The significance of the intervention therefore shifted from a primarily productive livelihood outcome toward a protection- and rights-related form of resilience.

Home-garden beneficiaries reported continued value from the assets provided, particularly irrigation systems, tanks and pumps. These supported household production and water-related coping, although severe water scarcity limited the scale of productive change. The impact of home gardens should therefore be understood as modest but practical: they helped some households maintain or expand small-scale production and manage water-related constraints, but did not fundamentally alter household livelihood security.

Voucher assistance and temporary employment contributed primarily to short-term coping. Beneficiaries valued these forms of support because they helped households manage immediate economic stress, meet

basic needs and reduce pressure during a period of acute hardship. Their impact was therefore protective rather than transformative. They helped households absorb shocks and avoid further deterioration, but were not designed to create sustained income change.

Women reported some of the most significant changes. Participation in psychosocial, legal awareness, employment and training activities created opportunities for confidence-building, social interaction, access to support and greater participation outside the household. These changes were meaningful because they addressed forms of vulnerability that are often less visible than income loss but central to women's well-being and agency. For many women, being able to meet others, speak openly, understand rights, access legal support or participate in paid work represented a concrete shift in daily life and self-perception.

Children and families also reported positive but modest changes, mainly related to educational engagement, confidence and access to supportive activities. These changes should be understood as protective and enabling rather than transformational. They helped some vulnerable children remain connected to learning and support in a context where schools and families face pressures beyond the capacity of the project to address.

Beneficiary-reported changes point to a pattern of incremental but meaningful impact. The project helped beneficiaries cope, participate, access information and services, maintain productive or rights-related assets, and preserve forms of resilience under severe constraint. Economic changes were more limited and uneven, but psychosocial, legal, social and participation-related changes were more clearly significant for those reached.

2.5.2. EQ5.2 Are there observable changes in women's confidence, agency, economic participation or access to services?

Women's confidence, agency and access to services represent one of the clearest areas of emerging impact. The project created safe and structured opportunities for women to access psychosocial support, legal information, legal assistance, paid work and group-based participation. These opportunities were significant in communities where women's access to services, public roles and organized spaces remains limited.

At impact level, the most important change is that many participating women appear to have moved from relative isolation toward greater confidence, connection and willingness to seek support. The project did not remove the structural barriers that limit women's participation, but it did create practical entry points through which women could interact with others, reflect on their own situations, access information and, in some cases, act on rights-related concerns.

The psychosocial and legal components were particularly important because they addressed both internal and external dimensions of agency. Psychosocial support strengthened women's confidence, coping and self-awareness, while legal awareness and assistance increased their understanding of available options and services. The combination mattered: women were not only given information, but were supported in ways that made it more possible to use that information.

Economic participation also contributed to emerging change. Paid placements provided temporary income and work experience, but their wider significance lay in increasing women's visibility, confidence and participation in local institutions. These opportunities helped some women see themselves, and be seen by others, as capable of contributing beyond the household. However, the temporary nature of placements

and limited local labour market opportunities mean that this should not be overstated as sustained economic empowerment.

The project also created some momentum around women's collective participation, particularly through training related to women-led organization. However, this momentum was not fully consolidated. Without continued accompaniment, mentoring and support to move from training to practical organization, the potential for sustained collective agency remained only partially realized.

In sum, the project contributed meaningfully to women's confidence, agency, access to services and short-term economic participation. These changes were significant for the women reached, but remained incremental and uneven. The strongest impact was at the level of individual confidence, coping, legal awareness and participation, while deeper structural empowerment and sustained collective organization remained more limited.

2.5.3. EQ5.3 Are there indications of improved child well-being, school engagement or family support practices?

The project generated modest but meaningful emerging changes for children, particularly in school engagement, confidence and access to supportive activities. These changes were not large enough to suggest transformational educational or psychosocial impact, but they were significant in a context where many vulnerable children receive limited individualized support.

At impact level, the main significance of the child-focused interventions lies in their protective and enabling function. Remedial education helped some children remain connected to learning, regain confidence and better follow school material. Team Up and related activities provided structured opportunities for interaction, expression, movement and emotional support. Parent and teacher engagement contributed to a more supportive environment around children, although evidence of sustained changes in family or school practices remains limited.

The project's contribution should be understood against the scale of educational disruption and psychosocial stress facing children in the target communities. Learning loss, school overcrowding, reduced school days, economic hardship and exposure to violence all limit what a short-term intervention can achieve. Within these constraints, the project appears to have helped some children avoid further disengagement and experience renewed attention, encouragement and support.

The evidence does not support strong claims of sustained educational improvement or durable changes in family support practices. However, it does indicate that the project contributed to immediate improvements in children's engagement, confidence and access to supportive spaces. These gains are best understood as modest, protective and contextually meaningful rather than transformative.

2.5.4. EQ5.4 Did project activities contribute to reducing vulnerability or strengthening resilience in practical ways?

The project strengthened coping and adaptive capacity more than it reduced structural vulnerability. This distinction is central. The main drivers of vulnerability remained outside the project's control, but the project helped some individuals, households and communities manage their effects.

At household level, vouchers, temporary employment, home gardens and agricultural support helped beneficiaries address immediate needs, preserve productive assets or reduce pressure. Their contribution

was mainly protective: they helped households avoid deeper deterioration rather than achieve sustained economic change.

Agricultural support contributed to resilience where land remained accessible and usable. Where access was constrained, its value shifted toward maintaining presence, attachment to land and protection of rights.

For women, resilience effects were clearer. Improved coping strategies, stronger social networks, increased confidence and better knowledge of services strengthened women's ability to manage stress and respond to household and community pressures.

At community level, resilience effects were most visible where support improved emergency preparedness and local response capacity, particularly in Duma. Such support could not prevent protection threats, but it improved the community's ability to respond.

The overall finding emerging here is that the project helped beneficiaries cope, adapt and maintain essential capacities under pressure. It mitigated some immediate effects of vulnerability but did not substantially reduce its structural causes.

2.5.5. EQ5.5 Were there unintended positive or negative effects?

The evaluation identified several secondary positive effects and few significant negative effects.

One positive effect was the strengthening of relationships among women. Activities designed around psychosocial support also generated trust, solidarity and informal support networks. For some women, this social connection was among the most valued outcomes.

A second positive effect was increased self-perception and personal agency. Some women described changes in how they viewed their abilities, choices and future possibilities. These shifts went beyond immediate stress reduction and suggest early changes in self-confidence and self-worth.

The women's employment component also produced benefits beyond income. It helped participants gain experience, strengthen their CVs, expand professional exposure and become more visible in local institutions.

Land rehabilitation also acquired a broader protective meaning. In highly exposed areas, beneficiaries framed investment in land as an assertion of presence, ownership and refusal to abandon land under pressure. This protective and symbolic value extended beyond the original livelihood rationale.

Negative effects were limited, but some activities generated unmet expectations. Women who received training related to establishing women-led organizations were disappointed that further accompaniment was not available, and may have become discouraged to formalize by their knowledge about the bureaucracy of registering an NGO. Similarly, some community actors expected more follow-up support for CPCs, especially in Awarta, which absence prompted them to report reduced desire to engage in community work. These issues do not constitute major negative consequences, but they show that activities which raise expectations for collective organization or local protection structures require sufficient follow-through.

2.5.6. EQ5.6 How significant were these changes in light of the wider contextual constraints?

The project's emerging changes are significant mainly because they occurred in a context of worsening conditions. Target communities faced escalating violence, restricted mobility, reduced livelihood options, weakened public services, water scarcity and widespread psychosocial stress.

Against this background, the project's achievements are more meaningful than they may appear if assessed only by scale. For women, confidence, coping, social support and legal access matter because such support is scarce. For children, continued engagement in learning matters because schools are struggling to address learning loss. For farmers, continued use of land matters because access is increasingly threatened. For communities, preparedness matters because protection incidents are frequent and unpredictable.

While the project did not produce large-scale material transformation, its significance lies instead in helping people endure, adapt and remain connected to sources of support, land, learning and community life. The evaluation therefore concludes that the project's emerging impact lies primarily in preserving and strengthening capacities under pressure. Its value is best understood in terms of coping, continuity, dignity, participation, support and resilience.

2.6. EQ6 – Sustainability and Continuity of Benefits

To what extent are the benefits generated by the project likely to continue beyond the life of the intervention, and what factors support or undermine their sustainability?

Overall findings:

The evaluation finds a moderate level of sustainability, with significant variation across intervention types and locations. Benefits embedded in people—knowledge, coping skills, confidence, legal awareness, social relationships and practical experience—have the strongest prospects for continuity. Benefits dependent on physical access, water availability, functioning institutions, employment opportunities and the wider protection environment are more fragile.

Sustainability must be interpreted realistically in the southern Nablus context. Communities continue to face escalating settler violence, movement restrictions, shrinking livelihood opportunities, weakened public services, water scarcity and widespread psychosocial stress. In such conditions, sustainability cannot be assessed only by whether activities continue after funding ends. A more relevant test is whether the project has left behind capacities, assets, relationships and practices that continue to provide value despite a deteriorating environment.

Viewed in this way, the project has generated several benefits likely to endure, especially in women's coping capacity, legal awareness, social networks, community preparedness and local skills. However, many livelihood and institutional gains remain exposed to external shocks and may require further support to remain functional.

2.6.1. EQ6.1 To what extent are livelihood-related benefits likely to be sustained?

The sustainability of livelihood-related benefits is mixed and depends less on the continued existence of project-supported assets than on the conditions that allow households to use them. The key sustainability variables are safe access to land, water availability, household capacity to maintain assets, continued economic need, and the broader protection environment.

Physical assets such as rehabilitated land, agricultural roads and home-garden infrastructure are likely to remain beyond the project period. However, their sustainability should be assessed functionally rather than only technically. An agricultural road or rehabilitated plot may remain physically intact, but its value declines sharply if farmers cannot reach it safely, cultivate it regularly or secure the water needed for productive use.

In Awarta, livelihood-related sustainability prospects are comparatively stronger because rehabilitated lands remain more accessible and are being used. Continued benefits are therefore plausible, provided that access remains possible and water constraints do not worsen. In this case, the project-supported assets have a clearer pathway to continued productive value.

In Qusra, sustainability prospects are more fragile. The main risk is not the technical durability of the works, but the insecurity of access. If settler violence, access restrictions and movement constraints continue or intensify, the practical use of rehabilitated land and roads will remain limited. The assets may still retain protection and rights-related significance as investments in continued presence on land, but their livelihood value will be constrained unless access conditions improve.

In Duma, livelihood sustainability is more limited because conventional agricultural interventions have become less viable in the current access and protection context. The project's adaptation toward community preparedness and protection was therefore appropriate, but it also means that longer-term livelihood continuity in Duma will require different modalities, including household resilience, local services, home-based activities or alternatives less dependent on exposed agricultural access.

Home gardens have moderate sustainability prospects. Tanks, pumps and irrigation systems can continue to provide value, but the scale of continued benefit will depend heavily on water availability and affordability. Where households can secure water, gardens are likely to continue supporting small-scale production and household resilience. Where water remains scarce or expensive, benefits will remain below potential.

Temporary employment, cash-for-work and voucher assistance were not designed to produce sustained livelihood benefits after the end of support. Their sustainability lies mainly in the short-term relief they provided, the assets created through labour-intensive work, and any practical experience gained by participants. They should therefore not be judged by whether income continued, but by whether they helped households cope and whether the assets or experience created remain useful.

Overall, livelihood-related benefits are likely to continue where three conditions are present: assets remain usable, households can access and maintain them, and water or other enabling resources are available. Sustainability is therefore strongest in accessible agricultural areas, more fragile in exposed areas where access is insecure, and weakest where livelihood models depend on conditions that no longer hold. Future livelihood programming should therefore distinguish between technical sustainability, functional sustainability and protection-related value.

2.6.2. EQ6.2 To what extent are psychosocial, legal and educational outcomes likely to continue?

Psychosocial and legal-awareness outcomes have relatively strong sustainability prospects because they are rooted in knowledge, behaviour and relationships rather than continued material inputs.

Among women, coping techniques, stress-management practices and improved self-awareness are likely to continue beyond project closure. Women described applying these skills in daily life, which suggests that at least some benefits have become part of their personal coping repertoire.

Social relationships developed through group activities also have potential to endure. In communities where organized spaces for women are limited, the networks created through the project may continue to provide informal support after formal activities end.

Legal-awareness outcomes are similarly likely to persist. Women who gained knowledge of rights, procedures and available services are unlikely to lose this knowledge after the project closes. The more important risk is not the loss of awareness, but whether women can continue to access appropriate legal support when needed.

Educational outcomes are more uncertain. Children may retain some gains in confidence and engagement, but sustained progress will depend on school conditions, family support and availability of further remedial or psychosocial assistance. Given the scale of learning loss and pressure on schools, project-supported gains may weaken without continued support.

Hence, the key finding is that psychosocial and legal-awareness benefits are more likely to endure than educational gains because they are more directly embedded in individual knowledge, confidence and behaviour. Educational continuity remains more dependent on broader institutional conditions.

2.6.3. EQ6.3 To what extent are community structures and local capacities likely to continue functioning?

The sustainability of community structures varies significantly by location and depends on whether structures were meaningfully embedded, supported and owned.

Duma provides the strongest example. The CPC there built on a longer process of community engagement and support from multiple actors. It is recognized by local stakeholders, and the equipment provided through the project continues to support emergency response capacity. Because the project reinforced an existing structure rather than creating one from scratch, prospects for continuity are relatively strong.

Awarta presents a weaker picture. Although a CPC was established, the evaluation found limited evidence that it became functional or institutionalized. Members reported uncertainty about their roles and limited follow-up after establishment. Local political dynamics may have constrained development, but the result is that the committee's sustainability prospects remain weak.

The same concern applies to emerging women-led collective action in Awarta. Training generated interest and potential, but momentum weakened without continued accompaniment related to mobilization, registration, fundraising and organizational development.

The main lesson is that structures are not sustained by establishment alone. They require role clarity, facilitation, practical tasks, local legitimacy and follow-up support. Where these conditions were present, sustainability is stronger. Where they were absent, continuity is uncertain.

Overall, community-level sustainability is strongest where the project reinforced existing capacities and weakest where it introduced new structures without sufficient time or support for institutionalization.

2.6.4. EQ6.4 To what extent have communities and local actors demonstrated ownership of project outcomes?

Community ownership is one of the stronger dimensions of sustainability. Beneficiaries and local stakeholders generally valued the project interventions and expressed willingness to continue using supported assets, skills and practices where conditions allow.

Ownership was particularly evident in relation to land. Even in Qusra, where access restrictions reduced practical benefits, beneficiaries strongly defended continued investment in land as a matter of rights, presence and refusal to abandon threatened areas. This suggests that ownership extends beyond immediate economic returns.

The conditional cash assistance approach also appears to have strengthened ownership by involving landowners, local workers and service providers directly in implementation. In some cases, beneficiaries invested additional resources beyond project requirements, indicating commitment to the assets created.

Women also demonstrated ownership of psychosocial, legal and organizational activities. Participants described applying what they learned and expressed demand for continued engagement. This indicates that participation was not passive; women saw practical value in the support received.

Local councils and community institutions engaged with implementation and articulated clear future priorities. However, ownership should not be confused with capacity to sustain activities independently. Local actors may value and support the interventions, but their ability to maintain or expand them is constrained by resources, insecurity and weak public systems.

Ownership was found to be relatively strong at beneficiary and community levels overall, but it is not sufficient by itself to guarantee sustainability where external constraints remain severe.

2.6.5. EQ6.5 What factors support or undermine sustainability?

Several factors support sustainability. The project invested in knowledge, skills, awareness and local capacities, which are more likely to remain after funding ends. It also used local actors, institutions and human resources, strengthening community embeddedness and reducing dependence on external presence. In some cases, especially Duma, it reinforced existing structures rather than creating entirely new ones. Strong beneficiary ownership further increases the likelihood that assets and practices will continue to be used.

At the same time, several factors undermine sustainability. The most important are contextual: settler violence, access restrictions, movement constraints, water scarcity, unemployment and declining public services. These factors directly affect whether beneficiaries can continue using land, sustaining livelihoods, accessing services or maintaining community initiatives.

Water scarcity is a particularly important threat to the sustainability of agricultural and home-garden benefits. Without reliable and affordable water, productive use of supported assets will remain limited.

Institutional fragility also poses risks. The experience of the Awarta CPC and women-led organizational development shows that local structures may stall without continued facilitation and practical accompaniment. Short project duration also limited the depth of institutionalization in some components.

Overall, sustainability is supported by strong ownership and capacity-building investments, but undermined by the deteriorating operating environment and limited local institutional capacity to compensate for structural constraints.

2.6.6. EQ6.6 How likely is it that project benefits will continue after project closure?

Project benefits are likely to continue, but unevenly. Benefits rooted in knowledge, awareness, psychosocial coping, legal literacy, social relationships and individual confidence have the strongest prospects. These are likely to remain with participants and may continue shaping behaviour and decision-making after the project ends.

Physical assets are also likely to remain, including agricultural roads, rehabilitated land and home-garden infrastructure. However, their practical value will depend on access, water availability, security and households' ability to maintain and use them.

Community preparedness in Duma is likely to continue because it builds on existing structures and local capacities. By contrast, the Awarta CPC and emerging women-led organizational initiatives have weaker prospects unless further support is provided.

Finally, educational benefits may continue for some children in the form of improved confidence and engagement, but sustained learning progress will depend on school capacity and continued support.

Overall, the project has left behind a meaningful legacy of capacities, relationships, awareness and assets. The continuity of these benefits will depend partly on beneficiary ownership and local capacity, but also heavily on the broader political, economic and protection environment.

2.7. EQ7 – Cross-Cutting Issues: Gender, Protection, Participation and Accountability

To what extent did the project integrate and respond to cross-cutting considerations related to gender, protection, participation, inclusion and accountability?

Overall Findings:

The evaluation finds that the project demonstrated moderate to strong integration of gender, protection and participation considerations, with particularly strong performance in relation to women's psychosocial well-being, access to legal support, meaningful participation and child-focused support. Cross-cutting considerations were not treated as peripheral safeguards; in several components, they were central to the project's relevance, effectiveness and emerging impact.

Gender integration was one of the strongest aspects of the intervention. The project recognized women's overlapping vulnerabilities, including psychosocial stress, legal insecurity, economic exclusion, limited public participation and social isolation, and responded through a combination of psychosocial support, legal awareness and assistance, temporary employment and support to collective action. These interventions generated some of the project's most credible and meaningful changes.

Protection was also meaningfully integrated, although the project operated in a context where protection needs evolved rapidly and exceeded available resources. The intervention addressed protection through community preparedness, legal support, psychosocial care, protective presence, child-focused activities and advocacy-related components. However, community narratives increasingly emphasized physical safety, household-level protection, emergency preparedness, safe access to land and protection of public facilities. The project addressed parts of this broader protection agenda but could not respond fully to its scale or speed of change.

Participation was generally locally grounded and meaningful, particularly for women and children reached by the project. However, participation was not equally accessible to all groups. Care responsibilities, mobility constraints, insecurity, youth exclusion and the limited visibility of disability-related inclusion affected the depth and equity of participation.

Accountability mechanisms appear to have existed and implementing partners were generally trusted, but evidence regarding the actual use, accessibility and responsiveness of formal feedback systems is more limited. The project performed better on practical responsiveness and community acceptance than on systematically documented accountability to affected populations.

Overall, the project integrated cross-cutting issues in a meaningful and often effective manner, but with areas requiring further strengthening, particularly disability inclusion, youth responsiveness, feedback loops, institutionalized participation and practical measures to reduce participation barriers.

2.7.1. EQ7.1 Did the project adequately identify and respond to the specific needs of women, girls, boys and men?

The project demonstrated a generally strong understanding of differentiated vulnerabilities and selected interventions that responded well to several priority groups. Its strongest performance was in addressing the needs of women and children, while its attention to youth, particularly young men, was more limited.

Women's needs were particularly well identified. Across the target communities, women faced overlapping pressures linked to insecurity, household stress, social isolation, legal vulnerability, limited economic opportunities and restricted public participation. The project responded through a package of psychosocial, legal, employment and participation-related support that was well aligned with these vulnerabilities. This was not a narrow gender mainstreaming approach; it was a substantive gender response that addressed both practical needs and aspects of agency, confidence and access to services.

Children's needs were also appropriately identified. Educational disruption, learning loss, psychosocial distress and limited supportive services were reflected in the remedial education, Team Up and parent-teacher activities. These interventions were modest in scale but relevant to the specific vulnerabilities of children who were already struggling academically or socially.

The project also addressed the needs of agricultural households through land rehabilitation, agricultural roads, home gardens, voucher assistance and conditional cash assistance. However, agricultural vulnerability changed during implementation. Access restrictions, settler violence and water scarcity increasingly shaped whether support could generate practical benefits. This does not mean that the interventions were poorly targeted, but it does show that vulnerability among agricultural households became less about productive assets alone and more about safe access, water, protection and continued presence on land.

The main gap concerns youth. Stakeholders repeatedly identified young people, especially young men, as facing severe economic and psychosocial pressures and having limited opportunities for engagement. This gap should not be interpreted as a weakness of the women-focused components, which were clearly justified and effective. Rather, it indicates that the project's differentiated vulnerability analysis did not fully translate into a response for all groups whose needs were becoming increasingly acute.

Hence, overall, the project responded well to the needs of women, children and vulnerable households, but less comprehensively to youth vulnerabilities and with limited evidence on how persons with disabilities were identified and supported.

2.7.2. EQ7.2 Were women and children able to participate safely and meaningfully?

Field visits confirm that women and children who participated in project activities generally did so safely and meaningfully. The project created spaces that were perceived as respectful, useful and accessible to many participants. For women in particular, participation was not only a means of receiving support; it was itself a valued outcome in communities where organized spaces for women are limited.

Women described the psychosocial, legal-awareness and training activities as welcoming and relevant. These activities enabled them to interact with peers, discuss concerns, access information and build confidence. The evidence indicates that participation was substantive rather than symbolic: women gained practical knowledge, developed relationships and used some of what they learned in daily life.

The project also appears to have provided safe spaces for participation. No evidence emerged that women felt threatened, disrespected or exposed through participation. On the contrary, women generally described facilitators and service providers as supportive and trustworthy.

However, meaningful participation was not equally accessible to all women. Care responsibilities, household obligations and mobility constraints limited participation for some. This is an important inclusion issue. Public advertisement and open access are not sufficient where women cannot attend because of unpaid care burdens or practical barriers. Future interventions should therefore treat participation barriers as design issues, not only as individual constraints.

Children's participation also appears to have been safe and appropriate. School actors and children described positive experiences with remedial education and psychosocial activities. The evidence does not point to safeguarding concerns in children's participation. However, as with other components, the scale of support was limited relative to the level of need.

The overall findings emerging from the evaluation is that participation was generally safe and meaningful for those reached, but the project could have done more to reduce practical barriers affecting women's access and to expand opportunities for groups less directly targeted.

2.7.3. EQ7.3 Did the project contribute to women's empowerment, protection or access to services?

The project promoted women's empowerment, protection and access to services in a meaningful and gender-responsive manner. Women were not treated as a general vulnerable category, but as rights-holders facing specific barriers related to psychosocial stress, legal vulnerability, economic exclusion, limited mobility, restricted participation and social isolation. This represents one of the stronger cross-cutting features of the intervention.

The project's approach to women's empowerment was strongest at the individual level. It created safe and structured spaces through which women could access support, information, services and opportunities for participation. Psychosocial support, legal awareness, legal assistance and paid work placements each addressed a different dimension of women's exclusion. Taken together, they provided practical entry points for strengthening confidence, coping capacity, rights awareness and access to assistance.

From a protection perspective, the intervention was particularly relevant because it linked women's well-being with access to rights-related support. Legal and psychosocial services were not delivered as isolated activities; they responded to real barriers that often prevent women from seeking help, speaking openly about problems or acting on legal concerns. This strengthened the protective value of the intervention, especially in rural communities where specialized services are limited.

The project also contributed to women's participation in local and public spaces. Paid placements and group activities enabled women to engage with community institutions and with one another in ways that are not always available in their daily lives. However, this contribution remained more significant at the level of individual participation than at the level of sustained collective empowerment. The attempt to support women-led organization generated interest and momentum, but required longer accompaniment, mentoring and practical follow-up to become institutionally durable.

The main limitation was that the project could not fully address the structural and practical barriers that constrain women's participation. Care responsibilities, household obligations, mobility constraints, limited local employment opportunities and prevailing social norms continued to affect who could participate and how far benefits could extend. These barriers do not diminish the value of the intervention, but they show that gender-responsive programming requires not only appropriate activities, but also practical measures that enable women to access and sustain participation.

Overall, the project promoted women's empowerment, protection and access to services effectively within its scope. Its strongest contribution was in creating safe, relevant and trusted entry points for women to access support, information, rights-related services and public participation. Its weaker area was the limited consolidation of collective and institutional empowerment beyond the life of specific activities.

2.7.4. EQ7.4 Were accountability mechanisms accessible, trusted and used?

The project appears to have established basic accountability mechanisms, and communities generally trusted the implementing partners. However, the evidence is stronger on the existence of mechanisms and general community acceptance than on their actual use and responsiveness.

Project documentation indicates the presence of several feedback and complaint channels, including complaint boxes, contact information, open communication channels, local committees, WhatsApp

groups and direct communication through project staff. Field evidence also suggests that beneficiaries and community stakeholders generally perceived implementation as fair, transparent and responsive. The evaluation did not encounter significant complaints about targeting, corruption, favouritism or misuse of resources.

This positive picture should be interpreted carefully. Limited complaints do not necessarily prove that accountability systems were fully accessible or effective. They may also reflect satisfaction with implementation, reliance on informal channels, limited awareness of formal mechanisms, or reluctance to use complaint systems. The evaluation found limited direct evidence of beneficiaries actively using formal complaint channels or of how complaints were logged, addressed and communicated back.

The project appears to have performed better in everyday responsiveness than in systematic accountability documentation. Partners were accessible and trusted, and communities were broadly satisfied. However, stronger evidence would be needed to assess whether formal mechanisms were known by all groups, safely accessible, disability-inclusive, gender-sensitive and consistently used to inform management decisions.

Overall, accountability mechanisms were present and basic trust was strong, but accountability to affected populations could be strengthened through clearer documentation of use, response, feedback closure and learning from complaints and suggestions.

2.7.5. EQ7.5 Were confidentiality, safeguarding and do-no-harm principles adequately applied?

The available evidence suggests that confidentiality, safeguarding and do-no-harm principles were generally respected in implementation. This is particularly important given the sensitivity of psychosocial and legal support provided to women.

Women's willingness to discuss personal issues, including family conflict, divorce, legal disputes and psychosocial distress, indicates a degree of trust in facilitators and service providers. The legal and psychosocial components appear to have been delivered in a manner that respected privacy and dignity. No evidence emerged of breaches of confidentiality, inappropriate disclosure or harm resulting from participation.

The project also appears to have avoided major do-no-harm risks in community implementation. No evidence was found that activities exacerbated local tensions, created significant conflict over beneficiary selection, or exposed participants to additional risk. Some unmet expectations emerged around women's collective action and CPC follow-up, but these relate more to continuity and expectation management than to safeguarding failures.

At the same time, the evaluation has limited evidence on the formal safeguarding architecture behind implementation. It cannot fully assess the robustness of written procedures, referral pathways, staff training, incident reporting systems or survivor-centred response mechanisms. This matters because trust-based and informal safeguards, while important, are not a substitute for clearly documented systems, particularly when working with women, children and people facing protection risks.

Hence, implementation appears to have respected confidentiality and do-no-harm principles. The main area for strengthening is not evident practice, but clearer documentation and assurance regarding formal safeguarding systems and referral pathways.

2.7.6. EQ7.6 Were there barriers to participation that affected inclusion or equity?

The project made meaningful efforts to include vulnerable groups, but several barriers affected equitable participation and benefit. The most visible barrier was women's unpaid care burden. Some women were unable to attend activities because of childcare, household responsibilities or care for family members. This indicates that access cannot be measured only by whether activities were open or advertised. Inclusion requires attention to the practical conditions that allow participation.

The wider protection environment also shaped inclusion. Movement restrictions, insecurity and settler violence affected people's ability to participate safely and consistently. These constraints were not within the project's control, but they influenced who could benefit and how fully.

Water scarcity created another equity issue. Home-garden support did not benefit all households equally because productive use depended on access to water and ability to absorb related costs. Households with better water access were more able to convert support into practical benefits, while others derived more limited value.

Youth vulnerabilities were insufficiently addressed. Stakeholders repeatedly highlighted young people, particularly young men, as facing growing unemployment, frustration, psychosocial stress and limited opportunities. The project's focus on women and children was justified, but future programming should consider youth more explicitly to avoid leaving a major vulnerability group under-supported.

Disability inclusion remains the least evidenced cross-cutting area. The evaluation found limited information on how persons with disabilities were identified, consulted, accommodated or monitored. This does not mean that persons with disabilities were excluded, but it does mean that the evaluation cannot confirm that disability inclusion was systematically integrated.

It is thus the conclusion of the evaluation is that the project was inclusive in several important respects, particularly for women and children reached by the intervention. However, equity was affected by care responsibilities, contextual insecurity, water access, youth exclusion and insufficient evidence on disability inclusion.

2.8. EQ8 – Complementarity and Nexus Practice

To what extent did the project move beyond parallel implementation toward meaningful complementarity between livelihoods, protection, legal support, psychosocial support and community engagement components?

Overall Findings:

The evaluation finds that the project demonstrated moderate operational nexus practice. The intervention was grounded in a strong multi-sector logic and there were several practical examples where livelihoods, protection, psychosocial support, legal assistance, child-focused support, community preparedness and advocacy reinforced one another. However, the project did not

consistently operate as an integrated nexus model at beneficiary, household or community-system level.

The strongest examples of operational nexus practice were found where components were delivered within a connected package or where one activity clearly created entry points for another. This was most visible in PSCCW's work with women and children, where psychosocial support, legal awareness, legal assistance, remedial education, parent engagement and women's participation activities were mutually reinforcing. It was also visible in the way agricultural interventions in exposed areas acquired both livelihood and protection significance, particularly where maintaining land use became linked to continued presence and rights protection.

However, the project's operational nexus practice remained less developed across partner and component boundaries. The evaluation found limited evidence of systematic cross-referral, joint case identification, shared beneficiary follow-up, sequenced support packages or community-level mechanisms that deliberately connected PARC, PSCCW and Result 5 advocacy work around common protection and resilience pathways. Beneficiaries often experienced support through one activity stream or one implementing partner rather than through a deliberately integrated package.

The project therefore performed better as a coordinated multi-component intervention than as a fully operationalized nexus model. Its main limitation was not conceptual fragmentation, but the incomplete translation of complementarity into systematic operational mechanisms.

2.8.1. EQ8.1 To what extent did beneficiaries access multiple forms of support through connected pathways?

Beneficiaries accessed multiple forms of support in some cases, but this was not consistently organized through deliberate pathways. The strongest connected pathways were found within PSCCW's package of support. Women could move between psychosocial sessions, legal awareness, legal assistance, employment opportunities and group-based participation. Children's support was also linked, to some extent, with parent and teacher engagement. These examples show that integrated support was possible when activities were delivered through a common service logic and by the same partner.

Outside these internally connected packages, integration was more limited. Agricultural beneficiaries, voucher recipients, home-garden beneficiaries, women participating in psychosocial activities, and CPC members were not consistently linked through a shared assessment, referral or follow-up mechanism at household level. Some households may have received more than one form of support, but this appears to have resulted more from overlapping eligibility or local participation than from a structured pathway designed to combine livelihood, protection, psychosocial and legal support.

This matters because many households faced multiple vulnerabilities simultaneously. For example, agricultural households exposed to land-access restrictions may also have required legal information, psychosocial support, protection referral or advocacy documentation. Similarly, women receiving psychosocial or legal support may also have faced livelihood, household protection or service-access needs. The project addressed these needs through different components, but did not consistently connect them through a beneficiary-level pathway.

The evaluation therefore finds that access to multiple forms of support occurred, but was only partially operationalized as integrated nexus programming. Future interventions would benefit from clearer referral

criteria, shared beneficiary mapping and simple follow-up mechanisms that identify when households or individuals need support from more than one component.

2.8.2. EQ8.2 How effectively did livelihood, protection, psychosocial and legal components reinforce one another in practice?

The project generated several important forms of practical reinforcement between components, although these were stronger within some intervention streams than across the project as a whole. The clearest reinforcement was between psychosocial support, legal assistance and women's participation. Psychosocial activities helped create trust and safe spaces, while legal awareness and assistance provided practical pathways for women to understand and act on rights-related concerns. Employment and participation activities added a further dimension by increasing women's visibility and engagement in local institutions. This combination gave the women-focused work a stronger nexus character than if each activity had been delivered in isolation.

There was also reinforcement between child-focused educational and psychosocial support. Remedial education, Team Up activities, and parent and teacher engagement addressed different aspects of children's vulnerability. While not a fully institutionalized case-management model, this combination helped link learning, psychosocial well-being and the protective environment around children.

The livelihood-protection link was also significant, but operated differently. Agricultural roads, land rehabilitation and home gardens were not only livelihood inputs. In exposed communities, particularly Qusra, continued investment in land also carried protection and rights-related meaning. The project therefore reinforced resilience not only by supporting production, but by helping households and communities maintain connection to land under pressure.

The weaker area was systematic linkage between community protection, legal support and advocacy. Community-level protection concerns were highly relevant to the work of Israeli human rights organizations under Result 5, but the evaluation found limited evidence that incident documentation, legal referral, community protection planning and international advocacy were routinely connected through operational protocols. This limited the potential for community-level protection evidence to feed more consistently into legal, media or diplomatic advocacy pathways.

Overall, components reinforced one another in meaningful but uneven ways. Reinforcement was strongest where activities were naturally linked within the same partner package, and weaker where integration required deliberate cross-partner mechanisms.

2.8.3. EQ8.3 Were referral, sequencing and follow-up mechanisms sufficient to support integrated assistance?

Referral, sequencing and follow-up mechanisms were not sufficiently developed to support fully integrated assistance. The project relied mainly on partner coordination, local knowledge and parallel implementation rather than on formal operational tools for identifying, referring and following up beneficiaries across components.

The absence of a more systematic referral mechanism was not a major obstacle to activity delivery, but it limited the depth of nexus practice. There was no clear evidence of a shared process through which partners jointly identified households requiring combined livelihood, psychosocial, legal or protection

support. Nor was there strong evidence of routine cross-referral between livelihood beneficiaries and psychosocial or legal services, or between community protection structures and legal/advocacy actors.

Sequencing was also only partially developed. Some components naturally complemented one another, but the project did not consistently sequence support in ways that would build a pathway from immediate relief to recovery, protection and resilience. For example, cash assistance, agricultural support, psychosocial services, community protection and advocacy could have been more deliberately linked around specific household or community protection priorities.

Follow-up was uneven. It was stronger where services involved repeated contact, such as psychosocial support or legal assistance. It was weaker where activities required longer institutional accompaniment, such as the Awarta CPC and the emerging women-led organization. These examples show that establishing a structure or delivering training was not sufficient to produce a sustained nexus function without mentoring, role clarification and practical follow-up.

Hence, the central finding in relation to EQ8.4 is that referral, sequencing and follow-up were present in limited and informal ways, but were not strong enough to fully operationalize the project's nexus ambition.

2.8.4. EQ8.4 Did community-level structures support integrated planning, referral and follow-up?

Community-level structures contributed to implementation, but their role as platforms for integrated nexus practice was uneven. Local councils, CPCs, schools, health facilities and community actors helped facilitate activities, identify needs and support delivery. However, they were not consistently used as mechanisms for integrated planning, referral or follow-up across all project components.

Duma provides the strongest example of community structures contributing to a more integrated local response. The CPC, village council, medical centre, school and emergency-preparedness activities were connected to a broader community protection agenda. This created a stronger basis for linking preparedness, protection, local services and community resilience.

In Awarta, the potential of the CPC was not realized. Although the committee was established, it did not become a functional platform for identifying protection issues, linking households to services, coordinating with other project components or following up community-level risks. This limited its value as an operational nexus mechanism.

In Qusra, community-level actors strongly understood the interconnection between agriculture, protection, land access and resilience. However, the severity of settler violence and access restrictions limited what local structures could realistically achieve. Protective presence and land-related support had important solidarity and rights-related value, but were not embedded in a broader operational system linking local protection planning, legal referral and advocacy follow-up.

Across communities, the evaluation finds that CPCs and other local structures had potential to serve as connectors between project components, but this potential was only partially used. Future nexus programming should define more clearly the role of community structures in referral, joint planning, protection monitoring, follow-up and linkage with advocacy actors.

2.8.5. EQ8.5 What enabled and limited operational nexus practice?

Several factors enabled operational nexus practice. The project was implemented in communities where vulnerabilities were clearly interconnected, creating strong practical justification for integrated support. The presence of specialized partners allowed the intervention to cover livelihoods, psychosocial support, legal assistance, child-focused support, community protection and advocacy. Existing relationships with local actors also made it possible to operate in a difficult environment and to adapt activities to community realities.

The main limitation was that operational integration depended too heavily on general coordination and partner complementarity rather than on explicit nexus mechanisms. The project had a coherent multi-component design, but fewer practical tools to ensure that components connected around the same households, risks or community protection priorities. In practice, partner specialization sometimes supported quality but also reinforced activity separation.

Contextual deterioration also constrained operational nexus practice. Settler violence, movement restrictions, weak public services, political dynamics at local level and limited project duration all reduced the space for sustained follow-up and integrated planning. However, these constraints also made operational integration more necessary, because households and communities were facing overlapping risks that could not be addressed through isolated activity streams.

A further limitation was the incomplete connection between community-level protection work and Result 5 advocacy, documentation and legal action. Stronger operational links with Israeli human rights organizations could have helped translate community-level incidents, protection priorities and access restrictions into more systematic documentation, referral and advocacy pathways.

Overall, operational nexus practice was enabled by a strong rationale, relevant components, specialized partners and local relationships, but limited by weak cross-referral, limited sequencing, uneven community-structure functionality and insufficient connection between field-level protection and higher-level advocacy. The project therefore represents a credible but only partially operationalized localized nexus model.

3. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

3.1. Conclusions

The evaluation concludes that the project was a relevant, coherent and largely effective localized nexus intervention implemented under exceptionally difficult conditions. Its strongest contribution was not in producing large-scale material transformation, but in helping targeted individuals, households and communities cope, remain connected to sources of support, maintain presence on land, access services and preserve elements of dignity and resilience in a rapidly deteriorating environment.

The project was highly relevant to the realities of Southeast Nablus. It responded to a context where livelihoods, protection, psychosocial well-being, access to land, legal vulnerability, educational disruption and weakened public services are deeply interconnected. The project's multi-component design was therefore appropriate. It recognized that vulnerability in the target communities could not be addressed through a single-sector response and that protection must be understood broadly, including physical safety, access to land, psychosocial well-being, legal support, community preparedness and the ability to remain present under pressure.

The evaluation also concludes that the project was grounded in a credible strategic foundation. The broader Action Group assessment and strategy provided a shared understanding of community vulnerabilities, and project-level consultations helped validate priorities. This foundation contributed to strong relevance and conceptual coherence. However, the evaluation also finds that feedback loops with communities could have been stronger. Communities were consulted, but the process through which findings were synthesized, prioritized and translated into programming decisions was not always visible to those consulted. This limited the potential for deeper accountability and community ownership of strategic choices.

The project achieved a moderate to strong level of effectiveness. Planned outputs were largely delivered, and the quality of implementation was generally satisfactory. The project was most effective where outcomes depended on direct service delivery, trusted human interaction and localized support. This was particularly evident in women's psychosocial support, legal awareness and assistance, temporary employment, remedial education, child-focused activities and some community preparedness measures. These components generated credible and meaningful changes, even if they remained modest in scale.

Livelihood-related outcomes were more mixed. Agricultural roads, land rehabilitation, home gardens, voucher assistance and cash-for-work support were relevant and generally well implemented. However, their ability to generate sustained livelihood outcomes was constrained by settler violence, restricted access to land, insecurity, water scarcity and economic decline. In Awarta, where access remained more feasible, agricultural support produced stronger practical benefits. In Qusra, where access became increasingly dangerous or restricted, the same types of interventions acquired a more protective and symbolic significance. They helped maintain presence and assert rights, but did not generate clear evidence of sustained income or productivity gains.

This leads to one of the evaluation's central conclusions: in Southeast Nablus, livelihoods and protection are no longer separable programming categories. Agricultural interventions may be designed as livelihood support, but their meaning and value increasingly depend on whether they help communities remain connected to land, resist abandonment and protect claims under conditions of coercive pressure. Future programming should therefore assess agricultural support not only in economic terms, but also in relation to access, protection, water feasibility and rights-preserving value.

The project demonstrated moderate to strong efficiency. Partner roles were broadly clear and aligned with comparative advantage. PARC, PSCCW and ACPP each contributed distinct capacities, and the use of local councils, local workers, schools, community structures and local institutions supported delivery under restrictive conditions. Adaptation was also an important strength. The shift in Duma away from less viable agricultural activities toward community protection and preparedness illustrates pragmatic and appropriate adaptive management. However, efficiency was weaker where outputs were delivered but not sufficiently followed up, as seen in the Awarta CPC and women-led organizational development training.

The project generated meaningful emerging changes, especially in psychosocial, social, legal and participation-related domains. Women's confidence, coping capacity, social connectedness and access to legal support represent some of the strongest outcomes. These changes were important not because they transformed structural gender relations, but because they strengthened women's ability to manage stress, seek support, participate in community life and exercise agency in a context where safe spaces and services are limited. Child-related changes were more modest, but remedial education and psychosocial activities helped vulnerable children remain connected to learning and support. Community-level changes were strongest where support built on existing structures, particularly in Duma.

Sustainability prospects are moderate and uneven. The most sustainable benefits are those embedded in people and relationships: coping skills, legal awareness, confidence, practical experience, social networks and local capacities. Physical assets are likely to remain, but their usefulness depends on access, security, water and maintenance. Institutional sustainability is more fragile. Duma demonstrates the value of building on existing community structures and longer-term engagement. Awarta demonstrates the limits of establishing structures without sufficient accompaniment, role clarification and practical follow-up.

The project performed relatively well on gender, protection and participation, but less strongly on some aspects of inclusion and accountability. Gender integration was a clear strength, particularly through PSCCW's psychosocial, legal, employment and participation-related activities. Protection was also meaningfully embedded, although community protection needs evolved faster than the project could fully address. Participation was generally safe and meaningful for those reached, but some women faced care-related barriers, youth vulnerabilities were insufficiently addressed, and disability inclusion was not strongly evidenced. Accountability mechanisms existed and partners were trusted, but there was less evidence on the use and responsiveness of formal feedback systems.

The project also demonstrated moderate complementarity and nexus practice. It was not a set of unrelated activities; it was grounded in a shared Action Group assessment and a coherent understanding of interconnected vulnerabilities. However, it did not fully operate as an integrated nexus model at beneficiary or household level. Complementarity was strongest in design logic, partner specialization, PSCCW's internal package of services, the livelihood-protection meaning of agricultural interventions, and the convergence of activities in Duma. It was weaker in cross-partner referral, sequencing, joint follow-up and the use of CPCs as platforms for integrated local coordination.

Overall, the evaluation concludes that the project provides a strong example of relevant and localized nexus programming under severe constraint. Its main limitations do not negate its achievements. Rather, they point to the difficulty of translating short-term, multi-component interventions into deeper and sustained change in a context where structural conditions are rapidly worsening. The project's value lies in its contribution to coping, continuity, dignity, participation, local preparedness and protection-sensitive resilience, rather than in transformational change.

3.2. Lessons Learned

Lessons learned from this evaluation point to the need for future programming that is not fundamentally different in strategic direction, but more integrated, adaptive and follow-up oriented. The project demonstrates that localized nexus programming is both relevant and feasible in Southeast Nablus. At the same time, the evaluation generated twelve specific lessons that help clarify how this approach can be strengthened in future programming. These lessons relate to the operational integration of components, the need for iterative needs assessment, the protection dimension of agricultural livelihoods, the centrality of water, the conditions required for sustaining women's participation and community structures, and the importance of stronger accountability, inclusion and advocacy linkages. Combined, they suggest that future effectiveness will depend on strengthening the mechanisms that connect components, sustain community structures, respond to evolving risks and translate community participation into accountable and adaptive programming.

The first lesson is that localized nexus programming is most relevant where vulnerability is multidimensional, but its effectiveness depends on operational integration. The project correctly recognized that livelihoods, protection, psychosocial well-being, legal rights, education and community preparedness are interconnected. This strategic logic was strong. However, the experience also shows that conceptual complementarity is not enough. Future nexus programming should include practical mechanisms for cross-referral, sequencing, joint follow-up and integrated household or community-level pathways.

The second lesson is that needs assessment must be treated as an iterative process in volatile contexts. The Action Group assessment provided a credible foundation, but needs evolved quickly after October 2023. Water, household-level protection, youth vulnerability, emergency preparedness and the sustainability of community structures became increasingly prominent. In such environments, a strong initial assessment should be complemented by periodic light-touch reassessment, community feedback and adaptive decision-making.

The third lesson is that agricultural livelihood support in exposed areas must be designed through a protection lens. Land rehabilitation, agricultural roads and cultivation support can remain highly relevant even when economic returns are constrained. Their value may lie partly in maintaining presence, protecting land rights and resisting abandonment. However, these interventions should be accompanied by realistic analysis of safe access, settler violence, water availability and the likelihood that assets can be used. Without these enabling conditions, technically sound assets may have limited functional value.

The fourth lesson is that water is not a secondary input but a central determinant of agricultural resilience. Home gardens and rehabilitated land generated benefits where water was available or where infrastructure improved water storage. However, water scarcity sharply limited productivity and sustainability. Future agricultural and home-garden interventions should begin with water feasibility and should consider storage, irrigation efficiency, rainwater harvesting, network improvements or stronger linkage with WASH actors.

The fifth lesson is that women-focused psychosocial, legal and participation interventions can generate durable value even at modest scale. The project's strongest and most sustainable changes were often those embedded in women's knowledge, coping skills, confidence, social networks and access to legal support. These benefits are not dependent on continued material inputs in the same way as physical assets. However, if the aim is to move from individual empowerment to collective organization, training alone is

insufficient. Women-led initiatives require follow-up accompaniment, mentoring, support for registration, fundraising and practical opportunities to exercise leadership.

The sixth lesson is that community structures are not sustained by establishment alone. The contrast between Duma and Awarta is instructive. Duma's CPC benefited from previous support, local recognition and practical relevance. Awarta's CPC, by contrast, was established but did not become operational. This shows that committees require role clarity, legitimacy, mentoring, practical tasks, links to local authorities and continued follow-up. Establishment should be treated as the start of institutional development, not as the achievement of sustainability.

The seventh lesson is that partner specialization strengthens quality, but can also create operational separation. PARC and PSCCW delivered strong components because their roles matched their expertise. This supported efficiency and credibility. At the same time, specialization did not automatically produce integrated beneficiary pathways. Future programming should preserve specialization while adding simple systems for referral, shared follow-up and joint problem-solving across partners.

The eighth lesson is that community ownership is necessary but not sufficient for sustainability. Beneficiaries valued the project and, in many cases, expressed strong commitment to maintaining assets, practices and forms of participation. However, ownership cannot compensate for severe external constraints such as insecurity, land access restrictions, water scarcity, unemployment and weak public services. Sustainability strategies must therefore distinguish between what communities can maintain themselves and what requires continued external support or improved enabling conditions.

The ninth lesson is that participation requires attention to practical barriers, not only formal openness. Activities may be publicly advertised and welcomed, but some women remain unable to attend because of care responsibilities, mobility constraints or household obligations. Future programming should treat such barriers as design issues. Flexible timing, childcare arrangements, decentralized delivery, transport support or alternative formats may be needed to ensure more equitable participation.

The tenth lesson is that youth vulnerability requires more explicit attention. The project's focus on women and children was justified and effective. However, stakeholders repeatedly raised concerns about youth, particularly young men facing unemployment, frustration, psychosocial stress and limited opportunities. Future programming should consider youth-specific pathways that address economic participation, psychosocial support, civic engagement and safe spaces without reducing the necessary focus on women and children.

The eleventh lesson is that accountability requires closing the loop with communities. Consultation and local acceptance were strong, but communities were less consistently informed about how assessment findings were interpreted, how priorities were selected and why certain needs could or could not be addressed. In localized protection programming, accountability means more than collecting views. It also requires feeding back decisions, explaining trade-offs, managing expectations and giving communities opportunities to validate or challenge priorities.

Finally, the twelfth lesson is that advocacy and documentation components should be more deliberately connected to community-level protection. Result 5 contributed to documentation, media outreach and duty-bearer engagement through specialized Israeli human rights organizations. However, the potential for stronger linkages with local protection work was not fully realized. Future programming could create clearer referral pathways, legal awareness linkages, documentation protocols and advocacy channels connecting community-level incidents with national and international advocacy.

4. Recommendations

The overall recommendation of this evaluation is that future programming should continue the broad strategic direction of the project: localized, multi-component, protection-sensitive nexus programming in Southeast Nablus. The model is relevant and appropriate. However, it should be strengthened through deeper operational integration, stronger follow-up to community structures, more explicit water and protection analysis in livelihood interventions, improved accountability feedback loops, greater attention to youth and disability inclusion, and more systematic linkage between community-level protection and advocacy. The aim should not be to replace the current approach, but to make it more adaptive, integrated and durable under conditions of continuing deterioration.

The recommendations below are intended to support ACPP, Action Group partners and future donors in strengthening localized nexus programming in Southeast Nablus and similar protection-affected contexts across the West Bank. They build on the project's demonstrated strengths while addressing areas where future interventions could improve integration, sustainability, inclusion and adaptive responsiveness.

Recommendation 1: Maintain the localized nexus approach, but strengthen operational integration across components.

Future programming should continue to combine livelihoods, protection, psychosocial support, legal assistance, education, women's participation, community preparedness and advocacy. This multi-component model remains highly relevant because community vulnerabilities are interconnected and cannot be addressed through isolated sectoral interventions.

However, future projects should move further from conceptual complementarity toward practical integration. Partners should establish simple and workable mechanisms for referral, sequencing and joint follow-up across components. This does not require a heavy case-management system, but it should ensure that households or individuals with multiple needs can be connected to relevant support across partners.

Action points:

- Develop simple referral protocols between PARC, PSCCW and other relevant partners.
- Introduce joint review meetings at community level to identify cases or groups requiring complementary support.
- Track whether beneficiaries receive only one-off support or are linked to other relevant services.
- Use CPCs or other local structures, where functional, as entry points for identifying cross-sectoral needs.

Recommendation 2: Treat needs assessment as an iterative process, not a one-time design exercise.

The Action Group assessment provided a strong foundation for relevance and strategic coherence. However, the operating context changed rapidly during implementation, especially after October 2023. Future projects should therefore include periodic reassessment and community feedback processes to ensure that emerging needs are captured early. This is particularly important for issues that became more prominent during implementation, including water scarcity, household-level protection, emergency preparedness, youth vulnerability and the sustainability of community structures.

Action points:

- Include light-touch reassessment exercises at least once or twice during implementation.
- Hold structured community feedback sessions to validate whether project assumptions remain valid.
- Document changes in community priorities and use them to inform adaptive management.
- Share summarized assessment findings back with communities to strengthen transparency and accountability.

Recommendation 3: Design agricultural and livelihood interventions through a combined livelihood, protection and water-security lens.

Agricultural support remains relevant, but its success increasingly depends on access, security and water. Future agricultural interventions should not be assessed only in terms of potential income or productivity. In highly exposed communities, land rehabilitation and agricultural roads may also contribute to maintaining presence, protecting land rights and resisting abandonment. At the same time, future investments should be more realistic about the limits of agricultural support where land access is unsafe or water is unavailable.

Action points:

- Conduct a pre-intervention access, protection and water feasibility assessment for agricultural activities.
- Prioritize agricultural investments where land remains accessible or where the protection value of maintaining presence is explicitly recognized.
- Integrate water storage, irrigation efficiency, rainwater harvesting or links to WASH actors into agricultural and home-garden programming.
- Avoid standard agricultural packages where water scarcity makes productive use unlikely.
- Consider differentiated packages by community: productive agriculture where feasible, land-protection and presence-oriented support where access is contested, and alternative resilience support where agriculture is no longer viable.

Recommendation 4: Strengthen follow-up and accompaniment for community structures.

Future projects should avoid treating the establishment of committees or groups as an end in itself. The experience of CPCs, particularly the contrast between Duma and Awarta, shows that local structures require sustained support to become functional. The same applies to women-led organizational initiatives. Training can generate interest and momentum, but without follow-up support, this momentum may weaken.

Action points:

- Include minimum accompaniment packages for CPCs and women-led groups.
- Provide role clarification, basic workplans, mentoring and practical assignments.
- Link CPCs to local authorities, emergency responders, legal actors and relevant service providers.
- Support women's groups with registration advice, mobilization, fundraising skills and links to existing women's organizations.
- Monitor committee functionality, not only committee establishment.

Recommendation 5: Continue and deepen women-focused psychosocial, legal and participation support.

Women-focused interventions generated some of the strongest and most sustainable benefits of the project. Future programming should continue investing in psychosocial support, legal awareness, legal assistance, social connection, temporary employment and participation opportunities for women. However, future programming should also strengthen pathways from individual empowerment to longer-term agency and collective participation.

Action points:

- Continue group psychosocial support and individual follow-up for women with specific needs.
- Maintain legal awareness and legal assistance, especially on family law, inheritance, maintenance, labour rights and protection-related issues.
- Link psychosocial and legal support more deliberately, recognizing that women often need confidence, trust and emotional support to act on legal information.
- Expand women's employment opportunities where feasible, while being transparent about duration, pay and continuation prospects.
- Provide second-stage support for women interested in collective organization or community leadership.

Recommendation 6: Address practical barriers to women's participation.

Future interventions should recognize that open access does not guarantee equitable access. Some women were unable to participate because of childcare, household responsibilities, mobility constraints or other practical barriers.

Action points:

- Schedule activities at times that reflect women's care responsibilities.
- Explore childcare arrangements during sessions where feasible.
- Consider decentralized delivery closer to women's homes.
- Provide transport support where movement is a barrier.
- Use follow-up or repeat sessions for women unable to attend initial activities.
- Monitor who is not participating and why, making this as part of the continuous learning and operational adaptation strategy of projects.

Recommendation 7: Expand attention to youth vulnerabilities, particularly young men.

Future programming should include a more explicit analysis of youth vulnerabilities. Stakeholders repeatedly raised concerns about young people, especially young men, facing unemployment, frustration, psychosocial stress and lack of opportunities. This should not necessarily reduce the strong focus on women and children, which remains justified. Rather, it should broaden the response to include another group facing growing risks, including through referrals and stronger coordination with other humanitarian and development actors.

Action points:

- Conduct targeted consultations with young women and young men during design.

- Introduce youth-focused activities related to skills, temporary employment, civic engagement, psychosocial support and safe participation.
- Consider linking youth to community protection, preparedness, volunteerism or local service initiatives.
- Ensure youth activities are conflict-sensitive and do not reinforce exclusion or competition between groups.

Recommendation 8: Strengthen disability inclusion across design, targeting and monitoring.

The evaluation found limited evidence on how persons with disabilities were identified, consulted, accommodated or monitored. Future projects should make disability inclusion more explicit.

Action points:

- Include disability-sensitive questions in needs assessments and beneficiary selection tools.
- Consult persons with disabilities and caregivers during design.
- Ensure activity venues, communication methods and participation arrangements are accessible.
- Track participation of persons with disabilities where appropriate and ethical.
- Link with specialized disability organizations where needed.

Recommendation 9: Improve accountability feedback loops with communities.

Partners were generally trusted and beneficiary selection was broadly perceived as fair. However, accountability can be strengthened by ensuring communities understand how their inputs are used and why certain priorities are selected.

Action points:

- Share simplified assessment findings with communities after consultations.
- Explain why some priorities are selected and others cannot be supported.
- Provide clear information on beneficiary selection criteria and complaint channels.
- Document complaints, suggestions and responses.
- Close the feedback loop by informing communities what was done in response to their input.
- Use community feedback not only for accountability but also for adaptive management.

Recommendation 10: Strengthen coordination between community-level protection and Result 5 advocacy/documentation work.

Future projects should create stronger operational links between local protection work and the documentation, legal advocacy, media and duty-bearer engagement undertaken by specialized Israeli human rights organizations. This would increase the value of both community-level protection and advocacy work by connecting incidents, evidence, legal pathways and international messaging more systematically.

Action points:

- Establish referral pathways for incidents of settler violence or access restrictions.
- Organize legal awareness sessions in targeted communities where relevant.
- Develop simple documentation protocols for community actors and partners.

- Use reports and evidence generated by human rights organizations more systematically in Spanish and international advocacy.
- Explore joint briefings, translated materials and engagement with Spanish duty bearers.
- Clarify how community-level concerns can inform advocacy priorities.

Recommendation 11: Build adaptive management more explicitly into project design and budgeting.

The project showed important adaptive capacity, particularly in Duma. Future programming should formalize this strength by including adaptation mechanisms from the start.

Action points:

- Include flexible budget lines for emerging needs.
- Agree with donors on procedures for justified reallocation.
- Establish periodic partner reflection sessions to review assumptions and risks.
- Document adaptation decisions and their rationale.
- Use monitoring data and community feedback to trigger adjustments.

Recommendation 12: Differentiate future programming by community context.

The evaluation shows that communities face related but distinct realities. A uniform package is unlikely to be equally effective across Awarta, Qusra and Duma.

Action points:

- In Awarta, prioritize agricultural support where land remains accessible, while strengthening CPC functionality and women's collective organization.
- In Qusra, frame agricultural support more explicitly around land protection, safe access, water feasibility and household-level protection.
- In Duma, prioritize community preparedness, emergency response, local service support, household resilience and alternatives to conventional agriculture where access is severely constrained.
- Use community-specific risk and opportunity profiles to guide activity selection.

Recommendation 13: Balance broad outreach with sequenced support where needed.

Exclusion criteria that prevent repeated support are important for fairness, but they may also prevent beneficiaries from receiving complementary assistance needed to consolidate earlier investments.

Action points:

- Maintain fairness and broad outreach as guiding principles.
- Allow exceptions for sequenced or complementary support where clearly justified.
- Distinguish between repeated assistance that duplicates benefits and follow-up support that protects or consolidates previous investments.
- Consider second-stage support for land beneficiaries requiring water-related investments.
- Consider follow-up opportunities for women whose temporary employment or organizational training could lead to stronger longer-term outcomes.

Recommendation 14: Strengthen evidence on outcomes, not only outputs.

The project generated strong output evidence and credible qualitative outcome evidence. Future programming would benefit from more systematic monitoring of outcome-level change, especially for livelihoods, psychosocial support, legal empowerment, child engagement, CPC functionality and referral pathways.

Action points:

- Define a small number of practical outcome indicators for each component.
- Track use and functionality of assets, not only delivery.
- Monitor whether CPCs meet, act and coordinate, not only whether they exist.
- Track whether legal awareness leads to consultations or referrals.
- Capture changes in women's confidence, coping and participation through simple pre/post or follow-up tools.
- Document cases of integrated support across components.

Recommendation 15: Preserve partner specialization while creating stronger shared implementation mechanisms.

Partner specialization was one of the project's strengths. Future projects should not dilute this by forcing all partners to do everything. The priority is to preserve specialization while strengthening the mechanisms that connect specialized services.

Action points:

- Maintain clear division of roles based on comparative advantage.
- Add shared planning and follow-up tools at community level.
- Use regular cross-partner case or activity review meetings.
- Develop shared referral directories and contact points.
- Clarify how each partner contributes to the wider nexus logic.

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

EQ1 – Relevance and Appropriateness

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
To what extent was the project relevant and appropriate to the needs, priorities, and rights-related vulnerabilities of the target population in Southeast Nablus?	**To what extent did the project respond to the most pressing needs identified in the target communities?**	Assessment will consider the extent to which project components corresponded to documented and perceived priority needs in Awarta, Duma, and Qusra, including livelihoods, protection, psychosocial well-being, legal support, and community-level vulnerability. **Strong:** Activities clearly respond to the main needs identified in project documents and confirmed by beneficiaries/local actors across all target communities. **Moderate:** Activities respond to most key needs, but some gaps or uneven relevance are identified across communities or groups. **Limited:** Activities respond to some needs, but important priorities remain insufficiently addressed. **Weak:** Activities show weak connection to the most pressing needs or are not perceived as relevant by key stakeholders.	Project proposal; needs assessment; logframe; PARC and PSCCW reports; ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; local councils; community committees; direct beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries.	Document review; KIIs with partners and local actors; FGDs with livelihood beneficiaries, women beneficiaries, caregivers, and non-beneficiaries.
	Were the selected components appropriate to the specific vulnerabilities of women, children, and agricultural households?	Assessment will examine whether the project's components were suitably tailored to the distinct vulnerabilities of key groups: women facing psychosocial stress or rights-related challenges, children requiring psychosocial or educational support, and agricultural households exposed to land/access constraints. **Strong:** Components are clearly tailored to the differentiated needs of women, children, and agricultural households, with evidence of appropriate modalities for each group. **Moderate:** Components are generally appropriate, but some groups or vulnerabilities are less fully addressed. **Limited:** Components are only partially adapted to group-specific	Women beneficiaries; caregivers; agricultural households; PSCCW staff; PARC staff; local councils; project documentation.	FGDs with women, caregivers, and livelihood beneficiaries; KIIs with PARC and PSCCW; document review.

		vulnerabilities, with notable design or implementation gaps. **Weak:** Components are generic or poorly matched to the needs of targeted groups.		
	To what extent did the project design reflect the realities of restricted access, settler-related violence, and limited service availability?	Assessment will consider whether the project design realistically accounted for access restrictions, security risks, exposure to settler violence, limited public services, and operational constraints in Area C and nearby affected communities. **Strong:** Design clearly reflects contextual risks and includes appropriate mitigation or adaptation measures. **Moderate:** Design reflects major contextual realities, but some assumptions or modalities appear optimistic or insufficiently adapted. **Limited:** Contextual constraints are recognized but weakly integrated into design or implementation planning. **Weak:** Design appears poorly adapted to access, security, or service constraints.	Project proposal; risk analysis; partner reports; ACPP/PARC/PSCCW staff; local councils; community focal points; beneficiaries.	Document review; KIIs with partners and local actors; FGDs with beneficiaries.
	Were targeting and selection processes appropriate, transparent, and perceived as fair by stakeholders and beneficiaries?	Assessment will examine whether beneficiary selection criteria were clear, vulnerability-based, consistently applied, and understood by communities, including perceptions among selected beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. **Strong:** Targeting criteria and processes are clear, transparent, vulnerability-sensitive, and widely perceived as fair. **Moderate:** Targeting is generally appropriate, with minor concerns about communication, transparency, or inclusion. **Limited:** Significant concerns exist regarding fairness, clarity, or consistency of selection. **Weak:** Targeting is widely perceived as unclear, unfair, exclusionary, or influenced by non-transparent factors.	Beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries; local councils; community committees; PARC and PSCCW field staff; selection documentation where available.	FGDs with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries; KIIs with local councils/committees and partner staff; document review.
	How well did the project integrate gender, protection, and	Assessment will consider whether gender, protection, and accountability were integrated as substantive design features rather than treated	Project proposal; logframe; accountability documentation; PSCCW and PARC reports;	Document review; KIIs with ACPP/PARC/PSCCW; FGDs with women beneficiaries,

	accountability considerations into its design?	as add-ons, including safe access, confidentiality, complaint mechanisms, participation of women, and responsiveness to protection risks. **Strong:** Gender, protection, and accountability are clearly embedded in design, targeting, implementation arrangements, and monitoring. **Moderate:** These considerations are present and generally meaningful, but unevenly applied across components or communities. **Limited:** Integration is partial, with important gaps in practical application. **Weak:** Gender, protection, and accountability are minimally addressed or largely absent from design and implementation.	ACPP/partner staff; women beneficiaries; local stakeholders.	caregivers, and community members.

EQ2 – Coherence and Complementarity

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
To what extent was the project coherent internally across its components and externally with the broader Action Group approach and other relevant interventions?	**Were the livelihoods, protection, legal, psychosocial, and community engagement components designed and implemented in a complementary manner?**	Assessment will examine whether different components were conceptually and operationally linked, reinforcing one another rather than functioning in isolation. **Strong:** Clear evidence that components were intentionally designed and implemented to reinforce each other, with beneficiaries experiencing complementary support across pathways. **Moderate:** Some complementarity exists, but linkages are inconsistent or limited to specific locations or groups. **Limited:** Components operate largely in parallel with minimal interaction or reinforcement. **Weak:** Components are fragmented and function independently with no meaningful complementarity.	Project proposal and ToC; ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; beneficiaries (especially those exposed to multiple components); community actors.	Document review; KIIs with partners; FGDs with beneficiaries across different support types.
	To what extent did coordination among ACPP, PARC, and PSCCW support coherent implementation?	Assessment will consider the structure, frequency, and effectiveness of coordination mechanisms and whether they facilitated joint planning, information sharing, and problem-solving. **Strong:** Regular, structured, and effective coordination leading to coherent planning and implementation across partners. **Moderate:** Coordination is generally functional but uneven or reactive rather than strategic. **Limited:** Coordination is irregular or limited in scope, with weak influence on implementation coherence. **Weak:** Minimal or ineffective coordination, resulting in fragmented implementation.	ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; coordination meeting records (if available); project documentation.	KIIs with partner staff; document review.
	Did the project benefit from its positioning within the Action Group framework?	Assessment will examine whether the project's integration within the Action Group provided added value in terms of access, coordination, strategic positioning, or complementarities with other interventions. **Strong:** Clear and consistent added value from Action Group positioning, including enhanced access, coordination, and synergy. **Moderate:** Some benefits observed, but not consistently across components or communities. **Limited:** Limited	ACPP and partner staff; documentation on Action Group; community actors.	KIIs with ACPP and partners; document review.

		evidence of added value beyond nominal alignment. **Weak:** No observable benefit from Action Group positioning.		
	Were overlaps with other interventions managed effectively to avoid duplication and strengthen complementarity?	Assessment will consider whether the project identified and managed overlaps with other actors and interventions in the area, including coordination and differentiation of support. **Strong:** Overlaps actively identified and managed, with clear complementarity and minimal duplication. **Moderate:** Some overlap exists but is partially managed. **Limited:** Overlaps present with limited mitigation, leading to inefficiencies. **Weak:** Significant duplication or lack of coordination with other interventions.	Partner staff; local councils; community actors; documentation.	KIIs; document review.
	To what extent did community-level implementation reflect a coherent project identity, rather than separate partner-led activities?	Assessment will examine whether beneficiaries and community stakeholders perceive the project as a unified intervention or as a set of disconnected activities implemented by different partners. **Strong:** Project is widely perceived as a coherent, unified intervention with clear identity. **Moderate:** Generally perceived as coherent, but with some distinctions between partners. **Limited:** Mixed perceptions, with noticeable fragmentation. **Weak:** Widely perceived as separate, uncoordinated partner activities.	Beneficiaries; community members; local councils; partner staff.	FGDs with beneficiaries and community members; KIIs with local actors and partners.

EQ3 – Effectiveness

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
To what extent did the project achieve its intended results, and what factors enabled or constrained achievement?	**To what extent were planned activities and outputs delivered as intended?**	Assessment will examine reported delivery against the project logframe, workplan, and partner implementation reports, including the extent to which targets were achieved, partially achieved, delayed, adapted, or not achieved. **Strong:** Planned activities and outputs were fully or nearly fully delivered, with reported achievements supported by consistent documentation and stakeholder confirmation. **Moderate:** Most activities and outputs were delivered, with some delays, adaptations, or partial delivery that did not substantially undermine results. **Limited:** Several activities were only partially delivered, delayed, or implemented with significant gaps. **Weak:** Major planned activities or outputs were not delivered, or evidence on delivery is weak or inconsistent.	Project logframe; partner reports; ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; local councils; field facilitators; beneficiary groups.	Document review; KIIs with partners and local actors; FGDs with beneficiaries.
	What evidence exists of changes in livelihoods, income, productive capacity, or household resilience?	Assessment will examine whether livelihood-related activities, including agricultural infrastructure, land rehabilitation, home gardens, and cash-based support, contributed to perceived or reported improvements in productive capacity, income, food access, coping capacity, or reduced economic vulnerability. **Strong:** Clear and consistent evidence across documents, beneficiaries, and implementers of meaningful livelihood or resilience improvements. **Moderate:** Evidence suggests positive changes, but these are uneven across groups, communities, or activity types. **Limited:** Some beneficiaries report benefits, but evidence is partial, short-term, or not clearly linked to improved resilience. **Weak:** Little or no evidence of livelihood improvement or household resilience gains.	PARC reports; livelihood beneficiaries; agricultural households; PARC field staff/engineer; local councils; community agricultural actors.	Document review; FGDs with livelihood beneficiaries; KIIs with PARC and local actors.
	What evidence exists of changes in psychosocial	Assessment will examine whether psychosocial and child-focused activities contributed to changes in	PSCCW reports; women beneficiaries; caregivers;	Document review; FGDs with women and caregivers;

	well-being, coping skills, or protective environments for women and children?	emotional well-being, coping mechanisms, confidence, social support, caregiver practices, or protective environments for women and children. **Strong:** Consistent evidence from beneficiaries, caregivers, PSCCW staff, and reports of meaningful improvements in psychosocial well-being and coping. **Moderate:** Positive changes are reported, but evidence is uneven or concentrated among some groups. **Limited:** Evidence of change is anecdotal, limited, or difficult to distinguish from short-term participation effects. **Weak:** Little or no evidence of improved psychosocial well-being or protective environment.	PSCCW facilitators; teachers/school actors where relevant; local community actors.	KIIs with PSCCW staff and school/community actors.
	To what extent did legal awareness and assistance improve women's access to rights-related support?	Assessment will examine whether legal awareness and assistance improved women's knowledge of rights, confidence to seek support, access to legal advice or representation, and ability to address rights-related concerns. **Strong:** Clear evidence that women increased rights awareness and accessed relevant legal support, with documented examples of assistance or case follow-up. **Moderate:** Evidence suggests improved awareness and some access to support, but coverage or follow-up is limited. **Limited:** Awareness activities were delivered, but evidence of actual access to rights-related support is weak. **Weak:** Little or no evidence that legal support improved awareness, access, or outcomes.	PSCCW legal reports; PSCCW legal case worker; women receiving legal support; ACPP/PSCCW staff; confidential case summaries where available.	Document review; KII with legal staff/case worker; FGD or individual consultations with women beneficiaries where ethically appropriate.
	How effective were community engagement mechanisms in supporting implementation and accountability?	Assessment will examine whether local committees, community engagement processes, and accountability mechanisms supported beneficiary selection, implementation, communication, problem-solving, complaint handling, and local participation. **Strong:** Mechanisms were active, inclusive, trusted, and contributed clearly to implementation quality and accountability. **Moderate:** Mechanisms functioned and supported implementation, but with uneven participation,	Local councils; community committee members; beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries; ACPP/PARC/PSCCW field staff; accountability documentation.	KIIs with local actors and committees; FGDs with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries; document review.

		limited visibility, or some gaps in accountability. **Limited:** Mechanisms existed but had weak functionality or limited influence on implementation. **Weak:** Mechanisms were inactive, unknown to communities, or ineffective in supporting accountability.		
	What were the main factors that enabled or constrained effectiveness?	Assessment will identify internal and external factors affecting project performance, including partner capacity, coordination, community participation, access restrictions, settler-related violence, administrative constraints, gender norms, and beneficiary demand. **Strong:** Enabling and constraining factors are clearly identified, consistently evidenced, and linked to variations in results. **Moderate:** Key factors are identified, though evidence is uneven or less clearly linked to results. **Limited:** Some factors are mentioned, but analysis of their effect on outcomes is weak. **Weak:** Factors affecting effectiveness are poorly understood or not evidenced.	ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; local councils; beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries; partner reports; contextual documentation.	KIIs; FGDs; document review; cross-site analysis.
	Were there differences in effectiveness across communities, components, or beneficiary groups?	Assessment will compare evidence across Awarta, Duma, and Qusra, and across livelihoods, psychosocial, legal, and community engagement components, to identify whether results were stronger or weaker for specific groups or locations. **Strong:** Clear, well-evidenced differences are identified and explained by contextual, design, or implementation factors. **Moderate:** Some differences are identified, but explanations remain partial. **Limited:** Differences are suggested but evidence is insufficient for robust interpretation. **Weak:** No meaningful comparison is possible due to insufficient or inconsistent data.	Cross-community beneficiary FGDs; partner staff; local councils; monitoring and implementation reports; logframe achievement data.	Comparative analysis of FGDs, KIIs, and documents; evidence grading by community and component.

EQ4 – Efficiency and Adaptive Management

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
To what extent were project resources, coordination mechanisms, and implementation arrangements used efficiently, and how effectively did partners adapt to contextual constraints?	**Were activities implemented within the planned timeframe and budget, and where deviations occurred, were they justified?**	Assessment will examine adherence to planned timelines and budgets, including the nature, scale, and justification of any deviations, as well as their implications for delivery. **Strong:** Activities implemented largely on time and within budget, with any deviations minor, justified, and well-managed. **Moderate:** Some delays or budget deviations occurred, but these were generally justified and did not significantly affect delivery. **Limited:** Frequent or significant delays or cost issues affected implementation, with partial justification. **Weak:** Major delays or inefficiencies occurred, with weak or no justification and clear negative impact on delivery.	Project workplans; budgets (if available); partner reports; ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff.	Document review; KIIs with partners.
	Did the division of roles among partners contribute to efficient implementation?	Assessment will consider clarity of roles, complementarity between partners, and whether the division of labor supported smooth and timely implementation. **Strong:** Roles were clearly defined, complementary, and consistently supported efficient implementation. **Moderate:** Roles were generally clear and functional, with minor overlaps or inefficiencies. **Limited:** Some ambiguity or overlap in roles led to inefficiencies or coordination challenges. **Weak:** Roles were unclear or conflicting, significantly undermining efficiency.	ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; coordination documentation.	KIIs with partner staff; document review.
	Were procurement, selection, and delivery mechanisms appropriate and timely?	Assessment will examine the effectiveness of operational systems used to deliver support (e.g., procurement of inputs, beneficiary selection, delivery of services or materials), including timeliness and appropriateness. **Strong:** Mechanisms were timely, well-managed, and appropriate to context and beneficiary needs. **Moderate:** Mechanisms were generally effective, with some delays or operational challenges. **Limited:** Mechanisms experienced notable delays or inefficiencies affecting delivery quality. **Weak:** Mechanisms were consistently ineffective, causing major delivery issues.	Partner staff; beneficiaries; shop owners (if relevant); documentation.	KIIs; FGDs; document review.

	How did partners respond to access restrictions, security risks, administrative constraints, and changes in community demand?	Assessment will consider the extent and quality of adaptive management in response to contextual constraints, including flexibility in implementation and decision-making. **Strong:** Partners demonstrated proactive and effective adaptation, maintaining delivery despite constraints. **Moderate:** Partners adapted to constraints, though responses were sometimes reactive or uneven. **Limited:** Adaptation occurred but was limited in scope or effectiveness. **Weak:** Little or no adaptation observed despite significant constraints.	ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; community actors; documentation.	KIIs; document review.
	Did adaptations improve project delivery without compromising quality, inclusion, or accountability?	Assessment will examine whether adjustments made during implementation strengthened or weakened delivery, including any trade-offs between efficiency, quality, and inclusiveness. **Strong:** Adaptations improved delivery and maintained or enhanced quality, inclusion, and accountability. **Moderate:** Adaptations generally improved delivery, with minor trade-offs. **Limited:** Adaptations addressed some issues but introduced new limitations or trade-offs. **Weak:** Adaptations negatively affected delivery quality, inclusion, or accountability, or failed to improve efficiency.	Beneficiaries; partner staff; local actors; documentation.	FGDs; KIIs; document review.
	Were there missed opportunities to improve efficiency or coordination?	Assessment will identify areas where efficiency gains could have been achieved but were not realized, including coordination, resource use, or implementation approaches. **Strong:** Few or no significant missed opportunities; implementation reflects strong efficiency practices. **Moderate:** Some missed opportunities identified, but overall efficiency remains acceptable. **Limited:** Several missed opportunities suggest inefficiencies in implementation. **Weak:** Many missed opportunities indicate systemic inefficiencies and weak coordination.	Partner staff; ACPP; community actors; documentation.	KIIs; document review; synthesis analysis.

EQ5 – Impact and Emerging Changes

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
What early or emerging changes can be plausibly associated with the project, and how significant are these changes for targeted individuals, households, and communities?	**What changes do beneficiaries report in their livelihoods, well-being, rights awareness, or participation?**	Assessment will examine self-reported changes across key domains, including livelihoods, psychosocial well-being, awareness of rights, and participation in community processes, while considering plausibility of project contribution. **Strong:** Clear, consistent, and multi-source evidence of meaningful changes across several domains, plausibly linked to project activities. **Moderate:** Positive changes reported, though uneven across groups or domains, with plausible but partial contribution. **Limited:** Some changes reported, but small in scale, inconsistent, or weakly linked to the project. **Weak:** Little or no evidence of meaningful change attributable to the project.	Beneficiaries (livelihood, women, caregivers); partner staff; documentation.	FGDs; KIIs; document review.
	Are there observable changes in women's confidence, agency, economic participation, or access to services?	Assessment will consider changes in women's empowerment dimensions, including confidence, decision-making, economic engagement, mobility, and access to support services. **Strong:** Clear and consistent evidence of increased agency, confidence, and/or access to services among women beneficiaries. **Moderate:** Some improvements reported, but uneven or limited in scope. **Limited:** Minor or short-term changes with limited evidence of sustained empowerment. **Weak:** No observable or reported changes in women's empowerment.	Women beneficiaries; PSCCW staff; community actors; documentation.	FGDs with women; KIIs with PSCCW and local actors; document review.
	Are there indications of improved child well-being, school engagement, or family support practices?	Assessment will examine perceived changes in children's well-being, emotional state, school participation, and caregiver practices as influenced by project activities. **Strong:** Clear and consistent evidence of improved well-being, engagement, and supportive practices. **Moderate:** Some improvements reported, though uneven or limited in duration. **Limited:** Minor or anecdotal improvements with weak supporting evidence. **Weak:** No observable or reported improvements.	Caregivers; teachers/school actors; PSCCW staff; documentation.	FGDs with caregivers; KIIs with teachers and PSCCW; document review.
	Did project activities contribute to reducing vulnerability or	Assessment will consider whether households and individuals are better able to cope with shocks, maintain livelihoods, access support, or avoid negative coping strategies. **Strong:**	Livelihood beneficiaries; women;	FGDs; KIIs; document review.

	strengthening resilience in practical ways?	Clear evidence of improved coping capacity, reduced vulnerability, and strengthened resilience across multiple groups. **Moderate:** Some improvements in coping or resilience, but uneven or limited in scale. **Limited:** Limited or short-term improvements with weak evidence of sustained resilience. **Weak:** No observable effect on vulnerability or resilience.	caregivers; partner staff; documentation.	
	Were there any unintended positive or negative effects?	Assessment will identify unintended outcomes, including both positive spillovers and negative consequences (e.g., tensions, exclusion, dependency). **Strong:** Unintended effects are clearly identified, well-understood, and appropriately contextualized. **Moderate:** Some unintended effects identified, but analysis is partial. **Limited:** Limited identification or understanding of unintended effects. **Weak:** No evidence or consideration of unintended effects.	Beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries; partner staff; community actors.	FGDs; KIIs.
	How significant were these changes in light of the wider contextual constraints?	Assessment will examine the relative importance of observed changes given the broader context (access restrictions, economic hardship, insecurity), focusing on whether even modest gains represent meaningful improvements. **Strong:** Changes are significant and meaningful despite severe contextual constraints. **Moderate:** Changes are meaningful but limited in scale or depth. **Limited:** Changes are minor relative to contextual challenges. **Weak:** Changes are negligible or insignificant in context.	All stakeholder groups; contextual analysis; documentation.	Synthesis of FGDs, KIIs, and contextual data; comparative analysis.

EQ6 – Sustainability and Continuity of Benefits

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
To what extent are the project's benefits likely to continue, and what factors support or threaten their sustainability?	**Are livelihood-related gains likely to continue beyond the project period?**	Assessment will examine whether livelihood-related gains, including restored productive capacity, home gardens, land rehabilitation benefits, income opportunities, and use of agricultural assets, are likely to continue after project support ends. **Strong:** Clear evidence that beneficiaries can maintain and use livelihood assets or practices beyond the project, with manageable risks. **Moderate:** Livelihood gains are likely to continue for some beneficiaries, but with notable constraints or dependency on external conditions. **Limited:** Continuity is fragile, short-term, or limited to a small number of beneficiaries. **Weak:** Livelihood gains are unlikely to continue without substantial external support.	Livelihood beneficiaries; PARC field staff; local councils; agricultural/community actors; project reports.	FGDs with livelihood beneficiaries; KIIs with PARC and local actors; document review.
	Are beneficiaries able to continue using skills, knowledge, or assets gained through the intervention?	Assessment will consider whether beneficiaries retain and apply knowledge, skills, tools, assets, or practices gained through the project, including agricultural practices, coping skills, rights awareness, and household-level practices. **Strong:** Beneficiaries demonstrate continued use of skills/assets and describe practical application beyond project activities. **Moderate:** Beneficiaries retain and use some skills/assets, but application is uneven or constrained. **Limited:** Skills/assets were received but continued use is uncertain or limited. **Weak:** Little evidence that skills, knowledge, or assets are retained or used.	Beneficiaries across components; women beneficiaries; caregivers; PARC and PSCCW staff; project documentation.	FGDs; KIIs; document review.
	Are psychosocial, legal, and educational gains likely to be sustained without continued external support?	Assessment will examine whether improvements in psychosocial well-being, legal awareness/access, and child or caregiver-related outcomes are likely to persist, and whether referral pathways, follow-up mechanisms, or local support systems exist. **Strong:** Gains are supported by continued capacities, referral pathways, or local/institutional support mechanisms.	Women beneficiaries; caregivers; PSCCW staff; legal staff/case worker; school/community actors; project reports.	FGDs with women/caregivers; KIIs with PSCCW/legal/school actors; document review.

		Moderate: Some gains may continue, but follow-up systems or local support remain limited. **Limited:** Gains appear short-term and heavily dependent on continued project or partner presence. **Weak:** Gains are unlikely to continue without external support, with no clear follow-up or support mechanism.		
	Are community structures or local mechanisms sufficiently functional to continue after project closure?	Assessment will consider whether local committees, community engagement processes, accountability mechanisms, or other local structures are active, trusted, and likely to remain functional beyond project closure. **Strong:** Structures are active, locally owned, and have clear roles or resources for continuation. **Moderate:** Structures exist and may continue, but with limited capacity, resources, or clarity of roles. **Limited:** Structures were established but are weak, inactive, or dependent on project facilitation. **Weak:** No meaningful community structures or local mechanisms are likely to continue.	Local councils; community committees; beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries; ACPP/PARC/PSCCW staff; documentation.	KIIs with local actors and partners; FGDs with beneficiaries/non-beneficiaries; document review.
Nnex 5	**What role do local councils, community-based organizations, schools, and partner organizations play in sustaining benefits?**	Assessment will examine the extent to which local and partner institutions can support continuation of project benefits, including through follow-up, referrals, maintenance, institutional anchoring, or integration into ongoing work. **Strong:** Local and partner institutions have clear, active, and realistic roles in sustaining benefits. **Moderate:** Institutions show willingness and partial capacity, but support is uneven or resource-constrained. **Limited:** Institutional roles are informal, unclear, or weakly resourced. **Weak:** Institutions have little role, ownership, or capacity to sustain benefits.	Local councils; schools; CBOs/community actors; ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; beneficiaries.	KIIs; FGDs where relevant; document review.
	What contextual risks threaten sustainability?	Assessment will identify external risks that may undermine sustainability, including access restrictions, settler-related violence, economic deterioration, social norms, institutional weakness, and continued service gaps. **Strong:** Risks are clearly identified, actively monitored, and mitigation options are realistic. **Moderate:** Major risks are recognized, but mitigation	ACPP/PARC/PSCCW staff; local councils; beneficiaries; contextual documentation; project reports.	KIIs; FGDs; document review; risk synthesis.

		is partial or uncertain. **Limited:** Risks are recognized only generally, with limited mitigation. **Weak:** Sustainability risks are poorly understood or unaddressed.		

EQ7 – Cross-Cutting Issues: Gender, Protection, Participation, and Accountability

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
To what extent were gender equality, protection, participation, and accountability effectively integrated into project design and implementation?	**Did the project adequately identify and respond to the specific needs of women, girls, boys, and men?**	Assessment will examine whether the project identified differentiated needs by gender and age, and whether activities were designed and implemented in ways that responded to these needs. **Strong:** Clear evidence that gender- and age-specific needs were identified and meaningfully addressed across components. **Moderate:** Differentiated needs were generally considered, but response was uneven across groups or activities. **Limited:** Some differentiated needs were recognized, but practical response was partial or weak. **Weak:** Little evidence that the project identified or responded to differentiated needs.	Project proposal; logframe; PSCCW and PARC reports; women beneficiaries; caregivers; partner staff; local actors.	Document review; FGDs with women and caregivers; KIIs with partner staff and local actors.
	Were women and children able to participate safely and meaningfully in relevant activities?	Assessment will examine whether participation arrangements were safe, accessible, culturally appropriate, and enabling for women and children, including timing, location, facilitation, confidentiality, and risk mitigation. **Strong:** Women and children participated safely and meaningfully, with clear evidence that barriers were anticipated and addressed. **Moderate:** Participation was generally safe and meaningful, but some access or comfort barriers remained. **Limited:** Participation occurred but was constrained by safety, access, social norms, or facilitation limitations. **Weak:** Significant barriers prevented safe or meaningful participation.	Women beneficiaries; caregivers; PSCCW staff; local councils; community committees; project reports.	FGDs with women and caregivers; KIIs with PSCCW and local actors; document review.
	Did the project contribute to women's empowerment,	Assessment will consider whether women experienced changes in confidence, agency, rights awareness, psychosocial well-being, economic participation, legal access, or connection to services. **Strong:** Clear and	Women beneficiaries; PSCCW staff; legal case worker; local institutions; project documentation.	FGDs with women; KIIs with PSCCW/legal/local actors; document review.

	protection, or access to services?	consistent evidence that the project contributed to women's empowerment, protection, and/or access to services. **Moderate:** Positive changes are reported, but they are uneven or concentrated among certain groups. **Limited:** Some changes are reported, but evidence is limited, short-term, or weakly linked to the project. **Weak:** Little or no evidence of contribution to women's empowerment, protection, or service access.		
	Were accountability mechanisms accessible, trusted, and used by community members?	Assessment will examine whether communities were aware of accountability mechanisms, whether they perceived them as safe and credible, and whether feedback or complaints were received and acted upon. **Strong:** Accountability mechanisms were known, accessible, trusted, and used, with evidence of follow-up. **Moderate:** Mechanisms existed and were somewhat known, but use or follow-up was uneven. **Limited:** Mechanisms existed but awareness, trust, or use was low. **Weak:** Mechanisms were absent, unknown, or not trusted by community members.	Beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries; community committees; local councils; ACPP/PARC/PSCCW staff; accountability records if available.	FGDs with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries; KIIs with partners/local actors; document review.
	Were confidentiality, safeguarding, and do-no-harm principles adequately applied, especially in activities involving GBV survivors and children?	Assessment will consider whether sensitive activities were implemented with appropriate safeguards, including confidentiality, safe referral, informed consent, child-sensitive approaches, and avoidance of retraumatization or exposure to risk. **Strong:** Safeguarding, confidentiality, and do-no-harm principles were clearly applied and consistently reflected in practice. **Moderate:** Principles were generally applied, with some minor gaps or uneven documentation. **Limited:** Application was partial or inconsistently evidenced. **Weak:** Significant safeguarding or confidentiality gaps are evident or likely.	PSCCW staff; legal/PSS facilitators; caregivers; women beneficiaries; project protocols/documentation.	KIIs with PSCCW/legal/PSS staff; FGDs with women/caregivers where appropriate; document review.

	Were there any barriers to participation that affected inclusion or equity?	Assessment will identify barriers related to gender norms, mobility, safety, disability, poverty, information access, timing, stigma, or selection processes, and whether these affected who participated and benefited. **Strong:** Barriers were clearly identified and effectively mitigated, supporting equitable participation. **Moderate:** Some barriers remained, but mitigation measures allowed generally inclusive participation. **Limited:** Significant barriers limited inclusion for certain groups. **Weak:** Barriers substantially excluded or disadvantaged vulnerable groups.	Beneficiaries; non-beneficiaries; women; caregivers; local councils; partner staff.	FGDs with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries; KIIs with local actors and partners; cross-group comparison.

EQ8 – Complementarity and Nexus Practice

Evaluation Question	Sub-question	Judgement Criteria / Scoring Rubric	Data Sources	Methods
To what extent did the project move beyond parallel implementation toward meaningful complementarity between livelihoods, protection, legal support, and community engagement components?	**Were beneficiaries able to access multiple forms of support in a coherent and reinforcing manner?**	Assessment will examine whether beneficiaries experienced integrated support across components (e.g., livelihoods + PSS + legal), and whether this led to more holistic outcomes. **Strong:** Clear evidence that beneficiaries accessed multiple complementary services that reinforced each other and improved outcomes. **Moderate:** Some beneficiaries accessed multiple services, but integration was uneven or limited in scope. **Limited:** Few beneficiaries accessed more than one component; services largely delivered in isolation. **Weak:** No evidence of beneficiaries receiving or benefiting from multiple components.	Beneficiaries (especially cross-component participants); partner staff; project documentation.	FGDs with beneficiaries; KIIs with partners; document review.
	Did livelihoods and protection/psychosocial components reinforce each other in practice?	Assessment will consider whether livelihood support contributed to reduced stress and vulnerability, and whether psychosocial or protection interventions supported economic participation and resilience. **Strong:** Clear two-way reinforcement between livelihoods and protection/PSS observed across multiple cases. **Moderate:** Some evidence of reinforcement, but limited or uneven. **Limited:** Minimal interaction between components, with weak reinforcing effects. **Weak:** Components functioned independently with no observable interaction.	Beneficiaries; PSCCW and PARC staff; local actors.	FGDs; KIIs.
	Were there referral, coordination, or sequencing mechanisms between components?	Assessment will examine whether formal or informal referral pathways existed between partners (e.g., from PSS to legal, or livelihoods to protection), and whether these were used in practice. **Strong:** Clear and functional referral or coordination mechanisms actively used across components. **Moderate:** Some referral or coordination exists but is inconsistent or informal. **Limited:** Limited or ad hoc referral between components. **Weak:** No evidence of referral or coordination mechanisms.	ACPP, PARC, PSCCW staff; documentation; beneficiaries where relevant.	KIIs; document review; FGDs (where applicable).

	Did partner coordination lead to integrated planning, implementation, or follow-up at community level?	Assessment will consider whether coordination translated into integrated action on the ground (joint targeting, follow-up, sequencing of activities). **Strong:** Clear evidence of integrated planning and implementation at community level. **Moderate:** Some integration, but not systematic. **Limited:** Coordination exists but does not translate into integrated action. **Weak:** No evidence of integrated planning or follow-up.	Partner staff; community actors; local councils.	KIIs; FGDs; document review.
	What factors enabled or limited complementarity across components?	Assessment will identify operational, contextual, or design factors influencing complementarity (e.g., partner coordination, funding structure, timelines, targeting). **Strong:** Enabling and limiting factors clearly identified and consistently evidenced across sources. **Moderate:** Key factors identified, though analysis is partial. **Limited:** Some factors mentioned, but weakly evidenced. **Weak:** Little or no understanding of factors affecting complementarity.	All stakeholders; documentation.	KIIs; FGDs; synthesis analysis.

Annex 2: Interview and FGD guides

GUIDE 1 – KII: ACPP (Management / MEAL / Coordination)

A. Introduction

- Explain purpose, confidentiality, voluntary participation

B. Relevance & Design

- How were needs identified in target communities?
- To what extent did the project respond to the most pressing needs?
- Were some needs not addressed? Why?
- How were gender, protection, and vulnerable groups considered in design?
- How did contextual constraints (access, settler violence, services) shape the design?

Probe:

- Can you give specific examples of needs that were addressed or not addressed?

C. Coherence & Complementarity

- How were roles divided among partners?
- How did coordination function in practice?
- Were components designed to work together or separately?
- Did beneficiaries receive multiple types of support?
- Were there referrals between components?

Probe:

- Can you give an example where one component reinforced another?

D. Effectiveness

- Were activities and outputs delivered as planned?
- What results were achieved across components?
- What worked better and what worked less well?
- Were there differences across communities or groups?

Probe:

- Who benefited more? Who benefited less? Why?

E. Efficiency & Adaptation

- Were activities implemented on time?
- What delays or bottlenecks occurred?
- How did the project adapt to constraints?
- Were there missed opportunities to improve efficiency?

Probe:

- Did any delays affect results or beneficiaries?

F. Impact & Changes

- What changes can be linked to the project?
- Which changes are most significant given the context?
- Were there any unintended effects?

Probe:

- Can you provide concrete examples?

G. Sustainability

- Which results are likely to continue?
- What might prevent continuation?
- Who will support beneficiaries after the project?

H. Cross-Cutting & Accountability

- How were gender and protection handled in practice?
- Were accountability mechanisms used?
- Were there safeguarding concerns?

Probe:

- Did beneficiaries feel safe giving feedback?

I. Learning

- What worked best?
- What would you do differently?

GUIDE 2 – KII: IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS (PARC / PSCCW / PHG)

A. Relevance

- How were beneficiaries selected?
- Did activities match their needs?
- Were some groups excluded?

Probe:

- Was targeting perceived as fair by communities?

B. Implementation & Effectiveness

- What activities did you implement?
- What changes did you observe among beneficiaries?
- Were results consistent across communities?

Probe:

- Who benefited most and least?

C. Complementarity

- Did your activities link with other components?
- Were beneficiaries referred between services?
- Did different supports reinforce each other?

Probe:

- Can you give a concrete example?

D. Efficiency & Adaptation

- What challenges did you face?
- How did you adapt?
- Were delivery mechanisms timely?
- Did delays or constraints affect outcomes?

E. Impact

- What meaningful changes did you observe?
- Were there unintended effects?

F. Sustainability

- Will beneficiaries continue to benefit?
- What might limit sustainability?

G. Cross-Cutting

- How were gender and protection addressed?
- Were there participation barriers?

H. Accountability

- Were feedback mechanisms used?
- Did beneficiaries raise complaints? How what evidence?

GUIDE 3 – KII: LOCAL COUNCILS / COMMUNITY LEADERS

A. Relevance

- What were the main needs in your community?
- Did the project address them? How and to what extent/how well? What remained undadressed?
- Can you reflect on your partnership with the AG members over the years? Has this helped in anyway in addressing community needs?

B. Targeting & Fairness

- How were beneficiaries selected?
- Was the process fair?

Probe:

- Were any groups excluded?

C. Results

- What changes have you observed?
- Which groups benefited most/least?

D. Coherence & Complementarity

- Did partners work together effectively?
- Did activities reinforce each other?

E. Efficiency

- Were activities delivered on time?
- Any challenges?

F. Sustainability

- Will benefits continue?
- What is in place now to ensure that these benfits continue? How has the project or AG partners help in this regard?

G. Risks & Gaps

- What challenges remain?
- Any negative effects?

H. Accountability

- Were communities able to give feedback? How and how responsive was the project?

GUIDE 4 – KII: LEGAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

A. Relevance

- What legal services did you provide specifically?
- Were legal services aligned with women's needs? How?

B. Effectiveness

- What services were provided?
- Did awareness and access improve? How?

C. Barriers

- What challenges do women face in accessing legal support?

D. Complementarity

- Did legal services link with other supports (PSS, livelihoods)?

E. Safeguarding

- How is confidentiality ensured?

F. Impact

- What changes have you observed?

G. Sustainability

- Will access to services continue? How? What was done to ensure this?

GUIDE 5 – KII: MARKET ACTORS / SHOP OWNERS

A. Relevance

- Were voucher systems appropriate?

B. Implementation

- How did the system work in practice?

C. Efficiency

- Were processes timely?
- Any delays or issues?

D. Impact

- Did the project affect local markets? You as a shop keeper? Positively or negatively.

E. Sustainability

- Will benefits continue?

GUIDE 6 – FGD: LIVELIHOOD BENEFICIARIES

A. Relevance

- Did the support match your needs?

B. Results

- What changed after receiving support?
- Income, productivity, coping?

Probe:

- Compared to before, what is different?

C. Complementarity

- Did you receive other support? What?
- Did they help each other?

D. Efficiency

- Was support received on time?
- Did delays affect you?

E. Impact

- What difference did the project make?

F. Sustainability

- Will you continue using what you received? How? Why?
- What might stop you?

G. Fairness

- Was selection fair?
- Were others excluded in your opinion?

H. Negative Effects

- Did anything negative happen? Has your participation affect you in any negative way? Did the project help?

I. Accountability

- Did you know how to give feedback?
- Did anyone use it?
- What do you think of the established feedback system?

GUIDE 7 – FGD: WOMEN BENEFICIARIES (PSS / LEGAL)

A. Safe Introduction

B. Relevance

- Did activities respond to your needs?

C. Psychosocial Changes

- Any changes in stress, confidence, well-being?

D. Legal Awareness

- Did you learn about your rights?
- Did you access services?

E. Participation & Safety

- Were you comfortable participating?
- Any barriers?

F. Complementarity

- Did different supports help each other?

G. Impact

- What difference did the project make in your life?

H. Sustainability

- Will benefits continue?

I. Negative Effects

- Any problems or concerns?

J. Accountability

- Did you know how to give feedback?
- Was it safe?

GUIDE 8 – FGD: CAREGIVERS

A. Changes in Children

- Any changes in behavior, well-being, school?

B. Parenting

- Did your approach change?

C. Impact

- What difference did the project make?

D. Sustainability

- Will these changes continue?

E. Complementarity

- Did different supports reinforce each other?

F. Negative Effects

- Any challenges?

GUIDE 9 – FGD: NON-BENEFICIARIES

A. Awareness

- Do you know about the project?

B. Targeting

- Was selection fair?

C. Community Impact

- Did the project benefit the community?

D. Gaps

- Who was excluded?

E. Negative Effects

- Any tensions or issues?

GUIDE 10 – KII: COMMUNITY PROTECTION COMMITTEES (CPCs)

A. Introduction

- Explain purpose, confidentiality, voluntary participation
- Clarify role of CPC in project context

B. Role and Functioning of CPC

- What is the role of the CPC in your community?
- How was the CPC formed? Who is represented?
- How often do you meet and what do you typically discuss?

Probe:

- Are women and vulnerable groups represented? How?

C. Relevance and Needs

- What are the main protection risks in your community?
- How does the CPC identify these risks?
- Did the project help address these risks?

D. Effectiveness

- What actions has the CPC taken to respond to protection issues?
- Were these actions successful? Why or why not?
- Did the CPC help connect people to services (PSS, legal, livelihoods)?

E. Complementarity

- Did CPC activities link with other project components?
- Were there referrals between CPC and other services?

Probe:

- Can you give an example where different supports worked together?

F. Participation and Inclusion

- Who participates in CPC activities?
- Are some groups excluded? Why?

G. Challenges

- What challenges does the CPC face?
- Are there barriers to acting on protection issues?

H. Sustainability

- Will the CPC continue after the project ends?
- What support is needed to sustain it?

I. Impact

- What changes have you observed in the community due to CPC work?
- Has awareness or response to protection issues improved?

J. Accountability

- Do community members trust the CPC?
- Can they raise concerns or complaints?

GUIDE 11 – KII: ADVOCACY / MONITORING ACTORS (ACPP, Yesh Din, B'Tselem, Others)

A. Introduction

- Explain purpose and scope
- Clarify role in monitoring / advocacy / documentation

B. Relevance

- What are the main protection issues you monitor or address?
- How does the project align with these issues?

C. Documentation and Monitoring

- What types of violations or issues are documented?
- How is information collected and verified?

Probe:

- Are communities involved in reporting?

D. Use of Evidence

- How is this information used?
- Does it inform advocacy, reporting, or legal processes?

E. Advocacy and Engagement

- Who are the main targets of advocacy?
- What forms of engagement are used (reports, meetings, media)?

F. Effectiveness

- What results or changes have you observed?
- Has visibility of issues increased?
- Has there been any response from duty-bearers?

G. Constraints

- What limits the effectiveness of advocacy?
- Are there political or security barriers?

H. Complementarity

- How does advocacy link to field-level activities (PSS, legal, livelihoods)?
- Does documentation influence service provision or targeting?

I. Sustainability

- Will monitoring and advocacy continue?
- What conditions are required?

J. Risks and Ethics

- Are there risks to individuals or communities from documentation?
- How are confidentiality and safety ensured?

Annex 3: List of Interviewees and Participants Consulted

A. Action Group Partners and Implementing Organizations

Name	Position	Organization
Ms. Clara Ela Rey García	Middle East-Mashreq Project Manager	ACPP
Ms. Celia Domínguez Yuste	País Valencià Representative	ACPP
Mr. Naseh Shaheen	Nablus Office Manager and Project Coordinator	PARC
Ms. Alaa Abu Hashish	Nablus Office Manager	PSCCW
Ms. Yara Thouqan	Project Manager	PSCCW
Ms. Reem Abu Rumoh	Project Coordinator	PSCCW
Ms. Areen Al-Hakim	Project Manager	PSCCW
Mr. Sami Dawood	Nablus Office Manager	PHG
Mr. Ala' Dumaidi	Project Manager	PHG

B. Qusra

B.1. Local Authorities and Community Representatives

Name	Position / Role
Mr. Abdel Atheem Odeh-Wadi	Chairman, Qusra Village Council
Mr. Mohammad Aqel	Qusra Village Council Staff
Ms. Ibtisam Odeh	Women's Committee Member
Ms. Suhair Hassan	Community Protection Committee Member
Ms. Shurouq Odeh	Social Worker
Ms. Ruqayya Saleh	Community Member (Non-beneficiary)

B.2. Livelihood and Agricultural Beneficiaries

Name	Position / Role
Mr. Fat'hallah Abu Reeda	Agricultural Road Rehabilitation Beneficiary
Mr. Ahed Odeh	Agricultural Road Rehabilitation Beneficiary
Mr. Hadi Majed	Agricultural Road Rehabilitation Beneficiary

Mr. Nash’at Hassan	Land Rehabilitation Beneficiary
Mr. Samer Abdelraziq	Agricultural Road and Land Rehabilitation Beneficiary
Ms. Kainat Fare’	Home Garden Beneficiary
Ms. Hanan Mansour	Home Garden Beneficiary
Ms. Amal Rateb	Home Garden Beneficiary

B.3. Cash and Food Assistance Beneficiaries

Name	Position / Role
Ms. Um Mohammad	Food Voucher Assistance Beneficiary
Ms. Shurouq Al-Nuri	Food Voucher Assistance Beneficiary

C. Awarta

C.1. Local Authorities and Community Representatives

Name	Position / Role
Mr. Amjad Qaqareeq	Awarta Village Council Staff
Mr. Ahmad Darawsheh	Awarta Village Council Member
Mr. Luai Awwad	Awarta Village Council Member
Mr. Awad Awad	Community Protection Committee Member

C.2. Livelihood Beneficiaries

Name	Position / Role
Mr. Suleiman Hundawi	Agricultural Road Rehabilitation Beneficiary
Mr. Mahmoud Muntaser	Land Rehabilitation Beneficiary (Conditional Cash Assistance)

C.3. Women Beneficiaries – Psychosocial, Legal and Community Activities

Name	Position / Role
Ms. Ahlam Shurrab	Participant in PSCCW Women's Sessions
Ms. Yasmeen Darawhseh	Participant in PSCCW Women's Sessions
Ms. Nibal Awad	Participant in PSCCW Women's Sessions
Ms. Rasha Yousef	Participant in PSCCW Women's Sessions

Ms. Ghada Shurrab	Participant in Women's Employment Opportunity and Community Activities
Ms. Wafa Awad	Participant in Women's Sessions and Employment Opportunity
Ms. Nadia Qawareeq	Participant in Women's Sessions and Employment Opportunity
Ms. Hanadi Awad	Employment Opportunity Beneficiary
Ms. Ruba Al-Qadi	Employment Opportunity Beneficiary
Ms. Samah Qawareeq	Employment Opportunity Beneficiary
Ms. Kawthar Awad	Employment Opportunity Beneficiary

D. Duma Community

D.1. Local Authorities and Community Representatives

Name	Position / Role
Mr. Suleiman Dawabshe	Chairman, Duma Village Council
Mr. Rasem Dawabshe	Village Council Member
Mr. Izzat Dawabshe	Accountant, Duma Village Council
Mr. Musa Dawabshe	Chairman, Duma Sports Club and CPC Member
Mr. Ali Dawabshe	Deputy Chairman, Duma Sports Club and CPC Member

D.2. Women Beneficiaries

Name	Position / Role
Ms. Shireen Dawabshe	Participant in PSCCW Women's Sessions
Ms. Maram Dawabshe	Participant in Women's Sessions and Employment Opportunity
Ms. Samaher Dawabshe	Participant in Women's Sessions and Employment Opportunity
Ms. Unood Kayed	Participant in Women's Sessions and Employment Opportunity
Ms. Rahma Abdelhafeth Dawabshe	Participant in Women's Sessions and Employment Opportunity

Annex 4: Documents Reviewed

No.	Document reviewed
1	Project proposal and logical framework for *SOLHUM/2024/0030*.
2	Evaluation inception report, including evaluation approach, workplan, evaluation matrix and data collection framework.
4	Action Group Humanitarian Strategy for Palestine.
5	Action Group Needs Assessment / Humanitarian Strategy Needs Assessment for Palestine 2022–2024.
7	Spain–Palestine Country Partnership Framework 2020–2024.
10	PARC final technical report for *SOLHUM/2024/0030*
11	PSCCW final technical report for *SOLHUM/2024/0030*, covering women's psychosocial support, legal awareness and assistance, internships, child protection, remedial education and school initiatives.
13	*SOLHUM/2024/0030* implementation and monitoring documentation, including correspondence with the donor, partner-level project documentation and reporting material shared for the evaluation.
14	Yesh Din and B'Tselem documentation and reporting on human rights violations, legal/accountability work, testimonies, visual evidence and advocacy activities supported under the project.