Terms of Reference

Consultancy for an Endline Study / Final Impact Evaluation of Swiss Church Aid’s Open Forum Programme in Israel and Palestine

1 Purpose of the Consultancy

Swiss Church Aid (HEKS/EPER) seeks to procure the services of a lead researcher to design, plan and conduct an endline study / final impact evaluation of the Open Forum Programme (2016-2019) in Israel and Palestine.

The desk research / inception phase is expected to take place during February 2020, while the field research / data collection phase is expected to take place during March 2020. The data analysis and report writing are expected to take place during April 2020.

It is expected that the lead researcher (national or international) will have extensive knowledge of and experience in designing, planning, and conducting impact evaluations (using various designs, in particular qualitative designs). In addition, there will be up to two national researchers with extensive knowledge of and experience in designing, planning, and conducting data collections, as well as in-depth knowledge of the local context, and in-depth knowledge of the baseline assessment which was conducted in 2017.

2 About Swiss Church Aid

Swiss Church Aid is the aid organization of the Protestant churches in Switzerland. It is engaged in development cooperation, humanitarian aid, and church cooperation. In 2018, Swiss Church Aid worked in 289 projects worldwide with a total budget of nearly 65 million Swiss Francs.
3 Description of the intervention

The intervention to be evaluated is the Open Forum, a network and exchange platform of organisations working on access to land within a conflict transformation context. The Open Forum serves as an “open” space for partner organisations of the Swiss Church Aid country programme in Israel and Palestine to share experiences, develop synergies, and engage in co-operations. It provides an institutionalised space for developing joint strategies and alternative rights-based models for improving access to land, housing and public space, and for planning and implementing common projects around specific problems of access to land, housing and public space.

Between 2016 and 2019 the Open Forum programme had a total budget of 5.4 million Swiss Francs. It consisted of 13 bilateral projects (between a partner organisation and Swiss Church Aid) and 14 joint actions (involving several partner organisations). Projects were implemented in the West Bank (including East Jerusalem), Gaza, and Israel.

*Please see Annex 1 for the LogFrame of the Open Forum and Annex 2 for the Theory of Change of the Country Programme.*

4 Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

The planned evaluation is an endline assessment / impact evaluation which builds upon a baseline assessment conducted in 2017. The purpose of the impact evaluation is threefold. Conducting an external end-of-phase evaluation is a PCM requirement and serves the purpose of being accountable to the People of our Concern, our partners, and donors. The results of the impact evaluation will also be utilized for the purpose of steering, i.e. for adapting the next programme phase (2021-2024). Lastly, the entire impact evaluation process will also support an institutional learning process: which impact evaluation designs, approaches, and methods are suitable in a conflict context that is constantly changing and contains a myriad of various actors and influences.
The target audience of the impact evaluation are Swiss Church Aid staff of the Israel and Palestine country programme, as well as the partner organisations participating in the Open Forum, and the Desk Officer for the Israel/Palestine country programme. They will utilize the results to adapt their programming, and to transfer lessons learnt to other interventions. The results are also targeted at the MEL unit of Swiss Church Aid in Switzerland which will utilize the results for reporting purposes, and to improve Swiss Church Aid’s impact assessment policy and practice.

The specific projects (or components of projects) to be covered by this impact evaluation, including their geographic focus, will be determined together with the research team.

5 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The impact evaluation will assess two of the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were the objectives of the Open Forum achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the major factors influencing the achievement (or non-achievement) of objectives?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the program succeed in increasing the beneficiaries’ / communities’ absorptive, adaptative, and transformative capacities in the face of identified shocks and stresses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have the beneficiaries and their communities claimed their rights, taken transformative initiatives / HRB-alternatives, exercised their rights?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the programme been successful in overcoming barriers to rights claiming that have been identified at baseline (e.g. motivation, fear, apathy, interest, social pressure, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have these transformative initiatives, HRB-alternatives, actions to claim rights and the mobilised rights holders behind them been picked up by local / international media and by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relevant civil society actors? Has the programme been successful in linking rights holders and international media / civil society actors?

- Have duty-bearers been influenced (e.g. to change their rhetoric, behaviour or policies) through actions taken by target rights holders / communities, or by any projects or initiatives driven by the Open Forum?
- Has the public discourse / opinion in Israel and / or internationally been positively changed regarding Palestinian rights on access to land, housing, and public spaces?

**Impact:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o What has happened as a result of the Open Forum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o What real difference have the projects of the Open Forum made for the target groups? (positive and negative, intended and unintended, direct and indirect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific questions**

- What is the effect of the Open Forum on the interrelations between partner organisations? Between (Palestinian, Israeli) organizations involved in human rights work in Israel and Palestine? Has the Open Forum succeeded in creating cooperation and discussion spaces for civil society organisations?
- What is the programme’s impact on access to land and resources of targeted rights holders / communities?
- What has changed and in what way in terms of the behaviour and initiatives of Civil Society Organisations?
- What has changed and in what way in terms of the behaviour and initiatives of the media?
- What has changed and in what way in terms of the attitudes and initiatives of duty-bearers?

6 **Impact Assessment Design**

Swiss Church Aid understands “impact” as the changes produced by an intervention. Consequently, this impact evaluation should not only measure or describe the changes that have occurred but should also identify the role of the Open Forum in producing these changes (causal attribution, causal contribution, or causal inference). The baseline study conducted in 2017 serves as a point of comparison. However, due to
the design of the baseline assessment (case studies), no difference-in-difference design will be possible.

Swiss Church Aid acknowledges that there are various causal approaches and impact evaluation designs, only some of which rely on a counterfactual ([please see Annex 3 for more details](#)). For this endline assessment, Swiss Church Aid suggests the following impact assessment design and methodology (to be either confirmed or adapted in consultations with the lead researcher during the inception phase):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strength or justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contribution analysis   | Outcome harvesting and qualitative impact assessment protocol (QuIP); complementary in-depth interviews or short surveys if relevant | • Contribution analysis addresses the “what worked?” and “with which contribution of the OF? “.  
• Outcome harvesting allows capturing unintended impact and elements of the intervention that were not initially planned or that stem from project adjustments due to changes in the context.  
• Outcome harvesting deals well with hard to predict/intangible outcomes and impacts.  
• Outcome harvesting is considered most useful when different stakeholders not only want to identify change, but also to learn about how and why those changes were brought about.  
• QuIP draws on contribution analysis but goes beyond it selects key changes around those expected in the theory of change, and addresses unintended changes (outcome or impact levels), and drivers/barriers to the observed changes. |
| Network analysis        | Software based, if possible                                            | • Relevant, as the strengthening of cooperation spaces or networks between same or different types of target groups ([e.g. same](#) – rights holders in the West Bank and rights holders in East Jerusalem; [different](#) – rights holders and Civil Society) |


Organisation) is an intended outcome of the Open Forum Programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quasi-experimental (to be confirmed)</th>
<th>Short survey</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                                       |             | • Applicable for rights holders, if judged complementary enough to two confirmed approaches (contribution and network analyses)  
|                                       |             | • e.g. short surveys with farmers in target and comparison groups in the Gush Etzion area, to compare levels of three layers of resilience; baseline poll survey with the Jewish Israeli population in the Galilee repeated at endline. |

The following sampling is proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of the ToC</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Sampling proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rights holders     | QuIP   | • Purposive sampling  
|                    |        | • Direct beneficiaries  
|                    |        | • 6-7 interviews from approximately 10 partner organisations’ direct targets groups  
|                    |        | • 1 Focus Group Discussion per target area with non-interviewed direct beneficiaries |
| Rights holders     | Outcome harvesting | • Direct and indirect beneficiaries  
|                    |        | • Covering target areas of all partner organisations  
|                    |        | • Interviewees for Key Informant Interviews to be defined according to the context and type of intervention (who are the key informants; is it relevant to include beneficiaries or community members in the interviewee group) |
| Civil Society Organisations | Outcome harvesting | • Ideally, covering all targeted civil society organisations’ communities  
|                          |        | • Media, same method, same open questions (see Annex 4, Evaluation Matrix) |
| Duty bearers        | Outcome harvesting | • Same method, same open questions (see Annex 4, Evaluation Matrix) |


| Partners organisations | Outcome harvesting | • Same method, same open questions (see Annex 4, Evaluation Matrix) |


*Please see Annex 4 for a draft Evaluation Matrix.*

The researcher is expected to comment on the proposed design and methodology in the application (maximum 1 page). The selected researcher will be able to finalise the design and methodology, and suggest adaptations, in the inception report.

7 Deliverables

Application phase:

- As part of the application, the researcher is expected to comment on the proposed design and methodology; comments on the ToR are also invited

Inception phase:

- Inception report, finalising the design and methodology for the endline study / impact evaluation, including a revised evaluation matrix, a revised sampling strategy, and a revised sample size

- Quality assurance plan, setting out the systems and processes for assuring the quality of the research process and the deliverables

- Data collection tools (draft, final); these tools may include research instruments used during the baseline assessment, any revisions to these tools, and/or the development of new tools

Endline / Impact evaluation phase:

- Training conducted for the national consultant(s) and possibly for enumerators on the impact evaluation design, sampling framework, research instruments,
and research ethics. Duration and content of training to be determined by the researcher

- Data collection, together with the national consultant(s) and possibly enumerators
- Fully “cleaned-up” dataset in Excel, if applicable
- Documentation of qualitative data (notes or transcripts, as appropriate and feasible)
- Impact evaluation report (draft, final)
- Presentation of impact evaluation findings to the evaluation steering committee, the programme team, and key stakeholders
- Regular progress reports submitted to Swiss Church Aid’s MEL Officer in Zurich during the consultancy period, detailing 1) activities / tasks completed to date, 2) any challenges faced, 3) any adjustments made in response to the challenges, 4) any deviations from the timeline and explanations for the deviations, and 5) additional human resources and/or logistical support needed.
- Support for the development of target-specific products, such as a policy brief

### 8 Schedule for the lead researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th># of working days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>Application phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deadline for applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 15(^{th}), 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews (via skype) will be conducted between January 20(^{th}),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020 and January 29(^{th}), 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| February 2020 | Inception phase | - Document review  
- Writing of inception report, including a half day Q&A (via skype) with the steering committee  
- Developing quality assurance plan  
- Developing data collection tools, including a half day Q&A (via skype) with the steering committee to validate the data collection tools | 10 days |
| March 2020 | Endline / Impact Evaluation phase | - Travel to the field (for international researcher, if applicable)  
- Training of team and enumerators, if applicable  
- Qualitative data collection  
- Quantitative data collection  
- Preliminary data analysis in country  
- Continuous quality assurance  
- Continuous exchange with the MEL Officer at HQ  
- Debriefing in country | 15       |
| April 2020 | – Quantitative data entry, if required (this may be done by a third party)  
– Data analysis (quantitative data analysis may be done by a third party, if required)  
– Reporting, including a half day Q&A (via skype) with the steering committee to clarify any questions  
– Presentation of results to the steering committee and other stakeholders, as applicable  
– Adapting the report, if required |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>– Producing different products for various target groups / uses, e.g. policy brief for advocacy work, short video clip to explain process of qualitative impact assessments, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants are expected to submit their daily rate, including VAT, and their estimated travel costs to and from Jerusalem as part of the application. Accommodation and transportation in country will be arranged directly by the Swiss Church Aid Country Office and/or the partner organisations and does not need to be included in the budget. Enumerators will be hired locally – if required – and do not need to be included in the budget.
9 **Management Roles and Responsibilities**

The researcher will be responsible for administering and supervising the endline study, including the methodological preparation, the data collection and analysis, and writing the endline study report.

The **Steering Committee** consists of the Country Director of the Swiss Church Aid Country Programme in Israel and Palestine, the Desk Officer of the Country Programme based at Swiss Church Aid HQ in Zurich, and the MEL Officer of Swiss Church Aid, also based in Zurich.

The Steering Committee will oversee the administration and overall coordination of the entire assessment / evaluation process, including monitoring progress. The main functions of the Steering Committee are:

- Establishing the Terms of Reference;
- Reviewing, commenting on and endorsing the Inception Report;
- Engaging periodically with the substance of the evaluation and providing preliminary feedback to the researcher;
- Managing the commenting process on the draft endline assessment / impact evaluation report;
- Reviewing, commenting on and endorsing the final report; and
- Establishing a dissemination and utilization strategy.

The MEL Officer (HQ) will lead the Steering Committee. During its work, the Steering Committee will strive towards reaching consensus on any issues that are discussed. In case of disagreement among the Committee members, the MEL Officer (HQ) will decide. In case of disagreement regarding comments on the draft endline assessment and/or impact evaluation report, minority views will be reflected in an annex to the final report.
The Swiss Church Aid Country Office in Israel / Palestine will assist the researcher by providing all necessary documents (baseline assessment, proposals, logframes or alternative results models, workplans, budgets, reports) and by facilitating access to key stakeholders and specific information or expertise needed to complete the evaluation. Together with the partner organisations, the Swiss Church Aid Country Office will coordinate the field research, including meetings, transportation and logistics, as well as organising the debriefing in country.

The researcher will report directly to the MEL Officer (HQ) who will manage the consultancy contract(s).

10 Follow up of the Evaluation

a) Assessment of the reports: The endline assessment / impact evaluation report will be assessed by the MEL Officer (HQ) against Swiss Church Aid’s Quality of Evidence checklist.

b) Management response: The Country Director of the Israel / Palestine Country Programme will write a management response, providing the Country Team’s perspective on the results and recommendations. The Country Director will also develop an Action Plan to ensure that findings and actionable recommendations are disseminated, and appropriate action is taken.

c) Swiss Church Aid will publish a summary of the endline assessment / impact evaluation report on its website. Further external dissemination will be discussed by the Steering Committee and other relevant stakeholders, as applicable.

11 List of Documents

Documents for the desk review will include:
– Baseline assessment report
– Project proposals
– Mid-term review / action plan
– End of phase project reports 2019
– End of phase project evaluations 2019
– Annual programme reports 2016-2018

12 Evaluation Team / Qualifications

The evaluation team will be made up of one lead researcher and up to two researchers who were part of the team conducting the baseline assessment. Enumerators may be hired, if necessary.

The researcher is expected to meet the following qualifications:

– Master’s degree in social sciences (e.g. sociology, anthropology, development studies)
– At least 5 years of research and other relevant professional experience, including experience in complex contexts
– Sound understanding of various approaches to assess impact
– Sound expertise in qualitative data collection and analysis; expertise in quantitative data collection and analysis is considered an asset
– Strong track record of using contribution analysis with outcome harvesting and/or QuIP
– Experience with network analysis will be considered an asset
– Experience with software to collect micro-narratives (e.g. Spryng, SenseMaker) will be considered an asset
– Strong analytical skills and proficiency in writing in English
– Ability to deliver quality reports/analysis and results in line with established deadlines
– In-depth knowledge of the situation in Israel and Palestine, in particular with regards to the discourse regarding the right of return
– Knowledge and demonstrated experience with a human rights-based approach to programming
– Excellent facilitation and coordination skills
– Arabic will be considered an asset
– Access throughout Israel and the West Bank

Interested and eligible candidates should submit the following:

– A cover letter, indicating how the candidate meets the required qualifications (maximum 2 pages)
– A CV (maximum 3 pages)
– Comments on the proposed design, methodology, and sampling (maximum 1 page)
– Two references

If selected for an interview, the candidate will be requested to submit one example of previous, similar work.

The following criteria will be used when evaluating the proposals:

– The experience and competence of the researcher in relation to the Terms of Reference;
– The comments of the researcher on the Terms of Reference;
– The researcher’s ability to perform the assignment in the appropriate time; and
– The budget for the assignment.

Submit completed applications (preferably in one file) with the e-mail title “Application Impact Assessment Israel / Palestine” to Annika.Klotz@heks.ch by January 15th, 2020. Please indicate in your application on which website or through which mailing list you came across the call for applications.

For questions about your application, please contact Ms. Annika Klotz, MEL Officer at Swiss Church Aid in Zurich (Annika.Klotz@heks.ch).
## ANNEX 1 – LogFrame of the Open Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project theory of change / intervention logic</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators (incl. HEKS Key Indicators)</th>
<th>Sources / means of verification</th>
<th>Key Risks (contextual, programmatic, institutional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expected impact:** Disenfranchised and/or dispossessed communities enjoy their rights and can maintain or improve their access to land, housing and public space | • HKI: observed changes in the adaptive capacity of rural communities  
• Progress marker about integration, leadership and organizational capacities of disenfranchised communities to be elaborated together with partner organisations  
• # of protection strategies elaborated, quality and effectiveness of protection strategies  
• HKI: # of activities striving for equality and non-violence taken up by participants of HEKS/EPER’s rights and CT education/CB based on their own initiatives  
• HKI: % of women that report effective participation in decision-making bodies at community level | | • Increase of power struggles and conflicts on community level  
• Increase of open civilian violence and state violence  
• Increase of extremist ideologies (nationalism, fundamentalism, fascism)  
• Shift from two state paradigm to a one state (by facts on the ground created by Israel, by change of the role of the PA) – accompanied by mass annexation of lands by Israel and fundamental change of the role of PA  
• Inability to operate in present working areas because of shrinking space |

**Key Sought Change 1:** Disenfranchised communities are resilient to resist violations of human rights and effectively keep claiming rights through nonviolent means.  
• Intermediary outcome 1.1: Disenfranchised communities, men and women, are more aware about their rights and about root causes of conflict  
• Intermediary outcome 1.2: Disenfranchised communities have motivation, leadership, women participation and organizational capacities to claim rights and to adapt their methods to the fast changing conflictive context.  
• Intermediary outcome 1.3: Disenfranchised communities have better protection strategies which include specific needs of men and women  
• Intermediary outcome 1.4: Disenfranchised communities are able to maintain livelihoods  
• Intermediary outcome 1.5: Different disenfranchised groups have overcome fragmentation and have more unified claims  

• # of models/concepts for human rights based alternatives elaborated and advocated for by PO | • Reports of bilateral projects and JA, evaluation meetings  
• To be defined  
• Protection strategies, assessment by community  
• According to guidelines for HKI  
• According to guidelines for HKI | |  

**Key Sought Change 2:** Palestinian and Israeli civil society organizations have jointly developed and are advocating for gender-sensitive human rights based alternatives & strategies for access to land, housing and public space  

• # of models/concepts for human rights based alternatives elaborated and advocated for by PO | • Reports of bilateral projects and JA | |  

Reports of bilateral projects and JA, evaluation meetings  
• To be defined  
• Protection strategies, assessment by community  
• According to guidelines for HKI  
• According to guidelines for HKI |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Sought Change 3: Claims and human rights based alternatives are more present in public discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Intermediary outcome 3.1: Human Rights Based alternatives and claims are taken up by more civil society actors (pal./isr./intl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intermediary outcome 3.2: HRB alternatives and claims are taken up by media (pal./isr./intl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intermediary outcome 3.3: Resistant or indifferent persons and groups are more favourable to equal rights and Human Rights based alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intermediary outcome 3.4: Partner Organisations and Right Holders actively claim protection of space for civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of Civil Society Actors other than HEKS PO who have taken up human rights based alternatives proposed by POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HKI: Quality of representation of discrimination of minorities in public discourse and the media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reports of bilateral projects and JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To be developed, according to to guidelines for HKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Sought Change 4: Israeli, Palestinian and international Duty bearers take responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intermediary outcome 4.1: Claims are addressed to duty bearers (pal./isr./intl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Duty bearers respect and protect the space for civil society social and political action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HKI: # of official claims reflecting the interests of PooC made/accepted with the contribution of HEKS/EPER or POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HKI: HEKS/EPER activities have made progress towards the creation or reform of institutions and policies which handle grievances and the enactment of equal rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To be developed, according to to guidelines for HKI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Activities 2016</th>
<th>Indicators on output level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Contributing to key sought change 1:
- Capacity Building for communities in HRBA, alternative planning, advocacy or monitoring of public policies (according to needs) (Adrid, HRA, ACAP, Badil, Emek Shaveh...)
- Communities in Gush Ezion Region start to work together, create a representative structure and start developing joint strategies for maintaining access to land in area C (Badil)
- Promoting exchange of experience between organizations and communities, with special emphasis of linking initiatives in Gaza to the Open Forum (Open Forum in general)
- Development of protection strategies
- Raising awareness on cultural and land rights of communities affected by limited access to land because of archaeological projects (Emek Shaveh, Yesh Din, PalVision)
- Counselling to IDPs in Israel and planners about the consequences of a new law affecting "absentee property" (ACAP, Adrid)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 100 persons from minorities and marginalized communities have improved skills which help them to claim their rights</td>
<td>At least 2 protection strategies developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointly developed strategy by communities</td>
<td>At least 6 communities involved in actions about archaeological projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed cases of new or improved cooperation</td>
<td>Number of IDPs and planners who have contacted the helpdesk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reports, participant's evaluation of CB events</td>
<td>Project reports, outcome of reflection meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reports, outcome of reflection meetings</td>
<td>Project reports, outcome of reflection meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reports, attendance lists</td>
<td>Project report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contributing to key sought change 2:
- Submit an alternative planning in a case of Palestinian village inside Israel (ACAP)
- Participants of the Oudna project engage with their communities to further develop visions for return to their villages (Adrid, Baladna, HRA, Zochrot)
- Publications, public discussions and conferences practicalities of return are presented and discussed (Zochrot, Badil)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case submitted</td>
<td>At least 6 villages have further developed visions of return with participation of others than youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 600 persons reached by information and debates about practicalities of return</td>
<td>At least 1000 persons (including 10 previously identified key persons) reached by information and debates about practicalities of return</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td>Project reports, evaluation meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reports, evaluation meetings</td>
<td>Project reports, attendance lists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Contributing to key sought change 3:
- Media campaigns on issues of equal rights (Israel Social TV, HRA, Baladna, Adrid, ...)
- Build up additional partnership that reaches out to wider Israeli society
- Develop strategy for Advocacy Work on report by Kerem Navot about state land declaration policy in the WB
- POs actively participate in public campaigns and coalitions against new law proposals in Israel (Adrid, HRA, New Profile, Zochrot)
- Establish advocacy subforum, manage information flow between POs and HEKS/EPER
- At least 20 articles or TV/Radio emissions on issues of access to land, housing and public space published through initiatives of POs
- Partnership successfully built up
- Advocacy strategy elaborated and being implemented
- At least 4 POs of the OF are involved
- Advocacy subforum is functioning
- Project reports, tracking of media work
- Program portfolio
- Project reports, outcome of workshop
- Project reports and outcome of reflection meetings
- Annual Program report
- Number and outcome of meetings with authorities
- Plan has been received by planning committee
- Documentation of meetings, project report
- Project report

### Contributing to key sought change 4:
- Interventions with Israeli authorities on access of Palestinian communities to archeological sites (Emek Shaveh, Yesh Din)
- Proposition of alternative plan to planning committee in the case of one Palestinian village inside Israel (ACAP)
- Number and outcome of meetings with authorities
- Plan has been received by planning committee
- Documentation of meetings, project report
- Project report
ANNEX 2 – Theory of Change

VISION

- Disenfranchised and/or dispossessed communities enjoy their rights and can maintain or improve their access to land, housing and public space
- Rights of all are implemented (protected, respected, and fulfilled)

DUTY BEARERS

- Policies are changed
- Duty Bearers take responsibility

Duty bearers refrain from limiting space for civil society

WIDER CIVIL SOCIETY

- Claims and human rights based alternatives more present in public discourse
- Resistant or indifferent persons and groups are more favorable to equal rights and Human Rights Based alternatives
- Claims are addressed to Duty Bearers

Partner Organization and Right Holders actively claim protection of space for civil society

HRB alternatives and claims taken up by media

Human Rights Based alternatives and claims taken up by more civil society actors

Human Rights Based alternatives are developed addressing taboos and factors that prevent respect of rights

DISENFRANCHISED COMMUNITIES

- Disenfranchised communities are resilient to resist violations of human rights and effectively keep claiming rights through nonviolent means
- Communities / deprived groups have awareness about rights, Leadership capacities and motivation to claim rights
- More unity, less fragmentation, connection of claims

RIGHT HOLDERS + PARTNER ORGANIZATION

- Partner Organization and deprived groups have better protection strategies
- Communities are able to maintain livelihoods

Media

More unity, less fragmentation, connection of claims
The OF will continue to focus on access to land, housing and public space, because – as shown in the context analysis - this is a key area where rights of people of concern are violated in a systematic way and because this is an important basis for any sustainable development of livelihoods in the longer term.

The overall objective of the OF thus can be formulated as follows:

Disenfranchised and/or dispossessed communities enjoy their rights and can maintain or improve their access to land, housing and public space.

As described in the context analysis, access to land, housing and public spaces has been further deteriorating in the past years, resulting in a situation where the program will need to focus on maintaining current access and slowing down dispossession and displacement, while improvements might be out of reach for some communities in the current political situation.

In order to make progress towards this long term objective, the program will focus on three levels of intervention: 1. disenfranchised communities of right holders themselves and civil society organizations which represent them and work with them, 2. Increase public involvement of wider Israeli, Palestinian and International civil society for the respect of rights 3. Addressing Israeli, Palestinian and International duty bearers.

1. On the level of disenfranchised communities of right holders

As described in the context analysis, systematic violations of rights deeply affect daily lives of many Palestinian communities and severely obstruct their economic development. Increasing the resilience of disenfranchised communities thus is key for them to continue living in their places and for their abilities to claim their rights, as is stated in the following key sought change:

Expected Outcome / Key sought change 1

Disenfranchised communities are resilient to resist violations of human rights and effectively keep claiming rights through nonviolent means.

Increasing their resilience in a comprehensive way starts with an increasing awareness about their rights and about root causes of conflict. Experience of the last program phase also showed that it is crucial to address both men and women in efforts to facilitate a common understanding of the rights the community would be entitled to and the root causes for the denial of these rights.

Often, disenfranchised communities are paralyzed and show signs of disintegration. In a situation of long-standing conflict, maintaining motivation despite external pressure and backlashes is a challenge. As a result, HEKS/EPER and PO will support communities in building their organizational and leadership capacities, in addressing disintegrative tendencies and in finding ways to keep up motivation of their members. A further step consists in enlarging the support basis within the community, bring local key persons and opinion leaders on board.

During the past years, pressure on communities claiming rights and on individual human rights defenders have increased. It is therefore crucial that communities, POs and HEKS jointly reflect on protection strategies and elaborate concrete protection plans for different scenarios. These can include measures such as local or international protective presence, targeted advocacy work to increase protection or legal assistance.

Especially in rural areas in the West Bank (and possibly also Gaza), people of concern increasingly pointed to the importance of access to markets as a way to maintain a livelihood and to stay in their town or villages despite difficult conditions and discriminatory regulations. While HEKS/EPER decided
not to build up a fully developed additional focus of its program at the time being, it will include this aspect of maintaining resilience in its projects by fostering cooperation with specialist organizations and by possibly supporting pilot activities in this field.

Interventions on this level will target mainly Palestinian communities in all geographical areas of the program, as they are the ones who are mostly deprived of their access to land, housing and public space. In some cases inside Israel, however (e.g. in mixed cities), other groups of Israeli society might suffer from the same issues and are deprived of rights as well. HEKS/EPER will foster approaches which try to connect different deprived groups with each other and provide space for finding common denominators where possible.

**Key strategies of intervention on the levels of communities of right holders:**

- Capacity building and awareness raising about rights in disenfranchised communities
- Support of strategic processes and organizational development of CBOs with representative role
- Legal assistance
- Protective presence and protective advocacy
- Capacity building and empowerment to ensure women participation on all levels
- Linking communities up with existing projects to increase livelihoods and access to markets
- Pilot projects of production and marketing initiatives

**2. Level of wider Israeli, Palestinian and international civil society and media**

One of the main obstacles that needs to be overcome in order to make equal rights more accepted, are powerful discourses which claim that there are no alternatives to discrimination and use of force towards Palestinians, because otherwise the rights of Israelis would be in danger (“us or them logic”), or simply that rights based solutions are impossible. Especially for the broader Israeli public, the idea of respecting the rights of all is also connected to fears and taboos. Human Rights Based Alternatives can play an important role in showing that it is possible to find solutions which protect both the rights of Palestinians and Israelis and thus also addressing some of the fears and taboos. By cooperating and working jointly, partner organizations are able to develop rights based alternatives for access to land, housing and public space, which can be advocated for among Israeli, Palestinians and international publics. In the previous program phases this has been done for the issues of return of refugees and IDPs and by using alternative planning as a method to present alternatives to discriminatory planning. Alternative strategies are also needed as means of non-violent resistance to Human Rights violations such as forced displacement and dispossession. Especially in cases where there are little possibilities to reach an improvement of the situation through the legal system. In the last program phase, such strategies have been developed for example in the Gush Ezion area in the West Bank and in the Negev/Naqab.

Both aspects are reflected in the second key sought change of the theory of change:

**Expected Outcome / key sought change 2**

Palestinian and Israeli civil society organizations have jointly developed and are advocating for gender-sensitive human rights based alternatives & strategies for access to land, housing and public space.

A next step of the theory of change then consists in bringing both the elaborated human rights based alternatives together with the claims of disenfranchised groups into wider society and public discourse:

**Expected outcome / key sought change 3**

Claims and human rights based alternatives are more present in public discourse
This can be done through a variety of ways, depending on the issue, the target groups to be addressed and the state of discussion:

- For many issues, bringing more civil society actors on board is a first step to reach out to wider society. This is done through active networking, study days, tours on the ground, conferences etc.
- Systematic media work, involving traditional and new media, contributes to spreading the ideas to a wider public and putting issues on the agenda. Media also play an important role in increasing public awareness about root causes of conflict.
- As mentioned above, dealing with resistance, fears and indifference towards violations of rights of Palestinians of wide sectors of Israeli society is a challenge for the program. In the past, partners of the Open Forum have for example organized tours to expose Israeli groups to issues of access to land in area C of the West Bank or to visit destroyed Palestinian villages inside Israel in order to inform Israeli groups about the Naqba and to bring up the problems of IDPs in Israel. While evaluations have shown that these definitely had some effects on the - and sometimes beyond - the participating groups, creativity will be needed to develop additional means to find “cracks” in indifference and reduce resistance. This can also involve engaging people in / providing space for deep processes where preconceived opinions are reflected upon and trustful visions can be built up.
- In Palestinian society, the issues at stake are creating a broader basis for human rights based approaches and alternatives and overcoming fragmentation – not only geographically, but also for example between refugees and non-refugees, so that more unified visions can emerge.
- International civil society also plays an important role in preparing the ground for human rights based approaches. Its role is to point to complicity of their own countries with HR violations in Palestine/Israel and to advocate their countries to fulfill their obligations as third states to the conflict in view of systematic violations of international law. HEKS/EPER’s partner organizations agree that there won’t be any fundamental change to the present situation without international pressure. In addition, international civil society can also give human rights based alternatives and models a platform which then can create resonance back in Israel and occupied Palestine (e.g. by media attendance, …).

As detailed in the context analysis, space for civil society becomes more and more limited in both Israel and occupied Palestine. Advocating actively for an enabling environment will thus be a very important transversal issue for the next program phase. The assessment that is currently done by ACT partners will provide the background for developing strategic interventions by Israeli, Palestinian and international organizations.

**Key Strategies of intervention on the level of wider civil society:**

- Active networking with wider civil society (local/international), using present and new networks
- Media work
- Public campaigns, conferences, study days, tours and delegations
- Documentation/Publication of HR violations and possible solutions / human rights based alternatives
- Sensitize indifferent or resistant groups about HR violations and for possible solutions, provide space for addressing fears and resistance
- Advocacy for protection of space for civil society

**3. Level of Israeli, Palestinian and international duty bearers**
HEKS/EPER’s theory of change assumes that there are two main ways of engaging duty bearers. In some cases, it will be possible to address duty bearers directly, e.g. by sensitizing a specific Palestinian or Israeli ministry for the needs of disenfranchised communities, or by addressing the EU or Switzerland on the basis of their 3rd states responsibilities. In other cases, public awareness and in some cases also pressure first needs to built up, as described under 2. The desired long term outcome of both strategies is the following:

**Expected outcome / key sought change 4**

**Israeli, Palestinian and international Duty bearers take responsibility**

This involves both the responsibilities of Israeli, Palestinian and International duty bearers towards the rights of disenfranchised groups and communities and their responsibility for the protection of an enabling environment and space for civil society.

**Key Strategies of intervention:**
- Lobbying Palestinian, Israeli and international duty bearers
- UN advocacy
- Advocacy towards EU and Switzerland on the basis of 3rd states responsibilities
- Inform, raise awareness and maintain contacts to duty bearers where possible
- Delegations, field visits
ANNEX 3 – Causal approaches and impact evaluation designs

CAUSAL APPROACHES AND IMPACT EVALUATION DESIGN

SYSTEMS APPROACHES

CAUSATIONIST
- Counterfactual
- Regularity
- Experimental
- RCT
- Quasi-experimental
- Natural experiments

CONFIGURATIONAL
- Case-based
- Qualitative Comparative Analysis
- Network Analysis

GENERATIVE
- Theory-based
- Process Tracing
- Realist
- Contribution analysis

PARTICIPATORY
- Actor Agency
- Participatory Evaluation
- Action Research
- Democratic Evaluation

Methods
- Household survey
- Structured observation
- Semi-structured interviews
- Focus group discussions

Adapted from Stern et al (2012)
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### ANNEX 4 – Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC</th>
<th>Evaluations questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Source / Sampling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1- Effectiveness | To what extent were the objectives of the Open Forum achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement (or non-achievement) of objectives? | # and types of changes in the targeted communities/groups under each domain of change evaluated (i.e., livelihoods, community empowerment, social cohesion, knowledge / capacities, rights-claiming, rights secured, HRB-alternatives, access to land) | QuIP                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | • Projects and program documents and evaluations  
• Direct beneficiaries  
• Members of the broader targeted communities (e.g. village members)  
• Key informants in targeted communities (e.g. members of the village council; members of the village committee in Gush Etzion projects)                                                                 |
| ToC1 | 1.1 To what extent did the program succeed in increasing the beneficiaries and their communities’ absorptive, adaptative, and transformative capacities in the face of identified shocks and stresses? | # and types of drivers for observed change and evidence of OF’s contribution (project, program level)  
# and types of barriers to expected outcomes |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|       | 1.2 To what extent have the beneficiaries and their communities claim their rights, taken transformative initiatives / HRB-alternatives, exercised their rights? | | Outcome harvesting                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | • Projects and program documents and evaluations  
• Direct beneficiaries  
• Members of the broader targeted communities (e.g. village members)  
• Key informants in targeted communities (e.g. members of the village council; members of the village committee in Gush Etzion projects)                                                                 |
|       | 1.3 To what extent has the program been successful in overcoming barriers to rights claiming that had been identified at baseline (e.g. motivation, fear, apathy, interest, social pressure, etc.)? | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| ToC2 | 1.4 Have transformative initiatives, HRB-alternatives, actions to claim rights and the mobilized rights holders behind them, Type and degree of change in the level of focus/interest of media, CSOs, for the | | Outcome harvesting                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | • Projects and program documents and evaluations  
• Direct beneficiaries  
• Members of the broader targeted communities (e.g. village members)  
• Key informants in targeted communities (e.g. members of the village council; members of the village committee in Gush Etzion projects)                                                                 |
<p>|       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | | • Step 1: review of project documents, media review,                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ToC3</th>
<th>1.5 Have duty-bearers been influenced (e.g. to change their rhetoric, behaviour or policies) through actions taken by target RH / communities, or by any progress or initiatives driven by the Open Forum?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type and level of change in terms of rhetoric, policies, behaviors of duty-bearers regarding key elements of the ToC (access to land, RoR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># and types of drivers for observed changes and evidence contribution to observed changes in rhetoric, policies, behaviors of duty-bearers regarding key elements of the ToC (access to land, RoR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome harvesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Step 1: review of project documents, media review, inputs gathered with the QuIP exercise; media review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Step 3: interviews with key informants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2- Impact</th>
<th>What has happened as a result of the Open Forum? - What real difference have the projects of the Open Forum made for the target groups?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This means, looking at positive and negative, intended and unintended impact, direct and indirect changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.1 What is the effect of the OF on the interrelations between partner organizations? Between (Palestinian, Israeli) organizations involved in human rights in Israel and Palestine? Has the Open Forum succeeded in creating a collaboration and discussion space for civil society organizations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC1</td>
<td>2.2 What is the program impact on access to land and resources of target RH / communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC2</td>
<td>2.3 What has change and in what way in terms of CSOs behavior and initiatives, on the effect of the OF – and/or despite the OF’s efforts and goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC3</td>
<td>2.4 What has changed and in what way, in terms of media behavior and initiatives, on the effect of the OF – and/or despite the OF’s efforts and goals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>