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## Evaluation background

### Background on the Programme:

Sawasya II: Promoting the Rule of Law in Palestine is a joint “One-UN” programme comprised of UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF. The government signatories to the programme document are the Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), the High Judicial Council (HJC), the Attorney General’s Office (AGO), and the Supreme Judge Department (SJD). Non-signatory partners include, inter alia the Palestinian Civil Police (PCP), the Palestinian Bar Association (PBA), and the Palestinian Judicial Institute (PJI). The programme is supported by the Netherlands, the Swedish International Development Agency and the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation.

The programme is designed as a “3+2” in which the first three years of the programme are guaranteed by the development partners with the possibility of a two-year extension. The programme is budgeted at $10 million per year and has currently received funds and commitments of around $17 million.

Strategically, Sawasya II serves the primary vehicle of the United Nations for advancing the rule of law, integrity, gender justice and human rights in Palestine for the period 2018-2023. Bringing together the main UN entities mandated and invested in these areas in an integrated programme framework (three years, with provision for a further two optional years), Sawasya II seeks to elevate the statebuilding enterprise for a progressively functioning and increasingly inclusive rule of law system that respects, protects and fulfils human rights and gender equality and promote peace and security.

Sawasya II is adopting a holistic gender mainstreaming approach and developed a gender strategy which sets out tools, methods and approaches to ensure that women’s rights, needs and interests are adequately taken care of in the programme’s policy, programming frameworks and directions. The programme is reaching between 30,000-40,000 beneficiaries through legal education, awareness, consultation/ advice, legal representation, and psycho-social support per year.

Acknowledging that the ability to access to justice is a human right itself and is key to the realization to all other human rights, Sawasya II is set out to address gender justice gaps and discrimination against women which are deeply entrenched in the justice and security systems in Palestine. In doing so, Sawasya II has conducted a gender analysis for the underlying causes of gender inequality and discrimination against women as well as the the adverse impact of the identified underlying causes on women’s access to justice and their realization to human rights.

As concerns children, the legal framework on advancing their access to justice is in place with the amendment of the Palestinian Child law in 2014 and the endorsement of the juvenile protection law by a presidential decree in 2016. The child justice and protection institutions made efforts to implement these laws but an assessment of children’s access to justice conducted by UNICEF highlighted existing gaps and challenges. Sawasya II is informed by the recommendations made in the assessment and addresses a number of them. The interventions are focused on strengthening the capacity of specialised child justice professionals and establishing a referral, diversion and alternatives to detention systems.

The overarching objective of Sawasya II has UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 16 and 5 at its core: focussed on the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provision of access to justice for all, and the realisation of effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (SDG 16), and on achieving gender equality and empowerment for women and girls (SDG 5). Sawasya II is fully aligned with the National Policy Agenda (2017-2022) and relevant sector and cross-sector strategies of the Palestinian Government, including the Justice Sector Strategy 2017-2022, Security Sector Strategy 2017-2022, National Strategy to Combat Violence Against Women (2011-2019), the National Cross-Sectoral Strategy to Promote Gender Equality, Equity and Women’s Empowerment (2017-2022), Juvenile Protection National Strategic Plan and implementation Framework (2016-2019) and the Child Protection Action Plan (2018-2022).

Sawasya II is designed to contribute to key priorities in the five-year United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Palestine, which was launched in 2018. Sawasya II secured commitment from the Palestinian government at the highest level and aims to reinforce broader national and international political and technical efforts aimed at supporting the realisation of a well-functioning Palestinian State, based on principles of good governance and the rule of law in accordance with gender equality and social inclusion.

Sawasya II builds on the considerable accumulated experience and expertise of the involved UN entities, at both global and local levels, including that of the Sawasya I joint programme of UNDP and UN Women, as well as the experience of UNICEF, and aims to leverage partnerships with other key bilateral and multilateral development partners, including the Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, the Office of the Middle East Quartet, the European Union (via both the Office of the EU Representative and the EUPOL COPPS), and lead bilateral donors in the justice and security sectors.

Sawasya II builds on established partnerships with government and civil society at all levels and capitalises on the extensive reach of the involved UN entities across the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip.

### Context

Efforts to advance the rule of law in Palestine continue to contend with three essential problems: the democratic deficit that profoundly affects the capacity, accountability and perceived legitimacy of the state’s justice and security apparatus; the obstacles to full realisation by the Palestinian people of their basic human rights and fundamental freedoms; and gender inequality and stereotypes that are deeply entrenched in legal, social and political norms. Stagnation of the peace process, the statebuilding process, and national reconciliation efforts have all hindered recent efforts to strengthen the rule of law, and while technocratic solutions have made positive inroads towards improving institutional capacities, strengthening services and advancing access to justice and security, many of the fundamental preconditions for sustainable rule of law development have yet to be realised.

There are key external and internal factors that affect sustainable development in the rule of law and the realisation of human rights in Palestine the key external factor is the ongoing occupation by Israel. While the key internal factors are the deep national division since 2006, a dysfunctional legislative environment, fractured legal jurisdictions, weak institutional capacities, corruption, discriminatory social norms, and a lack of clarity around institutional roles and mandates. Although there was a temporary breakthrough in the reconciliation process in 2018, it unfortunately did not result in any permanent gains. If the reconciliation process gains traction, there are numerous potential scenarios which will have a significant impact on the work in and of the justice sector. A flexible approach will be required in order to respond to the changing context to consolidate and capitalise on positive developments.

As a conflict-affected population, women and girls experience multi- layers of insecurity and discrimination due to the ongoing Israeli Occupation and the entrenched patriarchal norms and practices within the Palestinian society. Women and girls are disproportionately impacted by the discriminatory practices of the occupation, such as houses demolitions, prevention of family unification, freedom of movement and others, which put them at higher risks of violence in the public and private spheres. Gender myths and stereotypes on the other hand, have structurally influenced women’s access to rights, power, resources and knowledge, and resulted in the development of discriminatory legislations, policies and practices, that undermine women’s experience, voices and rights, and reinforce males’ domination and supremacy over women. This is reflected in lenient legal provisions, which are inherited from various years such as the 1960 Jordanian Penal Code, still applicable in the WB, with lenient legal provisions regard family violence. In addition to the shortcomings in the Family Status Law, which is not in harmony with international conventions regarding early marriage, women right to child custody and others.

With this in mind, and due to the predominant cultural norms, women are often stigmatized when reporting GBV to the authorities particularly sexual assault crimes. In addition to the lack of proper specialized services for these cases in the justice system, which discourage them to pursue justice, and result in low number of prosecutions and convictions of VAW cases. Likewise, lack of serious official data regarding crimes against women and girls is another aspect that is seriously affecting the realization of rights.

Notwithstanding the challenges noted above, important progress has also been made. On the legislative front, Sawasya I played a pivotal role in drafting and promoting a Family Protection Bill aligned with international human rights standards. With regard to justice for children, the Juvenile Protection Law (by decree), passed into law in March 2016, has been widely welcomed as providing greater protection for children in contact with the law. It has galvanized justice sector actors to ensure child-friendly procedures and modalities are in place to implement the law. The law unifies domestic and international law, and updates the Palestinian juvenile justice system. It recognises minors – those under the age of 18 – as victims in need of protection, rehabilitation, and reintegration into society, rather than as criminals deserving punishment.

In addition, the provision of specialised services by law enforcement and prosecution has afforded greater state protection for victims of gender-based violence, the Palestinian Bar Association has initiated an office for pro bono legal assistance, and systems improvements have enhanced the case disposal rates in the courts. Recently, the National Policy Agenda (2017-2022) has also incorporated a strong justice and rule of law agenda for the coming six years, with specific plans to promote the rights of, and access to justice for, women and children.

Rule of law remains a cornerstone of statebuilding in Palestine and continues to be an important focus for international assistance. The international community has long recognised that developing functioning and successful public institutions is a long-term challenge for governments, particularly in fragile settings, but also that both short-term and long-term results can be achieved through well-designed and committed development assistance programming. Within the United Nations system, there is a general consensus that in the post-2015 agenda, gender equality and the empowerment of women are pivotal as intrinsic human rights principles, and as catalysts for achieving all human development goals and good governance. Realizing women’s human rights implies recognizing and addressing the underlying foundations of gender-based inequality, and the root causes of women’s human rights violations; challenging structural constraints to equal rights and putting in place appropriate policy and programmatic responses in line with human rights principles enshrined in the major UN Conventions.

Investments made by donors and the UN, including through the first Sawasya programme, have achieved progressively significant results in Palestine. However, impediments to achieving sustainable improvements on rule of law, integrity, gender justice and human rights remain.

At the level of institutional regulatory and policy frameworks, rule of law, integrity, human rights and gender justice in Palestine are all seriously affected by the democratic deficit, including the lack of regular elections and a functioning legislature, the bifurcated and fragmented legal and policy settings and weak enforcement of laws. Laws promulgated after 2007 are subject to questions of legality and legitimacy and although Palestine ratified the core set of international human rights treaties in 2014, they have yet to be published in the official gazette and formally incorporated into law, policy and practice in a systematic way. Budget allocations are not yet fully aligned to the national and sector priorities, and the availability of data and statistics is insufficient to form a sufficient evidence base for law, policy and service provision.

At the level of effective, accountable and inclusive service provision, the influence of personal relationships over institutional frameworks and formal processes prevails. Corruption, whether actual or perceived, erodes public confidence in the public administration. The lack of monitoring and oversight of the public service, the inward focus of the public service, and the lack of a stable and professional public service culture all impede an outward facing, service delivery-focussed state apparatus. Transparency and accountability mechanisms are also limited, both in the public sector and in non-government service providers who fill the gaps in service provision in Palestine where service delivery by the State is weak, limited, or unavailable. The efficiency of the justice chain in Palestine has been significantly improved by the UNDP-supported MIZAN2 case management system, but the referral links between the justice chain and related service providers (police, health, housing, education, social services) remain weak.

Finally, access to justice, security and protection remains impeded by resource constraints (for example in the provision of legal aid and specialised services for vulnerable groups) and centralisation of services. Information about services is limited and poorly coordinated, meaning people are often unaware of services or where and how to locate them. At the societal and normative level, access to justice, in particular for women, is often impeded by discriminatory social norms that do not recognise gender-based violence as a crime; that do not recognise women’s human rights claims; and promote harmful practices and behaviours in communities and families. Moreover, social norms of preserving family honour translate into the resolution of violations by informal actors, often not in the best interests of women or children. Access to justice for children is largely user-unfriendly, and traumatising for children as victims as well as offenders. Long delays in judicial proceedings, poor investigative techniques with specialist and non-specialist police and social services, almost non-existent diversion and mediation services, as well as limited alternatives to detention, and limited rehabilitation and reintegration support services result in families and communities reliant on unregulated informal justice actors. Working with informal justice actors to ensure the rights and best interests of children is critical.

## Description of the program/ object of the evaluation

Sawasya II represents the primary programmatic vehicle of the United Nations for advancing the rule of law, integrity, gender justice and human rights in Palestine for the period 2018-2023. By harnessing the full capacities of those entities of the UN system in Palestine actively engaged in promoting the rule of law, integrity, gender justice and human rights, Sawasya II represents the most definitive package of development assistance in these areas to the Palestinian government and the Palestinian people, maximising the networks and developmental rule of law and human rights expertise of UNDP, the critical gender justice, mainstreaming and empowerment mandate of UN Women,7 and the protection agenda of UNICEF.8 In addition, as a UN family programme, it will draw on the human rights and political mandates of OHCHR and UNSCO to maximize impact. The logic for such an arrangement rests both on an identified added value in the Palestinian context and its consistency with emerging global best practices in the area of rule of law development assistance, while the scale of the programme rests both on the magnitude of the demand, and on the proven track record of the capacity of the participating UN organisations to deliver financially and substantively against agreed outputs.

In light of the challenges facing rule of law development in Palestine, recognition of the causes underpinning these challenges, and reflection on lessons learned from previous programming, Sawasya II is structured around four mutually reinforcing ‘outcomes’, designed to address the key problems and bottlenecks identified in the situation analysis. These four outcomes, detailed in the results framework and reflected on the cover page of this programme document, are underpinned by a coherent theory of change (see below), and rely on specific programme implementation strategies, which are elaborated in this programme document (including its Annexes). These strategies include: shoring-up national investment and alignment with national policy priorities; linking statebuilding and the social contract; integrating human rights, protection and development approaches; applying gender transformational approaches and gender analysis to root causes of gender inequalities in order to promote gender justice, women’s human rights claims and substantive gender equality; enhancing approaches to child protection and justice for children; strengthening applied political-economy analysis in programme implementation; refining capacity-building approaches; tailoring approaches in East Jerusalem, ‘Area C’, and Hebron 2; strengthening engagement in Gaza; adjusting engagement with civil society, and; institutionalising approaches to legal aid. Human rights and gender justice are both major central and cross-cutting themes of Sawasya II.

By engaging the full spectrum of official State rule of law-related institutions in Palestine, as well as civil society and grass roots actors, Sawasya II enhances its ability to employ a system-wide approach in addressing the identified problems and their causes, bringing together the supply and demand sides of the rule of law equation to ensure that statebuilding and institutional development are focused on improving services to the public, particularly to vulnerable groups such as women and children who face multiple forms of discrimination and violence, thereby reinforcing the social contract and the respect of the human rights as foundations of the state.

The international community has long recognised that developing functioning and successful public institutions and putting in place the conditions for sustainable rule of law development are long- term processes, particularly in fragile settings.9 The specific circumstances and unpredictability of the Palestinian context render this arguably even more so the case than in many other fragile settings. It has also reached a general consensus that in the post – 2015 agenda, gender equality and the empowerment of women are pivotal as intrinsic human rights principles, and as catalysts for achieving all human development goals and good governance.

Accordingly, Sawasya II envisages a five-year implementation period (three years, with a further two years based on a mid-term review of implementation and results). This timeframe necessitates both careful sequencing of interventions, as well as a greater degree of flexibility, which has been built into the programme’s strategy, its governance and management structures, and instruments.

Sawasya II is conceived under a Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), with responsibility for implementation and delivery resting primarily with the involved UN entities. Nevertheless, the absorption and delivery capacities of Sawasya II’s implementing partners are of importance for the success of the programme and the sustainability of its results. On the one hand, Sawasya II has capacity development at its core, vis-à-vis both for state and non-state partners, and is thus well positioned to scale or focus its support according to the capacities and/or capacity gaps of its main partners. On the other hand, safeguards are in place to micro-assess and monitor implementing partners’ capacities, and ensure a Harmonised Approaches to Cash Transfers (HACT) such that the risk of partners being unable to absorb assistance is mitigated to the fullest extent possible.

## Existing knowledge and evidence

The evaluation team has received the following reports:

* Final Evaluation of SAWASYA Programme “Strengthening the Rule of Law: Justice and Security for the Palestinian People”Outline of the Methodology Approach
* Statistical Impact Measurement of Awareness Raising Activities of Rule of Law and Access to Justice in the Occupied Palestinian Territory
* Report On the Effectiveness of the Palestinian Civil Police Disciplinary Accountability and Complaints System
* PBCS Statistical Report
* Final Evaluation Report: “Legal Clinics Inside Law Schools in Palestinian Universities”
* SAWASYA II Promoting the rule of law in Palestine. MPTF Office generic annual programme narrative report reporting period 1 January – 31 December 2018
* SAWASYA II Promoting the rule of law in Palestine. MPTF Office generic annual programme narrative report reporting period 1 January – 31 December 2019
* Strengthening the rule of law in the OPT: Justice and security for the Palestinian people. Final programme narrative report, reporting period 1 May 2014 – 30 June 2018

## Evaluation purpose, objectives and audience

### Purpose of the Evaluation:

The main purpose of this mid-term formative evaluation is to provide evidence and recommendations on the outcomes or results of the Sawasya II programme ”Promoting the Rule of Law in Palestine” on the lives of beneficiaries that can be attributed to UN-interagency interventions. This is also going to inform assessments of the progress achieved by the components of the current programme, determine the need for any continuation of the programme, and provide recommendations to adapt programme activities and approaches to improve outcomes for the remaining period of implementation.

The secondary purpose of the evaluation is to provide the Global Programme with evidence of monitoring good practices at the country level that could inform strategic monitoring guidance for UNDP RoL programmes.

### Specific objectives

1) Assess the relevance of project activities, procedures and structures to the program’s context and overall goal including strategic decision-making and prioritization of limited resources.

2) Assess the efficiency, effectiveness, impact, institutional capacity, sustainability, coherence, coverage, and risk management of the program including the role of the program’s steering committee, UN agencies organizational, financial, administrative and fundraising systems and actions for the implementation of the program.

3) Develop conclusions and suggest actions to inform the programme’s overall learning about what works and what does not so the programme can adjust/improve/refine if needed in the final phase of implementation. This should include not only the results the programme has achieved to date, but to explain the ‘how’ and the ‘why’ – why progress was made, and why not – in order to provide a process focus, rather than only a results focus – and what that learning informs for future programming.

4) Assess different stakeholders’ satisfaction from the program and its interventions.

5) The evaluation will also cover how cross cutting issues such as a human rights-based approach to programming (HRBAP), gender equality and equity has been addressed and make recommendations for increased mainstreaming of these cross-cutting issues as required.

## Scope

The programme is now at the mid-point of its three-year initial implementation phase (2018-2021). Considering the possible option of the additional two years of the programme, the partners felt that this was an opportune moment to conduct a mid-term formative evaluation with a view to taking stock of the programme, understanding what was working, and what was not, and examining the possibilities for moving forward. With this in mind, the collective partners involved with the Sawasya II programme are commissioning a mid-term evaluation to examine the programmatic design, management structure, lessons learned, achievements, and possible areas of programmatic adjustment through expansion or reduction, covering the period from June 2018 – December 2019.

Geographically, the evaluation will cover the selected locations in the West Bank and Gaza Strip as agreed under the programme document.

In every stage of the evaluation, criteria will be used (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, coherence, equity and human rights issues). The evaluation will present lessons learned, best practices and recommendations for future protection programming, while also adopting an approach that integrates the aspects of gender, human rights and equity throughout the evaluation and applied across the analysis of the programmes.

The scope of this evaluation will also focus on assessing the project contributions to gender equality and women’s empowerment and providing actionable, evidence-based recommendations and lessons learned to inform the future United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP) in UN agencies work.

The evaluation is going to be conducted between July and September 2020.

## Description of inception phase

 The inception phase involves initial discussions of the scope of the evaluation and agreement on the methodology and timeframes of the approach. During this phase the programme will provide an initial set of key documents to inform the development of the evaluation approach. The details of the evaluation approach will be described in the methodology during this phase, including the key questions to be answered, and drawing from UNDP’s evaluation guidance and the ISSAT approach to evaluations. The evaluation team will also meet (virtually) with key programme staff to discuss and confirm a joint understanding of the evaluation approach and intent. Once agreed with the key programme stakeholders the Inception report (this document) will be produced and the evaluation will commence.

## Evaluation criteria and final evaluation questions

The evaluation will be based on the ISSAT project evaluation methodology and OECD DAC Criteria for evaluations. The overall evaluation will be framed around 6 key criteria which will serve to frame the key questions and organize the data collection: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency, impact. Across these criteria are two cross cutting frames of assessment, the programme’s success in supporting human rights and gender equality. The evaluation will look specifically at the capability of the monitoring system to provide strong evidence to support assessment of all of the above criteria.

The purpose of the evaluation criteria is linked to the purpose of evaluation. Namely, to enable the determination of the merit, worth or significance of the programme. The evaluation should be conducted according to the six Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)- Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, the likely impact and sustainability). Each criterion is a different lens or perspective through which the intervention can be viewed. Together, they provide a more comprehensive picture of the intervention, the process of implementation, and the results.

The criteria play a normative role. Together they describe the desired attributes of interventions: all interventions should be relevant to the context, coherent with other interventions, achieve their objectives, deliver results in an efficient way, and have positive impacts that last. The criteria are used in evaluation to: a) Support accountability, including the provision of information to the public; and b) Support learning, through generating and feeding back findings and lessons.

Suggested evaluation questions are provided below. These guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with the UN evaluation stakeholders.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Sawasya II programme evaluation questions*****Relevance:** * To what extent was the programme in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, and the SDGs?
* To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
* To what extent does the original programme concept and objectives address the justice needs of targeted beneficiaries
* To what extent does the programme contribute to gender justice and equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
* To what extent does the programme contribute to child rights?
* To what extent the programme is flexible, adaptive and context-specific to adjust strategies over time, as circumstances evolve (eg. conflict in Gaza, the Covid-19 pandemic) and the changing external environment?
* To what extent the original programme design addresses not only justice needs but also the contextual constraints, i.e., the different legal systems and jurisdictions?

**Coherence** * To what extent is this intervention coherent with other actors’ intervention in the same context (This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.)
* To what extent is the intervention coherent with national authorities’ priorities?
* To what extent the intervention coherent is with international obligations on fair trial and access to justice?
* To what extent is the intervention coherent with international obligations on gender justice and justice for children?

**Effectiveness*** To what extent did the programme contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF Strategic Plans and national development priorities?
* To what extent are the programme outputs and outcomes on track or achieved?
* In which areas does the programme have the greatest/fewest achievements? Why and what have been the contributing factors? How can the programme build on or expand these achievements or how can they be overcome?
* What have been the key results so far and to what extent those results to date are likely to lead to achievement of the programme’s objectives in the remaining time?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the programme’s objectives?
* Are the programme’s objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its time frame?
* To what extent is the programme management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the programme objectives?
* How effective have the programme partnerships with civil society organizations been in contributing to achieving results in Gaza?

**Efficiency**To what extent:* Has the programme delivered its expected results to date, including in terms of budget allocation and cost-efficiency of activities?
* To what extent has the UN programme’s partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
* Was the intervention implemented in a timely way?
* Was the intervention implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
* Did the targeting of the intervention mean that resources were allocated efficiently?
* To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by the programme ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Impact** * What were the effects of the intervention on recipients’ lives?
* To what extent is the programme on track to support, or likely to support/contribute to capacity change of partners, influence on broader policy/systems and impacts at beneficiary level?
* Did a specific part of the intervention achieve greater impact than another?
* Were there unintended (positive or negative) effects for recipients and non-recipients of assistance?
* What were the gender-specific impacts? Did the intervention influence the gender context?
* What is the contribution of an intervention to long-term intended results?

**Sustainability*** To what extent did the programme intervention implementation arrangements include considerations for sustainability, such as capacity building of national and local government institutions, communities, exit strategies and other partners?
 |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluation cross-cutting questions*****Human rights*** To what extent have poor, physically challenged, women, children and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of the programme in the State of Palestine?
* Have there been any changes in society/with authorities in terms of behaviour/practice?
* To what extent the programme contributed to the protection and promotion of human rights and in the state of Palestine.

**Gender equality*** To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the programme?
* What evidence is there that the programme promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
 |

## Definition of the main terms or concepts

[**Accountability**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Accountability)

An obligation or willingness to accept responsibility or to account for one’s actions according to transparent lines.

[**Access to Justice**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Access-to-Justice)

Access by people to fair, effective and accountable (in)formal justice systems for the protection of rights, control of abuse of power and resolution of conflicts.

[**Evidence**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Evidence)

Evidence is everything that is permitted to be offered in court to prove the truth or falsity of the question(s) at issue. It is either testimonial evidence (a verbatim of orally given testimony by a witness), real evidence (any tangible object or exhibit offered as proof) or demonstrative evidence (chart, drawing, illustration), or a combination Evidence includes the results of a forensic examination.

[**Gender-Based Violence (GBV)**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Gender-Based-Violence-GBV)

Forms of violence which are based on the socially ascribed differences between males and females. GBV is not only violence against women; men and boys can also be victims. The concept also cover violence against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) persons as it is based on perceived nonconformity with gender roles.

[**Vulnerable Groups**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Vulnerable-Groups)

The high probability of exposure to risks and reduced capacity to overcome their negative results. Vulnerability is a result of exposure to risk factors, and of underlying socio-economic processes, which reduce the capacity of populations to cope with risks.

[**Good Governance**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Good-Governance)

A form of governance that is people-centred, equitable, accountable, transparent, engenders participation and consultation in planning and decision-making, is effective and efficient public sector management, and actively seeks and facilitates the involvement of civil society.

[**Gender Mainstreaming**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Gender-Mainstreaming)

The process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, in all areas and at all levels and to make their concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres, so that everyone benefits equally.

[**Gender**](https://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library2/SSR-Glossary/Gender)

The social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women, men, girls and boys.

## Evaluation design and approach

### Participation

A participatory and iterative evaluation approach will be adopted by the evaluation team throughout all phases. A fundamental aspect of such an evaluation focus is the need for the UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF staff to have a strong sense of ownership over the evaluation, including the analysis and recommendations produced in the final report. The evaluation team will work closely with the programme staff and their key stakeholders to focus the evaluation correctly and to ensure that there is full transparency in the data being collected, the programme team has opportunity to provide their views on all key areas explored or covered by the evaluation, and sufficient contingency is built into the methodology to allow the evaluation team, if needed and appropriate, to consider additional issues which the programme team would find useful to their work. As such, the evaluation team will strive to accommodate any specific requests for information or clarification through the final evaluation report or through informal advice as they emerge in the course of the evaluation.

With the need to have impartial and accurate feedback from stakeholders on the programme, all interviews conducted by the evaluation team will not include members of the programme team nor individuals that would otherwise have direct authority over the future of the programme. Furthermore, the final report will not have attribution of statements or specific findings to individuals interviewed during the evaluation to encourage stakeholders to speak freely and openly.

### Evaluation Team

ISSAT will use a three-person team, splitting the required competencies across those three roles. This will combine evaluation and gender expertise with a local partner to provide detailed contextual understanding. The split team construct will provide risk mitigation to potential data collection limitations that may be encountered due to the current pandemic, as explained below.

### Theory of Change

As a central element of the evaluation, the evaluation team will strive to re-construct the explicit or implicit programme theory of change. This is done initially on the basis of the programme design document, and then modified and updated through the evaluation process. This process will serve to show how the evaluation team understands the logic model of the programme and how the evaluation team has understood the actual and planned programme evolution over time.

In its initial form the ToC will be used to test the extent to which the programme has a sound logic model (efficiency & relevance sections) as well as to help define the extent to which there is actual attribution between the emerging or actual outcomes and the activities (effectiveness/impact sections). The evaluation will update the model theory of change during the various phases of the evaluation to reflect what was actually done, and what has been learnt through implementation. The ToC at the end of the evaluation should reflect the knowledge the programme now has of how change could occur in Palestine, and as a result serves as a powerful tool to assess the relative value, coherence, and importance of the range of programme activities being delivered or considered. Individual elements of the theory of change should help to highlight where there is a potential for collaboration/duplication with other development partners (coordination) and to highlight which elements of the programme are emerging that will need to be tested for the extent to which they are durable and sustainable without external support (sustainability section). As a critical step in the evaluation process, the programme team will be asked to comment specifically on the extent to which the theory of change developed by the evaluation team accurately reflects the expected and actual logic model of the programme.

## Evaluation phases

### Desk review (6 days)

* Development of semi-structured interview guide
* Interviews with core UN Programme staff
* Review of programme documents
* Development of initial Programme Theory of Change
* Finalisation of methodology

### Distance Consultations (10 days)

* Interviews with full range of UN staff
* Interviews with Key Donor staff
* Interviews with Palestinian government actors (where possible)
* Possible conduct of online survey (if assessed as suitable for the context)

### Plan A: Evaluation field mission (10 days)

August/September

* In person interviews: UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF staff
* Meetings with key national stakeholders: Relevant Ministry’s, operational organisations of the justice system, meeting with key civil society partners
* Meeting with donor partners
* Visit to implementation sites
	+ Meetings with key beneficiaries (implementing staff and justice system users)
	+ Observation of justice delivery, current state of Justice system elements
* De-brief of preliminary results with UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF and separate de-brief with donors/partners as required

### Plan B: Limited field data collection (15 days)

August/September

* Virtual meetings with key national stakeholders: Relevant Ministry’s, operational organisations of the justice system.
* Interviews with justice system users and justice focused community groups. Focus groups if the pandemic context allows, more extensive one on one interviews if not.
* Visit to implementation sites where local based travel is possible
	+ Meetings with key beneficiaries (implementing staff and justice system users)
	+ Observation of justice delivery, current state of Justice system elements
* Virtual de-brief of preliminary results with UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF and separate de-brief with donors/partners as required

### Drafting report (10 days)

### Stakeholder meeting and report finalisation (2 days)

## Data sources, data collection methods and sampling approach

### Interviews

The primary source of data will be semi-structured interviews. As such, the team will develop key guiding questions and interview guides for each key actor that is interviewed. This includes semi-structured interview guides: UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF programme team, central Government institutions (eg. Ministry of Justice), beneficiaries, development partners, and non-Government institutions relevant or involved in the field of justice delivery, human rights, and gender equality. The following table outlines the points of emphasis for each of the above-mentioned actors:

|  |
| --- |
| Outline of key areas of emphasis for each interview  |
|  | Relevance | Effectiveness / Impact | Efficiency | Sustainability | Coordination |
| UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF Team | X | X | X | X | X |
| UN Country Management | X |  | X |  | X |
| Donor Partners | X |  |  | X | X |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MoJ/MoSD | X | X |  | X | X |
| Attorney General’s Office | X | X | X | X |  |
| Judiciary (HJC/SJD/PJI) | X | X | X | X |  |
| Legal Aid/PBA | X | X |  | X |  |
| Police | X | X |  | X |  |
| Prosecution | X | X |  | X |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Sites (same as above) | X | X | X | X |  |
| NGO / local partners | X | X |  | X |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Background documents

In addition, to interviews the evaluation team will aim to conduct a comprehensive literature review. The following documents will be examined:

* Programme documents: documents outlining contractual obligations, programme budgets, programme activity plans, progress reports,
	+ It is asked that such documents are shared with the evaluation team as early as possible before the first field visit
* Programme outputs: training material, presentations, conference summaries, manuals/guides, commentaries on regulations/laws
* Background documents: documents highlighting reform needs in the justice sector, documents that indicate baseline information of justice system performance at the time of the programme inception and documents highlighting progress over time.
	+ It is requested that as far as possible the UN team provides or helps facilitate the process of sourcing all analytical and statistical reports available that highlight the situation/challenges at the start of the programme and at the time of the evaluation in areas related to the work of the programme
	+ The background documents should be as far as possible composed of a balanced mix of external reports (eg. NGO), Government reports (eg. statistical reports), development partner programme reports (eg. assessments reports) and documents that provide different views on the issue of justice.

### Stakeholders to interview

The team will aim to interview a range of stakeholders to get a diverse range of views on the same issues, including programme performance/effectiveness, relevance and sustainability. The aim is to meet a range of stakeholders that includes:

* UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF programme staff, management and supervision bodies:
* National authorities leading on implementation, including specifically Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), the High Judicial Council (HJC), the Attorney General’s Office (AGO), and the Supreme Judge Department (SJD).
* Other relevant programme partners: Palestinian Civil Police (PCP), the Palestinian Bar Association (PBA), and the Palestinian Judicial Institute (PJI).
* Donors engaged in support to the UN programme (the Netherlands, the Swedish International Development Agency and the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation) and other significant donors involved in supporting justice reforms in Palestine.
* Civil society engaged in justice reform and gender equality.
* Justice system users.

## Data Analysis and triangulation

To ensure that there is integrity in the findings and analysis, the evaluation team will aim to ensure that there is effective data triangulation of all findings. This includes aim to ensure that key findings are effectively checked and verified from three separate and distinct sources. As such, the same issues and questions will be explored with a range of stakeholders to capture different viewpoints and to check the data being provided.

## Complexity, risks, ethics, limitation and mitigation measures

### Adapting Methodology to the Current Context

With the pandemic currently limiting travel, ISSAT has attempted to balance possible evaluation approaches against negative impacts on the quality of data collection. The fundamental data collection issue that will be managed is that of differential access and comfort with remote information gathering. Remote data collection, using primarily internet and phone-based interactions, is a restricted modality that often systemically excludes or limits full participation by key disempowered groups. Given that the Sawasya II programme is fundamentally intended to improve justice provision to such groups, it is vital that this risk be managed and mitigated to the greatest extent. As such the evaluation approach will proceed on the basis of including non-virtual data collection stages where possible, and will explicitly focus on ensuring strong representation of the full range of stakeholder groups, most importantly including the community as justice system users, who are the intended end beneficiaries of this support.

The evaluation will be conducted using a phased approach, starting in phase 1 with an assessment of available programme documentation, then in phase 2 conducting interviews focused on key programme staff, available international stakeholders, and local stakeholders with strong access to and comfort with virtual communications approaches. Phase 2 may include the development and conduct of an online survey if this data collection approach is found to be suitable for the context, and will enable the participation of a greater range of local stakeholders in the process. Phase 3 is the conduct of field data collection using the full team, if appropriate, or locally engaged sub-elements if not. Phase 3 will conduct the focus groups (where greater group interaction is key to identifying how change occurs), and interviews involving the full range of stakeholders, but with a specific focus on disadvantaged groups (such as women) and civil society actors. Programme activity locations will be visited to assess the extent to which monitoring system have reflected obvious and sustained changes in justice delivery to the community.

In the event that travel to Palestine is not possible on reasonable timeframes the evaluation will use plan B, and approach phase 3 using more remote tools (where possible), and collecting data from key community groups in a reactive way as and when possible using the local evaluation team member. Selection of the local team member will prioritise strong knowledge of community systems and groups in Palestine, along with demonstrated expertise in valid and ethical data collection from communities (focus group methodologies, approaches to participatory learning, previous experience with sensitive assessments or evaluations, etc). In conjunction with the DCAF Palestine office the evaluation team will assess and manage the risks associated with community focused direct data collection, and adapt plans as required. Priority will be given to ensuring the safety of potential respondents. All of this may impact on time frames for data collection, which will be managed in consultation with UN system actors.

### Evaluation ethics

The evaluation approach and methodology will be periodically reviewed to ensure that scope of work is realistic, data collection and tools are appropriate for the context and needs, and to assess the extent to which new issues have emerged that should be integrated/or considered in the key questions. Key junctures at which the evaluation methodology will be reviewed include: following the completion of the desk review phase and completion of the field mission in Palestine. Any critical changes to the evaluation scope or key questions will be communicated to the programme team as soon as possible.

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF and partners.

This evaluation shall be based on rights-based approach and as participatory as possible. This will ensure that the beneficiary children and youth are engaged and that findings are derived from a collective contribution. In line with the Standards for UN Evaluation in the UN System (developed by the UN Evaluation Group), all those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities will aspire to conduct high quality and ethical work guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles. The evaluation will follow the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis and guided by the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) which spells out the rights to protection from all forms of child abuse, neglect, exploitation and cruelty, including the right to special protection in times of war and protection from abuse in the criminal justice system. In addition to the CRC, the evaluation process will be guided by other important treaties reinforcing rights that concern children.

Standards for Evaluation in the UN System: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/22](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22)

Norms for Evaluation in the UN System: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/21](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21)

Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – towards UNEG Guidance: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/980](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980)

UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender into Evaluation: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616)

UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/1452](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1452)

UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/607](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607)

UNEG Ethical Guidelines: [www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102)

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN: [www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100)

## Quality assurance

The final report is going to undergo an internal ISSAT quality assurance process including a peer review, as well as a validation process with SAWASYA II programme management.

## Workplan and deliverables

### Workplan

Option A (with field deployment)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| July  | Week 3 | Inception Phase | * Review of programme documents
* Creation of inception report
 |
|  | Week 4 | Desk review | * Interviews with core UN Programme staff
* Development of initial Programme Theory of Change
* Review of programme documents
 |
| August  | Week 1 | Desk review | * Development of semi-structured interview guide/ surveys
* Interviews with core UN Programme staff
 |
|  | Week 2 | Desk review | * Interviews with core UN Programme staff
 |
|  | Week 3 | Distance consultation | * Interviews with full range of UN staff
* Interviews with Key Donor staff
* Interviews with Palestinian government actors (where possible)
* Possible conduct of online survey (if assessed as suitable for the context)
 |
|  | Week 4  | Distance consultation |
| September  | Week 1  | Distance consultation |
|  | Week 2 | Evaluation mission  | * In person interviews: UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF staff
* Meetings with key national stakeholders: Relevant Ministry’s, operational organisations of the justice system, meeting with key civil society partners
* Meeting with donor partners
* Visit to implementation sites
	+ Meetings with key beneficiaries (implementing staff and justice system users)
	+ Observation of justice delivery, current state of Justice system elements
* De-brief of preliminary results with UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF and separate de-brief with donors/partners as required
 |
|  | Week 3 | Evaluation mission |
|  | Week 4 | Report drafting  |  |
| October  | Week 1 | Report draftingStakeholder meeting  |  |
|  | Week 2 | Report finalization |  |

Option B (remote evaluation)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| July | Week 3 | Inception Phase | * Review of programme documents
* Creation of inception report
 |
|  | Week 4 | Desk review | * Review of programme documents
* Development of initial Programme Theory of Change
 |
| August  | Week 1 | Desk review | * Development of semi-structured interview guide
* Interviews with core UN Programme staff
* Review of programme documents
* Development of initial Programme Theory of Change
 |
|  | Week 2 | Desk review | * Interviews with core UN Programme staff
 |
|  | Week 3 | Distance consultation | * Interviews with full range of UN staff
* Interviews with Key Donor staff
* Interviews with Palestinian government actors (where possible)
* Possible conduct of online survey (if assessed as suitable for the context)
 |
|  | Week 4  | Distance consultation |
| September  | Week 1  | Distance consultation |
|  | Week 2 | Remote evaluation | * Virtual meetings with key national stakeholders: Relevant Ministry’s, operational organisations of the justice system.
* Interviews with justice system users and justice focused community groups. Focus groups if the pandemic context allows, more extensive one on one interviews if not.
* Visit to implementation sites where local based travel is possible
	+ Meetings with key beneficiaries (implementing staff and justice system users)
	+ Observation of justice delivery, current state of Justice system elements
* Virtual de-brief of preliminary results with UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF and separate de-brief with donors/partners as required
 |
|  | Week 3 | Remote evaluation  |
|  | Week 4 | Report drafting  |  |
| October  | Week 1 | Report draftingStakeholder meeting  |  |
|  | Week 2 | Report finalization |  |

### Deliverables

The following deliverables should be produced as part of the overall evaluation:

* **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with the programme team (the joint programme manager and focal points of the three agencies responsible for the programme) after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit, if the current situation allows. The inception report should include the final agreed upon evaluation questions.
* **Evaluation debriefings.** Immediately following the initial the data collection phase, the evaluators will be expected to conduct a preliminary debriefing and present findings to the UN, authorities, stakeholders, and development partners for discussion.
* **Draft evaluation report (40 to 50 pages plus executive summary).** The initial draft should be produced 2 weeks after the conclusion of information collection and/or possible country visit if the situation allows. The relevant stakeholders will provide comments to the evaluators within a week of receiving the draft.
* **Evaluation report audit trail.** All products such as inception, draft and final reports will be validated by the evaluation reference group. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
* **Final evaluation report.** This should be provided within a week of the evaluators receiving the comments on the draft evaluation.
* **Final presentations to stakeholders remotely.** This should be done within two weeks of acceptance of the final evaluation report and will be organized remotely for the evaluation team.

## Evaluation dissemination and utilization plan

DCAF-ISSAT evaluations are published on the ISSAT website.

## Management arrangements

UNDP will be responsible for the management of the consultants and will in this regard designate focal persons for the evaluation and any additional staff to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key interlocutors, etc.) The UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report in coordination with the partners.

The *Sawasya II* staff will assist ISSAT in arranging introductory meetings with the relevant parties in programme and the three agencies, partners and government and civil society. The consultants will work with the *Sawasya* team for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The UN agencies will develop a management response to the evaluation within 1 week of report finalization.

The *Sawasya* Joint Programme Manager will convene an evaluation reference group comprising of technical experts, partners and the UN agencies to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This reference group will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The reference group will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluators are required to address all comments of the reference group completely and comprehensively. The evaluators will provide a detailed rationale for any comment that remains unaddressed.

## Annex 1: Outcomes

|  |
| --- |
| **SAWASYA II:PROGRAMME OUTCOMES****OUTCOME 1: *Rule of law institutions are strengthened and reunified by legal, regulatory and policy frameworks in line with international standards*****OUTCOME 2: *Service provision by rule of law institutions is effective, accountable and inclusive*****OUTCOME 3: *All Palestinians, especially children and vulnerable groups, have access to justice, security and protection without discrimination*****OUTCOME 4: *Women's access to justice and security are improved through gender-responsive service delivery and empowerment of women*** |

## Annex 2: Data collection grid

|  |
| --- |
| Sawaysa II Evaluation – Data Collection Grid |
| 1. **To what extent is the current programme and its objectives and activities relevant to the needs and priorities of national stakeholders?**
 |
| **Sub-question 1.1**: To what extent was the programme in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, and the SDGs? |
|  | **Possible interview questions:*** Is there a political and technical commitment to further develop the justice system?
* Are there sufficient national resources available to develop the justice system (affordability)
* What are the key reforms of the justice system at the moment?
 | Data to collect:* Strategies
* Budget
* Policies
* Interviews
* Statistics
* Assessment reports
 |
| **Sub-questions 1.2**: To what extent does the original programme concept and objectives address the justice needs of targeted beneficiaries? |
|  | **Possible interview questions:** * Does it adequately target gender equality, the empowerment and justice needs of women?
* Does it clearly aim to contribute to child rights?
* Are there elements of the model that are not supported/realistic given existing contextual constraints and legislation?
 | Data to collect:* Interviews
* Location visits
* Legislation
* Strategies/Action Plans
 |
| **Sub-question 1.3:** To what extent the programme is flexible, adaptive and context-specific to adjust strategies over time, as circumstances evolve (eg. conflict in Gaza, the Covid-19 pandemic) and the changing external environment? |
|  | **Possible interview questions:*** How does the programme understand that change occurs in Palestine?
* What has the programme done to change and adapt during implementation?
* If there is an extension – what would the next phase of the programme focus on and why is there a need to continue the programme?
 | Data to collect:* Programme documents
* Assessment report
* Risk matrix
* Discussion on assumptions

Development point:* Theory of change
 |
| 1. **To what extent has the programme part of a coherent approach to the justice needs of Palestine?**
 |
| **Sub-question 2.1**: To what extent is this intervention coherent with other actors’ intervention in the same context (This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.) |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** Is it coherent with the national authorities priorities?
* To what extent the intervention coherent is with international obligations on fair trial and access to justice?
* To what extent is the intervention coherent with international obligations on gender justice and justice for children?
 | Data to collect* National partner strategies and action plans
* National partner interviews
* Programme documents
 |
| **Sub-question 2.2**: How is coherence of the intervention manged and supported? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** What systems of coordination does the programme use with its partners?
* To what extent is the programme managed through inclusive and transparent processes?
* How are Palestinian priorities across stakeholders managed and supported?
* To what extent has the UN programme’s partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
 | Data to collect* Coordination meeting notes
* Interviews
 |
| 1. **To what extent has the programme achieved the expected results and to what extent is it likely to achieve the expected outcomes?**
 |
| **Sub-question 3.1:** To what extent did the programme contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP/UN Women/UNICEF Strategic Plans and national development priorities? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** What have been the key results so far and to what extent those results to date are likely to lead to achievement of the programme’s objectives in the remaining time?
* Are the programme’s objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its time frame?
 | Data to collect* Baseline data and progress data developed by the programme
* Justice system data on case loads, processing, perceptions of fairness, etc.
* Crime rates
 |
| **Sub-question 3.2** In which areas does the programme have the greatest/fewest achievements?  |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** Why and what have been the contributing factors?
* How can the programme build on or expand these achievements or how can they be overcome?
 | Data to collect* Programme data
* Location visits
* Validation with partners
 |
| **Sub-question 3.3** What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the programme’s objectives? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** To what extent is the programme management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the programme objectives?
* How effective have the programme partnerships with civil society organizations been in contributing to achieving results in Gaza?
 | Data to collect* Programme management documents
* Civil society interviews/focus groups
 |
| 1. **To what extent is the programme being managed efficiently and are resources efficiently used to achieve the desired results?**
 |
| **Sub-question 4.1** Does the programme have an effective management system? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** How are the management responsibilities divided and defined?
* How successfully does the programme use programme management systems to manage budget and deliver activities?
* How is the programme adapted over time as needed? Is the programme implementation modality flexible?
 | Data to collect* Steering Committee and donor feedback
* Budgeting reports
 |
| **Sub-question 4.2**: To what extent does the programme have an effective monitoring and evaluation system in place?  |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** What monitoring capacity and systems are there?
* Does monitoring/evaluation feed into planning?
* How does the programme monitor/address risks?
* Does the programme have capacity to identify lessons?
 | Data to collect* Monitoring framework
* Monitoring reports
* Planning documents
 |
| **Sub-question 4.3** To what extent is there an appropriate and cost-effective balance between the scope of activities, management capacity, and overall capacity to implement the programme? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** Was the intervention implemented in a timely way?
* Did the targeting of the intervention mean that resources were allocated efficiently?
* To what extent are the activities the most appropriate and cost-effective to achieve the desired results?
* Activities vs. capacity
* Budget/expertise
 | Data to collect* Activity Plan
* Programme Budget
* Analysis of alternatives
 |
| 1. **What evidence exists to show that the programme has had an impact on the quality of justice delivery?**
 |
| **Sub-question 5.1** What were the effects of the intervention on recipients’ lives? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** What is the contribution of an intervention to long-term intended results?
* Did a specific part of the intervention achieve greater impact than another?
 | Data to collect* National level crime and justice data
 |
| **Sub-question 5.2** Were there unintended (positive or negative) effects for recipients and non-recipients of assistance?  |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** Should the programme have identified these potential effects during planning?
* How has the programme responded to these outcomes?
 | Data to collect* Programme risk analysis
* Interviews
* Location visits
 |
| **Sub-question 5.3** What were the gender-specific impacts? Did the intervention influence the gender context? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** Were there any unintended effects?
 | Data to collect* Stakeholder Interviews
 |
| **Sub-question 5.4** To what extent the programme contributed to the protection and promotion of human rights and in the state of Palestine. |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** Have there been any changes in society/with authorities in terms of behaviour/practice?
 | Data to collect* Interviews
* Human rights reporting
 |
| 1. **To what extent are the activities and programme results sustainable without further external support?**
 |
| **Sub-question 6.1** To what extent did the programme intervention implementation arrangements include considerations for sustainability, such as capacity building of national and local government institutions, communities, exit strategies and other partners? |
|  | **Possible interview/follow up questions*** Is there evidence of the Palestine organisations owning and sustaining improvements?
* What can be done to improve the sustainability of the outcomes achieved so far?
 | Data to collect* Partner interviews
* Location visits (including phase 1 sites)
 |
|  |  |  |
|  |