

# TERMS OF REFERENCE

*for the purposes of conducting the*

## FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

***“Palestinian youth acquire quality professional skills for the development of economic activities”***

*(2024/PRYC/000270 – AECID 2024)*

**Fundación Promoción Social (FPS)**

*in partnership with*

**Agricultural Development Association (PARC) and Lutheran World Federation (LWF)**

*Co-financed by:*

**Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID)**

**October – December 2026**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The AECID 2024 project, titled “Palestinian youth acquire quality professional skills for the development of economic activities” (file code 2024/PRYC/000270), is a 20-month intervention co-financed by the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID) under the 2024 Call for Grants for Development Cooperation Projects in a Single Country. It is implemented by Fundación Promoción Social (FPS) as the lead applicant, in partnership with two Palestinian implementing partners: the Agricultural Development Association (PARC) – a leading rural-development organisation with over four decades of experience in agricultural training and value chains – and the Lutheran World Federation Jerusalem (LWF) – a long-standing provider of vocational training in East Jerusalem and Ramallah.

The intervention responds to the chronic structural vulnerabilities of the Palestinian labour market, sharply aggravated by the war on Gaza and its spill-over effects on the West Bank since October 2023: rising unemployment, a deepening skills mismatch, the contraction of the Israeli labour market for Palestinian workers, and the loss of household income that disproportionately affects youth and women. The project promotes employability and economic entrepreneurship of Palestinian youth aged 16–35 in East Jerusalem and the Ramallah Governorate by combining: (i) Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) and Agricultural TVET (TVET-A) aligned with current local labour-market demand; (ii) entrepreneurship and business-skills training for those wishing to launch their own ventures; and (iii) a vertical incubation–acceleration pathway that links graduates with seed capital, technical assistance and the private sector, with explicit attention to gender equality, environmental sustainability and inclusion of persons with functional diversity.

In line with the Spanish cooperation framework, the project is fully aligned with the V Master Plan for Spanish Cooperation, the Country Partnership Framework (MAP) Spain–Palestine and, in particular, with Intermediate Result 2.2 of the MAP, as well as with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4, 5, 8 and 10).

**Lead organisation for this Final Evaluation assignment.** Within the FPS–PARC–LWF partnership, the **Agricultural Development Association (PARC)** has been designated as the lead organisation in charge of this external Final Evaluation assignment. PARC will act as the administrative and contractual focal point for the assignment: it will publish the call, receive and process the offers submitted by interested consultancy firms, manage the contracting procedure, issue payments to the selected evaluator and serve as the principal point of contact with the service provider throughout the assignment. FPS retains overall project responsibility before AECID and chairs the Follow-up Commission described in section 4, while LWF participates as co-implementer in both the Follow-up Commission and the fieldwork in East Jerusalem and Ramallah.

## 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND

### 2.1. Basic data of the project

<b>TITLE OF THE PROJECT</b>	“Palestinian youth acquire quality professional skills for the development of economic activities”
<b>FILE CODE</b>	2024/PRYC/000270

<b>APPLICANT ENTITY</b>	Fundación Promoción Social (FPS)
<b>IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS IN THE FIELD</b>	Agricultural Development Association (PARC) and Lutheran World Federation Jerusalem (LWF)
<b>COUNTRY</b>	Palestine (East Jerusalem and Ramallah Governorate – West Bank)
<b>PROJECT DURATION</b>	20 months — from 01/03/2025 to 31/10/2026
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	844,292.02 EUR (including local contributions)
<b>DONOR</b>	Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID) — 2024 Call for Grants for Development Cooperation Projects in a Single Country
<b>OBJECTIVES</b>	<p><b>General Objective:</b> To increase the economic resilience of youth in the governorates of Ramallah and Jerusalem.</p> <p><b>Specific Objective:</b> To promote employability and economic entrepreneurship among the youth in Ramallah and Jerusalem.</p>
<b>EXPECTED RESULTS</b>	<p><b>R1:</b> Right Holders acquire specialised technical-professional skills demanded by local employers (TVET and TVET-A reinforced with self-employment and employment skills, with attention to gender-differentiated needs).</p> <p><b>R2:</b> Youth in Ramallah and Jerusalem acquire skills oriented to the development of business initiatives (marketing, accounting, business plans, access to financing, visibility).</p> <p><b>R3:</b> Youth launch SMEs that favour the incorporation of TVET and TVET-A graduates (incubation–acceleration pathway with seed capital, technical assistance and links to the private sector).</p>

## 2.2. Geographic area

The project is implemented in two geographic areas of intervention in the West Bank: East Jerusalem and the Ramallah Governorate. Both areas concentrate critical structural barriers for Palestinian youth (movement restrictions, fragmentation imposed by the Wall and Israeli checkpoints, contraction of the Israeli labour market, limited access to higher education and quality vocational training) and have been severely affected by the consequences of the war on Gaza since October 2023.

According to the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS, 2024) and the most recent ILO and OCHA reports, unemployment rates in Palestine have risen sharply since October 2023, with particularly acute impact among youth and women. The Palestinian participation rate in the East Jerusalem labour market remains structurally low, especially among women, and the supply of accredited TVET in Arabic for the East Jerusalem population is extremely limited.

The intervention reaches Right Holders coming from the following clusters of communities, identified through the participatory diagnosis and the Baseline Study (June–August 2025):

- East Jerusalem inside the Wall: Old City, Silwan, Issawiya, Wadi el Jouz, Beit Hanina, Ras Al-Ammoud, Al-Mukabir and Sour Baher.
- North-West East Jerusalem outside the Wall: Al-Eizariya, Abu Dis, Sheikh Saad, Swahara and Anata.
- East and North-East East Jerusalem outside the Wall: Biddo, Al Qubeiba, Beit Soreek, Beit Ijza, Beit Enan, Beit Ikxa, Qatana, Al-Jeeb, Bir Nabala and Al Jdaira.
- Ramallah main cities: Ramallah, Bir Zeit, Al-Bireh and Betunia.
- North-East Ramallah: Silwad, Al Mazra Al Gharbia, Kafr Malik, Deir Jarir, Ramoon, Yabrood, Ein Yabrood, Kherbet Abu Falah and Biteen.
- North-West Ramallah: Beit Reema, Abween, Qarawat Bani Zeid, Arora, Al Naby Saleh, Dier Gasanah, Abud and Deir Nitham.
- Refugee camps in Ramallah and vicinity: Al Jalazon, Al Amary, Qalandia and Deir Ammar.

Training delivery is centralised in the LWF Vocational Training Centres in Beit Hanina (East Jerusalem) and Ramallah and in the PARC training centres in Ramallah, Biddo and Aizariyyah, while community-based outreach activities, internships and follow-up are conducted in the localities listed above.

### 2.3. Logic of intervention

The intervention is grounded in a transformational employability and entrepreneurship model that simultaneously acts on the supply side (skills of Palestinian youth) and on the demand side (linkages with employers, financial institutions and the entrepreneurship ecosystem). Three interlinked pillars structure the action:

- **Pillar 1 – Specialised technical-professional skills (R1).** Strengthening of TVET and TVET-A pathways at LWF and PARC training centres, anchored in the market needs assessment carried out at the start of the project. Curricula are updated to reflect demand-side priorities identified for East Jerusalem and Ramallah and are complemented with twenty-first-century soft skills, gender-sensitive content and accommodations for trainees with functional diversity.
- **Pillar 2 – Business and entrepreneurship skills (R2).** Tailored entrepreneurship training based on the Business Model Canvas methodology, business plan development, financial education, access-to-finance literacy and pitching skills, with mentoring by entrepreneurs and exposure to private-sector and financial actors.
- **Pillar 3 – Incubation, acceleration and SME launch (R3).** A vertical pathway that selects the most promising business initiatives, provides seed capital, individualised technical assistance and legal support for registration, and creates employment opportunities for TVET and TVET-A graduates within the supported SMEs and agribusinesses (with a deliberate focus on water- and energy-efficient solutions such as hydroponics and photovoltaic systems).

The underlying Theory of Change is that, if Palestinian youth in East Jerusalem and Ramallah acquire labour-market-relevant TVET/TVET-A skills, business and entrepreneurial competencies, and access to seed capital, mentoring and SME job opportunities, then their economic resilience will increase, their participation in the labour market – particularly that of young women – will improve, and the local

productive ecosystem will become more diversified, sustainable and capable of absorbing trained youth.

## 2.4. Target group of the intervention

The intervention has been formulated around the categories of Right Holders (RH), Responsibility Bearers (RB) and Duty Bearers (DB) of the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) used by Spanish Cooperation, with quantitative disaggregation by sex where applicable.

Category	Description
<b>Right Holders (RH) – direct</b>	320 Palestinian youth (at least 30% women) aged 16–35 for women and 16–29 for men, residing in marginalised localities of East Jerusalem and Ramallah, with priority for those affected by the Wall, in densely populated areas and meeting socio-economic vulnerability criteria. Of these, 50 RH access urban-agriculture training delivered by PARC, around 100 RH access TVET in food processing, energy systems and electronics with LWF and around 150 RH access TVET-A and modern agricultural-systems training. Specific accommodations are foreseen for trainees with functional diversity.
<b>Responsibility Bearers (RB)</b>	PARC and LWF as implementing partners; 10 trainers from LWF and PARC training centres; 5 entrepreneurs/mentors involved in the training pathway; 5 representatives of financial institutions and the private sector engaged in internships and seed-capital provision.
<b>Duty Bearers (DB)</b>	Palestinian Ministry of Labour (MoL) and Palestinian Ministry of Agriculture (MoA); the Arab Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Jerusalem and the Ramallah Chamber of Commerce, providing strategic advice, support letters and links to the private sector through the project Steering Committee.
<b>Indirect beneficiaries</b>	Households of the 320 RH; the wider population of the 50+ targeted localities in East Jerusalem and Ramallah; private-sector actors and financial institutions exposed to the supported SMEs; and the broader TVET/TVET-A community of practice in Palestine.

## 3. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND RESULTS

### 3.1. Assessment objectives

Carrying out this Final Evaluation seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- Assess, after the execution period has elapsed, the relevance of the intervention and its objectives in relation to the problems and vulnerabilities identified in the project identification phase and reflected in the Baseline Study Report (Final, August 2025).

- Assess the design and execution of the intervention, the coherence between the expected results and the achievement of the specific objective, as well as their scope in the evaluated period, as foreseen in the logical framework of the intervention and in its schedule.
- Evaluate the activities carried out, their contribution to achieving the results and the optimisation of the resources used to carry them out (efficiency).
- Analyse the foreseeable impact of the intervention on the economic resilience of the target group and on the broader TVET/TVET-A and entrepreneurship ecosystem in East Jerusalem and Ramallah.
- Identify additional impacts and unforeseen positive (or negative) effects of the project that were not anticipated in the formulation matrix. The evaluation team is expected to go beyond the planned logframe indicators and explicitly document spill-over effects, ripple effects on households and communities, contributions to the wider TVET/TVET-A and MSME ecosystem, transformations in social norms (in particular around women's economic participation) and any other emerging outcome attributable, in whole or in part, to the project.
- Establish a qualitative and quantitative measurement of the indicators with respect to the baseline values determined at the beginning of the project, and the indicators built in the planning matrix.
- Assess the sustainability of the results once AECID funding ends, including the durability of the SMEs supported under R3 and the maintenance of TVET/TVET-A curricula updates.
- Assess the coherence of the intervention with the V Master Plan for Spanish Cooperation, the MAP Spain–Palestine (in particular Intermediate Result 2.2), other AECID-funded interventions in Palestine, and partner sectoral strategies (Palestinian MoL and MoA).

In other words, the Final Evaluation must analyse and evaluate the following areas of the intervention during its execution period:

- **a. Intervention design:** coherence and relevance of objectives and actions according to the logical framework of the project, including the adequacy of the Theory of Change to the rapidly evolving operational context (war on Gaza and its impact on the West Bank).
- **b. Intervention management:** institutional structure of FPS, PARC and LWF; planning and coordination mechanisms (Steering Committee and Technical Committee); management procedures; adequacy of human, financial and technical resources; effective participation of the different actors; and quality of monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL) processes.
- **c. Evaluation of results and indicators of success:** extent to which the actions have achieved their results and the foreseen indicators (objective and result level), as well as their contribution to the fulfilment of the specific and general objectives. Alignment with the priorities of Spanish Cooperation will also be assessed, together with the magnitude and sustainability of the predicted impacts on the physical and socio-economic environment, and the degree of involvement of national and local institutions and of the communities where the actions take place.

To carry out this Final Evaluation, the indicators designed in the formulation matrix and measured in the Baseline Study Report will be used. If necessary, the evaluation team must design additional indicators that allow progress to be measured.

The project cycle of the intervention will be examined, assessing, among other elements, its impact on the promotion of gender equality, environmental sustainability, cultural diversity, democratic governance and human-rights-based approach – the five cross-cutting approaches of Spanish Cooperation – and its coherence with sectoral strategies in TVET, agricultural development and youth employment in Palestine. A quantitative and, where appropriate, qualitative measurement of the indicators will be made, taking the project Baseline (LdB) study as a starting point.

Based on the analysis, the evaluation team will identify the main strengths and weaknesses of the intervention and offer recommendations to improve future actions, mainly aimed at strategic design, operational management, the instruments used and the results obtained, in each of the evaluated actions.

## 3.2. Evaluation scope

The scope of the Final Evaluation is articulated around the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability – with explicit incorporation of the cross-cutting approaches of Spanish Cooperation. The evaluation will be linked to the Baseline Study completed at the start of the project, ensuring continuity of the subjects analysed and representativeness of the data.

### 3.2.1. Key issues

In accordance with the Baseline Study and the formulation matrix, this Final Evaluation should analyse the following themes, which derive from the logical framework of the intervention:

a. Socio-economic profile and labour-market trajectories of Right Holders (TVET, TVET-A and entrepreneurship pathways), with attention to:

- Quantitative data on access to the labour market by RH (employed, self-employed, internships completed, income changes), disaggregated by sex, age, governorate and pathway.
- Socio-economic characteristics of RH: education level, household income, occupation, savings, mobility constraints related to the Wall and checkpoints.
- Quality of TVET and TVET-A training delivered (curriculum relevance, pedagogical adequacy, alignment with the market needs assessment, training-of-trainers effects).
- Employer satisfaction and uptake of trained graduates within Palestinian SMEs and the wider private sector.

b. Entrepreneurship and SME ecosystem:

- Quality of the entrepreneurship training itinerary (Business Model Canvas, business plan, financial literacy, pitching).
- Effectiveness of the incubation–acceleration pathway, including the selection of the 20 initiatives moving to the acceleration phase and the 10 supported SMEs.
- Use, accountability and sustainability of seed capital provided.
- Linkages with financial institutions, the Arab Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Jerusalem, the Ramallah Chamber of Commerce and other private-sector actors.
- Number, profile and viability of SMEs and agribusinesses launched, with specific attention to women-led initiatives (target: at least 3 of the 10 supported SMEs).

c. Cross-cutting approaches:

- Gender equality: female participation rates, gender-sensitive curricula, addressing barriers to female participation in the labour market in East Jerusalem and Ramallah.
- Environmental sustainability: integration of green skills, water- and energy-efficient agricultural practices (hydroponics, photovoltaic systems) and circular-economy principles in the supported SMEs.
- Inclusion of persons with functional diversity: accommodations applied during selection, training and follow-up.
- Human-rights-based approach and democratic governance: knowledge by RH of their labour rights and effective exercise thereof; participation of RH and RB in decision-making spaces.
- Cultural diversity: appropriateness of the methodologies for the Palestinian context, including East Jerusalem-specific dynamics.

d. Coordination, partnership and management:

- Effectiveness of the FPS–PARC–LWF tripartite consortium, Steering Committee and Technical Committee.
- Quality of MEAL systems and use of evidence for adaptive management, especially in response to the deteriorating security context.
- Coordination with Palestinian authorities (MoL, MoA) and other AECID-funded interventions in Palestine.

These issues may be prioritised by the evaluation team according to the interests of the parties and the conditions of the evaluation, the most important being those related to the results and objectives achieved, as well as the execution and management process.

### 3.2.2. Indicative evaluation questions by OECD-DAC criterion

The following set of indicative evaluation questions must guide the work of the evaluation team. They are provided as a **minimum reference; the consultancy firm is expected to refine, expand and adapt them** in the methodological proposal (Phase 0) and in the final Evaluation Planning Matrix (Phase I). Questions are organised by OECD-DAC criterion and by cross-cutting approach.

#### Relevance

- To what extent did the intervention respond to the actual needs and priorities of Palestinian youth aged 16–35 in East Jerusalem and the Ramallah Governorate, in particular of young women and persons living in marginalised localities (inside and outside the Wall, refugee camps)?
- To what extent did the project design remain relevant in the light of the war on Gaza (October 2023 onwards) and its consequences for the West Bank and East Jerusalem labour markets?
- How relevant was the choice of TVET/TVET-A specialisations selected for the training, compared with the actual demand of Palestinian employers and the entrepreneurship ecosystem identified in the market needs assessment?
- Were the cross-cutting approaches (gender, environment, HRBA, cultural diversity, democratic governance, functional diversity) properly integrated into the design?

- To what extent is the project aligned with the V Master Plan for Spanish Cooperation, the MAP Spain–Palestine (RI 2.2 in particular) and the sectoral strategies of the Palestinian MoL, MoA and the Palestinian TVET strategy?

### **Coherence**

- How coherent is the intervention internally? Are the three Results (TVET/TVET-A skills, entrepreneurship skills, SME launch and incorporation of graduates) articulated as a logical pathway and mutually reinforcing?
- How well does the project complement other AECID-funded interventions in Palestine and other donor-funded TVET, MSME and youth employment programmes operating in East Jerusalem and Ramallah?
- Is there evidence of duplication or synergy with other actors in the TVET, agricultural development or entrepreneurship space?
- To what extent does the FPS–PARC–LWF consortium adds value compared with each partner operating individually?

### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent has the General Objective been achieved? And the Specific Objective?
- Indicator by indicator (see Indicator Monitoring Matrix in section 6.2): what is the level of achievement of each indicator of the General Objective, Specific Objective, Result 1, Result 2 and Result 3 compared with the baseline value and with the target value?
- Which results were over-achieved and which were under-achieved? What are the main drivers of these results (internal factors, partnership performance, contextual factors)?
- How effective was the TVET/TVET-A training in preparing Right Holders for the local labour market? What proportion of graduates completed internships and accessed paid employment within six months of training completion?
- How effective was the entrepreneurship training pathway (Business Model Canvas, business-plan development, financial education)? How many initiatives reached the acceleration phase and how many SMEs were ultimately launched? What is the female-led ratio?
- How effective was the incubation–acceleration component in connecting graduates with employment opportunities within the supported SMEs?

### **Efficiency**

- Was the project executed within the planned timeframe (1 March 2025 – 31 October 2026)? Where there were delays, what were the main causes and how were they managed?
- Was the budget executed in line with the foreseen distribution? Are there significant variations by budget line that should be flagged?
- What is the cost per Right Holder reached and trained? Is this comparable to similar TVET/TVET-A and entrepreneurship interventions in Palestine?
- To what extent were the human and material resources mobilised by FPS, PARC and LWF adequate, well-coordinated and used efficiently?
- How efficient were the governance mechanisms (Steering Committee, Technical Committee) in steering implementation and resolving bottlenecks?

### **Impact**

- What measurable changes can be observed in the lives of the Right Holders – particularly in their employment status, income, skills, sense of agency and women’s economic participation – attributable to the project?
- What is the impact of the project on the supported SMEs and on the local entrepreneurship ecosystem in East Jerusalem and Ramallah?
- What is the impact of the project on the capacities of PARC and LWF as TVET/TVET-A and MSME-support actors, and on the FPS country strategy in Palestine?
- **Unforeseen impacts.** What positive and negative effects of the project, NOT anticipated in the formulation matrix, can be documented? In particular: spill-over effects on the households and communities of the Right Holders; influence on local labour-market norms and on the perception of female economic participation; effects on the PARC, LWF and FPS internal capacities; effects on local value chains and private-sector actors; and any negative or do-no-harm-relevant effect observed during implementation.
- To what extent has the project contributed to the achievement of SDGs 4, 5, 8 and 10 in the West Bank and East Jerusalem?

### **Sustainability**

- How likely is it that the benefits generated by the project will be sustained after the end of the AECID funding (post 31 October 2026)?
- Institutional sustainability: have the updated TVET/TVET-A curricula been integrated into the standard offer of LWF and PARC training centres? Have they been validated by the relevant Palestinian authorities?
- Financial sustainability of the supported SMEs: what is the survival rate of the supported initiatives 6 to 12 months after their launch? What are the main risks and what mitigation strategies should be considered?
- Sustainability of the partnerships established with employers, financial institutions, the Chambers of Commerce and the Palestinian Duty Bearers.
- Environmental sustainability of the SMEs supported (in particular agribusinesses applying water- and energy-efficient practices).
- What strategic recommendations can be made for a possible follow-up phase – including geographical scaling, deepening of the entrepreneurship pathway or stronger integration with the Palestinian TVET national strategy?

### **Cross-cutting approaches**

- Gender equality: to what extent did the project succeed in removing barriers to female participation in TVET/TVET-A and entrepreneurship? Were the female-led SME targets met? Did female RH increase their autonomy and decision-making power within the household and community?
- Environmental sustainability: were green skills, water- and energy-efficient practices (hydroponics, photovoltaic systems) and circular-economy principles effectively integrated into the training and the SMEs?
- Human-rights-based approach: to what extent did Right Holders strengthen their knowledge and exercise of labour rights? Did Duty Bearers improve their responsiveness?

- Inclusion of persons with functional diversity: how effective were the accommodations applied during selection, training and follow-up?
- Cultural diversity and conflict sensitivity: did the project apply a do-no-harm approach in the politically sensitive context of East Jerusalem and Ramallah?

The evaluation team must structure the Final Evaluation Report around these criteria and questions, and must explicitly state, for each question, the answer reached, the evidence base used and the level of confidence in the answer.

### 3.2.3. Geographical scope

The Final Evaluation will cover the totality of the geographical area of intervention: East Jerusalem (inside and outside the Wall) and the Ramallah Governorate (main cities, North-East, North-West and refugee camps), as well as the LWF Vocational Training Centres in Beit Hanina (East Jerusalem) and Ramallah and the PARC training facilities in Ramallah.

### 3.2.4. Temporal scope

The period of time covered by the Final Evaluation will be the whole execution period of the project, from 1 March 2025 to 31 October 2026 (20 months). Where data become available shortly after closure, the evaluation will incorporate post-project measurements (such as the six-month income tracking foreseen for IOV3 of the specific objective) for triangulation.

## 3.3. Expected results of the evaluation

By carrying out this Final Evaluation, the project expects to obtain two principal categories of products: (i) the Final Evaluation Report itself, with conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations; and (ii) an Indicator Monitoring Matrix that contrasts, for every indicator of the logical framework, the value reported in the Baseline Study (August 2025) with the value measured during the Final Evaluation, providing the achievement level of each indicator at the end of the project (the structure of this matrix is detailed in section 6.2). The full list of formal deliverables is set out in section 6.1.

Specific areas from which lessons learned and recommendations should be extracted include:

1. Analysis of FPS, PARC and LWF as Responsibility Bearers regarding the actions linked to the project and their relationship with the target group and other actors involved, assessing their strengths and weaknesses, as well as opportunities for improvement in their internal capacities and tripartite coordination.
2. Analysis of how these entities have positioned themselves and have added value in response to local development needs and to others not foreseen at the time of formulation – in particular the consequences of the war on Gaza on the East Jerusalem and Ramallah labour markets.
3. Identification of successful lines of action and opportunities, including those for improvement, with explicit attention to the TVET–TVET-A–entrepreneurship pathway.
4. Identification of the challenges faced compared with the formulation phase – particularly the deteriorating security and economic context in the West Bank and East Jerusalem since October 2023 – and the adaptive measures applied by the partnership.
5. Assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and capacities of the intervention in relation to the broader opportunities for youth employability and entrepreneurship in Palestine.

6. Guidance for the definition of medium- and long-term strategies, including a possible follow-up phase, in line with the V Master Plan for Spanish Cooperation and the MAP Spain–Palestine.

The evaluation will also assess to what extent the intervention contributes to the general objective of Spanish development cooperation: poverty reduction and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals to which the project is interrelated (SDG 4 – Quality Education; SDG 5 – Gender Equality; SDG 8 – Decent Work and Economic Growth; SDG 10 – Reduced Inequalities) in the West Bank and East Jerusalem.

Another purpose of the evaluation focuses on its value as a learning and knowledge-management process, as well as its contribution to accountability and transparency among all the actors, including the target group as Right Holders and active subjects participating in the achievement of development results.

In this perspective, the Final Evaluation should be approached from different angles so as to offer an analysis that integrates the interests and needs of each of the key actors in the intervention.

## 4. ACTORS INVOLVED AND DOCUMENTATION

### 4.1. Actors involved

This Final Evaluation will include the participation of the following stakeholders:

- Evaluation team: selected through a public bidding process, preferably locally based or with a strong local component.
- FPS Headquarters in Madrid: project manager and Director of Programmes.
- FPS Country Office in Jerusalem: Head of Mission and project officers.
- PARC (Agricultural Development Association): project coordinator and field staff in Ramallah; PARC also acts as the lead organisation for this evaluation assignment, managing the contractual relationship with the selected consultancy firm (see section 1).
- LWF Jerusalem: Vocational Training Programme management and field staff in Beit Hanina and Ramallah.
- Right Holders: Palestinian youth participating in TVET, TVET-A and entrepreneurship pathways, and SME founders supported under R3.
- Responsibility Bearers: trainers, mentors, entrepreneurs and representatives of the private sector and financial institutions involved in the project.
- Duty Bearers: representatives of the Palestinian Ministry of Labour and the Palestinian Ministry of Agriculture, the Arab Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Jerusalem and the Ramallah Chamber of Commerce.

An evaluation Follow-up Commission will be established whose functions will be to:

- Validate these Terms of Reference.
- Approve the methodological proposal and planning documents submitted by the evaluation team.
- Facilitate the work of the evaluators and access to information sources.

- Approve and complement, if necessary, the working documents prepared during the evaluation, as well as the final conclusions.

The Follow-up Commission will be operational from the inception phase to the end of the fieldwork and will be composed of:

- A representative of FPS Headquarters in Madrid.
- The FPS Head of Mission in Jerusalem.
- The PARC project coordinator.
- The LWF project coordinator.

## 4.2. Documentation

The basic documentation on which the evaluation must be based and which must be used by the evaluators will be:

Documents	Location
Formulation of the intervention (Application Form, Project Proposal, Logical Framework, Budget)	FPS / AECID
MoU between FPS and implementing partners (PARC, LWF)	FPS
AECID Resolution and regulatory legislation applicable to the Call 2024	AECID, FPS
Baseline Study Report – PRYC2024000270 (Final, August 2025)	FPS, PARC, LWF
Market needs assessment and curricula development reports	PARC, LWF
Quarterly financial reports, half-yearly and annual narrative reports submitted to AECID	FPS
MEAL plan and monitoring data (registers of trainees, internship records, business-plan portfolio, seed-capital tracking, SME registration evidence)	FPS, PARC, LWF
Steering Committee and Technical Committee minutes	FPS, PARC, LWF
V Master Plan for Spanish Cooperation	AECID (web)
Country Partnership Framework (MAP) Spain–Palestine	AECID (web)
Sectoral strategies of the Palestinian National Authority (MoL, MoA, TVET national strategy)	FPS, MoL, MoA
Strategic plans of FPS, PARC and LWF	FPS, partners
Methodological references: Spanish Cooperation Evaluation Methodology (2007), OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria (2019)	AECID, OECD

Documents	Location
Letters of support from Duty Bearers (MoA, Chambers of Commerce of Jerusalem and Ramallah)	FPS

This documentation will be shared with the evaluation team upon signature of the contract.

## 5. METHODOLOGY AND WORK PLAN

### 5.1. Methodology

This Final Evaluation must be based on the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability – and apply a Human-Rights-Based, gender-responsive and participatory approach. The evaluation team will make use, to a greater or lesser extent, of the following tools and sources of information, to be agreed upon with the Follow-up Commission:

#### *Primary sources of information:*

- Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with Right Holders (women and men, by training pathway and location).
- Key-informant interviews with Responsibility Bearers (FPS, PARC, LWF staff, trainers, mentors, entrepreneurs, financial-sector representatives).
- Key-informant interviews with Duty Bearers (MoL, MoA, Chambers of Commerce).
- Field surveys in all the localities specified in the Baseline sample to allow comparability of indicator values.
- Field visits to LWF Vocational Training Centres in Beit Hanina and Ramallah, to PARC training facilities and to a representative sample of supported SMEs.

#### *Secondary sources of information:*

- Project documentation listed in section 4.2.
- Statistical sources: PCBS, ILO, OCHA, UNRWA, World Bank Palestinian Economic Notes, FAO data on Palestinian agriculture.
- Sectoral studies on the Palestinian TVET system, women’s labour participation in East Jerusalem and Ramallah, and the entrepreneurship ecosystem.
- Accounting books and registers of supported SMEs (subject to consent and anonymisation).

### 5.2. Work plan and products to deliver

The evaluation will be divided into four phases, in addition to preparatory activities, with an estimated duration calculated from the signing of the contract:

#### **Phase 0 – Selection of the evaluation team (estimated duration: 2 weeks)**

During this phase the consulting teams that participate in the tender must provide the following documents:

- **Methodological proposal:** the technical proposal of the evaluation team, whose qualitative assessment will be decisive for the selection of the team that will be hired. The proposal must include, at least, the following elements:
  1. Descriptive part, justifying the relevance of the proposed evaluation to the project and the intervention context, including:
    - 1.1. Objectives and scope of the evaluation, incorporating the expectations and concerns of the interest groups.
    - 1.2. General methodological approach, with justification of its relevance.
    - 1.3. Incorporation of cross-cutting approaches (gender, environment, HRBA, cultural diversity, democratic governance) into the evaluation process.
    - 1.4. Participation of interest groups and the population (RH, RB, DB) in the evaluation process.
    - 1.5. Detailed description of the data-collection instruments, justifying their relevance to the East Jerusalem and Ramallah context (including security and access constraints).
    - 1.6. Methods for data analysis, including triangulation.
    - 1.7. Identification of the final users of the report and a plan for the use of the evaluation findings.
  2. A list of the products to be delivered and their content.
  3. A list of key informants and their relevance for the evaluation.
  4. A detailed schedule with the action plan.
  5. An evaluation planning matrix reflecting:
    - 5.1. The evaluation criteria (OECD-DAC).
    - 5.2. The evaluation questions for each criterion.
    - 5.3. The sources of information for each question.
    - 5.4. The information-gathering tools and instruments.
    - 5.5. The key indicators for assessing success against each criterion.
- CVs of the members of the evaluation team.
- Accreditations and references for similar assignments.

### **Phase I – Desk study (estimated duration: 1 week from validation of the work programme)**

- Analysis of the available documentation regarding the performance of FPS, PARC and LWF in the country of execution and at FPS Headquarters.
- Identification and examination of the documentation referring to the national, regional and local development context (PCBS, ILO, OCHA, World Bank, MoL, MoA).
- Identification of key informants and definition of the interview agenda.
- Request and examination of additional information from FPS, PARC and LWF.
- Refinement of the methodological tools for the collection, processing and analysis of information, ensuring reliability of sources and rigour of analysis in the field.

#### **Deliverables:**

- Evaluation Planning Matrix, including evaluation criteria and questions.

- Final work plan with the schedule of evaluation stages and delivery dates of the expected products.

### Phase II – Field work (estimated duration: 2–3 weeks)

- Conducting interviews with key informants in the country and requesting additional information from other organisations and institutional and/or international actors. The interviews will include all the previously listed actors and any others that the evaluation team considers relevant.
- Application of the methodological tools designed for information collection, including a representative sample of RH surveys allowing comparability with the Baseline Study.
- Field visits to East Jerusalem (LWF Beit Hanina centre, communities inside and outside the Wall) and Ramallah (PARC and LWF centres, supported SMEs and target localities), with security protocols agreed with FPS in advance.
- Visual inspection of any infrastructure, equipment, training premises and SME facilities developed within the framework of the project.
- Drafting of the Fieldwork Report, including a memory of the activities carried out during the field mission and a structured presentation of the data collected.

#### *Deliverables:*

- Fieldwork Report.

### Phase III – Preparation and presentation of the Final Report (estimated duration: 2 weeks)

The Final Report will be drafted, integrating the different levels of analysis. It will incorporate the Fieldwork Report and the Indicator Monitoring Matrix as annexes. After delivery of the Final Report, the evaluation team will participate in the presentation of results to FPS, PARC, LWF and AECID.

#### *Deliverables:*

- **Indicator Monitoring Matrix** (standalone Excel file): a matrix that compares, indicator by indicator, the values reported in the Baseline Study (August 2025) with the values measured during the Final Evaluation, presenting the level of achievement of each indicator at the end of the project. The detailed structure of the matrix is described in section 6.2.
- **Preliminary Evaluation Report** (Draft Final Report).
- **Results-sharing event hosted in Ramallah** for approximately 20 attendees (FPS, PARC, LWF, AECID, Duty Bearers, selected Right Holders and private-sector partners). The consultancy firm assumes the organisation of the event end-to-end, including venue, materials and catering (food and beverages) for the participants, within the all-inclusive budget of the assignment.
- **Final Evaluation Report**, including the Indicator Monitoring Matrix as a mandatory annex.
- **Executive Summary in English**, and OECD-DAC Evaluation Summary Sheet.

In any case, the team will maintain its independent criteria and must not negotiate the terms of the report with persons outside the team. During interviews, evaluators may choose, if they wish, not to be accompanied by persons outside the evaluation team. The use of the Spanish Cooperation Evaluation Methodology (2007) and the OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria (2019) is required.

## 6. DELIVERABLES AND STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORTS

The evaluation team must produce, in addition to the working products listed under each phase in section 5.2, the set of formal deliverables described below. All deliverables (Inception Report, Fieldwork Report, Indicator Monitoring Matrix, Unforeseen-impacts log, Preliminary and Final Evaluation Reports, Executive Summary and OECD-DAC Evaluation Summary Sheet) must be drafted in English. No Spanish version is requested. All deliverables will be submitted in editable format (Word and Excel, as applicable) and in PDF.

### 6.1. List of formal deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to produce, at a minimum, the following deliverables:

1. **Inception Report.** Submitted at the end of Phase I, including the refined evaluation planning matrix, the final work plan, the data-collection instruments (interview guides, focus-group protocols, survey questionnaires, observation grids), the sampling strategy and the risk-mitigation plan for fieldwork in East Jerusalem and Ramallah.
2. **Fieldwork Report.** Submitted at the end of Phase II, including the memory of the field mission (interviews, meetings, visits, surveys, focus groups), a structured presentation of primary data collected, the list of stakeholders consulted, the photographic record (with consent) and the preliminary findings emerging from the field phase.
3. **Indicator Monitoring Matrix (key deliverable).** A standalone Excel/Word matrix that compares, indicator by indicator, the values reported in the Baseline Study (August 2025) with the values measured during the Final Evaluation, presenting the level of achievement of each indicator at the end of the project. See section 6.2 below for the required structure of this matrix.
4. **Unforeseen-impacts log.** A structured narrative annex documenting the positive and negative effects of the project NOT anticipated in the formulation matrix — including spill-over effects on households and communities, changes in social norms (in particular around women's economic participation), effects on local value chains and the private sector, contributions to the institutional capacities of PARC, LWF and FPS, and any do-no-harm-relevant effect observed during implementation. For each unforeseen effect, the evaluation team must specify the actors affected, the evidence base, the direction (positive / negative) and a preliminary judgment on its likely persistence after project closure.
5. **Preliminary Evaluation Report (Draft Final Report).** Submitted at the start of Phase III for review by the Follow-up Commission, with the full set of conclusions, recommendations and annexes.
6. **Results-sharing event in Ramallah.** A face-to-face event hosted in Ramallah for approximately 20 attendees, including representatives of FPS, PARC, LWF, AECID Technical Cooperation Office in Jerusalem (where feasible), Palestinian Duty Bearers (MoL, MoA, Chambers of Commerce of Jerusalem and Ramallah), a delegation of Right Holders and selected partners from the private sector. The event is intended to share the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, to validate them with stakeholders and to harvest additional insights for the Final Report. The selected consultancy firm is responsible for organising the event end-to-end, including the venue rental, simultaneous interpretation if

required, and the catering for the approximately 20 attendees (food and beverages). All these costs must be foreseen within the all-inclusive budget of the assignment (see section 7).

7. **Final Evaluation Report.** Final version of the report, integrating the comments received on the Preliminary Report and on the workshop. The report must follow the structure detailed in section 6.3 below.
8. **Evaluation Summary Sheet.** Stand-alone summary following the OECD-DAC format used in the inventory of evaluations of Spanish Cooperation, suitable for publication.
9. **Executive Summary.** Maximum 10 pages, in English, suitable for circulation among AECID, FPS sede, PARC, LWF and the Palestinian Duty Bearers.
10. **Raw and processed datasets.** Anonymised raw data (interview transcripts where consent was given, focus-group notes, survey microdata, observation logs) and processed datasets used to populate the Indicator Monitoring Matrix and the analytical sections of the Final Report.

## 6.2. Structure of the Indicator Monitoring Matrix

The Indicator Monitoring Matrix is one of the central deliverables of this Final Evaluation. It must be delivered both as a standalone Excel file (one row per indicator, with the columns described below) and as an annex to the Final Evaluation Report. The matrix must be structured as follows:

Column	Content required
Logframe level	General Objective / Specific Objective / Result 1 / Result 2 / Result 3.
Indicator code	Code as in the project logical framework (e.g. OVI-OE.1, OVI-R1.2, OVI-R3.3).
Indicator wording	Full text of the indicator as stated in the formulation matrix and the Baseline Report.
Unit of measurement	Number, percentage, ratio, qualitative scale, etc.
Disaggregation	Sex, age group, governorate, training pathway (TVET, TVET-A, entrepreneurship, SME), as applicable.
Source of verification (HV/FV)	Means of verification used (registers, certificates, business registration documents, financial reports, follow-up surveys, focus groups, etc.).
Target value (logframe)	Value foreseen in the formulation matrix at the end of the project.
Baseline value	Value reported in the Baseline Study (August 2025), with reference to the page or table of origin.
Final evaluation value	Value measured during the Final Evaluation, with the same disaggregation as the baseline value.

Column	Content required
Achievement (%)	Percentage of achievement of the indicator against the target, calculated as (Final value – Baseline value) / (Target – Baseline) × 100, or as appropriate to the type of indicator.
Achievement category	Colour-coded classification: Achieved (≥100%), Substantially achieved (75–99%), Partially achieved (50–74%), Limited achievement (<50%), Not measurable (with justification).
Comments and qualitative interpretation	Brief narrative explaining the result, including contextual factors (war on Gaza, mobility restrictions, security incidents) that influenced achievement, and any methodological caveat regarding comparability with the baseline.
Recommendations linked to the indicator	Where applicable, specific recommendations stemming from the level of achievement observed (e.g. for replication, scale-up, redesign, follow-up phase).

The matrix must cover all indicators of the General Objective, the Specific Objective and Results 1, 2 and 3 of the project, plus any additional indicators that the evaluation team may have introduced – with prior validation by the Follow-up Commission – to strengthen measurement. The colour-coded achievement classification must also be reproduced as a synthesis chart in the Final Evaluation Report.

### 6.3. Structure of the Final Evaluation Report

The Final Evaluation Report must be written in English, must include the Executive Summary in English, must not exceed 70 pages (excluding annexes; font size 12, line spacing 1.15) and must follow the structure below:

1. Front page (project title, file code, donor, evaluators, dates).
2. Table of contents, list of tables, list of figures, list of acronyms.
3. Executive Summary (in English, maximum 10 pages, including a synthesis of the Indicator Monitoring Matrix).
4. Introduction:
  - 4.1. Background and rationale of the evaluation.
  - 4.2. Object of evaluation: brief presentation of the project, partnership and operational context.
  - 4.3. Objectives, scope and intended use of the evaluation.
  - 4.4. Conditions, limits and methodological caveats of the study (including security and access constraints, sample limitations and any deviation from the inception methodology).
  - 4.5. Presentation of the evaluation team and division of responsibilities.
5. Evaluation questions and criteria:
  - 5.1. OECD-DAC criteria adopted (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability) and their adaptation to the project.

- 5.2. Cross-cutting approaches: gender, environment, HRBA, cultural diversity, democratic governance.
  - 5.3. Final evaluation planning matrix (criteria – questions – sources – tools – indicators of success).
6. Methodology:
- 6.1. Methodological approach and justification.
  - 6.2. Sources of information: primary and secondary.
  - 6.3. Sampling and stakeholder mapping (with reference to the Baseline sample for comparability).
  - 6.4. Data-collection tools used (interview guides, focus-group protocols, survey instruments, observation grids).
  - 6.5. Data analysis and triangulation strategy.
  - 6.6. Ethical considerations applied (informed consent, confidentiality, do-no-harm, safeguarding/PSEAH).
7. Context analysis:
- 7.1. Political, security and humanitarian context in the West Bank and East Jerusalem during the implementation period (March 2025 – October 2026), with explicit attention to the impact of the war on Gaza.
  - 7.2. Socio-economic context: youth unemployment, women’s labour participation, TVET system in Palestine, MSME and entrepreneurship ecosystem.
  - 7.3. Institutional context: Palestinian MoL, MoA, Chambers of Commerce, AECID portfolio in Palestine and other relevant donors.
8. Findings by OECD-DAC criterion:
- 8.1. Relevance.
  - 8.2. Coherence (internal and external, including alignment with the V Master Plan, MAP Spain–Palestine and Intermediate Result 2.2).
  - 8.3. Effectiveness, including indicator-by-indicator analysis based on the Indicator Monitoring Matrix.
  - 8.4. Efficiency (use of resources, value for money, financial execution against logframe).
  - 8.5. Impact (foreseeable and observed impact on RH, partner organisations and the broader ecosystem), including explicit identification of unforeseen positive and negative effects of the project not captured by the logframe indicators.
  - 8.6. Sustainability (institutional, financial, technical, environmental and social sustainability of the SMEs supported, the curricula updates and the partnerships established).
9. Findings on cross-cutting approaches:
- 9.1. Gender equality and women’s economic empowerment.
  - 9.2. Environmental sustainability and green skills.
  - 9.3. HRBA and democratic governance (knowledge and exercise of labour rights).
  - 9.4. Inclusion of persons with functional diversity.

- 9.5. Cultural diversity and conflict sensitivity.
10. Findings on management, partnership and MEAL:
- 10.1. Performance of FPS, PARC and LWF as Responsibility Bearers.
  - 10.2. Effectiveness of the Steering Committee, Technical Committee and tripartite ATD.
  - 10.3. Quality of MEAL systems and adaptive management in response to context shocks.
  - 10.4. Coordination with Duty Bearers and other AECID-funded interventions.
11. Conclusions, structured by OECD-DAC criterion and by cross-cutting approach.
12. Lessons learned (intended for FPS, PARC, LWF and AECID).
13. Recommendations:
- 13.1. Strategic recommendations (medium- and long-term, including a possible follow-up phase).
  - 13.2. Operational recommendations (project design, MEAL, partnership management).
  - 13.3. Recommendations for AECID and the wider Spanish Cooperation portfolio in Palestine.
  - 13.4. Recommendations for partner organisations and Palestinian Duty Bearers.

Each recommendation must be prioritised (high / medium / low), addressed to a specific actor, and accompanied by a suggested timeframe and indicators for monitoring its uptake.

14. Annexes:
- A1. Terms of Reference.
  - A2. Evaluation planning matrix (final version).
  - A3. Indicator Monitoring Matrix (full version, including the Excel file).
  - A4. List of stakeholders consulted (with role, organisation and date of consultation).
  - A5. Data-collection instruments used.
  - A6. Fieldwork Report.
  - A7. Documentary references and bibliography.
  - A8. OECD-DAC Evaluation Summary Sheet.
  - A9. Photographic record (where consent was obtained).
  - A10. Methodological note on the comparability of the Baseline and Final Evaluation samples.

## 6.4. Format requirements

All written deliverables must comply with the following format requirements:

- Body of the report: font size 12, line spacing 1.15, justified text, with consistent heading hierarchy and pagination.
- Tables, figures and charts must be numbered, titled and accompanied by a clear legend and source. The Final Report must include, at a minimum, a synthesis chart of the Indicator Monitoring Matrix and a logframe-aligned overview of achievement.

- Direct quotations from informants must respect anonymity (e.g. “young woman, Ramallah, focus group, October 2026”).
- All deliverables must be submitted in Word/Excel and PDF.
- The cover page must display the logos of FPS, PARC, LWF and AECID, in line with the visibility requirements applicable to AECID-funded projects.

## 7. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team must be composed of a minimum of 2 experts whose availability must be specified in the offer. The team must meet the following requirements:

- Demonstrable experience in the design and conduct of intermediate, final and/or impact evaluations of development projects (at least 5 evaluations completed, of which 3 must refer to Palestine and/or to the youth employment, TVET or entrepreneurship sectors).
- At least one team member must have specific training in social-research methodologies and techniques.
- To the extent possible, the team will include professionals from Palestine and will respect gender balance.
- Experience in development cooperation and in evaluation techniques and methodologies, with explicit familiarity with OECD-DAC criteria, Spanish Cooperation Evaluation Methodology (2007) and HRBA-/gender-responsive evaluation approaches.
- Mastery of English is mandatory, as all deliverables of this assignment must be drafted in English. Working knowledge of Spanish will be valued for liaison with FPS Headquarters and AECID, but is not a requirement for any deliverable.
- Working knowledge of Arabic by at least one team member, to allow direct interaction with Right Holders, is mandatory.
- Solid knowledge of the Palestinian reality and proven experience in TVET, agricultural development, MSME support and gender approach in the West Bank.

The evaluation company must provide the CVs of the persons selected to carry out the evaluation, the work plan and the accreditation of the necessary requirements. An evaluation team that includes professionals from the country of execution and is familiar with the reality on the ground will be preferred.

The team leader will act at all times as the interlocutor and representative before FPS when interacting with those responsible for the project. Any change in the composition of the evaluation team must be previously notified and authorised by the FPS Evaluation Management Unit.

It is an external evaluation: the evaluation team will be accompanied by FPS, PARC and LWF staff in the field where required for security and logistics, but without interference in their work, guaranteeing their independence in the development of the assignment and in the issuance of the Report.

The proposals received will be analysed using the following evaluation table:

	Maximum score
Technical proposal:	

	Maximum score
Evaluation tools and calendar	5
Methodological approach:	
Participatory approach with RH, RB, DB	7
Incorporation of cross-cutting approaches	9
Gender approach	7
Evaluation team:	
Experience in similar evaluations	22
Knowledge of the sector and the Palestinian context	9
Joint experience of the team members	11
Economic proposal:	30
Total	100

**Total budget in euros (all taxes included): 14,000 euros.**

This budget is all-inclusive and must cover the entire scope of the assignment, including the evaluation team's fees, local travel within Palestine, accommodation, per diems, data-collection logistics, document production and all costs related to the on-site results-sharing event in Ramallah described in section 6.1 (venue rental, simultaneous interpretation if required, food and beverages for approximately 20 attendees, and logistical support).

**Form of payment:** 40% upon signature of the contract; 60% upon presentation and approval of the Final Report.

## 8. EVALUATION ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation team must comply with the following professional and ethical requirements:

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the right of persons to provide information, ensuring their anonymity and the confidentiality of the data collected, in line with applicable data-protection standards.
- **Responsibility.** Any disagreement or difference of opinion that may arise between the team members or between them and those responsible for the project, in relation to the conclusions and/or recommendations, must be mentioned in the report. Any statement must be supported by the team or the disagreement must be recorded.
- **Integrity.** The evaluation team will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in these Terms of Reference if necessary to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.

- **Independence.** The evaluation team must guarantee its independence from the evaluated intervention, not being linked to its management.
- **Do-no-harm and security.** The team must adopt a do-no-harm approach in line with the Palestinian operational context, applying conflict-sensitivity principles, complying with FPS, PARC and LWF security protocols and avoiding any action that may compromise the safety of staff or of the target population.
- **Safeguarding.** The team must adhere to FPS’ Safeguarding and PSEAH (Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment) policies, particularly when interacting with young women and persons in vulnerable situations.
- **Incidents.** Should problems appear during the fieldwork or in any other phase of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to FPS. Otherwise, the existence of such problems may not be used to justify failure to obtain the results established in this technical specification.
- **Validation of information.** It is the responsibility of the evaluation team to guarantee the veracity of the information compiled for the preparation of the reports, and ultimately the team will be responsible for the information presented.
- **Evaluation reports.** The dissemination of the information compiled and of the Final Report is a prerogative of the signing parties of the project (FPS, PARC, LWF and AECID).

## 9. INDICATIVE SCHEDULE

The provisional schedule for the Final Evaluation, with start in October 2026, is as follows:

Milestone	Indicative date
Publication of the call and reception of proposals	From 12 May 2026 to 4 June 2026
Selection of the winning company	12 June 2026
Signature of the contract and start of the assignment	15 June 2026
Phase 0 – Methodological proposal, CVs and accreditations validated	12 October 2026
Phase I – Desk study completed	19 October 2026
Phase II – Fieldwork completed and Fieldwork Report submitted	13 November 2026
Phase III – Preliminary Evaluation Report	27 November 2026
Discussion of the Draft Report and results-sharing event in Ramallah	4 December 2026
Submission of the Final Evaluation Report	15 December 2026

The schedule may be adjusted by mutual agreement between FPS and the evaluation team in the light of operational and security conditions in the West Bank and East Jerusalem.

## 10. SUBMISSION OF OFFERS

Those interested in carrying out the Final Evaluation of the project 2024/PRYC/000270 must submit their corresponding technical and economic offer **before June 4 2026**. As stated in section 1, the Agricultural Development Association (PARC) is the lead organisation for this Final Evaluation assignment and acts as the administrative and contractual focal point for the process of reception and evaluation of offers, contracting and follow-up with the selected service provider.

Offers should be sent to the following email addresses, with copy to FPS for information:

- [notificaciones@promocionsocial.org](mailto:notificaciones@promocionsocial.org)

All offers must include: (i) the methodological proposal as detailed in Phase 0; (ii) the CVs of the proposed team members and accreditations; (iii) a detailed economic offer (all taxes included) within the indicative budget of 14,000 EUR; and (iv) at least two references from comparable assignments completed in Palestine in the last five years.

Any clarification request regarding these Terms of Reference must be addressed in writing to PARC, with copy to FPS, at least seven calendar days before the closing date of the call.