

Terms of Reference FINAL EVALUATION

Joint Program 2022-2026

FIAN Belgium, Quinoa, Solidagro et Viva Salud

Outcome PALESTINE

« A strong social movement to uphold the right to health and food for the Palestinian people »

Table of Contents

Context of the evaluation	1
Project context	1
Four organisations	2
Outcome Palestine	3
Roles	4
Objective of the final evaluation	5
Evaluation questions	6
Methodology	7
The evaluation report	8
Process timetable	8
The evaluator (required profile)	9
Submission of proposals	9
Budget for the evaluation	10
Appendix	11

Context of the evaluation

Project context

A joint programme

FIAN Belgium, Quinoa, Solidagro and Viva Salud collaborate on a joint programme, co-financed by the Federal Public Service of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, from 2022 to 2026: "*Empowered citizens and stronger social movements for a fair, united and sustainable world*".

The narrative of our programme is as follows: in a context of growing global inequalities, FIAN Belgium, Quinoa, Solidagro and Viva Salud are working to bring about structural change in our economic, social and political system at various levels.

Together, the four NGOs want citizens to have more power and their political participation through social movements to be strengthened in order to bring about systemic change, so that a fair, united, decolonised and sustainable world can emerge, based on respect for human rights, the sovereignty of peoples and the protection of biodiversity.

To achieve this, we are implementing the following strategies: (1) **Awareness-raising, training and mobilisation** to strengthen citizen engagement; (2) **Support for movements and networking** to strengthen their capacity for action and organisation; (3) **Advocacy and expertise** to inspire policy choices that favour systemic change; and (4) **Strengthening and supporting alternative models** to improve the socio-economic conditions of the population and promote these good practices.

This joint programme is active in eight countries: Belgium, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, DR Congo, Mali, Senegal, Palestine and the Philippines.

Four organisations

FIAN Belgium

FIAN Belgium is a Belgian NGO that promotes the right to food. It is the national section of FIAN International. It carries out its activities in five areas: co-construction of knowledge, advocacy, mobilisation, support for struggles and support for social movements. FIAN Belgium works to promote adequate, healthy and nutritious food within the framework of sustainable and localised food systems. Together with citizens and social movements, it defends people's sovereignty over food systems and natural resources and promotes agroecology. FIAN Belgium opposes corporate control of food systems and the financialisation and commodification of resources. It also denounces the dismantling of democracy, human rights violations and the criminalisation of social actors, as well as the destruction of the environment and the climate.

<http://fian.be>

Quinoa

Founded in 1991, Quinoa is a Belgian NGO and Youth Organisation for Education for Global and Solidarity Citizenship. It aims to stimulate the engagement of young people and the French-speaking public in collective actions for a fair and sustainable world. Through its awareness-raising and training activities, Quinoa encourages a critical understanding of the mechanisms of injustice and global issues related to social, political, economic, cultural and environmental dimensions. It also supports citizen mobilisation by strengthening the capacities of individuals and groups to actively engage in social change dynamics.

www.quinoa.be

Solidagro

Solidagro is a Belgian NGO committed to the right to food and drinking water through the promotion of agroecology. It works with local partners in six countries, strengthening their capacities and supporting community initiatives targeting grassroots organisations to sustainably improve food security, incomes and access to water, hygiene and sanitation. Its actions integrate environmental and gender dimensions, with a particular focus on women's empowerment. In Belgium, Solidagro carries out awareness-raising and political work to

influence public decisions in favour of sustainable food systems. It also contributes to national platforms to promote agroecology in Belgium and in its six partner countries.

www.solidagro.be

Viva Salud

Viva Salud is a Belgian NGO that believes that every individual and every community has the right to health. That is why Viva Salud supports social movements in their fight for the right to health. In the Philippines, Palestine, the Democratic Republic of Congo and elsewhere, Viva Salud works in partnership with social organisations on joint campaigns, learning from each other and mutually reinforcing their work. In the face of increasingly global challenges, the solution lies in international solidarity. Viva Salud also supports them financially through grants and donations collected in Belgium. In addition, Viva Salud supports their struggle through its activities in Belgium and its international network, such as the *People's Health Movement*.

www.vivasalud.be

Outcome Palestine

Country	Palestine
Type of evaluation	Field evaluation
NGOs involved	Viva Salud, Solidagro

Viva Salud, Solidagro and their Palestinian partners aim to support and strengthen the Palestinian social movement so that it can effectively influence local, national and international duty bearers to better respect the rights of the Palestinian population, particularly the right to health and the right to food, in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.

The programme, which applies a Human-Rights Based Approach, focuses on strengthening the capacities of target groups to conduct awareness-raising and political advocacy campaigns through training, exchanges of good practices and lessons learned. It promotes community-based documentation and research to generate evidence and testimonies that feed advocacy efforts and inspire other social movements. It also supports networking and alliance-building at national and international levels to amplify a unified voice and strengthen international solidarity. Public awareness-raising and political advocacy are key components, including policy proposals, dialogue with duty bearers, and monitoring of both the implementation of existing laws and the adoption of legislation that may negatively affect the right to health and food. In addition, partners establish and support pilot initiatives and demonstration sites to test and refine innovative practices in real-life conditions, creating safe and dynamic spaces for exchange, collective learning and movement-building across networks.

To achieve this, the outcome is structured in 4 Results:

- R1 – Right to Health: Partners and their networks strengthen the Palestinian social movement’s capacity to advocate for a Human Rights–Based Approach (HRBA) to

health, aiming to achieve a more inclusive, accessible, affordable and quality health system in Palestine.

- R2 – Occupational Health and Trade Union Strengthening: Partners and their networks reinforce active trade unions, with the support of union activists within the Palestinian social movement, to improve occupational safety and health for Palestinian workers.
- R3 – Legitimacy and International Law: Partners and their networks increase their legitimacy at local, national and international levels and contribute to improved compliance by duty bearers with international human rights and humanitarian law.
- R4 – Agroecology and Food Sovereignty: Partners and their networks promote agroecology as an alternative, collective and inclusive model, rooted in communities, that empowers farmers and supports food sovereignty in Palestine.

Roles

Evaluation	Responsible	Evaluation Committee
Palestine	Youcef Boughriet	Youcef Boughriet – Programme Management Coordinator Viva Salud David Verstockt – Programme Management Officer Palestine Dennis Genesse and Pascal Van Driessche – Programme Management Officers Solidagro Antía González Filgueira – Consortium Coordinator

Responsible person:

- Draft and publish the Terms of Reference (ToR);
- Serve as contact and information points for the evaluators;
- Ensure financial follow-up with Antía and Jan Mertens ;
- Guarantee the quality of the final evaluations;
- Draft (together with committee members, where applicable) the management response.

Staff Participating in the Evaluation Committee:

- Improve and validate the ToR;
- Act as intermediaries between the responsible person (Youcef) and the partners;
- Ensure proper follow-up and smooth organization of the evaluation in the field;
- Provide comments on the evaluation report;
- Contribute to drafting the management response.

General Steering Committee: Tim (Solidagro), Fanny (Viva Salud), H el ene (Quinoa), Claire (FIAN) and Ant ia (consortium coordinator).

Objective of the final evaluation

The final evaluation, as required by the DGD, aims to assess the progress made and the achievement of the eight outcomes of the 2022-2026 joint programme, based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria (*coherence, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact*). By evaluating our work in the eight countries where we are active, we will be able to draw lessons from these five years of cooperation, formulate recommendations and lessons learned, and report on the results of our programme.

A capitalisation seminar

Furthermore, with the aim of further capitalising on our achievements, and in line with the work carried out within the joint programme, we wish to deepen the final evaluation by organising a dedicated event once the evaluation processes for the various outcomes are well advanced: the capitalisation seminar.

The capitalisation seminar aims to strengthen the reporting, joint analysis and collective learning as part of the final evaluation of the joint programme. It will highlight the results and lessons learned from the evaluations of the eight outcomes of the Joint Program (Belgium, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, DR Congo, Mali, Senegal, Palestine and the Philippines), drawing on the set of cross-cutting evaluation questions, which will serve as a common thread for a comparative and collective reading of the results (see section on Evaluation Questions).

Role of the evaluator in the capitalisation seminar

As part of the evaluation of the Palestine outcome, we expect the evaluator(s) to include in their analysis the cross-cutting evaluation questions common to the outcomes of the joint programme, particularly those relating to the criteria of relevance, coherence and effectiveness. The findings, lessons learned and elements of analysis from the intermediate report – and, where applicable, the final report – will contribute to the capitalisation seminar organised at the joint programme level and scheduled for the end of 2026.

The direct participation of the evaluator of Palestine outcome in the seminar is not required.

Intended use

The results, conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation will be used to inform the DGD, the four members of the consortium, our national partners and stakeholders involved in the program, including the various actors of the international cooperation sector with activities in the same countries.

The final evaluation report and the management response will be made public and published online as to enhance the transparency and accountability of all parties involved in the implementation of the joint programme.

Evaluation questions

Here are the evaluation questions that we hope the evaluation will provide information and answers to. They are classified according to the OECD's DAC criteria:

Relevance

1. *To what extent does the programme respond to the urgent and shifting needs of communities affected by genocide, displacement, and occupation in Gaza and the West Bank?*

Effectiveness

2. *How effective were the partner's new strategies (e.g., working with shelters in Gaza, relocating and decentralizing agroecology model farms in West-Bank) in ensuring continuity of health promotion, community outreach and AE promotion?*

Coherence

3. *How did the Palestine outcome contribute to the achievement of the strategic targets of the Palestine Geographical Joint Strategic Framework (JSF) 2022-2026?*
4. *How effective were the partner's new strategies (e.g., working with shelters in Gaza, relocating and decentralizing agroecology model farms in West-Bank) in ensuring continuity of health promotion, community outreach and agroecology promotion despite the ongoing genocide?*

Efficiency

5. *Considering the severe restrictions on financial transfers and movement (including checkpoints and blockades), how efficiently were program resources converted into outputs and outcomes?*
6. *To what extent has direct partner coordination, without a country office, increased cost-effectiveness and lowered overheads, while still achieving results?*

Impact

7. *To what extent and through what mechanisms did partners influence international discourse and policy debates related to Israel/Palestine?*
8. *How has the programme contributed to building resilience, empowerment, and political agency among Palestinian youth, women, and farmers?*

For each evaluation question, we expect the final report to present:

- ✓ Areas for improvement.
- ✓ Best practices; Success factors.
- ✓ Possible solutions in the form of recommendations.

In addition, the following evaluation criteria stand out as particularly cross-cutting across all our outcomes: relevance, effectiveness and consistency.

Under the criteria of **relevance**, we wish to evaluate the alignment of all outcomes with the needs and priorities of the target audiences:

To what extent does the programme respond to the priority, urgent or evolving needs of the target groups (communities, women, young people, social movements, producers), taking into account the specific socio-political context of each country?

Under the criteria of **effectiveness**, the theme examined across all outcomes will be the achievement of objectives and the nature of the changes produced by the programme's strategies and activities, particularly in difficult contexts:

To what extent did the programme achieve the expected (and possibly unexpected) results, and to what extent did the strategies, training and activities implemented generate concrete changes in practices, capacities, behaviours or organisations?

Under the criteria of **coherence**:

How did the various outcomes contribute to the achievement of the strategic targets of the 2022-2026 geographical JSFs as planned in 2021?

We expect the evaluator(s) to consider these questions as common to each country/outcome in order to facilitate comparative analysis and strengthen capitalisation between countries within the consortium. These questions will serve as an important common thread for the capitalisation seminar that will follow the submission of the interim reports.

Methodology

We would like the evaluator(s) to implement a participatory method, both with the partner organisations and with the country offices of Solidagro and Viva Salud, as well as with the teams of the NGOs working from Belgium. We also expect the evaluator to specify their approach to implementing a participatory process.

We estimate that the mission could be carried out over a period of 12 to 15 working days between May and September, including the document review, data collection, analysis, report drafting and the debriefing workshop.

Several parameters will need to be taken into account:

- Innovation: We would be delighted to discuss and see innovative methodologies applied.
- Working languages: English and Arabic

The evaluator's service proposal should take these different aspects into account and indicate how he/she/they intend(s) to proceed.

Further methodological details will be adjusted and developed with the selected evaluator to ensure the best approach to the evaluation questions and the most appropriate approach for each context and project.

The evaluation report

In order to ensure a certain level of comparative analysis between the different evaluations, we would like all evaluations to follow the model below:

- ✓ Table of contents
- ✓ List of abbreviations
- ✓ Summary of no more than 2 pages (which can be used as a stand-alone document)
- ✓ An introduction that includes the objectives of the evaluation, the approach, the techniques used and any limitations of the evaluation
- ✓ An evaluation covering the criteria set out in these terms of reference (*relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and impact*), clearly answering the related evaluation questions
- ✓ Lessons learned
- ✓ Conclusions and recommendations
- ✓ A short educational / knowledge dissemination video (maximum 5 minutes) presenting key evaluation highlights and practical lessons learned (e.g. recommended practices to continue, adapt or discontinue). The video should be dynamic, accessible and adapted to a non-technical audience (field teams, partners, donors). A creative and engaging format is encouraged (e.g. storytelling, visual summaries, short-form video style).
- ✓ Appendices

The report must be written in English.

Process timetable

Period	Stage
March 2026	Launch of the evaluator recruitment process
By the end of April 2026	Recruitment of the evaluator(s)
May 2026	Preparations and information meetings with the evaluator (methodology, working and communication procedures, etc.)
June 2026	Field evaluation process of the Palestine outcome and preparation of the contribution to the capitalisation seminar (this last point will be done during the evaluation process of the eight outcomes)
September 2026	Intermediate report available Presentation of the evaluation results

November 2026	Capitalisation seminar
December 2026	<p>Final report available. Presentation, summary and communication of evaluation results.</p> <p>Publication of the management response to the final evaluation of the 2022-2026 joint programme.</p>

The evaluator (required profile)

The evaluator (or evaluators) must:

- ✓ Be fully independent from the project and all its stakeholders
- ✓ Demonstrate proven experience in evaluating international cooperation programmes
- ✓ Strong knowledge of the Palestinian context, including the realities and dynamics of civil society in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.
- ✓ Experience in fragile or conflict-affected contexts, preferably in the MENA region
- ✓ Expertise in working with social movements and civil society actors (preferably on issues related to the right to health and health justice, and/or the right to food/food systems/agroecology)
- ✓ Be familiar with the OECD DAC criteria
- ✓ Have expertise in participatory and inclusive evaluation approaches
- ✓ Be familiar with Theory of Change-based evaluation frameworks
- ✓ Have a good understanding of gender and environmental integration in development programs.
- ✓ Possess excellent analytical and writing skills, with the ability to write clearly and concisely; be organised and communicative
- ✓ Be able to facilitate group sessions and participatory workshops

This evaluation could be conducted in pairs, with one evaluator based in the West Bank and one in Gaza.

Working languages: English, Arabic.

Submission of proposals

Interested candidates are invited to send their applications to Youcef [youcef@vivasalud.be] by **15 April 2026**.

Proposals, written in English, must include:

- ✓ CV(s) of the candidate(s)
- ✓ A note describing the understanding of the mission, outlining the proposed methodological approach and a work plan (maximum 5 pages).
- ✓ A budget proposal (detailed estimate).
- ✓ A relevant example of a similar evaluation carried out by the evaluator (the relevant example of a previous evaluation may be written in English, French or Arabic).

The evaluation grid that will be used to assess the candidates received is as follows:

	Weighting	Offer A	Tender B	Offer C
Evaluator's experience (relevant to the expertise required for this evaluation)	17 points			
Proposed timetable and communication	17 points			
Understanding of the context and challenges related to the evaluation	21 points			
Consideration of evaluation issues	12 points			
Proposed evaluation methodology	21 points			
Languages	12 points			
Total quality	100 points			
Price submitted	in euros (€)			

Candidates will be evaluated by a committee composed of the consortium coordinator and Viva Salud and Solidagro programme managers.

Budget for the evaluation

All consultants applying are requested to submit their best budget proposal for this evaluation service and to present a technical proposal including an appropriate evaluation design and budget breakdown.

The budget must include:

- ✓ The preparation days required to analyse existing documents and meet with selected staff members (directors, Belgian coordinators from each organisation and consortium coordinator);
- ✓ The working time required to carry out the evaluation;
- ✓ Domestic travel expenses, daily allowances and consulting fees related to the implementation of the evaluation (the service provider is responsible for its own insurance, logistics, etc.);
- ✓ The drafting of an interim report, its presentation at a feedback session with staff from the four organisations, and the drafting of a final report.



To enable an external evaluator to carry out these evaluations, Viva Salud and Solidagro have the following budget (including VAT): **€7,200**

Appendix

- Palestine part of the 2022-2026 joint programme of Fian Belgium, Quinoa, Viva Salud and Solidagro

This document will be shared only with candidates who express interest in submitting an offer for this evaluation. Please contact us to obtain a copy.