Mid-term Evaluation Process

1. PREPARATION
   April - May

2. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS
   May - September
   
   2.1 REMOTE DATA COLLECTION
   May - August

   2.2 VALIDATION & RECOMMENDATION
   September

3. LEARNING AND CAPITALIZATION
   October
# Phase 2.1: Data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Individual interviews| **Semi-structured one-to-one interviews (via online platform)** | - Regional Project Manager  
- Technical Advisors  
- Gender Advisor  
- MEAL advisor  
- Grant Manager  
- National Project Management Unit (PMUs)  
- European Commission (EC) Project Officer  
- Policy makers  
- Other Local Stakeholders SESOs technical staff |
|                      | ![Avatar]                                                        | N° = 28 (out of 30 planned)                                                 |
| Participatory methods | **Structured Focus group discussions**                          | - SESOs' technical staff  
- National PMUs (one for each country)                                       |
|                      | ![Avatar]                                                        | N° = 3 (out of 6 planned) national-based  
(with SESCO representatives from Lebanon, Morocco and Palestine-one SFGD for each country)  
N° = 1 transnational (with Jordanian, Lebanese and Palestinian PMU representatives) |
| Survey questionnaire  | **Online questionnaire**                                        | 51 Social Enterprises  
(80% of the project Social Enterprises completed the survey)                  |
### Phase 2.2: Validation & Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Case Stories        | ![Person Icon]  
*In-depth interviews (via online platform)*  
\(N=6\) (1 per each project country) | **Direct Beneficiaries**  
*Social Entrepreneurs selected as good practice* |
| Participatory methods | ![People Icon]  
*Working Group discussions*  
\(N° = 2\) |  
- Regional Project Manager  
- Project Assistant/Communication Officer  
- Technical Advisors (Diesis, Euclid Network, Impact Hub and Oxfam Novib)  
- Gender Advisor  
- MEAL advisor  
- Grant Manager  
- Global Portfolio manager  
- Regional Head of Programs (Regional Platform)  
- National Project Management Unit (PMUs) Staff (Oxfam Affiliated entities + Southern Mediterranean Co-applicants) |
## Data Collection Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
<th>Lebanon</th>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Palestine</th>
<th>Tunisia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview with Country PMUs</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Level Stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National FGD With SESO Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interview with SESO Representatives</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation to Transnational FGD with PMUs</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Survey Respondents</td>
<td>78% (7)</td>
<td>100% (11)</td>
<td>64% (7)</td>
<td>58% (7)</td>
<td>92% (12)</td>
<td>78% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation to Working Group Discussion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation to Working Group Discussion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual interview with Social Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MedUp! Mid-Term Evaluation Pillars

1. Synergies across the entire MedUp! Consortium
2. Key engagement of MedUp! Teams & Partners
3. Data harmonization across countries
4. Micro, Meso, Macro and Regional level analysis
5. Cross-sectional Themes
6. Listening to Beneficiaries’ voices
7. Quick adaptability to actors and circumstances
8. Cross-validation of findings
9. Mutual learning and capitalization
10. Participatory and self-enforcing Learning Process
DAC CRITERIA (OECD-DAC, 2019)

- Relevance
- Coherence
- Impact
- Med-Up!
- Effectiveness
- Sustainability
- Efficiency

Too early to be assessed
RELEVANCE

Evaluation questions:

• Project’s ability to identify and respond to beneficiaries’ and local stakeholders’ needs and priorities;

• Appropriateness and inclusiveness beneficiaries’ selection process;

• Project’s ability to detect and tackle new emerging needs.
RELEVANCE

MAIN FINDINGS

✓ MACRO, MESO and MICRO level beneficiaries’ actual needs properly identified and tackled by MedUp!;

✓ Gender and geographical INCLUSIVE SELECTION process of beneficiary SEs;

✓ A flexible and adaptable project response to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

✉️ Lack of stable SESO’s commitment to the project activities
Evaluation questions:

• Is the project conformed to implementing organizations’ vision and mission?

• To what extent is the intervention harmonized with other existing activities?

• Is project in line with
  → MENA region priorities and strategies?
  → national priorities and strategies?
  → international priorities and strategies (SDGS)?
COHERENCE

MAIN FINDINGS

✓ Partners’ vision and mission are aligned and coherent to MedUp! objectives;

✓ Current MENA region projects and initiatives are working in synergy with MedUp! and/or offer potential for further synergy;

✓ Where present the project shows to be fully consistent with national policies framework on SEs;

✓ MedUp! further develops the EU cooperation strategy in the MENA region;

✓ MedUp! project is both directly and indirectly contributing to the achievement of SDGs.
EFFECTIVENESS

Evaluation questions:

• To what extent the project contributed to macro-level OUTCOME (iOC1)
  meso-level OUTCOME (iOC2)
  micro-level OUTCOME (iOC3)

• In case of operational adjustments, did any efficiency-effectiveness trade off arise?

• Has a gender sensitive approach been applied, while implementing all the activities?
EFFECTIVENESS

MAIN FINDINGS

MACRO
✓ Interviewed policy-level beneficiaries have benefitted from MedUp! project activities;

MESO
✓ SESOs’ average evaluation of MESO level project activities is, overall, positive;

MICRO
✓ The financial and technical support provided by MedUp! is helping SEs in expanding their business and their social/environmental impact;
✓ An overall positive feedback emerges as for the effectiveness of the project in improving gender-related aspects of SEs’ activities and generated effects.
EFFECTIVENESS

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- Low visibility and a weak project “marketing”. However, this aspect was said to be decisively improved since the hiring of a Project Assistant/Communication officer;

- Quite unclear implementing strategy for the gender component across the project’s activities.
EFFICIENCY

Evaluation questions:

• Have human and financial resources been properly used to maximize outputs?
• Were the objectives timely reached?
• Was partners’ expertise conformed to project needs and objectives?
• Is current management and governance structure of the project fully functional to reach the project’s objectives?
• Did internal governance guarantee inclusiveness of decision-making processes?
EFFICIENCY

MAIN FINDINGS

✓ Despite external constraints, the project has been **timely reaching its results** so far with minor delays;
✓ **Participative budget design**: allocation of financial resources is generally perceived to be **equitable and well-balanced across countries**;
✓ Effective coordinating role and high responsiveness by Oxfam IT;
✓ A **remarkable governance structure** aiming at ensuring both efficiency and inclusiveness of decision-making processes;
✓ **Cooperation within countries’ PMUs** is efficient, smooth and based on effective mutual support;
✓ Overall smooth collaboration among project partners;
✓ **Diversity and complementarity of partners’ expertise** perceived as key factors in pursuing project objectives.
EFFICIENCY

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Once the complex and inclusive project governance structure is implemented on the ground, it sometimes slows down the flow of the decision-making process, mostly due to numerous communication exchanges collecting feedbacks from all partners.

- Risk of excessive compartmentalization of partners’ tasks

- Multi-country rather than a regional project: intermittent connection and dialogue among project countries;

- Good and complementary overall consortium expertise but single partners’ expertise not fully exploited
SUSTAINABILITY

Evaluation questions:

• Are benefits likely to continue after the project ceased?
• To what extent technical, financial, environmental, social and institutional sustainability is ensured?
• Which kind of measures have been already put in place to ensure future sustainability of the project? Which ones still need to be further strengthened?
SUSTAINABILITY

MAIN FINDINGS

✓ Good premises for long-lasting benefits: all the five dimensions of sustainability are being addressed by putting in place concrete actions at all levels;

✓ MICRO-level beneficiaries provide premises of project long-lasting impact potentials, mainly thanks to a) the tailored selection of the most promising SEs where sustainability was identified as a selection criteria and b) to the project approach in targeting multiple levels of the countries’ SE ecosystem.
SUSTAINABILITY

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Allowing for a multi-level dialogue and synergy across SE ecosystem levels;
- Stimulating the creation of both strategic and operational partnerships and networks at national and international levels;
- Boosting local stakeholders’ engagement and ownership;
- Engaging financial players and the private sector in the SE ecosystem;
- A need to move from a micro-management to a more strategic-oriented approach in order to ensure the project’s sustainability;
- More efforts are needed to further boost SEs’ financial sustainability.
Learning & Capitalization

During the two Working Group Sessions, Lessons Learnt and Potential Concrete Actions have been discussed in order to collectively elaborate recommendations for the next years of the project implementation.

Topics discussed during the Working Groups*:

- How can we keep a high SESOs’ commitment to the project activities?
- How should the gender-sensitive approach be translated into project activities?
- During the project’s implementation, how can dialogue and synergy be fostered between project partners?
- How can we foster dialogue and synergy across and within SE ecosystem levels (micro, meso, macro level stakeholders)?
- Which are the best strategies to boost local stakeholders’/actors’ ownership of the project’s effects and approach?
- Which aspects of the project’s strategy could be further developed/revised?

*outcomes of the WG discussions are summarised in the Mid-Term Evaluation report
Recommendations from the evaluators:

FOSTERING SESOs ENGAGEMENT (I)

- Start an in-depth dialogue with more committed SESOs in order to build with them a “modular” training set-up for upcoming MedUp! trainings;

- Link the capacity building and networking components in such a way to enable SESOs to acquire the skills to take advantage of networking opportunities;

- Organize more business/partnership oriented networking events allowing SESOs to meet potential partners, clients (SEs) and sources of funding;

- Leverage an effective communication when offering “MedUp! package” of activities, opportunities and advantages to SESOs.
Recommendations from the evaluators:

- FOSTERING SESOs ENGAGEMENT (II)

- Create a label for SESOs and SEs that will identify MESO and MICRO level organizations with are effectively supporting the SENT ecosystems, allowing for their visibility and recognition;

- Support the creation/formalization of national “Social Entrepreneurship Clubs” in project countries engaging SEs and SESOs;

- Launch a regional award-winning competition for SEs-SESOS from project countries.
Recommendations from the evaluators:

STRENGTHENING MEDUP! GENDER COMPONENT

- Ask the Gender Team to design brief practical guidelines instructing project implementors on the meaning of a gender-sensitive approach and on how to translate the latter in concrete actions when carrying out project activities;

- Provide SESOs with tailored gender guidelines, during capacity building activities;

- Inform SESOs with gender-related data showcasing statistics on main benefits and impact of WSEs as well as SEs working for gender empowerment.
Recommendations from the evaluators:

- Organize a **roundtable every 2-3 months**, facilitated by Oxfam IT, mainly between project PMUs, but also gathering technical partners and advisors, project affiliates, regional platform actors and beneficiaries’ representatives, depending on the topic of discussion. As for the latter, we advise to set up a **participatory agenda** where all partners can propose the topic to be discussed;

- Take into consideration the possibility to use a dedicated **online platform** to improve the Consortium direct and informal dialogue (e.g. Slack).
Recommendations from the evaluators:

- Leverage **networking events** as tools to boost local stakeholders’ ownerships and learning;
- Foster **external synergies** and **alignments with other projects**;
- Increase the **PMUs connection with European Union delegations** in project countries.
Recommendations from the evaluators:

ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES IMPOSED BY COVID-19 OUTBREAK (I)

MACRO

- Focus the awareness-raising actions on **highlighting and promoting SEs’ positive contribution** in tackling and alleviating social problems. (e.g. by publicizing meaningful examples of SEs which are sustainably solving collective issues in the current setting);

- As far as financial institutions are concerned, lobby and **emphasize SEs’ ability to attract and repay credit**.

MESO

- Provide SESOs with a **list of free digital tools** that can be used for online networking and cooperation (to do so, the creation of on-demand digital short lessons might be considered);

- Emphasise **digitalization**.
Recommendations from the evaluators:

ADDRESSING THE CHALLENGES IMPOSED BY COVID-19 OUTBREAK (II)

- Promote SEs’ financial liquidity, first of all by enhancing their capacities to access financing opportunities. To be more effective, this activity might be carried out with the direct involvement of financial institutions, selected in each Country by the PMUs;

- Exploring crowdfunding opportunities for SEs, along with the enhancement of SEs’ self-branding skills in order to become more attractive to private investors;

- For SEs having an online market potential, technical support could encompass e-commerce techniques and tools;

- Share with SEs a list of free digital tools to work online, together with an up-to-date list of grants, donations and emergency funds made available after the pandemic outbreak;

- Consider little modifications to the sub-granting procedures.
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