

## **Call for Expression of Interest**

### **Terms of Reference:**

### **Evaluation of Welthungerhilfe Programme in Somaliland 2008-2018**

**(20180908)**

## **1. Introduction and background**

### **Welthungerhilfe in Somaliland – Programme Overview**

Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V. is a German Non-Governmental Organization, operating in the field of Emergency Aid, International Development Cooperation and Assistance. The organization supports development partner organizations and is as well active with own staff in 28 Country Offices and support implementation of projects in 40 countries worldwide.

Welthungerhilfe has been active in Somaliland for the past 17 years. It has officially started in 2001 with a food security project in Baki District with a total budget of 1.013.308, - Euro funded by EU. However, WHH made preparations already in early 2000 with small project planning with 23.481, - Euro. The first WHH Somaliland office was in Borama and field office in Baki. It expanded in successive years by opening other field offices in Togdheer and Sanag. It continued to work in the three regions until 2008. For safety reasons, the field offices in Togdheer and Sanag were closed in 2008 and the intervention area has been limited in the Awdal Region since then. WHH had a liaison office in Hargeisa which closed in 2008 and has been reopened in 2017, now the WHH Country Program Office.

In the past 17 years, WHH Somaliland has worked for the poor people focusing on integrated food security, agriculture, natural resource management, education, health, resilience and on WASH. Recently with the reoccurring of climate related disasters, WHH has expanded its portfolio to include emergency response activities such as food distributions, water trucking and emergency-related cash-for-work.

The main donors have been the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the European Union (EU), and WHH itself own sources. The funding share of each is EU 34%, BMZ 54% and WHH the remaining 12% from the total of 16.502.891,- Euro during the whole 17 years.

After working such an extensive period of time in Somaliland, it is now intended to have a closer look into the mid- and long-term impact of the WHH program regarding the aim to

- i. strengthen resilience of the communities and their livelihoods to better withstand climate related disasters,
- ii. secure or even improve the natural resources base (water, soils, vegetation) for agriculture, horticulture and animal production,
- iii. provide the necessary and most effective inputs and linkages for improving livelihoods as well as living standards and
- iv. improve nutrition outcomes as an overall strategic objective of WHH

To achieve this objective, this evaluation will focus on the timeframe 2008-2018 and mainly on the activities in the Awdal Region. The evaluation is not to focus on the impact of specific projects but rather look on the programmatic level on how the overall set up of the activities have contributed towards the achievements of the above mentioned programmatic objectives.

## 2. Objectives of the evaluation/ major interest in the evaluation

The key objective of this evaluation is to analyze the engagement of WHH during the last 10 years in order to:

- i. Determine, if WHH has focused its project activities in the most relevant sectors of rural livelihoods and the rural economy to achieve the desired four impacts above.
- ii. Identify approaches and methods that have positively contributed towards sustainable improvement of the livelihood of communities in the Awdal region for a period of at least 5 years or more (evidence based).
- iii. Identify approaches and methods that have been implemented in past projects and that have positively impacted the ability of those communities to cope with the drought during the last two years (evidence based).
- iv. List key learnings regarding focus, approaches and/or methods that have been used and that did not show the expected sustainable impact on the communities.
- v. Based on the above, make recommendations for the WHH future programming with pastoralist /agro-pastoralist communities in Somaliland but also for other, similar regions, that will contribute to a better resilience in arid and semi-arid lands of the Greater Horn of Africa and beyond.

## 3. Elements to be evaluated/ criteria and core questions towards the evaluation

Elements or core questions of this evaluation are clustered around the below listed OECD DAC criteria. The consultant is free to add criteria, if well justified. Questions under each heading should be understood as priority research questions provided by the programme. They should stimulate the development of a much more complete catalogue of research questions, to be presented in an evaluation matrix. By doing so it is important to keep in mind that the period under assessment started in 2008. Thus, the questions should not only focus on the current status of the country programme but also on previous activities.

**3.1 Relevance and coverage:** To what extent have we and are we currently addressing the most urgent and in terms of population reached, their most important problems and bottlenecks for disaster resilience, livelihoods, natural resources safe-guarding and economic development? Do we reach the most vulnerable or disadvantaged segments of communities in the WHH project region? Has and is WHH taking the most prominent untapped capacities and underutilized potentials into account with our programming? Do we have plausible reasons for the choice of project regions?

**3.2 Effectiveness:** Are we reaching the WHH objectives? Are the WHH objectives necessary and sufficient to reach the desired outcomes and impact?

Does the WHH MEAL system capture the WHH effectiveness?

**3.3 Efficiency:** Have we and are we currently utilizing the most cost-effective approaches at WHH disposal to reach our objectives? Did we consider alternatives or innovations to reach the same objectives? Did we strive to reach larger populations / more communities / wider areas with the resources of the WHH projects and program? Are there any examples of resource-wastefulness?

Does the WHH MEAL system capture efficiency?

**3.4 Connectedness:** Were/Are the WHH actions intended and able to connect humanitarian interventions, disaster management and disaster prevention, disaster resilience, food and water security, livelihood enhancement and economic development for a sustainable improvement of living conditions? Is there proof in the past of good connectivity or failures in connecting humanitarian activities with the broader objectives?

Have the various projects in the country programme been supporting each other for reaching shared objectives? How has the programme approach, implemented in the last years, positively contributed to reaching the overall objective?

Does the WHH MEAL system capture connectedness?

**3.5 Coherence and Coordination:** Is the programme supportive or complementary to Government policies and priorities? Do the projects and does the programme take UN programming and guidelines into consideration? Within the programme areas, are there or have there been examples of the programme being supportive or complimentary to other actors' actions? Has the WHH programme actively coordinate with various actors and on various topics? If so, are there practical examples of programming modifications due to coordination?

In which way has and is WHH cooperating with Alliance2015 partners and is the Alliance2015 cooperation potential tapped?

Does the WHH MEAL system capture coherence and coordination?

**3.6 Impacts:** Observations on mid- and long-term impacts (if not covered in other chapters), respectively unexpected factors inhibiting intended mid- and long term impacts. Identification of those approaches that have led to the highest impact and of those activities that have not created impact as expected. (Also in regard to identifying lessons learnt for other regions working with pastoralist/agro-pastoralist communities if feasible)

Which would be the most useful and pragmatic indicators to measure impact of older interventions and foresee impact for new or recent interventions? Is there an in-built MEAL element to look at the impact of already closed project interventions?

**3.7 Cross-cutting issues:** Gender/age - are data generated in a gender/age-specific way? Has the program taken the different needs, capacities and vulnerabilities of different gender and age groups into consideration? Has there been sufficient cooperation with civil society that defend the rights or address needs of the different gender/age groups?

Environment: Have WHH actions caused any kind of environmental threat or environmental damage? Has the programme successfully addressed environmental challenges and actively contributed towards stabilizing or improving environmental conditions? Are the WHH environment-sensitive actions focusing on the natural resources base for production or are they pursuing wider environmental objectives for future generations? Have the activities by addressing natural-resource management positively contributed towards a better resilience to climate related shocks (mainly drought).

Conflict: In which way is the WHH programme actively conflict sensitive? Are the most likely conflict scenarios developed and counterchecked (with specialized agencies)? Are there any actions that have triggered or have the potential to trigger conflict? Which types of conflict? Has there been any conflicts caused unintentionally by previous actions?

Does the WHH MEAL system capture critical data in the above cross-cutting issues?

**3.8 Accountability and Learning:** Is there a beneficiary / stakeholder feedback system that is approachable for the resource-poor members of our target groups? In which way have target groups, private and government stakeholders access to programming and decision-making?

Did and currently does WHH have established reporting links and routines to important GoSL stakeholders and other institutions of relevance? How have they influenced our programming?

In which way does programme-triggered 'learning' and capacity building take place among WHH staff, beneficiaries and other stakeholders? Which is the contribution of the MEAL unit in Hargeisa for targeted learning?

[There is an understanding, that all the above mentioned questions can not equally well been analyzed, hence in view of limited resources, clarification and prioritization will be an issue for the inception report, after studying the bulk of Somaliland project- and programme documents.]

#### 4. Methodology

The evaluation will use both quantitative and qualitative methods. The main process of the evaluation and the proposed data sources should include the following:

Desk review of key programme- and project documents, as well as strategy and country papers of WHH and WHH Co-Funding agencies supporting prior to departure.

Interviews with WHH Bonn based members of staff and key informants involved in earlier Somaliland project and programme planning and implementation. Country Representative Somaliland, Head of Programme and key informants within WHH Somaliland staff, partners, community members; other stakeholders from local or national government agencies or donor community identified in the programme-/ project strategies; in-country key informant interviews, other institutional counterparts.

Analysis, interview, reflection on the perception of WHH co-funding support agencies on WHHs project work and priorities.

Interviews with people we aim to assist, individual or focus group discussions using open dialogue approaches to assess changes or verify indicated progress, perception of WHH supported project work at local and national governmental level

Direct observations/ project visits in country

The evaluator will develop a detailed plan for the evaluation in discussion with the Head of Programmes Somaliland, Regional Representative and Regional Directorate 2. Details will be finalized in the Inception Report.

#### 5. Initiator of the Evaluation:

WHH Regional Directorate Southern and Eastern Africa / MENA (RD2))  
Coordination: MEAL of the Sector Strategy Knowledge and Learning Unit

## 6. Users of the evaluation

User of the evaluation will be the Country Team in Somaliland for future project and programme design, the Regional Directorate 2 and here especially other countries in the regions regarding learnings that can be transferred generally for the WHH resilience programmes with pastoralist communities plus the Sector, Knowledge and Learning Unit.

## 7. Products

Finally, the following products should be generated by the evaluation:

- a) Following the Desk Study phase an Inception Report shall be presented in which the evaluation design and the outline of the final report will be defined.
- b) Final report with systematic reflection on the leading core questions of the evaluation and recommendations with respect to the core questions of the evaluation (see chapter 3), here also especially recommendations for the future programme and project work with respect to strategies, implementing partners, focal areas and management set up (not to exceed 40 pages, plus annexes). Stand alone summary of final report (3-5 pages).
- c) Presentationn of the key findings of the evaluation to Staff members in country (debriefing) and interested HO staff members.

## 8. Geographic location

WHH works in three regions and six districts: Maroodi Jeh (Hargeisa District), Gabiley (G. District) and Awdal (Borama, Baki, Lughaya and Zeylac Districts). Except for Zeylac, where hardly any sub-projects are implemented, all districts offer opportunities for learning.

The consultant will develop a set of criteria for the selection of project sites, based on his study of project documents and evaluation matrix. The programme team will develop a first suggested visit plan, that will be reviewed and refined during the first days in country. The choice of project sites (sub-projects) will be a balanced mix of success stories, problem cases and perhaps failures.

## 9. Resources and Activities of the Evaluators

### 9.1. Time frame:

Pending on the availability of a qualified evaluator, the evaluation preferably should be conducted between November 2018 until end of January 2019

Approximately 35 days have to be calculated for the evaluation, depending on selection of locations for field visits, consultations, methodology and on empirical instruments applied.

	<b>Description</b>	<b>days</b>
a)	Briefing session Bonn (1 day)	01
b)	Desk study of documents and communication with Regional Office in Addis Ababa and Programme Office in Hargeisa for preparation of field visits	05

c)	Inception report (3 days)	02
d)	Field visits/ interviews/ data gathering at Country Office level:	14
e)	Interviews and reflections with staff in Bonn and elsewhere via Skype (2 days)	02
f)	Analysis and Draft Report writing (7 days)	07
h)	Presentation of findings and final discussion in Bonn (1 day preparation plus 1 day in Bonn=2 days)	02
i)	Final report	02
	Total	35

#### Remarks:

Due to budget restrictions the daily honorarium ceiling is limited to 420,- Euro per day (net, without VAT taxes, which will be reimbursed additionally); air travel will be arranged for by Welthungerhilfe, local travel and accommodation taken over, resp. reimbursed.

#### Additional Resources will be provided by WHH Somaliland:

- WHH staff input / resource persons support at Regional Office, Programme Office and project level.
- Input from former staff members of the Somaliland Programme (List to be shared by RD)
- Support for questionnaires, interviewers etc.
- In country travel, meetings,

#### 9.2. Qualification of the evaluator(s)

The evaluator should have a sound background on evaluation of integrated rural programmes in precarious environmental settings.

He/ She should have proven experiences with project-/ programme management and actual implementation of livelihood programmes/ agricultural projects as well as sound knowledge and skills on monitoring and evaluation methods.

Knowledge of the working methods and the organisational vision and mission of WHH are an added asset.

Female candidates are strongly encouraged to apply. There is no added risk for female evaluators in Somaliland but added advantage, as female evaluators can approach men and women equally. In case a team will conduct the evaluation, mixed gender will be prioritized.

#### 10. How to apply, indicate expression of interest:

Applications/ Expressions of Interest are invited from suitable qualified consultants.

**Closing date for the indication of interest is Monday, 24<sup>th</sup> September 2018, 16:00 hrs (MEZ).**

Please send your application / expression of interest via e-mail to:

[Bernhard.hoeper@welthungerhilfe.de](mailto:Bernhard.hoeper@welthungerhilfe.de) with cc copy to

[andrea.padberg@welthungerhilfe.de](mailto:andrea.padberg@welthungerhilfe.de)

**Please ensure that you submit full tendering information including:**

- a cover letter (of not more than two pages)
- your CV (resp, also if applies: CV of the proposed team member, if any)
- sample written work on a relevant topic
- 2 references

**Alternative to e-mail: Postal mailing address of Welthungerhilfe:**

Welthungerhilfe e.V.  
SEC\_MEAL Unit  
Attn: Bernhard Hoeper  
Friedrich-Ebert-Strasse: 1  
53173 Bonn  
GERMANY

.....