

Call for Expression of Interest Terms of Reference Evaluation

Evaluation of Welthungerhilfe's Experiences with the "Nexus" of Humanitarian Aid, Development Cooperation and Peace

1. Contracting Party

Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V. is one of the larger Non-Governmental Organisations in Germany operating in the field of Humanitarian Assistance and Development. It was established in 1962, as the German section of the "Freedom from Hunger Campaign", one of the world's first initiatives aimed at the eradication of hunger. Welthungerhilfe's work is dedicated to the following vision: "All people have a right to a self-determined life in dignity and justice, free from hunger and poverty".

In 2017, Welthungerhilfe and its partner organisations ran 410 international projects in 38 countries with an overall financing volume of 229,4 Million Euros, comprised of private donations, public national and international funds. WHH has a decentralized structure with over 28 Country Offices abroad. The sector portfolio of Welthungerhilfe's project work in 2017 roughly splits up in Humanitarian Aid (33.2%), Food and Nutrition Security (21.9%), Agriculture and Natural Resources (15%), Economic Development (10.1%), Civil Society and Empowerment (6,4%), Water Sanitation and Hygiene (6.3%) and others (7.1%).

2. Background and Context of the Evaluation:

2.1. Introduction and Context, Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD)

The primary goal of Welthungerhilfe's strategy is to improve sustainable food and nutrition security as part of its overall mandate to fight hunger and poverty and realizing people's right to food. Over the last decades, Welthungerhilfe has developed a large and diverse portfolio in this field, addressing hunger, food insecurity and nutritional deficiencies in different population groups, at the individual-, household- or community- and regional levels. Welthungerhilfe has also implemented humanitarian and short-term interventions to respond to acute humanitarian crises during conflicts, aftershocks and following extreme weather events.

Historically, in 1998, Welthungerhilfe having had two distinct units "Emergency Unit" and "Development Unit" merged these two into one Programme Unit in order to pursue the "Linking Relief, Rehabilitation, and Development Approach (LRRD) in the framework of 'New Humanitarianism'". Two aspects are important: there should be as much as possible a follow-up from emergency to rehabilitation/transitional aid and then development cooperation, a so called development "continuum". Practical experiences however showed, that this "continuum" could only hardly be met due to legal and funding implications, as well

as interfering or overlay of new (un-) expected crisis. Instead of a “continuum” one could observe a “contiguuum”, the implementation of emergency assistance, rehabilitation and development oriented project or project activities at the same time, to various extend, side by side in a given geographical emergency area or crisis scenario.

LRRD is also considered as one of the core references concept of the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) strategy on Humanitarian Assistance. **The “Strategy of the [German] Federal Foreign Office for Humanitarian Assistance Abroad” (Berlin, Nov. 2012, see p. 5 ff) states that in practice there is often no clear distinction between different stages of humanitarian assistance.** It differentiates between “immediate emergency assistance”, “ongoing emergency assistance” and “transitional humanitarian assistance”. Within the scope of these three, GFFO promotes integrated disaster reduction measures, which is also reiterated in it’s 2019-2023 Strategy (Strategie des Auswärtigen Amts zur humanitären Hilfe im Ausland, Berlin o.J., www.auswaertiges-amt.de).

The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development has at its disposal the newly developed recovery and rehabilitation instrument, which being part of development cooperation follows the principles of that sphere. Recovery and rehabilitation are aimed at strengthening the resilience of local communities, civil society players and (state) institutions at the dynamic interface between the Federal Foreign Office’s humanitarian assistance and long-term development cooperation through recovery and rehabilitation. (see also: “Closing the gap – The German Perspective on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus” by Ralf Schroeder and Mirko Schilbach in Rural 21, 1/2019, p. 17-20; www.rural21.com).

2.2. Going beyond LRRD:

Ongoing discussion at international level on Humanitarian Aid and Development Cooperation nexus:

Between the two, the “International Humanitarian Assistance” and the “International Development Cooperation” there are fundamental differences, most prominently the “Humanitarian Principles” based on the Geneva Convention: impartiality of aid, neutrality, unconditionality, rendering of life saving measures in times of need. Impartiality dictates providing unconditional humanitarian aid based on needs, whereas development assistance is often made conditional on the adoption of measures and policies deemed necessary to spur the type of society changes supported by the donors. International Development Cooperation however is more focused on long term social and economic development, reduction of poverty and even structural change to ensure social security. This is even more true for triple nexus peacebuilding-security: clear transformative agenda geared at societal change. Preconditions for its impact are factors like ownership of partner countries/partners, harmonization of strategies and programmes, international and bilateral agreements.

A more detailed description can be found in Kocks et al.: “Building Bridges Between International Humanitarian and Development Responses to Forced Migration” (EBA Report 2018:2 Stockholm 2018 (www.eba.se) and DEval Germany (www.deval.org)). See over there

p. 22 “Figure 2: Two worlds: international humanitarian assistance and development cooperation” also p. 44 Table 1: “Concepts of the humanitarian-development nexus” and p. 48 ff.: “Table 2: Different levels of the humanitarian-development sphere”; and the analytical framework, which orients itself on seven “gaps”: (1) A vision and strategy gap, (2) A funding gap, (3) Planning gap, (4) Institutional gap, (5) Geographic gap, (6) Ownership gap, (7) Sequence gap. (for more details see Kocks et al.: “Building bridges", 2018, p. 54-56).

Besides this, during the last two decades the idea of disaster preparedness, as well as fostering programmes and projects with the objective of strengthening the resilience of communities, could gain more importance in order to mitigate the occurrence of humanitarian crisis. At the same time there is a growing complexity of humanitarian crisis with “no end in sight”, so called **protracted crisis**, especially and most prominently the refugee crisis in Syria with neighboring countries or internally displaced people in Kenya (Dadab) and Sudan (Dafur), just to mention a few.

The World Humanitarian Summit 2016 in Istanbul addressed this “**Humanitarian – Development Divide**”. International donors and UN OCHA and UNDP came up with the so-called “**Grand Bargain**” initiative, to start considering development oriented aspects in humanitarian interventions early, right from the beginning, especially in fragile states. There is an expressed intention, that there will be more cooperation, exchange and coordination, also involving humanitarian oriented organisations and development oriented organisations when it comes to situational and needs assessments. Actual planning and implementation of humanitarian intervention should still be kept separately, in order to stick to the humanitarian principles. However, the “Grand Bargain” and the initiative “Charter for Change” also comprises of principles to design humanitarian assistance as local as possible and as direct a possible. “**Localization**” of first responders in humanitarian aid here means to support and invest in local, national and regional leadership, capacity strengthening and response systems...” and “Commit to empower national and local humanitarian action by increasing the share of financing accessible to local and national humanitarian actors and supporting the enhancement of their national delivery systems, capacities and preparedness planning.”

Another important distinction between humanitarian aid and development cooperation which is key: International development assistance tends to be state-centric. Such assistance hardly ventures into rebel-held territory. Humanitarian action is people-centric and tends to focus on underserved areas that are often neglected by or outside the effective control of the state. See here <http://alternatives-humanitaires.org/en/2019/03/25/revisiting-nexus-numbers-principles-issue-social-change/> by ICRC Vice-President Gilles Carbonnier.

2.3. Humanitarian - Development - Peace Nexus:

The report “One humanity: shared responsibility” of the Secretary-General for the Humanitarian Summit demands that: “Humanitarian and development actors need to work collaboratively across silos and mandates to implement plans with a clear and measurable collective outcome that reduces the vulnerability of internally displaced persons over the

longer term. Displaced people and host communities must be actively involved in the design and implementation of those outcomes.“ (UN General Assembly A/70/709 “One humanity: shared responsibility”. Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit, 2 Febr. 2016; see also: Startnetwork: Localisation in Practice: Emerging Indicators & Practical Recommendations; Global Mentoring Initiative, June 2018).

Within the OECD the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Recommendation on the Humanitarian – Development - Peace Nexus was adopted by the DAC at its Senior Level Meeting on 22 February 2019. At the centre of strengthening the coherence between humanitarian, development and peace efforts, is the aim of effectively reducing people’s needs, risks and vulnerabilities, supporting prevention efforts and thus shifting from delivering humanitarian assistance to ending needs. The DAC calls for “...strengthened policy and operational coherence [...] and building more complementary between humanitarian, development and peace actions”. (see: OECD, DAC Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus, OECD/LEGAL/5019, 2019). In the following the headings of the recommendations to better programming are summarized.

With reference to better Programme within the nexus, OECD DAC recommends that adherents should:

- 1.: Prioritise prevention, mediation and peacebuilding, investing in development whenever possible, while ensuring immediate humanitarian needs continue to be met,
- 2.: Putt People at the centre, tackling exclusion and promoting gender equality,
- 3.: Ensure that activities do no harm, are conflict sensitive to avoid unintended negative consequences and maximize positive effects across humanitarian, development and peace actions,
- 4.: Align joined-up programming with the risk environment,
- 5.: Strengthen national and local capacities,
- 6.: Invest in learning and evidence across humanitarian, development and peace actions.

The United Nations Sustainable Development Group & Interagency Standing Committee in it’s “Key messages on the Humanitarian -Development Nexus and its Links to Peace” from 22 March 2019 reiterates that “1.: Against the back drop of the SDGs—with the promise of leaving no one behind, ending needs by reducing risks and vulnerabilities is now a shared commitment within the UN and the IASC” furthermore [...] “Reducing the impact of protracted crisis on affected populations requires both meeting immediate needs, and investing in the medium to long term to reduce chronic vulnerabilities and risks affecting communities.” [...] “Aid Actors [= Humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding Agencies, Donors, and bilateral institutions] must evolve their thinking and working methods to address these issues more coherently.”

Oftentimes, at practical terms there is a mix of “peace” with “security agenda”, which is also an important point to be addressed here.

2.4. “Strengthen humanitarian aid and link it with development”: The Welthungerhilfe Strategy 2017 – 2020”:

The Welthungerhilfe Strategy 2017-2020 highlights that: “**We are aware that there is no linear model from humanitarian aid to development.** Often development efforts are interrupted by humanitarian needs. We are therefore engaged in relevant national and international networks, cooperate with partners and have the expertise to support people in situations of distress as well as in their efforts to get out of hunger and poverty sustainably. Strengthening resilience of people is our main guiding principle at the interface of humanitarian aid and development cooperation. **We continue to follow the LRRD (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development) concept, applying the contiguuum approach.**” (The “WHH Strategy 2017-2020”, WHH Bonn, Sept. 2016, p.4).

By February 2017 Welthungerhilfe Board of Directors approved the “**Welthungerhilfe Humanitarian Strategy 2017-2020**”, as a supplement and in line to the overall Welthungerhilfe Strategy 2017-2020” (Welthungerhilfe Humanitarian Strategy 2017-2020, WHH Bonn, 2017). Simultaneously new Emergency Structures were defined applying to all humanitarian stakeholder units in Welthungerhilfe across units in Germany and Country Offices. Content wise the Strategy is focusing on WHH’s core sectorial strengths in emergencies:

(i) Food and Nutrition Security in emergencies, (ii) WASH, (iii) Basic infrastructure, (iv) Shelter, settlements & non-food items, where Welthungerhilfe wants to further build up own capacities and profile. In addition, the strategy indicated needs for preparedness to be strengthened to ensure professional and effective response to emergencies.

2.5. Humanitarian Programming

Humanitarian Programming is part of the humanitarian paradigm shift in Welthungerhilfe. What entails is shown in a respective [Humanitarian eFlash Humanitarian Programming](#). The underlying principle is that the decision on development interventions should be based on the risks and dangers to which people are exposed (risk informed development programming). The aim of Welthungerhilfe’s development efforts is to strengthen the population’s resistance to these risks and dangers (**Resilience**). Thus, resilience building efforts represent the humanitarian-development nexus in Welthungerhilfe.

The implications of humanitarian programming are two-fold. For our country programmes. **Welthungerhilfe learns from loss and damages** caused by disasters in the respective countries, and from this derives measures to strengthen the resilience of people. In addition, country programming incorporates risk analysis as a central element for **risk informed development programming** towards resilience building and sustainability of Welthungerhilfe interventions. Here the results of the country **Risk Analysis**, which is already an integral part of the Emergency Preparedness & Response Planning described in a respective [Humanitarian eGuide EPRReP](#) used in the on-going [EPRReP Roll-out](#) in WHH programme countries. The Risk Analysis is used in a multi-fold manner in Welthungerhilfe, e.g. in MACP in order to come up with and work on a resilience strategy which in principle

can be both, people - as well as state centric. Advocacy efforts to mandatory integrate risk analysis in MACP are on-going. The MACP format is currently under revision with the aim to finalize it in 3rd quarter of 2019 most probably with a more focused approach on a Multi Annual Country Strategy (MACS). (For info on index for risk management see: <http://www.inform-index.org/InDepth/Methodology> , see: Inform).

2.6. State fragility amplifies risks, vulnerability and hinders long term development commitment in project planning and implementation

Most humanitarian assistance rendered by WHH takes place in so called “fragile states”, these are states in which the government is not willing or able to fulfil its core functions regarding security, legitimacy/rule of law and basic services. The OECD Report States of Fragility 2016 defines fragility as a “Combination of exposure to risks and insufficient coping capacity of the state, system and/or communities to manage, absorb or mitigate those risks. Fragility can lead to negative outcomes, including violence, the breakdown of institutions, dis-placement, humanitarian crisis or other emergencies”. In brief “fragility” is seen as a mix of risks and capacities over five dimensions: (1) economic, (2) environmental, (3) political, (4) security, (5) social (see: Ashoff, 2018).

In fragile states, there are specific issues and challenges for International NGOs (INGO) like Welthungerhilfe in project planning and implementation, in strengthening local Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and systemic issues and challenges in INGOs engagement: (1) Risk of INGOs bypassing the state and creating parallel structures, (2) Risk of INGOs undermining governments accountability vis-à-vis their own citizens, (3) Risk of INGOs reinforcing tensions in contexts of conflicts and societal mistrust, (4) Risks of leaving INGOs and national CSOs largely unaccountable (e.g. unintentionally fostering fraudulent service delivery or exclusionary national CSO (Ashoff, 2018)).

Within this context, awareness is there that INGOs involved in peacebuilding processes “to strengthen fragile states” risk getting embroiled in highly politicized processes. Peacebuilding is a politically-laden process where “the State” is expected to take the lead and faces opposition, not least by civil society. High risk of losing one’s acceptance as neutral and impartial organization if getting involved one-sidedly with civil society actors. Risk of endangering security of local NGOs who are perceived as “spies” working for external foreign agencies and risk that INGOs is perceived as following a “hidden political agenda.”

3. Rational, objectives and users of the evaluation on Humanitarian Aid, Development Cooperation and Peace Nexus

The evaluation study is of major interest for the WHH Programme Department and it’s units, here especially the Humanitarian Directorate (HD), the Donor Relations Unit (DON) as well as the Sector Strategy Knowledge and Learning Unit (SEC), the Regional Directorates and their Country Offices. Director Programmes for strategic alignment and steering, RDs for strategic decision making and regional programming and monitoring, CD for programme (MACP + Annual) and project development. DON/HD for positioning with donors, DON

lobbying for flexibility in funding, Policy and External Relations (PER)/HD for advocacy with political decision makers and governments.

The intended use is foremost fourfold:

- i) Identify existing and impactful approaches to work in fragile contexts and protracted crisis which take into consideration both the short-term humanitarian need and the long term development perspective (contiguum).
- ii) Give indications to decide for WHH whether or to which extend the peace component in the triple nexus needs to be taken into consideration in future planning. And if yes, how: Through building up own expertise, external short term expertise or through consortia partners? This also should imply the consideration of risk analysis in particular with regard to reputation and acceptance (see above neutrality and impartiality in highly politicized contexts, eg Sahel region)?
- iii) Provide best practices approaches in contiguum approaches to Country Programmes.
- iv) Feed into WHH position and into pragmatic conceptual framework on the (triple) Nexus.

Finally, objective and utilization of the evaluation study is also to contribute to the positioning of Welthungerhilfe in the German national- (VENRO, BMZ, GFFO) and international discourse on Humanitarian Assistance, Development Cooperation and Peace nexus (ALLIANCE2015, ALNAP, start network, OCHA).

4. Key questions Components or core elements to be analysed or evaluated / Core questions towards the evaluation (to be more refined in the Inception Report):

4.1. Previous programming experience with LRRD and the “Nexus”:

4.1.1: What are the experiences and learnings from previous emergency countries, where LRRD and the shift to transitional and longer-term development programming have already been implemented? Are there good examples of “connectedness”, where planning and providing humanitarian assistance was done in a way that enabled connectivity to longer-term development efforts? Are there any WHH Country Offices (or specific WHH projects/ programmes) where WHH can rightly claim of having fostered institutional changes (be it at state- and/or non-state actor level) to promote linkages between humanitarian assistance and development cooperation in the last fifteen years? What were the most influential factors for these?

4.1.2.: To what extent and how is risk-informed development programming applied, i.e. finds risk analysis consideration in Welthungerhilfe programme and project planning? Further, to what extent and how does Welthungerhilfe learn from loss and damages caused by disasters in the respective countries, and from this derives

measures to strengthen the resilience of people. In addition, is there a common coherent understanding between the Humanitarian Directorate in Bonn and respective Country Offices on Emergency Preparedness Response Planning (EPRoP) and Welthungerhilfe Emergency Structures? Perceived ownership for EPRoP and major influencing factors supporting, fostering this ownership?

4.1.3.: Localization and working with partners:

To what extent does WHH have successful approaches to work with Civil Society Organisations in fragile contexts and in protracted crisis ensuring both long-term development and short-term humanitarian impact at the same time?

Is „Localization“, which essentially includes capacity-building of local actors resilience, present in the mind of WHH Country Offices and clearly visible in the MACPs or special programme/ project approaches? Any deliberate support for “Localization” by WHH Head Office or (international) networking? Are there any recommendable outstanding examples, observations of good practices at WHH or partner level in this regard? Are there any outstanding examples, whereby local national Civil Society Organisations approached and inspired Welthungerhilfe to go beyond humanitarian assistance and strategically enter into development cooperation? Is there a common understanding on the “Do no harm”, conflict sensitive programming and implementation between WHH and partners? Evidence of good practices at field level? Appropriate capacity building approaches on “Do no harm” by Welthungerhilfe, especially in fragile contexts?

4.2.: Human Resources & WHH staff or WHH partner capacity (local and expat):

Acknowledging the triple nexus: which implications has this to WHH programmes/ projects considering the core competences of WHH in humanitarian aid and development (not peacebuilding)?

Are there indications for any intrinsic staff motivation, respectively incentives for members of staff to actively support the humanitarian and development cooperation nexus? Any aspects of short and long-term employment within Welthungerhilfe, staff capacity development approaches or partner capacity development approaches in this regard? How will capacities with partner organizations be strengthened in order to conduct programme work that fosters the nexus? Any recommendations or options to amplify a more integrated approach?

4.3.: Perception by international-, national- and state level agencies and institutions towards WHH especially in humanitarian project/intervention work: How does WHH work with government structures and how does this work affect the strategy on peace and conflict mitigation/ peace building?

How is the perception by state level agencies and institutions towards Welthungerhilfe in Germany and “in the field” or Country Office level? Do they perceive Welthungerhilfe as an organisation with equally well capacities in Humanitarian Assistance and Development Cooperation? Do they consider this two-fold mandate as an advantage in comparison to other German NGO or International NGO with a more focused, single mandate?

Do German and European resp. international Co-Funding agencies, who are bound either to humanitarian aid or to development cooperation specific budget lines see it as an advantage, that Welthungerhilfe facilitates both? ...that when it comes to funding and budgeting Welthungerhilfe (skillfully) “orchestrates” between the various co-funders, decision makers, resource mobilizers in humanitarian aid and development cooperation?

4.4.: What would be a good analytical, pragmatic and manageable framework in grasping the essence of the Humanitarian -Development -Peace Nexus at WHH and WHH Country Office level, which may be useful in analysing the actual status and (un/used) potential and which may serve as a reference in designing / steering its programme strategy and set up? See also the analytical framework by Kocks et al. (Vision gap, funding gap, planning gap etc.) mentioned in chapter 2.2, the OECD DAC Recommendations in chapter 2.3, and also the elaborations in chapter 2.5 on Humanitarian Programming and need for risk/loss/damage informed programming.

5. Evaluation Approach

5.1 Desk phase:

Studying of documents, besides project planning, monitoring and reporting documents, especially also Multi Annual Country Plans (MACP) and Annual Reports & Plans to get an insight into the humanitarian mindset of Country Offices towards humanitarian assistance, i.e. the consideration of risks, vulnerability, lack of coping capacities, hazards & exposures, learning from loss and damage in their rehabilitation and development programming, and EPRoP. Information gathering, interviews or focal group discussions with core members of WHH Bonn Office and selected WHH Country Offices (in writing or skype etc.), as well representatives of WHH partners, Civil Society Organisations, Co-Funders.

Clarification of TOR, draft analytical framework, Inception Report.

5.2 Field phase:

Visit to three max. four WHH Country Offices including respective partner and stakeholder consultations. Co-Funding Agencies.

At the end of the field phase reflection workshop with reference group (WHH small working group, kind of sounding board, who will go along with the evaluation process) on preliminary results and on data validation.

Compilation of good practices.

5.3 Synthesis phase:

Draft report, reflection on draft report, feedback loop with WHH Country Offices and WHH Bonn and selected stakeholders.

Final presentation of the report, recommendations and good practices on the occasion of a reflection workshop at WHH Bonn Office.

Final report and summary.

6. Products, deliverables

The following products should be generated by the evaluation:

- 6.1 Inception Report in which the evaluation design and also the outline of the final report will be defined.
- 6.2 Reflection workshop in between with the reference group on preliminary insights.
- 6.3 Final report with systematic reflection on the abovementioned leading core questions of the evaluation and recommendations (not to exceed 40 pages, plus annexes). Summary of final report.
- 6.4 Collection and systematic compilation of “good practices” (two to three case studies/ examples, max. five pages each).
- 6.5 Final presentation of the report, recommendations and good practices on the occasion of a reflection workshop at WHH Bonn Office.

7. Geographic location

Due to limited resources and efficiency considerations, core resource persons from all country offices can be interviewed, however the evaluation study should concentrate more intensively on max. four country offices, from which three - four should be visited at field level. Of importance will be also to interview external partners in the respective countries not only own staff in order to reflect on overall pros and cons of the nexus approach in the specific context, and on experiences from other stakeholders in the region.

Welthungerhilfe Country Offices with high preference to be selected (still to be decided, preferably at least one Country Office per Regional Directorate) will be:

RDs	Country	Remarks
1 W-Africa/Caribbean	Haiti	earthquake, hurricane
1 W-Africa/Caribbean	DR Congo	violence / IDPs
1 W-Africa/Caribbean	Central African Republic	violence/ IDPs
2 E-Africa/MENA	Turkey/ Syria	violence/ refugees
2 E-Africa/MENA	South Sudan	drought/ violence/ IDPs
2 E-Africa/MENA	Sudan	drought/ violence IDPs
2 E-Africa/MENA	Somaliland	drought
2 E-Africa/MENA	Ethiopia	drought

2 E-Africa/MENA	Madagascar	preparedness
3 Asia	Pakistan	flood/
3 Asia	Afghanistan	flood, drought, IDPs

8. Planning, Time Frame, Resources and Activities of the Evaluators

Time Frame:

Pending on the availability of a qualified evaluator, the evaluation (field phase) preferably should be conducted between mid of July / beginning of August and mid of September 2019.

Draft Report by October, final report and presentation by November 2019. This is a tentative schedule, which provides room for feedback loops in between.

Estimated Work Volume (“Working Days”)

Approximately 53 days have to be calculated for the evaluation, depending on selection of locations for field visits, consultations, methodology and on empirical instruments applied. [The following is a tentative calculation].

	Description	days
a)	Briefing session Bonn (1 day)	01
b)	Desk study of documents and communication with Country Offices for preparation of field visits (3 days per country office x 4=12)	12
c)	Interviews and reflections with functionaries and staff in Bonn, WHH Central Office (2 days)	02
d)	Inception report (3 days)	03
e)	Field visits/ interviews/ data gathering at Country Office level: (approx. 5 days per Country Office 4x 5= 20)	20
f)	Reflection workshop, feedback with reference group	02
g)	“Good Practice collection and case studies”	03
h)	Analysis and Report writing, Draft and Final Reporting (8 days)	08
i)	Presentation of findings and final discussion in Bonn (1 day preparation plus 1 day in Bonn=2 days)	02
	Total	53

Remarks:

The evaluation preferably should be conducted partly or in total by a team of two, then, pending on the actual division of labor and actual evaluation design, one could consider an increase of the honorarium days by 20%.

[Due to budget restrictions the daily honorarium ceiling is limited to 500,- Euro per day (net, without taxes, if required additional taxes 19% - 21% (VAT or "Umsatzsteuer"))]

Air and land travel will be arranged for by Welthungerhilfe, local travel and accommodation taken over resp. reimbursed.

Besides the evaluator (or evaluation team) other Welthungerhilfe members of staff could be involved additionally, especially also at the field visit level phase (support for questionnaires, translation, interviewers etc.).

Qualification of the evaluator(s)

The evaluator/ evaluation team should have a sound background on Humanitarian Aid and Development Cooperation projects and programmes, International NGOs, and Civil Society Organisations. well versed with training methods, moderation, facilitation and outstanding skills in information and communication in intercultural settings.

In case a team will conduct the evaluation, mixed gender will be of advantage, as well as one person should have a working knowledge of French.

9. Requirements for the Expression of Interest

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 Tuesday 18th June, 2019..

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

bernhard.hoeper@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 (or link)
- Indicate 2 references who can be contacted
- Indicate daily honorarium



June 3, 2019

Only shortlisted candidates will be contacted by Welthungerhilfe.

Postal mailing address of Welthungerhilfe:

Welthungerhilfe e.V.
FD SEC; MEAL;
Attn: Bernhard Hoepfer
Friedrich-Ebert-Strasse: 1
53173 Bonn
GERMANY

.....