

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Evaluation of the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action 2010-15

1 Introduction

The Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action 2010-15 (the Strategy) was launched in September 2009. It sets out the overall objectives; outlines key directions and priorities for Danish action and outlines the instruments that will be used in the implementation.

Annually, about 10% of the total Danish Development Cooperation budget is allocated to humanitarian aid, mainly through multilateral contributions and support to NGOs. The annual budget for humanitarian assistance amounts to approximately DKK 1.5 billion, often augmented through reallocations in the overall aid budget and the aid budget reserve to reach an annual level of approximately DKK 1.7 billion.

The Strategy stipulates that its implementation will be subject to an independent review in 2012 and an evaluation in 2015 in order to feed into the formulation of a new Humanitarian Strategy in 2016. For the evaluation of the Strategy to be relevant and timely for this important process, it has been decided to begin the evaluation in 2014 with a follow-up phase in 2015, thus enabling the evaluation to provide relevant and updated input in the process of revision of the Strategy. The Humanitarian Department in the MFA is as part of its active international engagement in further developing thinking about humanitarian issues and new trends engaged in the preparation of the recently announced UN hosted Humanitarian Summit to take place in Istanbul in the beginning of 2016. Hence, the evaluation will also inform the preparation process for this summit.

These Terms of Reference (ToR) outline the evaluation focus, scope and key evaluation questions to be answered in the evaluation. The ToR are based on an initial approach paper elaborated as part of the preparation process towards the end of 2013.

2 Background and objectives of the Strategy

The Danish Strategy for Development Cooperation, *The Right to a Better Life*, approved in 2012, emphasises the Danish engagement in fragile states and the alleviation of humanitarian needs and contribution to protection in humanitarian crises through one of four strategic priority areas, namely stability and protection. The Strategy underlines the importance of building coherence and synergies between humanitarian efforts and long-term development efforts.¹

The objectives of Denmark's humanitarian action are to save and protect lives, alleviate suffering and promote the dignity and rights of civilians in crisis situations; as well as to initiate recovery, build resilience to and prevent future crises by breaking the cycle between crises and vulnerability. Thereby, Denmark's humanitarian action contributes to improving human security and reducing poverty.

The specific objectives of the Strategy are:

- to save and protect lives
- to alleviate suffering and promote the dignity and rights of civilians in crisis situations
- to initiate recovery
- to build resilience
- to prevent future crises by breaking the cycle between crises and vulnerability.

¹ *The Right to a Better Life* Strategy for Development Cooperation, 2012.

To reach the specific objectives, the Strategy has six overall strategic directions, which are subdivided into 48 more narrowly defined strategic priorities. The strategic directions are defined as follows:

- 1 **Vulnerability:** prioritising women's empowerment, risk reduction, emergency preparedness and early recovery (supported by three statements of intent and six strategic priorities).
- 2 **Climate change and natural hazards:** DRR and the increasing humanitarian needs resulting from climate change (supported by three statements of intent and nine strategic priorities).
- 3 **Protecting conflict-affected populations:** civilians in armed conflicts, international humanitarian law, GBV, durable solutions for IDPs (supported by four statements of intent and 11 strategic priorities).
- 4 **Coordinated, principled and informed humanitarian action:** central coordination role of the UN, full adherence to GHD principles, focusing on a limited number of protracted crises (supported by three statements of intent and eight strategic priorities).
- 5 **Strengthening partnerships:** partnership framework agreements, increased division of labour between humanitarian donors, increased Danish field-level capacity (supported by three statements of intent and eight strategic priorities).
- 6 **Focus on results, innovation and communications:** focus on impact and accountability to beneficiaries, promote innovation and best practices, and regularly communicate results (supported by three statements of intent and five strategic priorities).

The Strategy stresses that a substantial part of Danish humanitarian assistance will continue to be focused on selected protracted crises. This allows Denmark to engage more effectively with partners in these situations, to understand the underlying causes and to work with partners and other parts of the Ministry to link humanitarian aid, early recovery and development. This long-term engagement is coherent with the human rights-based approach of Danida, as the focus is on staying until the state is capable of assuming its responsibilities as the duty bearer, for example being able to protect its citizens.

The Strategy was welcomed for its inclusive preparation process involving a wide range of stakeholders and was commended for its comprehensive mentioning and treatment of all important issues raised by stakeholders in the dialogue shaping the Strategy. Indeed, the Strategy clearly reflects the complexity of humanitarian assistance and the many partners and issues that Denmark wants to work with and influence. While it is laudable from a participation and ownership point of view that all views and interests are reflected, it does however pose a critical challenge that these are not prioritised or weighted. All appear equally important, thus providing little guidance on how in practice trade-offs between different options, opportunities and priorities may be made.

Denmark has been a prominent humanitarian donor and was commended in the 2011 DAC Peer Review for its 'strategic relationships with a smaller number of partners, stronger linkages between humanitarian initiatives and development programming'.² An annual review conducted by DARA³ ranks Denmark 2nd in the Humanitarian Response Index in 2011, particularly giving Denmark credit for its funding flexibility and participation in accountability initiatives.

Denmark adheres to and promotes the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and operational independence. Denmark is also a strong proponent of the Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles (GHD). The GHD initiative is an informal donor forum and network which facilitates collective advancement of GHD principles and good practices. It recognises that, by working together,

² 2011 DAC Peer Review.

³ DARA is an independent non-profit organisation committed to improving the quality and effectiveness of humanitarian action for vulnerable populations affected by armed conflict and natural disasters. <http://daraint.org>

donors can more effectively encourage and stimulate principled donor behaviour and, by extension, improved humanitarian action.⁴

The international humanitarian context

The last decade has seen an increase in the number of people affected by humanitarian emergencies. The United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA) reports that the number of people requiring international humanitarian assistance and the costs of helping them has increased significantly over the last decade.⁵ Today, international appeals for humanitarian funding typically target 60-70 million people annually, compared with 30-40 million 10 years ago.⁶ The British think-tank Global Humanitarian Assistance⁷ reports that incidents of conflicts have been increasing; resulting in an increase in numbers of refugees and IDPs.⁸ Globally, 45.2 million people were in situations of displacement at the end of 2012 – the highest number since 1994.⁹

The reasons for these trends are complex, however, many of the risks that lead to humanitarian crises are known – an increasing number of natural disasters and protracted conflicts, poverty becoming concentrated in fragile states, climate change, population growth, urbanisation and food and water insecurity. These factors contribute to the increase in the number of people at risk and affected by humanitarian crises.¹⁰

Although economic development has delivered development gains globally, poverty is becoming more concentrated in fragile states, where 50% of the world's extreme poor will live by 2014.¹¹ OCHA reports that although the proportion of poor or hunger-affected people has decreased, the actual number is increasing due to population growth.¹²

Growing food insecurity is likely to create new humanitarian emergencies – the existence of nearly a billion chronically hungry people and the potential reduced yields due to climate change and thus, recurrent and cyclical crises will most likely be more frequent in the future. This, in turn, has the potential risk of fuelling conflict and destabilisation.

A few humanitarian crises create the majority of humanitarian needs and funding requirements, and have done so over the last decade. Of countries that had an international appeal in 2012, 8 had an appeal in 8 or more of the 10 previous years.¹³

The number of humanitarian actors has increased during the recent years. OCHA reports a sharp increase in numbers of non-governmental organisations implementing humanitarian assistance¹⁴ through the international humanitarian system. Also, new donors are entering the humanitarian arena; especially the BRIC countries have increased their humanitarian engagement and donations. In the recent humanitarian crises in the Middle East and Horn of Africa the trend has been towards increasing involvement by Arab donors.¹⁵

This development represents both opportunities and challenges for 'traditional donors' such as Denmark, as the international humanitarian system must find ways to work with these partners,

⁴ www.goodhumanitarianandonorshop.org

⁵ UN OCHA: World Humanitarian Data and Trends 2013: 2.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org

⁸ GHA Report 2013: 73.

⁹ UN OCHA: World Humanitarian Data and Trends 2013: 2.

¹⁰ UN OCHA: World Humanitarian Data and Trends 2013: 4-8; DFID: Humanitarian Emergency Response Review 2011: 9.

¹¹ UN OCHA: World Humanitarian Data and Trends 2013: 3.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Reliefweb.

¹⁵ GHA Report 2013.

particularly as traditional donors will likely provide fewer resources (both relatively and absolutely) in the future. Especially the UN system, to which Denmark is a strong supporter, will need to adapt to this changing environment in order to stay relevant to non-traditional donors and actors.

In the political crises in the Middle East and Asia, the international humanitarian system is challenged by these new actors, as these are increasingly contesting the legitimacy of the alleged Western-biased humanitarian system. In some cases, this challenges the involvement of donors and UN agencies, as these are perceived as parties to the conflict, thereby not adhering to the humanitarian principles of impartiality and neutrality. Furthermore, in some instances, humanitarian actors, including donors such as Denmark, are seen as parties to the conflict (e.g. Afghanistan, Iraq), which in turn inhibits the respect of humanitarian principles and especially humanitarian access.

The issue of humanitarian leadership remains a major problem in the international humanitarian system, causing humanitarian responses to be sub-optimal and ineffective. While this has been addressed by the United Nations Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) through the endorsement of the 'Transformative Agenda' as well as by donors, reforms are still to be implemented and the effects are yet to be seen. The Transformative Agenda focuses on strengthening leadership and improvement of coordination, planning and enhancing accountability to affected communities.

Disaster risk reduction and efforts to link humanitarian assistance and development cooperation remain high on the international agenda, in particular in contexts of protracted and cyclical crises by focusing on preparedness and resilience building. As Denmark increases its engagement in fragile states and given Denmark's engagement in the international policy dialogue around fragile states and peacebuilding, the Humanitarian Strategy's intended integration of humanitarian action, early recovery, resilience building and long-term development assistance remain highly important for Denmark's continued humanitarian – and long-term development engagements in fragile states.

Implementation of the Strategy

In 2010, Denmark supported a total of 29 emergencies: 16 in Africa, 11 in Asia and 2 in the Americas through a budget of approximately DKK 1.7 billion. The top three countries receiving Danish humanitarian aid were Sudan, Haiti and Pakistan. In 2012 Denmark provided assistance to 22 emergencies, 11 in Asia and the Middle East, 10 in Africa and one in the Americas. The top three recipients in 2012 were South Sudan, Afghanistan and Sudan.

In accordance with the Strategy, the bulk of the assistance is focused on approximately 10 protracted and complex humanitarian crises. This has been a relatively constant feature of the Danish humanitarian assistance throughout the period to be evaluated. The criteria for selection of these crises are a combination of some of the GHD principles (#11, #12 and #9) and an understanding that for Denmark to be able to deliver effectively in these protracted crises, knowledge and presence are of the essence. Hence, the focus on countries where Denmark is engaged or decides to get engaged more broadly based on an initial humanitarian response. In 2013, seven out of the 10 protracted crises receiving substantial assistance from Denmark were also priority countries for development assistance or otherwise received substantial development assistance.¹⁶

Overall Danish Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) allocations have mirrored the global trend of more funds flowing to fragile states, where the approaches and practices of linking different types of assistance, including humanitarian and development assistance, are particularly relevant.

The Humanitarian Department in the MFA is responsible for the implementation of the Strategy and the implementation modality of the Strategy during the period has mainly been through partnerships as

¹⁶ Note to the Minister of Development Cooperation 23 November 2012.

part of the principles of GHD and as part of a division of labour between the MFA and partners. The Strategy operates with two categories of implementing partners: Danish humanitarian organisations and multilateral humanitarian organisations. Additionally, a small proportion of the humanitarian aid is channelled through Danish embassies. In 2013, the implementing partners comprised of eight NGOs (called Danish Framework Organisations) and eight international organisations (including the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) administered by UN OCHA).

This 'delegated' model of implementation has implications for monitoring and quality assurance, as this is to a large extent the responsibility of implementing partners. The Danish Framework Organisations report directly to the Humanitarian Department in the MFA. The international humanitarian organisations report through their own reporting systems such as annual reports and through ongoing dialogue with the Department at MFA.

Thus, classical project or programme monitoring is replaced by capacity assessments of partners and high-level dialogue on performance, e.g. through partnership agreement negotiations (for Danish Framework Organisations) and through policy level dialogue with international organisations. Therefore, it becomes imperative to assess and ensure the solidity of systems that are critical for monitoring and quality assurance of partners.

To take account of this, the Humanitarian Department has engaged the Technical Advisory Services in the MFA in conducting reviews of humanitarian assistance in order to strengthen the quality assurance and monitoring of Danish humanitarian action. In 2009, the first capacity assessment was elaborated, one more followed in 2010, and in 2011, review of five partners were undertaken, as well as one in 2013. Three reviews are planned for 2014.

To strengthen implementation of the Strategy and ensure better integration of development and humanitarian interventions, three posts were created in the field and humanitarian specialists recruited to be placed in the field.

However, due to the general staff reductions in the Ministry, implementation capacity has constituted a significant challenge over the period as allocations have increased, but the number of staff responsible for humanitarian assistance has been halved from 10 to five since 2010. Moreover, as a result of a re-structuring exercise, the humanitarian specialists recruited were initially given other tasks at the representations where they were placed, and later these specialists were substituted by generalists with completely different assignments, thus considerably weakening the institutional capacity to deal with humanitarian issues.

Over the period changes have also been made in the delegation of authority between Copenhagen and missions. On the one hand, a decentralisation has taken place. Danish embassies monitor the humanitarian situation in their regions, often for multiple crises, and embassies in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Kenya are especially involved in monitoring the humanitarian situation and international efforts in their regions. Decentralised multilateral missions also play a role as they have responsibility for the dialogue with international organisations such as WFP in Rome, or UNHCR in Geneva. The missions are responsible for the monitoring and reporting on organisational strategies with these institutions. A challenge is that the multilateral performance management system is fundamentally development oriented, and instruments such as MOPAN (the donor-driven Multilateral Organisational Performance Assessment Network) are not geared to capture humanitarian issues, or assess organisations with dual mandates such as WFP. On the other hand, with the introduction of strategic partnerships as the main mode of implementation of the Strategy, a centralisation of the strategic decisions and follow-up with implementing partners has taken place. Today, activities within the partnership agreements are negotiated annually in Copenhagen with substantial and increasing participation of decentralised missions.

3 Evaluation objectives

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action 2010-15.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are two-fold:

- to inform decision-making and strategic direction when formulating a new Strategy for Humanitarian Action after 2015; and
- to document results.

The evaluation will have both a learning and accountability purpose and its main users will be stakeholders at the Ministry, implementing partners and the general public.

4 Scope and focus of work

The evaluation will focus on the entire period of implementation. The main evaluation phase will collect evidence of results from 2010 to 2013, but will, where relevant, compare the present Strategy with the previous to document changes. The evaluation follow-up phase to take place in 2015 will also analyse data and results from the 2014-15 implementation period, including possible follow-up to the recommendations from this evaluation.

The evaluation will cover both the policy and the operational level with a view to drawing lessons to inform the development of a new strategy:

At policy level, the evaluation will review the coherence and clarity of the strategic framework and its usefulness in guiding Danish international policy dialogue efforts as well as allocation and implementation decisions.

At operational level, modalities and implementation performance of partners will be assessed, results analysed and documented. The evaluation will chose three cases which will be used to analyse the dynamics of implementation of the Strategy in depth, but the evaluation may also draw on lessons from other countries and crises where evaluative evidence exists. The evaluation will review a selection of partnerships with multilateral organisations as well as NGOs.

5 Evaluation questions and criteria

The overall evaluation questions to be answered by this evaluation are the following:

- 1 How relevant and flexible is the Danish Humanitarian Strategy given the changing humanitarian context since 2010?
- 2 How relevant and effective has Danida's engagement been in the international policy dialogue on humanitarian issues?
- 3 What lessons can be drawn from relying on partnerships as the key implementing modality?
- 4 How well does Danida support and ensure follow-up, monitoring and reporting of performance by partners, including ensuring reporting on the effects on affected populations?
- 5 What are the lessons learned of linking emergency relief and development, i.e. reconciling humanitarian and development objectives in specific contexts and settings?
- 6 To what extent do the design, delivery and management of the Humanitarian Strategy align with the Principles and Practices of Good Humanitarian Donorship?

The evaluation will apply OECD/DAC's seven criteria for evaluation of humanitarian assistance:

- relevance
- effectiveness
- efficiency
- impact
- sustainability
- coherence
- coverage

Questions and issues to be covered by the evaluation are presented below. These are not exhaustive and the evaluation team is expected to further elaborate on these as part of the technical bid as well as in the inception report.

Relevance

- Have the strategic priorities been relevant and enabled the implementation of the Strategy given changing humanitarian challenges?
- How does Danida ensure adherence to the humanitarian principles and principles of GHD?
- To what extent is the Danish humanitarian assistance in line with needs and priorities and rights of affected populations, especially the most vulnerable?
- Have the interventions supported under the Strategy been in line with the strategic priorities?
- To what extent has the Strategy guided allocation decisions of the humanitarian budget?

Effectiveness

- What have been the implications of implementation through partnerships, including on the documentation and monitoring of results?
- What are the results of Denmark's role in international humanitarian policy dialogue and what has been the Danish contribution to promoting the implementation of better coordination of the international response and the UN's central role in this?
- What has been Denmark's contribution to promoting the GHD principles?
- To what extent did the Danish humanitarian assistance meet the needs of affected populations, especially the most vulnerable?
- Has the implementation of the Strategy prioritised gender-sensitive approaches and women's empowerment and has the implementation focused on protection issues, including the protection from GBV?
- How do expected and planned results compare against results delivered?
- Can Denmark's added value and comparative advantage within humanitarian assistance be inferred from the results of implementation?

Efficiency

- How efficient has the chosen mode of delivery, through partnerships, been in achieving results?

Coherence

- How clear is the Strategy in terms of guiding humanitarian activities and ensuring coherence with other strategic priorities in Danish foreign and aid policy?
- What are the lessons learned from the Strategy's approach of integrating relief with DRR, resilience building and early recovery?

- What are the lessons learned from linking relief, rehabilitation and development?
- How does the humanitarian assistance supported under the Strategy relate to other Danish-funded engagements in conflict-affected and fragile states?
- How well does Danida handle phasing out of crises and how is this related to long-term development assistance taking over?

Coverage

- Do the Strategy and the interventions under the Strategy provide sufficient coverage, taking into consideration the strategic choice of focusing on a number of longer-term engagements in specific crises?
- Is the Danish humanitarian support given regardless of nationality, age, ethnicity and gender – and thus based on needs alone?
- Is Danish humanitarian assistance allocated based on thorough needs assessments?

Impact and sustainability

It is acknowledged that causal links at the Strategy's impact level may be difficult to establish and that developments at this level are influenced by numerous factors and may evolve in a non-linear manner over time. Furthermore, it is recognised that it may be premature to expect sustainable impacts from a strategy initiated three years earlier. The evaluation should take these factors into account, but should nevertheless – where possible – document outcomes and the wider impact of the Strategy.

6 Approach and methodology

In accordance with OECD/DAC Quality Standards for Evaluation (2010) and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines (2012), the evaluation must be based on a clearly outlined methodology. The evaluation design must be rigorous and credible when judging both the internal and external validity of results. Bidders are free to propose the most appropriate design for responding to the evaluation questions indicated above.

As the evaluation will be forward looking and feed into the formulation of Danida's new Humanitarian Strategy, stakeholder involvement is an essential part of the evaluation. The evaluation will include stakeholder workshops throughout the evaluation process – one kick-off workshop, one validation workshop and a dissemination workshop.

The evaluation must in all aspects address issues related to equality and rights.

This section provides some initial thinking on the proposed approach and methodology which will need to be addressed by the evaluation team in the technical proposal and further developed in the inception report.

A mixed-method approach is proposed drawing on:

- document review (minutes of meetings, monitoring reports, review documents and other evaluative evidence from partners and from Danida)
- comparable analysis (for example of partners)
- context analysis (the changing context of humanitarian assistance in terms of funding, types of crises, and aid instruments, practices and standards)
- stakeholder analysis
- interviews (structured and semi-structured)
- observation (for example during field visits for case studies, or during stakeholder meetings)

- focus group discussions
- surveys/questionnaire
- case studies/field visits.

The evaluation will gather and analyse evidence on the extent to which Danida has contributed to addressing humanitarian needs in the crises, Danida has been engaged in. The evaluation will also consider contribution in terms of the influence that Danida has had on the international policy dialogue with regards to humanitarian issues.

Case studies

A case study approach is used to help understand and nuance key issues, triangulate findings, and provide evidence on key evaluation questions. The case studies also provide a unique opportunity to focus on the effects of the humanitarian assistance on the target populations. The sampling of cases is key to the conclusions and to their potential for providing conclusions that can be generalised. Careful consideration should be given to the comparability and incomparability of the different contexts and specific dynamics. Some cases will be based on desk studies; some will include missions and collection of primary data through the partnerships that Danida works through.

The cases chosen for the evaluation is selected considering the following criteria:

- significance in terms of partner presence and budget allocations
- situations facing the key issues identified, especially linking humanitarian and development assistance
- geographical diversity
- accessibility and security
- availability of documented evidence.

The cases chosen for the evaluation are South Sudan or Sudan and Pakistan/Afghanistan. Furthermore, a desk study of support to the humanitarian crisis in Syria should be conducted.

South Sudan is a long-term priority for Denmark, with several key partners intervening and includes both long-term and short-emergency issues, and linking relief and development. If the security situation permits, the evaluation team will conduct a field mission to South Sudan during the evaluation process. If the security situation deteriorates or remains unstable, the Evaluation Management and the evaluation team will discuss the possibilities of choosing Sudan as an alternative case.

Together **Afghanistan** and **Pakistan** receive a large amount of Danish humanitarian assistance, and illustrates the challenges of the international humanitarian system in terms of legitimacy and humanitarian access. The Danish humanitarian engagement is expected to be maintained over the coming years. Access to the areas where Danish humanitarian partners are operating might pose a challenge for the evaluation team, and the implications of this in terms of feasibility of travel will be discussed and decided upon with EVAL in the inception phase.

As **Syria** and its neighbouring countries are a high priority for Danish humanitarian assistance, the evaluation team is expected to conduct at the minimum a desk study of the Danish support to Syria and to Syrian refugees in the neighbouring countries (Lebanon and Jordan). If the security situation permits, it is expected that the evaluation team conducts a field visit to Syria or neighbouring countries. The focus of the case will be the support provided through Danish partners and will therefore be planned and coordinated in close coordination with implementing partners to the Strategy.

The evaluation team members must be willing and able to undertake field missions. As the chosen case countries for the evaluation are all countries and areas where access might pose a challenge, the

evaluation team will discuss possible solutions to this challenge with the MFA during the evaluation inception phase.

Field missions for international and local consultants will have to be based on assessment of the security situation at the time of the actual field work. It is the responsibility of the incumbent consultant team to make sure they have access to relevant security information to allow for appropriate and timely decision making regarding field missions. The advice provided at any given time for any given area in the case countries by Danish representations or other relevant humanitarian actors (e.g. UN entities and international NGOs) for its international and national staff, respectively, should be accessed by the consultant as part of the background for decision making on actual conduct of field work.

As outlined in the tender dossier, the consultant will take out an insurance policy against its professional liability. Also, as noted in the Standard Form of Contract of the MFA, the consultant is responsible for the safety and security of the employees of the consultant, sub-contracting consultants, including local employees, also if the assignment involves missions in an area of conflict or an area of high security risks.

Potential additional security costs is covered by the evaluation manager, and therefore the final decision on whether it is feasible to conduct the field visits is taken by EVAL after discussion with the evaluation team and with inputs from relevant departments at the MFA.

The evaluation will ensure the involvement of partners, both implementing partners such as NGOs, multilateral organisations and donors, but will also involve host country officials in the countries selected for the case studies to the widest extent possible. As part of country missions, the evaluation team will be required to hold validation and debriefing workshops with key stakeholders in the countries visited. Debriefing notes on the country studies will be shared with the Evaluation Management after each country visit.

7 Outputs

The evaluation is structured in four consecutive phases: an inception phase, a research and field study phase; an analysis, drafting, presentation and dissemination phase and finally a follow-up and results-updating phase.

While the first three phases are common in most evaluations, this evaluation will test an innovative approach of sequencing the evaluation so that most of the work is done within one year, and that a follow-up and update is then made after one year. This has several advantages: it allows for an update with the latest data on results which will not be available at the time of the evaluation, thus covering results for the full duration of the Strategy; it keeps the humanitarian assistance on the radar screen of policy makers; and it engages stakeholders for a longer period thus maintaining the pressure to implement recommendations, improve performance and actively use lessons learned in the formulation of a new Strategy.

The follow-up phase is expected to last two months and mainly be based on desk studies and a limited number of interviews with key stakeholders. The follow-up phase is intended to validate and update evaluation findings and report on the results of the remaining period of the Strategy.

The key outputs from the evaluation are as follows:

- A kick-off stakeholder workshop involving relevant stakeholders to the Strategy as part of the start-up of the evaluation.

- An inception report including a detailed evaluation plan and evaluation matrix further elaborating the methodology of the evaluation including the design, approach evaluation questions, sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence, data collection strategy and methods and reporting outline. The inception report should include an annotated outline of the evaluation report. The final inception report will reflect the agreed methodology and will be endorsed by the Evaluation Management before the analysis and fieldwork is commenced.
- Three country/crisis case reports (draft and final versions) comprising an analysis of the broad evaluation questions as outlined in the evaluation matrix and providing conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation team must hold debriefing sessions with stakeholders during country missions and debriefing notes must be shared with Evaluation Management.
- A synthesis evaluation report (draft and final version) presenting findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations of the evaluation.
- A findings and validation workshop presenting main findings and conclusions to relevant stakeholders.
- A follow-up report with updated results and qualifications to the synthesis evaluation report as analysed in the follow-up phase.
- Final stakeholder workshop to disseminate results and discuss lessons learned.

The inception report should not exceed 20 pages and should include:

- preliminary findings from the desk review;
- overview of humanitarian portfolio including budget allocations;
- a detailed methodology, including an evaluation matrix with elaborated evaluation questions, data collection sources and methods and a description of how to approach case studies;
- a detailed work plan and important milestones;
- a suggested outline for the evaluation report, including country reports.

The draft inception report should be submitted to the Evaluation Department and the ERG for comments, based on which a final version will be prepared for approval by EVAL.

The evaluation report should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes and should include cover photo proposals, preferably taken as part of data collection missions.

The evaluation report must include an executive summary of maximum eight pages, introduction and background, presentation and justification of the methods applied, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should follow Danida's layout guidelines and will be made publicly available through EVAL's website.

It is expected that the evaluation team elaborates three country case reports of a maximum of 20 pages each, excluding annexes.

8 Organisation of the evaluation

The management of the evaluation will follow the Danida Evaluation Guidelines (2012) and OECD/DAC quality standards (2010). There are three sets of roles in the evaluation process:

- 1 The Evaluation Management.
- 2 The evaluation team (external consultants).
- 3 The Evaluation Reference Group.

Role of the Evaluation Management (EVAL)

The evaluation will be supervised and managed by the Evaluation Department. The tasks of the Evaluation Management are to:

- participate in the selection of evaluation team based on received tenders (MFA contract office chairs the selection committee, assisted by an independent tender consultant);
- coordinate with all relevant evaluation stakeholders;
- ensure that quality control is carried out throughout the evaluation process;
- provide feedback to the evaluation team. Comment on draft versions of the inception report, work plan, progress reports and the evaluation report. approve final reports;
- organise and chair meetings of the ERG;
- facilitate and participate in evaluation workshops, including possibly at least one open dissemination workshop towards the end of the evaluation;
- organise presentation of evaluation results and follow-up on the evaluation to internal Danida programme committee, the development policy board and the Minister for Development Cooperation (responsible department (HCP) will develop the management response for the evaluation);
- advise relevant stakeholders on matters related to the evaluation (reference is made to the codes of conduct, which form part of the Danida Evaluation Guidelines, and which can be found at www.evaluation.dk).

EVAL expert panel

As part of EVAL's quality assurance work, the Evaluation Department will contract two to three experts within the humanitarian field to provide inputs to the evaluation process and thereby secure the quality, usefulness and relevance of the evaluation. These experts will, together with a representative from the Humanitarian Department and EVAL form an informal internal advisory group.

The expert panel will be contracted in collaboration with the Humanitarian Department, as it is expected that the expert panel will also contribute to the wider strategy work that the Humanitarian Department is undertaking.

Role of the evaluation team

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the evaluation team will be applied. The evaluation team will carry out the evaluation based on a contract between MFA and the incumbent company/institution. The evaluation team will:

- prepare and carry out the evaluation according to the ToR and the approved Inception Report and Work Plan, DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines;
- be responsible to the Evaluation Management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ensure that quality assurance is carried out and documented throughout the evaluation process according to quality assurance plan;
- report to the Evaluation Management regularly about progress of the evaluation;
- coordinate meetings and field visits, and other key events, including validation workshops in the countries selected for in-depth study and in Denmark with key stakeholders;
- organise dissemination workshop with the Evaluation Management;

- the team leader is responsible for the team's reporting, proper quality assurance, and for the organisation of the work of the team. The team leader will participate in the ERGs' meetings and other meetings as required;
- the team leader must participate in all the country case studies together with at least two team members, potentially supported by local or regional consultants.

Suggestions provided by the evaluation team in the inception report and work plan will be addressed by members of the ERG and the Evaluation Management prior to the initiation of the analysis and implementing fieldwork.

Role of the Evaluation Reference Group

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established and chaired by EVAL. The mandate of the ERG is to provide advisory support and inputs to the evaluation, e.g. through comments to draft ToRs and reports.

The members of the ERG are proposed to include:

- representatives from relevant departments at HQ level – Technical Advisory Service (UFT) and the Humanitarian Department (HCP);
- representatives of embassies/representations in countries chosen to be part of case studies;
- representatives of key Danish humanitarian NGOs and key multilateral partners.

The group may be supplemented by additional members.

The tasks of the ERG are to:

- comment on the draft ToR, the draft inception report, and draft evaluation reports with a view to ensure that the evaluation is based on factual knowledge about the Humanitarian Strategy and how it has been implemented;
- support the implementation, dissemination and follow-up on the agreed evaluation recommendations.

Other key stakeholders may be consulted at strategic points in time of the evaluation either through mail correspondence or through participation in stakeholder meetings/workshops.

The ERG will work through e-mail communication and video-conferencing mainly. Meetings will be held to discuss the draft inception report and the draft evaluation report. Members of the ERG who are not based in Copenhagen may participate through video link or by forwarding written comments in connection with the meetings.

9 Composition and qualifications of the evaluation team

The evaluation team must contain substantial experience in evaluation of humanitarian assistance (i.e. evaluations that conform to the DAC evaluation definition). Strong methodological and analytical skills are required, and the tender should explain the specific experience of the suggested team with evaluation work and the specific methods applied. The team must include members(s) with knowledge of relevant Danish strategies and aid modalities as well as the international humanitarian agencies and support to these, and at least one team member must be able to speak and read Danish. The ideal team combines a high level of evaluation experience with field-level experience from humanitarian work and a strong academic background related humanitarian assistance.

The evaluation team will be required to have:

- proven capacity and extensive experience in management and conduct of humanitarian evaluations, including also strong methodological and analytical skills and solid knowledge of humanitarian assistance;
- strong understanding and experience in work involving partnerships and relationships between NGOs, multilateral agencies and donors;
- capacity and experience with evaluating policy dialogue and advocacy at the international level;
- experience and knowledge about humanitarian action in the case countries chosen for the evaluation;
- proven experience with conducting field work in unstable and humanitarian situations;
- at least one team member must be able to read and communicate in Danish.

The evaluation team is expected to consist of three to four members involved full-time in the evaluation. These CVs will be evaluated as the key personnel. The tenderer can decide to include additional experts (up to three CVs) for additional functions. If so, these CVs will not be assessed on an individual basis but as part of the overall team composition and technical backup. The team leader and team members are expected to complement each other so that the specific profile of the proposed team leader will have implications for the team members (and vice-versa). All suggested profiles will be assessed with a view to the role, competencies and tasks they are suggested to cover in the team.

The tenders should clearly state who of the proposed team members covers which qualification criteria. The team must contain experience with all methodologies and tools suggested in the tender.

The organisation of the team's work is the responsibility of the consultants and should be specified and explained clearly in the tender. It is expected that the team leader is closely involved in the elaboration of the tender, and this should be indicated in the technical offer. The team leader should have an international background/experience and strong analytical skills. The team leader is responsible for the team's reporting to and communication with Danida EVAL, and for the organisation of the work of the team. The team leader will participate in meetings with EVAL as well as with the Reference Groups or Stakeholder Forums, as requested by EVAL.

More specifically, the evaluation team should cover the following competencies:

Qualifications of the team leader

General experience:

- relevant, higher academic degree;
- a profile with emphasis on humanitarian assistance, with professional experience with evaluation in the field of humanitarian assistance;
- experience as team leader for multidisciplinary teams (at least three references).

Adequacy for the assignment:

- extensive experience in evaluation of humanitarian assistance with references as team leader for complex evaluations;
- extensive knowledge of humanitarian assistance, including GHD, global trends and international humanitarian organisations and systems;
- understanding of current issues in humanitarian affairs including issues related to inking relief rehabilitation and development (LRRD).

Qualifications of the experts

General experience:

- relevant, higher academic degree;
- a profile with emphasis on humanitarian assistance, including relevant professional experience with evaluation in the field of humanitarian assistance;
- experience as team member on multidisciplinary teams (at least three substantial references).

Adequacy for the assignment:

- extensive knowledge on and experience with humanitarian assistance, including modes of delivery, policy level dialogue, GHD and humanitarian principles;
- international experience with evaluation or review of humanitarian assistance.

Team composition

Team composition will be evaluated according to relevance and complementarity of the qualifications of the entire proposed team. Relative gender balance will be part of the assessment.

10 Eligibility

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the evaluation team will be applied. In situations where conflict of interest occurs, candidates may be excluded from participation, if their participation may question the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. It is the responsibility of the bidders to inform the tender committee about any potential issues of conflict of interest. The final decision on eligibility, however, rests with the tender committee.

Any firm or expert participating in the preparation or implementation of a project or programme directly under the auspices of the Danish Humanitarian Strategy may be excluded from participation in the tender, unless the involvement does not constitute unfair competition.

11 Inputs

The total budget for the consultancy services is a maximum of DKK 2.2 million. This includes all fees as well as implementation and personnel-related reimbursable expenses required for the execution of the contract. This includes the follow-up work to be conducted in 2015, which is expected to last for approximately two full working months.

The budget does not include security costs in relation to the fieldwork (including the extra costs for insurance for travels to high-risk areas, use of armed vehicles as required etc.).

Normal costs related to fieldwork (e.g. accommodation, per diem and travel insurance, etc.) should be included under reimbursable cf. normal practice for tenders. During the inception phase when decisions on extent of fieldwork have been taken by EVAL in consultation with the evaluation team, the security costs must be assessed and a specified budget will have to be agreed with the MFA.

Part of the budget (approximately DKK 150,000) shall be set aside for kick-off, validation and dissemination workshops with relevant stakeholders to the Strategy, both in the evaluation main phase and in the follow-up phase. The bid must also include funding for initial interviews with key informants in Copenhagen at the beginning of the evaluation exercise and for participation by the team leader in meetings in the ERG and a dissemination workshop/public meeting in Copenhagen.

EVAL will cover expenditures for the meetings of the ERG, printing of the final evaluation report and costs related to a final dissemination workshop/public meeting.

12 Requirements of home office support

The evaluation team's home office shall provide the following, to be covered by the consultant's fees:

- general home office administration and professional backup. The backup activities shall be specified;
- quality assurance (QA) of the consultancy services in accordance with the evaluation team quality management and quality assurance system, as described in the tender. Special emphasis will be given to QA of draft reports prior to the submission of such reports;
- implementation of the business integrity management plan, as described in the consultant's application for qualification, in relation to the present evaluation. This implementation shall be specified.

The tenders shall comprise a detailed description of the proposed QA, in order to document that the tenderer has fully internalised how to implement the QA and in order to enable a subsequent verification that the QA has actually been carried out as agreed.

The tenderer should select a QA Team, envisaged to consist of minimum two persons, to be responsible for Head Office QA. The members of the QA should not be directly involved in the evaluation. Their CV should be included in the tender. The QA Team should have the similar competence and professional experience as the evaluation team. All QA activities should be properly documented and reported to Danida EVAL.

13 Evaluation timeline

Action/output	Dates	Responsible
Pre-qualification initiated (OJEC notice)	January 2014	HCP with EVAL
ToR elaborated and finalised	February 2014	EVAL based on consultations
Deadline PQ	13 February 2014	HCP with EVAL
Tender notice	26 February 2014	EVAL/HCP
Deadline for submission of bids	7 April 2014	HCP
Evaluation Team selected	April 2014	EVAL
Contract signed	April/May 2014	HCP and consultant
Evaluation inception phase	May 2014-June 2014	Evaluation team with EVAL
Kick-off meetings with reference group and stakeholders	May 2014	Evaluation team with EVAL
Inception report discussed in reference group	June 2014	EVAL and evaluation team
Inception report finalised	July 2014	Evaluation team
Evaluation main phase	July 2014-October 2014	Evaluation team
Draft evaluation report and country reports discussed in reference group	October 2014	EVAL and evaluation team
Findings and validation workshop with stakeholders	November 2014	Evaluation team with EVAL, based on consultations
Evaluation report and country reports finalised	November-December 2014	Evaluation team with EVAL, based on consultations
Follow-up phase	Fall 2015	Evaluation team

14 Documents and websites

Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action 2010-15.

Approach Paper for the Evaluation of the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action, Dorte Kabell 2013.