

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT EVALUATION



Evaluation of Improved Peaceful Coexistence and Social Cohesion for communities in Ninewa governorate, Iraq

On behalf of Welthungerhilfe, August 2026

1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Country:	Iraq
Project title:	Improved Peaceful Coexistence and Social Cohesion for Communities in Ninewa Governorate, Iraq
Project holder:	Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V. - Iraq
Partners:	The Women Empowerment Organization (WEO)
Co-financer (line):	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)
Project period:	01/12/2024 - 31/12/2026

1.1 Welthungerhilfe and partner organization(s)

Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e. V. is one of the largest non-governmental organizations in Germany working in the fields of humanitarian assistance and development cooperation. Established in 1962 as the German section of the United Nations' "Freedom from Hunger Campaign," it was one of the first international initiatives focused on eradicating hunger. Today, Welthungerhilfe's work remains guided by its founding vision: All people have a right to a self-determined life in dignity and justice, free from hunger and poverty.

In line with its Strategy 2025–2030: Zero Hunger on a healthy Planet, Welthungerhilfe promotes systemic change through evidence-based, impact-oriented approaches that are environmentally sustainable and socially just. The organization works in close partnership with local actors and communities to strengthen resilience, ensure food and nutrition security, and advance the realization of rights and agency among people affected by hunger and poverty.

Welthungerhilfe is committed to program quality, accountability, and continuous learning. Comprehensive Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) systems are embedded across the program cycle to ensure that interventions are effective, context-sensitive, and continuously improved. A central element of this approach is the Defining Impact paper, which outlines how WHH distinguishes between outcomes and impact to

enhance clarity, credibility, and learning in its work. The organization fosters a culture of reflection, transparent sharing, and collaboration - ensuring that evaluations contribute to both organizational learning and broader sectoral knowledge.

In **Iraq**, WHH has been operational since 2014, responding initially to the ISIL crisis in Sinjar and later expanding across Duhok, Erbil, Sulaymaniyah, Diyala, Ninewa, Kirkuk, Salah Al-Din, Anbar, Thi Qar and Baghdad. Registered in both the Kurdistan Region (2015) and Federal Iraq (2018), WHH implements integrated, multi-sector programming that links climate-adaptive agriculture and natural resource management with economic development, renewable energy, safe water access, and strengthened community governance. WHH Iraq's portfolio emphasizes **climate-resilient livelihoods and community resilience**. Projects promote climate-smart agriculture, nutrition-sensitive food systems, ecosystem restoration, and sustainable water solutions.

Partnerships are at the heart of WHH's approach. As a member of **Alliance2015**, WHH collaborates with seven European NGOs to advance humanitarian and development action. In Iraq, WHH works closely with line ministries, civil society, academia, and the private sector to deliver long-term, multi-pillar interventions. By 2025, WHH shifted further toward partner-led programming, empowering national and local NGOs to lead community-driven development, advocacy, and resilience-building. This localization strategy ensures sustainability, strengthens civil society's role in food security and climate adaptation, and places women, youth, and marginalized groups at the center of Iraq's resilience journey.

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) and the Women Empowerment Organization (WEO) share a strategic partnership in Iraq, combining strengths to advance resilience, food security, and inclusive development. Since 2024, they have collaborated on initiatives such as Growing Stronger in Dhi Qar, and together they have submitted joint proposals with two new projects set to launch in 2026, reflecting WHH's view of WEO as a key long-term partner. **The Women Empowerment Organization (WEO)** was founded in 2004 and is a women-led national non-governmental organization registered in Iraq and the Kurdistan Region. Its aim is the social, economic and political empowerment of women. WEO works in Iraq to strengthen the role and agency of women in Iraqi society in particular by promoting their social, political, economic and cultural participation. WEO organizes training courses, seminars, conferences and workshops that facilitate the exchange of information and experiences between national, regional and international human rights movements. It promotes women's and human rights, gender equality, economic and political participation, and the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women in accordance with the CEDAW Convention. These issues are addressed in all of WEO's activities.

WEO operates both in Central Iraq and in the Kurdistan Region in Erbil, Duhok, Halabja and Sulaymaniyah. WEO's work focuses on the following areas:

- Empowerment and inclusion of women (human rights protection, policy reform, women's participation and leadership, protection and resilience for women)
- Sustainable economic development (employment opportunities, business start-ups and enterprise development, cash-for-work schemes, life skills and vocational training, coaching and mentoring)
- Stability and good governance (peacebuilding and conflict resolution, awareness-raising and promoting acceptance, women's rights and participation, reducing migration risks)
- Humanitarian aid and climate resilience (emergency aid, climate protection measures and awareness-raising)

1.2 The Project and its context

The project "**Improved Peaceful Coexistence and Social Cohesion for Communities in Ninewa Governorate, Iraq**" aims to strengthen social cohesion, peaceful coexistence, and resilient livelihoods among conflict-affected communities in Ninewa Governorate, Iraq. It is implemented by WEO in partnership with WHH from **1 December 2024 to 31 December 2026**. The project is implemented in the districts of Hamdaniya, Talafar, and Sinjar in Ninewa Governorate, targeting vulnerable members of returnee and host communities, with particular attention to women, youth, and other vulnerable groups.

The project's overall objective is to strengthen social cohesion and peaceful coexistence, including the reintegration of returnees and displaced populations, in Ninewa Governorate by 2026. Specifically, the project seeks to enable 750 direct participants and their household members to use inclusive, non-violent communication and improved economic relationships to promote social cohesion and peaceful coexistence. To achieve this, the project focuses on three interrelated outcomes:

- 750 members of vulnerable groups of returnees, host communities and government authorities, community and religious leaders have improved capacities for interaction and networking, and increased opportunities for social interaction and social cohesion.
- Out of these 750 individuals, 360 vulnerable members of returnee and host communities have access to improved livelihoods.
- WEO's capacity for sustainable and high-quality service delivery with a focus on agricultural livelihoods and administrative efficiency is strengthened.

The primary target groups include vulnerable returnees, host community members, farmers, women, youth, local authorities, community leaders, religious leaders, and community-based organizations across Hamdaniya, Talafar, and Sinjar. Indirect beneficiaries include household members and the wider community who benefit from improved social cohesion, strengthened local institutions, enhanced agricultural practices, and increased livelihood opportunities. Community participation is embedded throughout the project, with beneficiaries contributing local knowledge, labor, land, and resources to support implementation and promote ownership and sustainability.

The project's Theory of Change assumes that if vulnerable returnees, host communities, local authorities, community and religious leaders, women, and youth are provided with opportunities to engage in inclusive dialogue, strengthen conflict resolution skills, and participate in joint community initiatives, and if vulnerable households gain access to sustainable and climate-resilient livelihood opportunities, while the local implementing partner strengthens its institutional and technical capacities, then trust, cooperation, and positive economic relationships between communities will improve. These changes will increase community resilience, reduce tensions and conflict, support the sustainable reintegration of returnees, and contribute to peaceful coexistence in Ninewa Governorate.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 Evaluation Purpose

The Final Evaluation is aimed at providing an independent assessment of the extent to which the project has achieved its intended impact, assess the coherence of interventions with the project's strategic objectives, and evaluate whether implementation was conducted in an efficient, effective, and timely manner, in accordance to WHH and donor requirements and the approved project design.

The evaluation will assess the overall project strategy, design, and implementation in line with the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact, and sustainability. WHH and its implementing partners will provide access to all relevant project documentation, sites, logical framework, and participant databases to facilitate the evaluation process.

Conducting the evaluation at the end of the project implementation provides an opportunity to assess the overall performance of the project, document lessons learned and good practices and generate evidence-based recommendations to support the design of future programmes and similar interventions implemented by Welthungerhilfe and its partners. The evaluation findings will also contribute to accountability towards the donor and other key stakeholders by demonstrating the project's achievements, challenges, and overall performance.

2.2 Evaluation Specific Objectives

The objectives of the final evaluation are to:

- Assess the relevance of the interventions in addressing the needs and priorities of the target communities.
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project's implementation model in delivering the intended results.
- Determine whether integrating livelihoods activities alongside social cohesion interventions generates additional or synergistic effects on social cohesion outcomes, compared to social cohesion programming delivered as a standalone intervention.
- Assess the sustainability of the achieved results and the likelihood that project benefits will continue after project completion.
- Identify key enabling and limiting factors that influenced project implementation and the achievement of results.
- Document lessons learned and good practices that can inform future programming.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This assignment is a final external evaluation of the project "Improved Peaceful Coexistence and Social Cohesion for Communities in Ninewa Governorate, Iraq." The evaluation will assess the performance of the interventions in accordance with the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The evaluation will cover the entire implementation period from 1 December 2024 to 31 December 2026 and will focus on interventions implemented in the districts of Hamdaniya, Talafar, and Sinjar in Ninewa Governorate, Iraq. The assessment will include the design, implementation, outputs, outcomes, and sustainability of project activities including:

- Social cohesion – 750 participants
 - Peace-oriented dialogue sessions with community members, members of parliament, activists and religious leaders with 80 participants.

- Training of 40 representatives of local political institutions, e.g. village councils and representatives of local authorities or administrative units
- 20 Workshops for joint dialog and mutual understanding
- Promotion of social cohesion through interactive activities for 750 participants (e.g. sports events, conflict-sensitive art and cultural activities, intellectual exchange events)
- **Livelihood activities – 360 participants**
 - Training on natural farming methods for agricultural workers, smallholders and young people
 - Vocational training for young people to improve industry-relevant skills and promote lifelong learning
 - Networking and marketing meetings for producers and market participants
- **Localization: WEO Capacity Building – 20 participants**
 - Providing workshops: Three one-day trainings led by WHH professionals on livelihoods, operations (finance/logistics), and MEAL.
 - Building WEO capacity: Strengthening institutional systems in livelihoods, social cohesion, finance, logistics, MEAL, HR, communication, and IT.
 - Offering continuous support: Ongoing supervision, technical guidance, and coordination from WHH staff to ensure sustainable cooperation with local authorities.

The evaluation will consider the perspectives of project participants, including smallholder farmers, vocational training participants, and other participants from returnee, IDP and host communities, men and women participants and people with disabilities, as well as representatives of Welthungerhilfe, the Women Empowerment Organization, relevant government institutions, and other stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project. The evaluation will use these perspectives to develop a comprehensive understanding of the project's performance and generate evidence-based conclusions and recommendations.

4. USERS AND USES OF THE EVALUATION

Intended User	Role	Intended Uses of the Evaluation Findings	Expected Process Uses
The German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).	Primary	Assess project performance, achievement of results, and accountability for the use of funds.	Review evaluation findings to inform future funding and reporting requirements.
Welthungerhilfe Iraq CO project staff	Primary	Inform future livelihood programming, improve implementation approaches, strengthen organizational learning	Reflect on project implementation, validate findings, and support evidence-based decision-making.

Intended User	Role	Intended Uses of the Evaluation Findings	Expected Process Uses
Welthungerhilfe Amman Hub Office	Primary	Assess return on investment and make informed decisions about future funding allocation and support	Reflect on findings, support evidence-based decision making to adjust Iraq CO programmatic strategy
Women Empowerment Organization (WEO)	Primary	Improve future project design and implementation, strengthen programme quality and MEAL practices, and apply lessons learned.	Participate in reflection and validation processes and strengthen learning from the evaluation.
Project participants	Secondary	Inform contribution to intended outcomes and share feedback about the project	Participate in reflection process and understand impact of the project
Other Local/international NGOs	Secondary	Learn from the project's experiences, lessons learned and challenges	
Relevant governmental institutions?	Secondary	Present the impact of the project in the region and learn from project implementation	

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The final evaluation will assess the performance of the project using the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

The evaluation questions have been developed to assess the project's performance against these criteria while generating evidence for organizational learning and accountability. The questions are aligned with the project objectives, the logical framework, and the priorities of Welthungerhilfe and key stakeholders. The evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods approach and draw on project documentation, monitoring data, the project's endline survey, and qualitative data collected during the evaluation.

I. Relevance

Overarching question: To what extent did the project's design and combination of social cohesion and livelihoods interventions respond to the actual needs and priorities of the target communities?

- To what extent did the project's design, including the balance between social cohesion and livelihoods activities, respond to the actual needs, priorities, and context of the target communities at the time of design?
- How well did the selection criteria for the two components (social cohesion vs. livelihoods) align with the vulnerabilities and capacities of different population groups (e.g., youth, agricultural workers, political/community representatives)?
- To what extent did the project remain relevant as the context evolved over the implementation period, and were adaptations made accordingly?
- How relevant were the specific activity modalities (e.g., peace-oriented dialogue, natural farming training, vocational training) to the stated needs of participants, compared to alternative approaches?

- To what extent did the capacity-building workshops and consultations address WEO's institutional needs in livelihoods, social cohesion, finance, logistics, MEAL, and other operational areas?

II. Coherence

Overarching question: To what extent was the project internally coherent (between its social cohesion and livelihoods components) and externally coherent with WHH's strategy, donor priorities, and other actors' interventions in the same context?

- To what extent were the social cohesion and livelihoods components internally coherent, i.e., designed and implemented as a complementary package rather than as parallel, disconnected activities?
- To what extent did the project complement, duplicate, or create synergies with other social cohesion or livelihoods interventions implemented by other actors (government, NGOs, UN agencies) in the same target areas?
- How consistent was the project's implementation with the approved project design and any subsequent approved amendments?

III. Effectiveness

Overarching question: To what extent did the project achieve its intended results across the social cohesion and livelihoods components, and what factors explain the level of achievement?

- To what extent did the project achieve its intended outputs and outcomes against the results framework/logframe targets, for both the social cohesion (750 participants) and livelihoods (360 participants) components?
- How effective were the specific activity modalities: dialogue sessions, training of local institutional representatives, joint dialogue workshops, interactive social cohesion activities, natural farming training, vocational training, and market linkage/networking meetings, in achieving their intended results?
- What factors (design, implementation modality, staffing, partner capacity, external context) enabled or constrained the achievement of results?
- How effectively did the trainings and support improve WEO staff's knowledge, skills, and ability to design and implement sustainable livelihoods and social cohesion interventions?

IV. Efficiency

Overarching question: To what extent were the project's resources used efficiently, and its activities implemented in a timely manner to deliver intended results, in line with organizational and donor requirements?

- Were resources (financial, human, technical) used efficiently to deliver the project's outputs, and how does cost-per-participant/cost-per-outcome compare across the two components or against comparable programmes?
- Was the project implemented in a timely manner according to the approved workplan? What were the causes of any delays, and how were they managed?
- To what extent were management, coordination, and monitoring systems (including MEAL systems) efficient in supporting timely, quality implementation and in generating data for decision-making, per organizational and donor requirements?

- How well were the training workshops and continuous support delivered in terms of cost, time, and use of WHH staff expertise, relative to the results achieved in strengthening WEO's capacity?

V. Impact

Overarching question: To what extent has the project contributed to its intended impact on social cohesion and livelihoods, and to what extent did combining the two components generate additional effects compared to social cohesion programming alone?

- To what extent has the project contributed to its intended outcome on social cohesion and livelihood improvement in target communities?
- How and under what conditions did the livelihood and social cohesion interventions reinforce each other, and did this differ across participant groups, locations or types of livelihood activities?
- What changes, intended and unintended, positive and negative, has the project generated at the individual, household, and community level as a result of social cohesion activities?
- What is the project's contribution to improved livelihood opportunities and outcomes, including WHH #ms indicators, (income, employment, market access, skills application) among livelihoods participants, and what broader community-level changes, if any, are attributable to or associated with this contribution?
- For agricultural participants, to what extent did the promoted practices lead to improved production and economic outcomes, and what influenced these results?
- For VT participants, to what extent did the training lead to employment or self-employment opportunities, and what factors enabled or constrained these outcomes?
- For participants in market-linkage activities, to what extent did the support lead to improved market access and sustained commercial relationships, and what factors enabled or constrained these outcomes?
- To what extent do social cohesion outcomes differ between participants who took part only in the social cohesion component and those who participated in both social cohesion and livelihoods activities, and what does this suggest about whether combining the two produces additional or synergistic effects?
- What changes in WEO's institutional capacity, staff performance, and ability to deliver quality livelihoods and social cohesion programming can be attributed to WHH's capacity-building support?

VI. Sustainability

Overarching question: To what extent are the results achieved by the project likely to be sustained beyond project completion?

- To what extent are the results of the social cohesion component (e.g., relationships built between community members, local political representatives, and religious/civil society leaders) likely to be sustained after project completion?
- To what extent are livelihood outcomes (skills, market linkages, natural farming practices) likely to be sustained and continue generating benefits without further project support?

- Have local structures, institutions, or informal mechanisms (e.g., trained village council/local authority representatives, producer networks established through market linkage meetings) been sufficiently strengthened to sustain project gains independently?
- What ownership exists among communities, local institutions, and partners over the project's approaches and results, and what risks could undermine sustainability?
- To what extent are the strengthened capacities likely to be maintained and applied by WEO beyond the project's duration?

6. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation is expected to adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods to assess the livelihoods component of the project against the selected OECD-DAC evaluation criteria and answer the evaluation questions presented in this ToR. The evaluation design should describe the overall approach for conducting the evaluation, while the methodology should explain how the evaluation questions will be answered, including the proposed sampling strategy, data sources, data collection methods, analytical approaches, and quality assurance measures.

The evaluation should not be conducted as a stand-alone exercise but should build upon the project's existing MEAL system and previously conducted MEAL activities. Existing project information including the baseline assessment, routine monitoring data, project documentation, and other relevant secondary data should be incorporated wherever appropriate.

The evaluator will use the endline dataset and analysis as the primary quantitative evidence for assessing the project's outcome indicators and should complement these findings through qualitative methods to explain why different outcomes were observed, identify key enabling and constraining factors and pathways of change explore implementation processes, explain observed results, assess the selected OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, and generate evidence-based conclusions and recommendations.

The proposed methodology is expected to include, but is not limited to:

- Document review of relevant project documents, including the project proposal, logical framework, baseline and endline assessments, monitoring data, progress reports, and other relevant documentation.
- Analysis of quantitative data generated through the project's endline survey and other available monitoring information.
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with relevant stakeholders including, but not limited to: government representatives, community leaders, private sector actors, and other stakeholders involved in project activities.
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with project participants and, where appropriate, non-participants to explore experiences, perceived changes, implementation challenges, and sustainability.
- Any additional qualitative or quantitative methods considered appropriate by the evaluator to strengthen the assessment and answer the evaluation questions.

The evaluator is expected to propose an appropriate sampling strategy that is consistent with the evaluation objectives, available resources, and previous project MEAL activities. The final sampling approach, data collection tools, and analytical methods should be presented and justified in the Inception Report.

Generally,

- The evaluation methodology has to allow for sex-disaggregated data, showing the project's effects separately for male and female participants. Further disaggregation by age group or disability is desirable.
- The methods and data sources should be triangulated for enhancing the validity of evaluation findings.
- Existing data (baselines, endlines, Measuring Success and other monitoring data, secondary data, data stemming from the project feedback and complaints mechanism) must be included, where appropriate, for the evaluation's purpose and scope.
- The evaluator is encouraged to use appropriate analytical methods to synthesize quantitative and qualitative evidence and provide well-supported findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Moreover, the proposals are expected to discuss the feasibility of the suggestions brought forward in the ToR. Please note that innovative ideas to adjust or complement the evaluation design or methodology as well as final products (see section 9) to address the outlined evaluation questions and meet the needs of the intended users are highly appreciated.

The final evaluation design and methodology will be agreed upon following the review of the successful bidder's proposal and will be finalized during the inception phase. The agreed approach, including the evaluation matrix, sampling strategy, data collection tools, and analytical methods, shall be documented in the Inception Report.

7. RESOURCES AND AVAILABLE DATA/DOCUMENTS

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) will provide the evaluator(s) with access to relevant project information, key stakeholders, and available project documentation required to conduct the evaluation. The evaluator is expected to propose an appropriate level of effort, including the evaluation team composition, number of working days, and methodology, in the technical and financial proposal.

The evaluator shall be fully responsible for planning and managing all logistical arrangements required to conduct the evaluation, including transportation, accommodation, communication, venue arrangements, data collection logistics, and any other operational costs. All such costs should be included in the financial proposal.

The evaluator will have access to relevant project documentation and data necessary to conduct the evaluation. Available documents and datasets are expected to include, but are not limited to:

- Approved project proposal and logical framework.
- Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Plan.
- Baseline assessment report and dataset (where available).
- Endline survey dataset (to be conducted separately by WHH prior to the evaluation).

- Routine monitoring data and indicator tracking tables.
- Narrative and donor reports.
- Project workplans and implementation reports.
- Relevant project databases and secondary data.
- Any additional documents considered relevant during the inception phase.
- Training reports and capacity building sessions with WEO.
- Field visits reports

Additional documentation and information may be shared with the evaluator during the inception phase or throughout the evaluation process, as required.

8. MANAGERIAL ARRANGEMENTS / ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) is the commissioner of this evaluation and will have overall responsibility for managing the evaluation process. WHH will serve as the primary point of contact for the evaluator, manage the evaluation contract, review and approve all evaluation deliverables, and provide overall guidance throughout the evaluation process. WHH will also be responsible for approving the Inception Report, Draft Evaluation Report, and Final Evaluation Report.

The Women Empowerment Organization (WEO), as the implementing partner, will support the evaluation process by facilitating access to relevant project documentation and available monitoring data.

The evaluator will be responsible for the independent design and implementation of the evaluation in accordance with these Terms of Reference. This includes refining the evaluation methodology during the inception phase, preparing the evaluation matrix and data collection tools, conducting data collection and analysis, ensuring compliance with ethical standards and data quality requirements, and producing all agreed deliverables within the agreed timeframe. The evaluator shall ensure that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are evidence-based, impartial, and independently derived.

Project staff from WHH and WEO will provide reasonable technical support throughout the evaluation by sharing project information, and reviewing draft reports for factual accuracy. However, responsibility for the analysis, findings, conclusions, and recommendations remains solely with the evaluator.

9. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

WHH is committed to uphold the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability, the organizational Code of Conduct and strong safeguarding principles, especially on the Protection from Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH). These standards guide all activities carried out by internal and external stakeholders, and require that all actions respect the dignity, rights and safety of individuals, especially project participants and those in vulnerable situations.

The consultants(s) are expected to adhere to these principles throughout the evaluation process. This includes but is not limited to:

- **Respectful, non-discriminatory and safe interactions**

They must treat all participants with dignity and respect, regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, religion or other identity markers. They must actively avoid any behaviour that could be perceived as discriminatory, intrusive or intimidating. Extra care must be taken when working with children, women, persons with disabilities and other potentially at-risk groups to ensure that their participation is voluntary, safe and culturally appropriate.

- **Prevent and report any suspected cases of SEAH in line with WHH's Policy against Sexual Violence.**

Evaluators have a duty of care to prevent any form of sexual exploitation, abuse or harassment during the evaluation. If any suspicion or disclosure of SEAH arises, it must be treated seriously and reported immediately through WHH's Reporting Channel: <https://welthungerhilfe.whispli.com/reportconcerns>. Evaluators must avoid any situations that could create a real or perceived power imbalance or misuse of authority.

- **Sign WHH's Code of Conducts prior to the start of the assignment.**

Before the assignment begins, all evaluators must formally confirm their commitment to WHH's ethical standards by signing the organization's Code of Conduct, which sets clear expectations for professional and ethical behavior. Additional declarations related to safeguarding, data protection and PSEAH compliance may also be required.

In addition, the evaluator(s) must follow ethical standards for research and evaluation, such as:

- **Consent**

The evaluator(s) must ensure that informed consent is obtained from all participants prior to any kind of data collection. This includes providing clear information about the purpose of the data collection, how the data will be used, and the voluntary nature of participation, including the right to withdraw at any time without consequences.

- **Confidentiality**

All documents and data acquired from documents as well as during interviews and meetings are confidential and to be used solely for the purpose of the evaluation. Any deliverables as well as all material linked to the evaluation (produced by the evaluator(s) or the organization itself) is confidential and remains at all times the property of the contracting party.

10. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING DEADLINES

The following deliverables are expected to be produced by the evaluator(s):

- **Inception report and evaluation matrix**

The inception report (max. 5-8 pages for the main text without front page, table of contents and annexes) should set out the planned design and methodology to meet the above-mentioned purpose and to answer the evaluation questions.

It should also reflect the limits of the suggested design and methodology and explore the feasibility for answering the EQ and reflect on the ToR, describe the overall approach of the evaluation and how data will be collected by providing an evaluation matrix breaking down the overarching evaluation questions, drafts of suggested data collection tools such as questionnaires and interview guidelines as well as a tentative evaluation schedule.

The inception report and the evaluation matrix follow standard outlines which will be provided to the evaluator(s) after contracting and needs the approval of the contracting party.

Deadline inception report incl. evaluation matrix: 10 working days after contracting or initial briefing.

■ **Data collection debriefing**

Debriefing notes/presentation outlining the most important observations from the data collection and reporting on any challenges faced during the data collection (2–4 pages).

Deadline: Within 3 working days after the end of data collection.

■ **Sensemaking session**

Comprehensive power point slides summarizing important preliminary findings and recommendations and their presentation to key stakeholders to discuss. The discussion should inform the reporting and ensure recommendations will be actionable.

Deadline presentation: 5 days after submitting first draft report.

■ **Evaluation report incl. higher-level project rating along selected evaluation criteria**

Evaluation report as draft and final (English, 25–35 pages main text, including the executive summary but excluding the front page, table of contents and annexes). The evaluation report must contain an executive summary of a maximum of 2 pages and several mandatory annexes, incl. a mandatory project assessment based on the selected evaluation criteria. A template for the criteria assessment as well as an overall outline with key expected content for the evaluation report will be provided to the evaluator(s).

Moreover, WHH will share a Report Quality Checklist that WHH staff will use to assess the quality of the report. The evaluator(s) are encouraged to take a look at the checklist and ensure the report meets the WHH report quality standards. The final report needs the approval of the contracting party. In case of dissent there should be documentation of the matter.

Deadline draft report: 2 weeks after Data collection debriefing session.

Deadline final report: 2 weeks after submission of draft report.

■ **Evaluation brief 2-pager**

A two-paged summary of the project, evaluation design and methodology, findings, conclusion and recommendations using a template provided by WHH.

Deadline: 2 weeks after submission of draft report.

■ **Management Response Matrix**

Management response matrix with actions derived based on the recommendations. A template will be provided to the evaluator(s).

Deadline: 2 weeks after submission of draft report.

- **Photos:** The evaluator(s) should provide a digital file with at least 5 photos of the evaluation, including photos related to the evaluation process (e.g. of group discussions, interviews, final workshop). The photos should be submitted in a JPEG or GIF format. The informed consent of the person presented is a prerequisite.

Deadline: 2 weeks after submission of draft report.

■ **Compilation of Good Practices and Success Stories**

A concise document presenting key good practices, lessons learned, and selected success stories identified during the evaluation. The document should highlight approaches that contributed to positive project outcomes and provide practical examples that can inform future programming and organizational learning. The format and length should be agreed upon during the inception phase.

Deadline: 2 weeks after submission of the draft report.

■ **Data collection tools:**

The evaluator(s) should develop and submit the proposed data collection tools for review and approval by WHH. The tools should be aligned with the evaluation questions and OECD-DAC criteria and ideally shared with WHH during the inception phase.

Deadline: With the inception report / before data collection starts.

■ **Raw dataset:**

The evaluator(s) should provide the raw and cleaned datasets collected during the evaluation in an editable format, subject to applicable data protection and confidentiality requirements.

Deadline: Upon submission of the draft evaluation report.

11. TIME FRAME / SCHEDULE

The whole evaluation is expected to be completed with 40 days after signing the contract. Accordingly, the consultant should illustrate a plan of action in the technical offer. An additional 5 working days will be included to accommodate for feedback between the consultant, WHH, and WEO. Noting that the final report should be submitted by 15/12/2026.

The final work plan will be developed by the contracted consultant and must include the location of activities, proposed methodology, timeframe, and key deliverables in line with the objectives of this evaluation.

Location of Work:

The evaluation will be conducted primarily in the project locations (Sinjar, Talafar and Al-Hamdaniya) in Ninewa Governorate.

- The consultant will be expected to work closely with WHH Iraq and its Implementing Partner to revise and adapt the work plan accordingly based on the contexts.
- Alternative methods of data collection (e.g., remote interviews, focus groups via phone/Zoom, etc.) may be employed if in-person access is not feasible.

Security and Permissions:

- The consultant must possess or obtain the necessary permits and security permissions to access the target project locations.
- WHH Iraq will support the consultant in coordinating the required permissions where possible but the responsibility for obtaining them lies with the consultant.

Working Days and Schedule:

- The official working days are Sunday to Thursday.
- The consultant will be required to develop a detailed evaluation schedule in close collaboration with WHH Iraq and key staff from Implementing Partners.
- The consultant must ensure that all agreed activities are completed within the established deadline, as per the approved methodology and work plan.

Timeframe:

The timeframe for conducting the evaluation will be 40 days and this must be reflected in the consultant(s) Work Plan and methodology. This should be realistic and reflect:

- Time needed for desk review, data collection (fieldwork or remote), analysis, and reporting;
- Any possible delays due to access, permitting, or security issues.

The final schedule will be agreed upon during the inception phase and approved by WHH.

12. EXPERTISE OF THE EVALUATORS

The evaluation may be conducted by an individual evaluator or an evaluation team. If an evaluation team is proposed, the team should collectively possess all the required competencies outlined below. When planning to apply for the conduct of the evaluation as an evaluation team consisting of several team members, it is important that the team is gender-balanced and includes national evaluators or experts.

i. Academic Qualifications

- An advanced university degree (Master's or equivalent) in Monitoring and Evaluation, Development Studies, Economics, Agricultural Sciences, Livelihoods, Rural Development, Social Sciences, or another relevant field.

ii. Relevant Evaluation Experience

- At least 5 years of demonstrated experience in designing and conducting independent evaluations of development and/or humanitarian projects.
- Proven experience in conducting final evaluations using internationally recognized evaluation standards, preferably the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.
- Previous experience evaluating livelihoods, agriculture, employment, vocational training, economic development, resilience, social cohesion or similar development programmes is required.

- Previous evaluation experience in Iraq or other fragile and conflict-affected contexts is considered an asset.

iii. **Research and Methodological Skills**

- Demonstrated expertise in mixed-methods evaluation design, including qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis.
- Proven experience in developing sampling strategies, data collection tools, and evaluation matrices.
- Strong skills in data triangulation and evidence-based analysis.
- Ability to apply participatory evaluation approaches and ensure gender-sensitive and inclusive evaluation processes.

iv. **Technical Knowledge**

- Good understanding of social cohesion programming, livelihoods programming, agricultural production, vocational training, employment generation, and local economic development.
- Familiarity with Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) systems and results-based management.
- Knowledge of the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria and internationally recognized evaluation standards.
- Familiarity with the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) and safeguarding principles will be considered an advantage.

v. **Analytical and Reporting Skills**

- Excellent analytical and critical thinking skills with the ability to synthesize qualitative and quantitative evidence.
- Demonstrated ability to produce clear, concise, and evidence-based evaluation reports with practical conclusions and actionable recommendations.
- Strong presentation and communication skills.

vi. **Language Skills**

- Excellent written and spoken English, with demonstrated report-writing skills.
- Fluency in Arabic is required. Knowledge of Kurdish is considered an advantage or the evaluation team should include members able to conduct interviews in the local language.

13. **TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER**

Applicants have to provide a technical and financial offer.

- The **technical part** (max. 10 pages main text) includes:

- Evaluation methodology: detailed explanation of how the evaluation purpose, criteria and questions will be addressed within the scope of the evaluation. The methodology should be proposed with the aim to meet the objectives outlined in this ToR and discuss its feasibility.
- Work plan: A clear and reasonable timeline of activities, aligned with the deliverables and ideally matching the overall deadlines mentioned in the ToR.
- Team composition and roles: where applicable, an overview of the proposed evaluation team, including individual roles, qualifications, relevant experience and an indication of whether the team has worked together in any capacity before.

- Feasibility and risks: Reflections on potential challenges and mitigation measures for the evaluation process.
- Full **CVs** of the proposed team members, including references, should be attached
- Examples of **relevant previous assignments** and, if publicly available, one **relevant work sample**, e.g. a final evaluation report or a relevant innovative evaluation product.
- The **financial part** includes a proposed budget for the complete evaluation (plus the respective VAT, if applicable). It should include information on the fees per working day and the number of working days, ideally by evaluation stage. Any other expected costs (e.g. visa costs, costs for logistics, costs for workshops) should be clearly indicated. All prices shall be quoted in IQD.
- **Proof of professional registration and taxation** is also required (e.g. by providing the evaluator(s) tax number).

Please further note that:

- All insurances are the responsibility of the evaluator(s)
- Soft copies of relevant documents will be provided by Welthungerhilfe
- Welthungerhilfe staff will facilitate community entry and contacts to interviewees

Please note that the proposals received will be assessed according to the following key criteria:

Criterion	Details	Weighting
Technical Approach and Methodology	Understanding of the assignment, appropriateness of the proposed methodology, feasibility, work plan, and risk management.	40%
Relevant Experience and Qualifications	Relevant evaluation experience, technical expertise, team composition, and previous experience with similar assignments.	30%
Financial Offer	Cost-effectiveness and value for money.	30%

14. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS AND COMMUNICATION

Offers must be signed or should include the phrase “valid without signature” and will be accepted by individual consultants, commercial companies, NGOs and academics.

Offers shall be submitted only directly via the e-tender platform. All communication will be handled through the e-tender platform only. Please note that registration to the platform is free.

The deadline for submission of proposals: 5/9/2026.

15. VALIDITY OF THE BID

All bidders are bound by the price for their bids for at least 60 calendar days after the closing date of the tender. The bidder can only withdraw their bid within the bidding period by a written declaration.

16. AWARDING AUTHORITY AND CONTRACTING ENTITY

Welthungerhilfe (WHH) – Iraq Country Office

Building (B), Apartment (28)- 6th Floor- 4 Towers

Erbil- Kurdistan Region - Republic of Iraq

The tender is valid without a handwritten signature.

KEY REFERENCES / ANNEX

TEMPLATE: STANDARD OUTLINE INCEPTION REPORT

TEMPLATE: STANDARD EVALUATION MATRIX

TEMPLATE: OUTLINE PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

TEMPLATE: STANDARD PROJECT ASSESSMENT BASED ON EVALUATION CRITERIA

STANDARD CHECKLIST: EVALUATION REPORTING QUALITY

TEMPLATE: STANDARD EVALUATION BRIEF 2-PAGER

TEMPLATE: STANDARD MANAGEMENT RESPONSE MATRIX