
PHASE 4 – Leave no one behind!

Terms of Reference – Project End Evaluation

Phase 4 – Leave no one behind!

Enabling the uptake of the IASC-Guidelines on Disability-Inclusion for lasting impact through side-scaling & localization

01.01.2025-31.03.2027

Date of publishing: 16.07.2026

Table of Contents

1. General Information	3
2. Context of the Evaluation	4
2.1 Project to be evaluated	4
2.2 Justification and objectives of the evaluation	5
2.3 Evaluation criteria and questions	6
Core Evaluation Questions	7
Learning questions (for the broader project series)	9
2.4 Evaluation methodology, actors and ethical measures	9
Data Collection methodology	9
Actors involved in the evaluation	10
Ethical measures*	10
3. Expected deliverables and proposed schedule	11
3.1 Deliverables	11
3.2 Evaluation dates and schedule	12
4. Means	13
4.1 Expertise sought from the consultant(s)	13
4.2 Budget allocated to the evaluation	14
4.3 Available resources made available to the evaluation team	14
5. Contract & sub-contracting	15
6. HI's contractual and institutional policies	15
7. Selection criteria and application process	16
7.1 Required documents	16
7.2 Assessment of bids	17
7.3 Selection of winning bidder	18
7.4 Submission of applications	18
7.5 Cancellation of a negotiated procurement procedure with open competition	19
Appendices	19

1. General Information

Handicap International e.V. and its global federation Humanity & Inclusion (HI) are implementing in consortia with CBM Christoffel-Blindenmission Christian Blind Mission e.V. (CBM) a 27-month project entitled “[Phase 4 - Leave No One Behind](#): Enabling the uptake of the IASC-Guidelines on Disability-Inclusion for lasting impact through side-scaling & localization” (hereinafter: LNOB). Since Phase 1 the LNOB projects are funded by the German Federal Foreign Office. In Phase 4 (2025-2027), the International Disability Alliance (IDA) and the African Disability Forum (ADF) joined LNOB as collaboration partners. Besides, several Organisations for Persons with Disabilities (OPD's) collaborated on project country level implementation in East and West Africa.

Since 2016, the Leave no one behind! (LNOB) project series focuses on mainstreaming disability in humanitarian action through capacity strengthening, inter-agency tool development, collecting and sharing of evidence, strengthening of local level expertise and empowering persons with disabilities and Organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs).

The cornerstone of our work is the [Inter-Agency Standing Committee's \(IASC\) Guidelines on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action](#) - the first system-wide globally accepted guidelines on disability-inclusive humanitarian action.

The fourth phase of Leave no one behind project series builds upon the successes of the previous project phases and enhances the uptake of **the IASC Guidelines on Inclusion** for lasting impact through side-scaling and localization.

Handicap International e.V. (HI) is now looking for a consultant or team of consultants to conduct the **external end evaluation** of the “Phase 4 – Leave no one behind!” project and to reflect the overall contribution of the project series.

Further information on the background and all details of this call can be found in this document. This call is part of a negotiated procurement procedure with open competition. All bids will be evaluated based on predefined criteria.

2. Context of the Evaluation

2.1 Project to be evaluated

Project title: Phase 4 – Leave no one behind: Enabling the uptake of the IASC-Guidelines on Disability-Inclusion for lasting impact through side-scaling & localization

Implementation dates: 01.01.2025 – 31.03.2027 (2 years implementation, last 3 months for closing)

Location/Areas of intervention: Phase 4 is a combination of global, regional and local interventions. It is implemented in 6 countries: Somalia/Somaliland, South Sudan, Uganda, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria. Some regional activities are implemented in Kenya and Cameroon. At global level, the focus is on inter-agency collaboration, tool development and advocacy.

Consortia Partners: Humanity & Inclusion – Handicap International e.V., Christoffel Blindenmission Christian Blind Mission e.V.

Collaboration Partners: International Disability Alliance (IDA) and the African Disability Forum (ADF) and several Organisations for Persons with Disabilities (OPDs) at country level.

Donors: German Federal Foreign Office (Division GO22, previously S08) as primary donor, Aktion Deutschland Hilft (ADH) and UNICEF for co-funding.

Total budget of the project: 4.344.254,42 EUR

Overall Objective: Humanitarian actors are supported, and pathways are further strengthened through side-scaling and localization to enhance response capacities for disability inclusive programming and coordination.

Core Components: Phase 4 of LNOB is guided by four interconnected results:

1. **Strengthening Disability-Inclusion in Humanitarian Coordination:** Building capacities of humanitarian stakeholders and facilitating localized technical support mechanisms to ensure inclusive coordination at the project countries.

2. **Uptake, Side-Scaling, and Localization of Programming Tools:** Development, roll-out and localization of inter-agency programming tools and guidance for inclusive Food Security, WASH and Health programming.
3. **Meaningful Participation and Empowerment of OPDs:** Removing barriers to meaningful participation and equipping OPDs with the skills and opportunities to engage effectively in humanitarian response and its coordination.
4. **Advancing Integration of Disability-Inclusion in the Global Humanitarian System:** Driving systemic change through strategic engagements and advocacy to embed inclusion of persons with disabilities into global humanitarian frameworks.

Target Groups: The LNOB projects are humanitarian-to-humanitarian (H2H) projects without direct humanitarian services for affected populations incl. persons with disabilities. Phase 4 targets international, regional and local humanitarian stakeholders, humanitarian coordination mechanisms and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs).

2.2 Justification and objectives of the evaluation

The Project Consortium is seeking a **consultant or a team of consultants** to conduct the external end evaluation of Phase 4 – Leave No One Behind!. The evaluation should primarily focus on Phase 4 but also consider the outputs as part of the broader project series and situate its findings within the evolving humanitarian context and ongoing “humanitarian reset”.

The primary objective of this end evaluation is to assess the performance and results of Phase 4 – Leave No One Behind! implemented during 2025–2026, with a focus on the **changes** achieved, **relevance**, various **partnerships**, and **efficiency** of the project's activities.

In addition, the evaluation will assess one of the project outcome indicators (Outcome 4): How **findings and good practices from Phase 3 and 4 are influencing selected global policy dialogues, sector or funding policies**.

As the current project was planned and designed as a final phase, the evaluation should also **assess it in the context of a project series (Phases 1-4)**. It should provide a concise

reflection on the overall contribution of the project series to support the inclusion of persons with disabilities, both as humanitarian actors and as part of the affected population, in the humanitarian response. At the same time, the evaluation should take into consideration the major ongoing shift in the humanitarian response, due to the abrupt humanitarian funding cuts, reduction of capacities to implement humanitarian response and the policy shifts framed as the 'humanitarian reset'. The evaluation therefore should **highlight major trends, lessons learned, remaining gaps if any and the cumulative contribution of the project series** against the changed humanitarian ecosystem, **without requiring a detailed assessment of earlier phases** (end evaluations of the previous phases are available).

The evaluation is part of the project's accountability approach towards target groups and donors by reflecting the voices, opinions and experiences of the participants and stakeholders reached and involved in this project. Furthermore, the evaluation will generate evidence and lessons learned to provide recommendations on how to address remaining gaps and observed risks of de-prioritization of disability inclusion in the humanitarian reset dialogues and loss of capacities at response and global levels, in order to inform future programming and partnerships. The evaluation should also identify in possible unintended effects (positive and negative) of the project's intervention including any potential adverse consequences or missed opportunities.

2.3 Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation should follow the following criteria, which were selected from the [HI Project Quality Framework](#) by global project staff from HI and CBM as well as OPD partners:

- Relevance
- Changes
- Partnership
- Efficiency

Questions will be structured according to the main components of the project. A preliminary list is presented below. **This list shall be refined and adjusted during the inception phase.**

Core Evaluation Questions

Relevance

- To what extent did the project activities identify and address the demands, needs, and gaps identified by humanitarian actors and OPDs in advancing disability-inclusive humanitarian action (coordination and programming)?
- How did the project contribute to strengthening a localised humanitarian response and what gaps remain?
- How did the project adapt its approach and implementation to the changing humanitarian context that is characterized by rapid reduction of humanitarian resources (finance and actors) despite growth in humanitarian needs, and policy shifts framed in the ‘humanitarian reset’ (at response and global level)?

Changes

- What changes in disability-inclusive humanitarian coordination and programming have taken place across the targeted sectors in the six project countries as a result of the project, and to what extent are these changes significant and likely to last beyond the project? Consider changes such as meaningful participation of persons with disabilities, disability-inclusive data collection, removal of barriers, strengthened capacities for inclusive programming, empowerment of organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), and use of the IASC Guidelines on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action.

Especially:

- How have humanitarian actors and OPDs improved their capacities to implement and contribute to disability-inclusive (DI) programming and coordination? How resilient is the capacity that has been built up and has the

continuity of established DI coordination mechanisms and structures being ensured?

- How have target groups engaged with and used the project's training materials and tools? To what extent has their use contributed to changes in programming and coordination practices that improve the inclusion and reach of persons with disabilities?
 - Specifically, what factors have hindered or supported humanitarian actors, including OPDs, in applying strengthened capacities to inclusive programming and coordination practices? And how significant are these changes in programming and coordination for persons with disabilities affected by humanitarian crisis?
- What specific changes in the meaningful participation of persons with disabilities and OPDs in humanitarian coordination have occurred, and how do these changes vary across countries and contexts?
- What changes did the project contribute to at the global inter-agency policy level and learning, if any, including through the engagement at the Global Disability Summit and collaboration with the Disability Reference Group (DRG)?
- Has the project made a lasting impact on the humanitarian system (globally and/or by country) beyond the project ending? If yes, can those be sustained without further funding and what are risks of no funding continuity?

Partnership

- How did the project partners (HI and CBM, IDA, ADF, national & local OPD partners) foster collaboration between humanitarian actors, OPDs, and other stakeholders (e.g. networks, UN agencies, IASC Secretariat, governments etc.) to advance disability inclusion? What worked well or didn't work well in these partnerships?
 - How were OPDs involved in the design, planning and implementation of project activities, and what was the quality of their participation?

- How did the partnership and inter-agency approach evolve over the project phases, and what lessons can be drawn for future collaborative and inter-agency approaches?

Efficiency

- To what extent were project resources (financial, human, and technical) used efficiently to deliver planned activities and achieve intended results?
- Were resources used in a manner that supported and empowered own teams, partners and OPDs to achieve change?

Learning questions (for the broader project series)

- How, and to what extent, have findings and good practices from project Phases 3 and 4 informed and influenced selected global policy dialogues, sector policies, and funding policies around Disability Inclusion in Humanitarian Action?
- What are main contributions of the project series (Phases 1–4) to the global and local efforts to advance the systematic inclusion of disability in humanitarian action (reflecting major trends, gaps, achievements, and lessons learned against the changed context)?

2.4 Evaluation methodology, actors and ethical measures

Data Collection methodology

The evaluator is expected to use a mixed-methods approach and **propose the methodology in detail in the technical offer**. We expect the data collection to be done mostly through a desk review, remote key informant interviews across different stakeholders' categories (HI/CBM staff, partner organization, OPD representative, humanitarian actors and donor), surveys, online focus group discussions etc.

Given the multi-country nature of the project and the available evaluation budget, it is not expected that primary data collection be conducted in all six project countries. The evaluator should propose a feasible and cost-effective methodology that ensures sufficient evidence is

collected. This may include a combination of remote and in-country data collection methods in selected countries. The approach used should ensure representation across different contexts and countries and should be justified in terms of feasibility, validity and findings.

It may be beneficial for the evaluator/s to participate in one of the project's activities (e.g. a training or workshop) to gain a better understanding of the project's implementation. Such participation may provide valuable opportunities for observation and/or additional data collection. Evaluators should indicate in their proposal the added value of such participation and explain how it would contribute to the data collection and overall evaluation methodology. Related transportation and accommodation costs related to selected activity would be covered by the project. HI reserves the right to accept / reject / adapt such participation.

Actors involved in the evaluation

An evaluation committee has been formed and will be the body in charge of steering, guiding and validating evaluative decisions, and will give an assessment of the quality of the evaluator's work. It is composed of LNOB team members from HI and CBM.

All project partners involved, including project country teams in East and West Africa will be available to support the evaluator. Clear roles and responsibilities will be defined jointly in the first stage of the evaluation.

Ethical measures*

As part of each evaluation, HI is committed to upholding certain ethical measures. It is imperative that these measures are taken into account in the technical offer:

- **Guarantee the safety of participants, partners and teams:** the technical offer must specify the risk mitigation measures.
- **Ensuring a person/community-centered approach:** the technical offer must propose methods adapted to the requirements of the target audience (e.g. tools adapted for persons with different types of impairments, etc.).

- **Obtain the free and informed consent of the participants:** the technical proposal must explain how the evaluator will obtain the free and informed consent and/or assent of the **participants**.
- **Ensure the security of personal and sensitive data throughout the activity:** the technical offer must propose measures for the protection of personal data.

**These measures may be adapted during the completion of the inception report.*

3. Expected deliverables and proposed schedule

3.1 Deliverables

All deliverables are to be produced in English. Expected deliverables include:

- **An inception report** specifying the proposed methodology for answering the evaluation questions and an action plan. This inception report will have to be validated by the evaluation Committee.
- **A preliminary report**, including PowerPoint presentation and Word document showing preliminary results, conclusions and recommendations, to be presented to the evaluation Committee.
- **A final report** of approximately 20-30 pages maximum with annexes.
- **An executive summary** of 3 to 4 pages
- **A PowerPoint presentation** and any other format (infographic, poster, video etc.) of the evaluation summarizing main findings and recommendations.

A final report template will be provided to the consultant.

All final deliverables are to respect the WCAG 2.2 standard for **digital accessibility**. This means that the documents (including pdf, word files, and ppts), texts, images, forms, sounds, etc. should be accessible, meeting the varying requirements of persons with different types of

impairments and being understandable by as many people as possible without discrimination based on impairment, gender, age, or other factors.

The final report will be produced in multiple formats such as accessible PDF, HTML or Epub (please specify in your offer the multiple formats proposed).

3.2 Evaluation dates and schedule

Total **estimated mission duration: 40-50 working days**. Please note that this is an indicative estimate. If your proposal includes a higher or lower number of working days, please provide a justification for your proposed level of effort.

There will be two rounds of revisions before the assignment is completed (revision of inception report, preliminary and evaluation report draft).

- HI aims to **start the service contract** beginning of **September 2026**.
- HI aims to have the evaluation report ready no later than **15.12.2026**.

Based on the proposed timetable, the consultant must set up a work schedule for the performance of the service. It must clearly specify the way the consultant will approach the activities required to perform the service.

The suggested evaluation schedule is as follows. Those steps are suggested, and the evaluator should confirm, adapt or add as seen fit.

Phase 1: Kick-Off Meeting & Inception Report - to be finalized by end September

- The consultant/s will undertake a desk review based on all documents sent by the project.
- The evaluator and the project team meet to refine the technical offer.
- On this basis, the evaluator will refine the evaluation questions, propose a detailed methodology and define a detailed work plan, including a list of stakeholders to meet during the interview phase in an inception report.

- The Evaluation Committee will validate the inception report and the proposed methodology in a meeting before proceeding with the evaluation.

Phase 2: Data collection and writing– end September/October/beginning of November

- Following the proposed method and work plan

Phase 3: Analysis and writing

- The consultant/s will analyze the evidence collected
- **Preliminary report** – the evaluator will provide a preliminary report with findings and presents it's to the project consortium – by mid-November
- **Feedback loops on final report draft**
- **Presentation of final report to evaluation Committee** by end of November

Phase 4: Validation

- **Validation of report quality** by evaluation Committee by beginning of December
- **Final adaptations and presenting final findings and recommendations** – Mid December
- **Survey filling** – An end-of-evaluation questionnaire will be given to the evaluator to be filled out at the end of the process.

4. Means

4.1 Expertise sought from the consultant(s)

The consultant (an expert or a team of experts) should be specialized in project evaluation, enjoying the following qualifications:

- Post graduate degree in social sciences, international studies, humanitarian action, development management or similar field

- Additional educational background or in-depth experience in the field of inclusion, humanitarian assistance and/or capacity building
- Specific proven experience or expertise in disability-inclusive humanitarian action
- Practical experience in humanitarian action (field experience, coordination of humanitarian action, global interagency work etc.) is highly desired
- Experience in capacity building in humanitarian action is highly desired
- Demonstrated experience in evaluation methodologies and data collection techniques as well as leading monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian projects funded by institutional donors
- Understanding innovative /piloting projects
- Working proficiency in English is mandatory
- French language is an asset
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills
- Proven knowledge on creating accessible digital documents

4.2 Budget allocated to the evaluation

Estimated between **15 000 EUR and 30 000 EUR incl.** VAT if applicable (NOTE! VAT reverse-charge mechanism NOT applicable).

The candidate must detail in the offer: the cost per day for each evaluator; the breakdown of the time spent per evaluator and per stage of work; the ancillary costs (incl. accessibility measures, other required services and additional documents); the overall cost of the service, including logistics, project management, translation costs; with proposals for payment modalities.

4.3 Available resources made available to the evaluation team

- General information and blog articles on [the project website](#)
- Project proposal and interim / final reports to the German Federal Foreign Office
- Previous project End Evaluations (Phase 1-3)

- Consortia and partnership agreements between HI and CBM, as well as OPD partners in global and national level
- Minutes of Project Progress Meetings, Country Catch-up, Steering Committee Meetings
- Documentation of Project Workshops and OPD Peer Exchanges
- Activity materials and reports
- Documentation of events at global level and national level supported through and working group/cluster meetings attended by the project
- Documentation of public relations work
- Access to studies, case studies, developed tools and materials, other documentation of findings and lessons learned
- MEAL documentation including databases.

5. Contract & sub-contracting

We intend to conclude one contract for the service as described in this call. An award in form of separate lots is not envisioned. Disclosure of intend to sub-contract certain parts should already be stated in the initial bid incl. reasoning and proposed sub-contractors if already known.

Note, that sub-contracting does not release the winning bidder from its responsibility to HI and the winning bidder needs to ensure that any sub-contract adheres to the agreed upon standards, code-of-conduct and other contractual agreements.

6. HI's contractual and institutional policies

Applicants shall commit to comply with all Protection Policies, Code of Conduct, Good Business Practices, General Purchasing Conditions available for consultation on [HI's website](#). HI's data protection policy can be viewed via [this link](#).

7. Selection criteria and application process

This call is part of **a negotiated procurement procedure with open competition**. All interested bidders are welcome to submit the required documents as specified in this call before the deadline for submission.

7.1 Required documents

Bidders shall provide as a minimum the following documents / information in English:

- Cover letter, reasoning why the consultants or team of consultants are best qualified to do the evaluation. This should include relevant experience working with and/or evaluating diverse humanitarian project's on global, regional and/or local level, experience/ knowledge on disability inclusion and disability-inclusive humanitarian action.
- In one paragraph, please describe how you understand the previous progress and current state of disability-inclusion in humanitarian action amid the humanitarian reset, humanitarian policy changes and funding decrease.
- A technical proposal including the methodology proposed.
- A detailed timetable and thereby confirmation that such services can be provided within the time frame indicated above.
- Description of consultant/s profile, roles & responsibilities and CV of the proposed evaluator/s. Please include information about educational background, expertise and experience in relation to the scope of the evaluation and the geographical location.
- Proof of experience and list of previous assignments of evaluator/s team in relation to disability-inclusion and capacity development in humanitarian action. Please submit minimum 2 and maximum 3 examples of evaluation reports and indicate how the proposed evaluator/s were involved.
- Detailed financial proposal in Euro with separately stated VAT if applicable (VAT reverse-charge mechanism NOT applicable).

- Disclosure if sub-contracting is envisioned and possible, including confirmation that bidder is fully responsible for all sub-contractors.
- Proof of valid registration of the bidder (according to the country of establishment of the consultant/firm, may be: legal status, registration certificate, tax registration certificate, tax clearance certificate, trading license, compulsory submission up to date...).
- Filled out and signed version of the [Declaration of Non-Conflict of Interests form](#) of HI.
- Filled out and signed version of the [Acceptance of Contracting Rules form of HI](#).
- Filled out and signed [Application form](#).

7.2 Assessment of bids

The following **exclusion criteria** apply:

- Submission of the application after the specified deadline (see below)
- Incomplete set of information and documents as listed above
- No previous experience in evaluating humanitarian projects
- No previous experience in evaluating disability inclusive projects
- No commitment to delivery until 15 December 2026
- No valid registration of bidder
- No fluency in English (written and verbal)

All bids are assessed with the following weighing:

Price	Experience / knowledge on disability inclusion and capacity development in humanitarian action	Experience with project evaluations & proposed methodology	Workplan and Time frame
30%	35%	25%	10%

7.3 Selection of winning bidder

After the assessment of the bids according to the point system above, HI reserves the right to negotiate with those with the highest points. HI will assess all bids according to the criteria above. We reserve the right to negotiate, accept or reject any bid or quotation at its sole discretion, and to continue the competitive dialogue for any response it considers advantageous.

If deemed necessary, online meetings are set-up with those bidders with the highest points and/or additional examples of previous work will be requested.

Handicap International is not obliged to accept the lowest prices or any of the bid.

7.4 Submission of applications

Applications should be sent via email to tender@deutschland.hi.org before **August 12, 2026, 16:00 CEST**. Please mention “LNOB/ End-evaluation consultancy application” as subject of your email.

Clarifications: All questions shall be submitted by email to Heidi Villikka: h.villikka@hi.org and Helen Lederer: h.lederer@hi.org as well in CC to the general tender email address, tender@deutschland.hi.org . **Deadline for questions is July 27, 2026, 15:00 CEST.**

Answers that are deemed necessary for all interested parties will be published publicly on the day after the deadline for questions on HI’s tender website to ensure a fair and competitive process.

Amendment or withdrawal of bids: Tenderers may amend or withdraw their bids by written notification before the closing date for submission of bids. No amendments may be made to bids after this date. Withdrawals shall be firm and final and will terminate any participation in the tendering process.

Costs of preparing bids: None of the costs incurred by tenderers in preparing and submitting their bids shall be reimbursable. All these costs shall be borne solely by the tenderers.

7.5 Cancellation of a negotiated procurement procedure with open competition

In the event of the cancellation of this process, tenderers shall be informed by Handicap International by email or by public notification. If the call for tenders procedure is cancelled before the submission deadline all received files will be deleted.

A cancellation may occur when:

1. The tendering procedure has been unsuccessful, i.e. HI has received no valid or financially viable bids, or no bids at all;
2. The project's economic or technical parameters have been fundamentally modified;
3. Exceptional circumstances or force majeure makes the normal execution of the project impossible;
4. All technically compliant bids exceed the available budget;
5. Irregularities have occurred in the procedure, especially if these have prevented fair competition.

In no circumstances shall Handicap International be liable for damages of any kind (in particular damages for loss of profits) in the event of the cancellation of a call for tenders, even if Handicap International has been warned of the possibility of damages.

Appendices

- [HI's Quality Framework](#), on which all evaluators must base their evaluation.
- HI's [The Disability - Gender - Age Policy](#), which must guide the evaluation approach