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**HIP summary**

HEKS/EPER works towards a more humane and more equitable world, assisting people and communities to overcome economic, social or humanitarian disparities in order to gain autonomy and to live with dignity.

Our activities occur in a demanding, dynamic and increasingly complex environment. The HEKS/EPER International Programme 2017–2020 (HIP) was drawn up based on a thorough analysis of the progress of the previous programme for 2013–17 and the international context (see Appendix 1).

The HIP outlines the programmatic framework including the objectives of the three sections of the HEKS/EPER International Division (ID) including the holistic and systemic perspective (Chapter 2.3) as well as the human rights-based approach (HRBA, Chapter 2.4), which shall foster dialogue between duty-bearers and rights-holders as well as contribute to good governance and systemic change. The cross-cutting issues of gender, conflict sensitivity and resilience building are described in Chapter 6. HEKS/EPER coordinates all efforts and seeks synergies between the sections to achieve progress and relevance.

The theories of change of the three sections:

- **Development cooperation (DevCo):** HEKS/EPER strengthens civil society and inclusive governance structures, living together in peace, the pursuit of access to land and resources as well as sustainable production and inclusive market systems. Thus, HEKS/EPER contributes so that all people and communities enjoy equal rights and prosperity despite shocks and stresses. (Chapter 3)

- **Humanitarian aid (HA):** HEKS/EPER’s humanitarian aid saves lives, alleviates suffering, restores livelihoods and rehabilitates infrastructure by providing and improving access to live-saving resources and basic services, livelihood opportunities, private and public infrastructure as well as increasing resilience of people and communities prone to or affected by disasters. (Chapter 4)

- **Church cooperation (CC):** The contribution of reformed churches to their societies is recognised as relevant. (Chapter 5)

The HIP also describes the management framework, highlighting focus and growth strategies, capacities, resources, cooperation, funds and financial accountability (Chapter 7) and the programmatic steering, using tools to monitor, learn and steer in order to achieve the HIP’s objectives (Chapter 8). HEKS/EPER strives for ‘enabling management’, which contributes to a professional, effective, transparent, relevant, and impact-oriented implementation that is meaningful for the people and communities we work with. It is a core HIP strategy to increase ID investments up to 45 million per year, to grow substantially in several hub countries and to lower administrative overhead costs.

This programme document serves as a guideline for the HEKS International Department and its partner organisations as well as a ‘strategy statement’ for donors and the public.
1 Foundations of the International Programme

When elaborating the HEKS/EPER International Programme (HIP) 2017–20, the International Division referred to the mission statement as stated in its statute (Chapter 1.3) and took into account the lessons learnt from analysing:

- The progress of the international programme 2013–17 for the period 2013–15 (summary in Chapter 1.2 / full version in Appendix 1, Chapter 1).
- The international context (summary in Chapter 1.1 / full version in Appendix 1, Chapter 2).

1.1 Context of international cooperation

The world is increasingly complex and multi-polar. Threats to human security, equal rights and prosperity cross borders, requiring internationally coordinated commitments such as the Sustainable Development Goals (Appendix 1, Chapter 2.9). In order to play an appropriate and relevant role HEKS/EPER strives to understand the international context. Below are a number of the key findings¹.

With 1.6 billion people living in multidimensional poverty, it remains a main challenge for the global community. A total of 844 million people in South Asia (52.5%) and 496 million people in sub-Saharan Africa (61.1%) are living in multidimensional poverty. Poverty of course strikes people in fragile contexts, with these contexts accounting for 72% of all poor people. Even though poverty has been reduced since 1990, there has been little success in raising living standards for those earning beneath USD 1.25 a day and there are more than a billion people living just above this poverty line who are prone to falling beneath it if contexts worsen. Acknowledging that growth has its limits, enhancing sustainable smallholder agriculture and inclusive markets are promising measures to increase yields, income and food security. Therefore access to land, water, resources and other assets are as crucial as making institutions and authorities work for rural communities.

Inequality concerning the fulfilment of fundamental rights, discrimination and economic inequality are on the rise and remain a key obstacle to enhancing sustainable livelihood opportunities. Inequalities weaken social cohesion, the ability to live together in harmony and finally undermine security, stability and democracy. In addition, access to land and resources will probably become more disputed due to environmental stresses, degradation, demographic pressure, land grabbing, etc. Although there is evidence that some gains have been made in narrowing disparities concerning life expectancy, education and health, the need to enhance equality to foster lasting development has come to be recognised globally, as the SDGs² show.

Of the people living in poverty, 70% are female and are hit harder by social, economic and political inequalities, often facing discrimination and violence. Women often work informally and are unpaid. Therefore, working on gender equality remains key when aiming for prosperity and equal rights for ‘all’.

Over the past ten years, 0.7 million people have lost their lives, over 1.4 million have been injured and 23 million have been made homeless by disasters. Risk exposure is high with more than 1.5 billion people who have been affected in various ways. Disaster trends are increasing worldwide with more than one third of the world’s poor living in multi-hazard zones. Climate change, limited land use, land degradation and lack of governance are risk drivers. Resilience building is key for any development.

Social fragmentation, political unrest, extremism, insecurity, armed conflicts and even risk exposure are ‘fostered’ by inequalities, often combined with a lack of good governance. Therefore, it is increasingly challenging to promote peace and human rights. Conflicts, criminality and governments introducing restrictive laws shrink the space for civil society and its organisations. Democracy and rule of law is at stake – not only in LICs and MICs, but also developed or ‘Western’ countries. Conflicts, inequalities and the lack of social or economic prospects hamper development and increase migration.

The lack of economic and social prospects – combined in many contexts – and violent conflicts lead to internal and international migration, which might be a chance for individuals and those at home, but also causes brain drain, especially in rural areas, making it difficult to build stronger rural communities. Fleeing from deprivation, disaster and conflicts means not only hardship for refugees, but strongly affects the

¹ For the sources behind this summary, read the full context analysis. (Appendix, Chapter 2)
² See SDG 10.
dialogue in ‘Western nations’ on migrants, causing more restrictive coping mechanisms and a debate on how to continue with international cooperation that links it strongly to political and/or economic claims.

A changing aid landscape sees a structural shift in the organisation and practise of economic and political power. The rise of emerging economies and the new role of the private sector results in countries or businesses becoming stronger actors in development cooperation. They pursue their own political and economic interests and new approaches, with not all of them working according to the principles of human and international rights. There is a risk of weakening the influence of civil society and democratic decision-making. Public-private partnerships might be a promising approach to negotiating conditions for investments that respect human rights and foster prosperity, depending on the intention, credibility and capacity of the stakeholders.

The international community – along with various stakeholders such as governments, private-market actors, international bodies (e.g. the UN), NGOs and civil society –, has agreed on some important responses on how to tackle the global challenges, with the most important being the Agenda 2030 with the Sustainable Development Goals (September 2015). Other landmarks in 2015/2016 were the Sendai Framework for DRR, the Paris Climate Agreement, the World Humanitarian Summit and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing Development. HEKS/EPER, in all modesty, commits itself to contributing to achieving the SDGs and also adheres to the above-mentioned reference documents and agreements.

For full context analysis, see Appendix, chapter 2.

1.2 Progress of the HIP from 2013–2015

During the previous programme phase, in DevCo, HEKS/EPER focused on the two thematic priorities of ‘development of rural communities’ and ‘conflict transformation’. In order to assess the main achievements, a variety of sources of information were used. According to the theory of change, the previous programme phase had been striving towards eight distinct objectives.

As one of its core topics, HEKS/EPER put secured access to land on its agenda. As a consequence of this, the number of projects focusing on access to land increased from 36 (20%) in 2013 to 51 (nearly 30%) in 2015. Analysis showed that the most success is possible in more stable democracies in which a rights-based approach with reference to national law is an appropriate strategy. However, in more fragile countries, progress has been slower and promising practices such as the creation of institutions to handle grievances are still in the testing phase.

In order to be able to continue to effectively promote people’s access to basic and public services, and resources such as water and seeds, a growing number of country programmes and projects have started to replicate and upscale promising practices based on experience gained in the HRBA, indicating a strong positive link between applying the HRBA and rights-holders’ negotiation power and duty-bearers’ fulfilment of their obligations. People getting access to services through HEKS/EPER projects doubled since 2013 reaching in 2015 80’000 persons. Moreover, since 2013, there has been an increase in the number of countries in which emphasis is placed on programme/project activities targeting access to seeds through the promotion of ‘seed keepers’ and local varieties. In addition, access to drinking water played a substantial role for HEKS/EPER, especially in its African programme. In Africa alone, in 2014 more than 90,000 people benefited from improved access to water through 13 WASH projects.

In 2015, more than half of HEKS/EPER’s projects contributed to improving agricultural production, compared to about one third in 2012–2013. This entails, for example, an increasing number of country programmes and projects addressing the regeneration of degraded land in order to promote agricultural production. It furthermore entails the promotion of agro-ecological production, which led to fewer problems in dealing with drought-instigated food crises, improved soil quality, tested seed varieties and production techniques, the use of bio-pesticides, substantially increased yields and ongoing organic certification processes.

During the last programme phase, HEKS/EPER also placed an emphasis on improved access to markets and the development of value chains. Accordingly, not only did HEKS/EPER develop and publish guidelines on market systems development, it also – and importantly – invested considerable resources in designing and mainstreaming a holistic and systemic approach in order to improve the effectiveness of projects and country programmes aiming at improved equality and prosperity for rural communities. The number of value chain projects increased from 37 projects (21%) in 2013 to 54 projects (30%) in 2015. This includes more locally focused project as well as promising international market development projects.
Since 2013, HEKS/EPER has been putting significant efforts into programmatic support and made progress in the fields of Conflict Transformation, Conflict Sensitivity and HRBA. Conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity assessments have been considered systematically in the creation of new country programmes (from 3 out of 16 in 2013 to 10 out of 16 in 2015) and led to new projects and programme components aiming at addressing root causes of conflict and key drivers of fragility.

The HIP objective that more people become actively engaged in seeking peace and equal rights has been approached through contributing to improved knowledge about how to cope with conflict and consideration of different values. Promising results include partner organisations being much better equipped to link capacity building on CT and HRBA with advocacy work in order to promote people’s own initiatives and make efforts to track them.

Moreover, the HRBA has been serving as a solid methodology for facilitating an increasing number of country programmes and projects in rendering the need for social inclusion of marginalised fringe groups and minorities much more visible (e.g. in the regional programme on social inclusion of Roma in Eastern Europe, the pastoralist project in Niger, and the Dalit and Adivasi projects in India and Bangladesh). Despite these institutional efforts and the increased number of promising practices, projects which aim at enhancing social inclusion in many cases still face challenges in meaningfully integrating mainstream society. Further, it is also a challenge to effectively move from raising awareness and skills among duty-bearers to triggering reliable action. The same holds true for shifting from individual action to the broader sociopolitical level and public commitment.

Through the so-called ‘diaprisis’ approach, which facilitates rival interest groups taking ownership of and taking on genuine work toward common goals, HEKS/EPER has contributed to social cohesion. During the HIP 2013–2017, the objective of enhanced space for social and political actions by civil society has been approached through the use of broad networks, in particular the ACT community, joint research on good practices as well as joint target-oriented national and international advocacy.

To enhance conflict sensitivity, HEKS/EPER together with other stakeholders has developed and introduced an online learning tool. Furthermore, HEKS contributed to the creation of a global network on conflict sensitivity (Chapter 6.2) and supported research and networking around the shrinking space for CSOs. At local level, conflict sensitivity and strategies to enhance the space for civil society were supported by diverse countries.

With regard to resilience building, HEKS/EPER has come a long way since 2013. Analysis in 2015 indicates that strategies for adapting to climate change and preparing for climate and disaster risk have been integrated to a large extent as cross-cutting themes into an increased number of development and humanitarian aid programmes and projects. Guidelines on ‘resilience building’ have been developed and accompanied by capacity-building workshops in the HEKS/EPER focus countries.

Humanitarian Aid sharpened its intervention strategy during the last phase. HEKS/EPER mainly intervened in priority or partner countries such as Ethiopia, Philippines, Haiti, Indonesia, Pakistan, Lebanon and Serbia linking activities with existing DevCo programmes and including DRR components in early recovery, reconstruction and rehabilitation projects. Personnel resources have been increased at HHQ as well as in the field (expats) and the new HA concept 2015–2019 has been launched – all to implement more effectively.

Church Cooperation has become a well-structured section, with more professional and accountable partners, and is a relevant player in social inclusion and social services in all countries with a country programme. Roma inclusion, home care services and nursing homes for the elderly or handicapped, as well as shelters for women with children, are implemented on a larger scale with better results.

Full progress review see Appendix 1, Chapter 1.
1.3 Vision and values

According to the foundations’ statute, HEKS/EPER has the mandate to act on behalf of the Protestant churches of Switzerland. It is the Assembly of Delegates of the Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches (FSPC) which briefs the aid organisation on its mandates and assignments. ‘HEKS/EPER campaigns for a more humane and equitable world’ and ‘to assist people in economic and social need in Switzerland and abroad’. ‘The focus of its commitments is on the dignity of each individual. This is one of the principles of universal human rights and it is also reflected in basic Christian values.’ The mission statement expresses its deep respect for people of all cultures, ethnicities and religions. As such, HEKS/EPER supports people and communities in gaining prosperity or claiming their rights regardless of their religious affiliation, ethnic origin, social background, gender or sexual orientation. All people should be able to live a life in dignity and of safety in social, economic and political terms.

According to the statute, ‘the International Division fights the causes of hunger, injustice and social deprivation; and gives humanitarian and emergency aid.’ In addition, ‘HEKS/EPER cultivates dialogue with rights-holders, duty-bearers, donors and working partners. HEKS/EPER bases its work on values like self-determination, solidarity, responsibility, participation and grass-roots involvement. The top priority is to bring people to a point where they are independent from outside aid. This is why schemes and projects are developed in a spirit of partnership and run in liaison with those affected.’

The new international programme 2017–2020 builds on the foundations’ values and goals.

---

2 International Programme 2017–2020

This chapter highlights the programmatic framework of the three sections (DevCo, HA, CC) of HEKS/EPER’s International Programme and how synergies between them contribute to achieving the respective theories of change. It briefly outlines the most important adaptations and continuations comparing the HIP 2013–17 phase with the HIP 2017–2020, while Chapter 3, 4 and 5 describe the section’s objectives in detail.

2.1 Evolution of the International Programme

Overall, continuity marks the HIP 2017–2020 phase. Building on the strengths of the International Programme 2013–17, HEKS/EPER adapts and supplements its strategy gradually by refining objectives, approaches and principles more specifically. Both the adaptations and continuations are based upon experience gained, evaluations and learnings documented in the Appendix 1 with the programme progress and the international context. The major areas of adaptations or continuations are detailed below.

Adaptations that the HIP 2017–2020 entails are:

- In the HIP 2013–17, systemic changes were already being aimed at through conflict transformation and the application of a HRBA. A continuous pattern identified in the progress analysis was the need to ‘strive for systemic change’. Emphasising the importance of the systemic perspective, the HIP 2017–2020 considers the topic as an inherent ‘principle’ of the entire HIP (Chapter 2.3) for enhancing systemic changes to overcome inequalities at their roots up to governance level, meaningful for individuals, households and communities with disadvantages.
- Synergies among the three sections of HEKS/EPER (DevCo, HA, CC) will be used systematically for more effective and relevant HIP implementation. (Chapter 2.2)
- All projects and programmes now feed into the current global strategy with clear ‘thematic’ objectives per section; there are no longer specific continental objectives. (Chapter 2.2)
- Resilience is now an inherent part of the DevCo theory of change and HEKS/EPER continues to mainstream the topic. (Chapter 6.3)
- The present HIP now strives for ‘inclusive and efficient market systems’, expanding the previous focus on ‘value chain development’ and ‘access to markets.’ (Chapter 3.2.)
- HEKS/EPER has been promoting gender aspects in its programming and implementation for many years. Nevertheless, in the next phase, more emphasis will be placed on gender, including a process of mainstreaming the topic, including more resources. (Chapter 6.1)
- More in-depth analysis on how to deal with psychosocial components and values in order to overcome fragility, transform conflicts and enhance social cohesion. (Chapter 3.4)
- Creating more prospects for refugees (HA) and for young people in rural communities (DevCo) – with topics such as education, employment, income, social cohesion and security – to avoid brain drain, recruitment into violence, apathy, etc. (Chapters 3.2.2 and 4)
- The roll-out of the new HA implementation concept will enhance the response capacity in all priority countries, for example, by developing disaster response plans. (Chapter 4)
- CC expands its activities to the Middle East in order to strengthen the values of a multi-religious and pluralistic society through its cooperation with reformed minority churches. (Chapter 5)

Continuations in the HIP 2017–2020 from the previous HIP are:

- The HIP still contains the DevCo, HA and CC sections with their specific theories of change and objectives. They have been rephrased to point out how programmes and projects will generate impact; however by large the intervention rationale represents an evolutionary continuation of the previous HIP. (Chapter 2.2)
- The holistic perspective – understood as the interdependence of ‘single’ objectives – remains key. It will continue to enhance in-depth context analysis with ‘broad holistic lenses’ and link the various fields of actions of programmes/projects to make progress towards the ToCs of each section (Chapter 2.3); the holistic perspective in the ToC of DevCo is well-established. (Chapter 3)
• HRBA remains the reference frame of HEKS/EPER’s work fostering human rights, enabling environment or conflict transformation, but also enabling access to land, resources, services or an inclusive market system. It is also applicable for CC and HA. (Chapter 2.4)

• Dealing with root causes of violent conflicts and enabling space for civil society actions continues to be a core topic of HEKS/EPER, especially because HEKS/EPER is working mainly in fragile contexts. A number of programmes are focused on keeping up dialogue between duty-bearers and a vibrant inclusive civil society. HIP strategies aim at providing alternatives to unjust structures and authoritarian rule, advocating for long-term political change. (Chapters 3.3 and 3.4)

• A well-balanced partner portfolio (Chapter 7.5), effective alliances and networks, multi-stakeholder approaches (Chapter 7.9) and approaching duty-bearers remain key to fostering effectiveness, knowledge sharing, protection and advocacy when striving for systemic changes and to achieve the objectives.

• In the 2013–17 phase, the PCM including a sound M&E system has been adjusted and clearly improved. It will significantly help in planning, implementing, monitoring, learning from and steering the HIP 2017–20. With its reflective approach, HEKS/EPER remains a learning organisation reflecting on its activities, the progress and documenting lessons learnt as well as steering decisions in its reporting. (Chapter 8)

• HEKS/EPER fosters ‘enabling management’ towards an effective, relevant and impact-oriented HIP with comprehensive management guidelines and administrative tools. (Chapter 7)

---

2.2 Sections and objectives of the HIP 2017–2020

To work towards a more humane and more equitable world, responding to challenges such as poverty, inequality, discrimination, conflicts or disasters and respecting the dignity of people and communities worldwide, HEKS/EPER’s International Division works since decades in the three sections of development cooperation, humanitarian aid and church cooperation. Each has its own theory of change, but HEKS/EPER coordinates its overall efforts and searches for synergies (table 1, page 11).

The HIP 2017–2020 aims to reinforce the linkages between the sections to enable mutual knowledge sharing, adequate management and professional and effective implementation. Guidelines, M&E tools, approaches, principles and cross-cutting issues are harmonised as far as possible and useful. HEKS/EPER aims to implement coherent programmes where the various partners and projects create synergies and contribute to the theories of change.

The intensity of the interaction and joint programming of the sections will be defined by the needs of people and communities, HEKS/EPER’s set-ups, capacities of our partners and scope for promising synergies on the ground in the respective countries.

Some aspects of linkages to be considered and key measures to be taken are:

• The Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) approach that HEKS/EPER is committed to links the activities in the different phases in order to provide sustainable long-term solutions to affected people and communities. Therefore, it is key to build on and intentionally strengthen local capacities in cooperation with local communities (participation), partners, authorities and other INGOs. Relief, reconstruction/rehabilitation and development do not always follow a direct line from relief activities after a disaster to reconstruction to development. In practice, development and relief may coexist. A disaster can disrupt the daily life of people and communities to such an extent that relief is necessary. Economic activities in war-torn regions continue despite the crisis and alongside relief interventions. The
idea of humanitarian aid and development work take place at the same time, side by side in the same communities, is thus more appropriate than that of a single line.

- Resilience building is an important HEKS/EPER cross-cutting issue to be mainstreamed more rigorously in DevCo and HA – but also in CC, if appropriate. (Chapter 6.3)
- Priority countries such as Niger, South Sudan and the DR Congo oscillate between DevCo programmes and HA interventions. Shocks and stresses such as recurrent droughts or conflicts hamper the successes of DevCo. There, HEKS/EPER strives not to intervene with isolated short-term HA interventions, but to integrate HA components into its ‘regular’ DevCo programming. Ideally and in the long-term, with LRRD and resilience building, people and communities should be able to cope with shocks and stresses without a distinct HA interventions.
- If a humanitarian response takes place in a priority country, it is imperative to take into account the capacities and experiences of country offices (CO) and partner organisations (PO). HHQ and CO, if a priority programme, will build on local knowledge, but also provide necessary capacity building (Chapter 4) and support during planning and implementation.
- Strengthening the capacities of POs in priority countries through training and setting up a disaster response plan (Chapter 4) to enable them to play a relevant role, if a humanitarian role is needed, while not neglecting the DevCo programme. Adapting programming of HA interventions, not overwhelming POs and COs with project volume or content. Ideally, early recovery and rehabilitation interventions are planned and implemented with clear links to the DevCo programme (see LRRD, resilience building).
- Beware of a charity mind-set with people and communities as ‘receivers’ and HEKS/EPER and POs as ‘donors’. Therefore, a mindful HA approach is needed and linking HA and DevCo has to be done professionally without harming ownership or scope for systemic changes.
- Investing in promising CC partners that have a long-term perspective and the capacity to implement DevCo or HA projects according the specific standards - e.g. in Serbia with a former CC partner today able to implement HA activities (refugees on the Balkan route) or in Romania with a CC partner able to implement DevCo projects on Roma inclusion.
- Considering strategic joint set-ups interlinking DevCo, HA, CC towards a coherent HEKS/EPER regional approach (e.g. Middle East, Serbia, Romania). Each partner organisation contributes with their distinct relations, networks and stakeholders of the project and the context. This lead to broader and enriching involvement of CSO, government and church actors.
- Synergies between international cooperation of HEKS/EPER and its Switzerland division were created during the refugee crises 2015/16 when projects in the crises countries (Lebanon, Iraq, Turkey), on the Balkan route (Serbia) and integration projects and campaigning for solidarity for refugees (in Switzerland) worked towards a joint aim. This is a promising practice of a broad action which has to be strengthened in the next phase.

Cambodia: HEKS/EPER’s seed and market access project near the village of Kampong Os.
Table 1: The framework of HEKS/EPER International division's three sections with its ToCs and the respective objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Development cooperation (DevCo)</th>
<th>Humanitarian aid (HA)</th>
<th>Church cooperation (CC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ToCs</strong></td>
<td>Equal rights &amp; prosperity despite shocks and stresses</td>
<td>Life saving, recovery, preparedness &amp; prevention</td>
<td>Contribution of reformed churches to their societies is recognized as relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Human rights-based approach</td>
<td>Human rights-based approach</td>
<td>Human rights-based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting issues</td>
<td>Resilience building / Gender / Conflict sensitivity</td>
<td>Resilience building / Gender / Conflict sensitivity</td>
<td>Resilience building / Gender / Conflict sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Holistic &amp; systemic perspective / Learning for steering</td>
<td>Holistic &amp; systemic perspective / Learning for steering</td>
<td>Holistic &amp; systemic perspective / Learning for steering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of rural communities</td>
<td><strong>Access to land, resources, services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Secured access to land and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Secured access to basic services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production &amp; market systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sustainable agricultural production.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Inclusive &amp; efficient market systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society &amp; governance</td>
<td>5. Enhanced security &amp; space for civil society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Inclusion &amp; participatory governance structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living together in peace</td>
<td>8. Improved intra- &amp; inter-group relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional objectives</td>
<td>1. The impact of HEKS/EPER interventions on access to land, territories and resources gained acknowledgement in the development sector and public visibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. International division programme work is relevant, effective and implemented professionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Holistic and systemic perspective

Interconnecting objectives and holistic perspective

The core competency of HEKS/EPER lies in pursuing a holistic approach to international cooperation and thereby an explicit consideration of the interconnectedness and synergies between its three sections (Chapter 2.2) and the different fields of action per section (see “circle figures” of the Chapters 3, 4 and 5). HEKS/EPER can add substantial value by creating such synergies and making use of interfaces and mutual reinforcing, which leads to working strategies that enable interventions to devise change processes more efficiently, competently and effectively, and make it possible to bring about structural changes in society, the economy, politics/governance and the environment. Single-aim interventions are, from a HEKS/EPER perspective, not sufficient to initiate or achieve systemic and sustainable change. Therefore, HEKS/EPER programmes combine the objectives adapted to the respective context and needs of the people and communities, also fostering diapraxis (see DevCo objective 8, Chapter 3.4.1).

Applying a holistic perspective in this sense not only means making use of the synergies between the thematic fields of action but also combining practical and strategic activities, advocating through a strong network along the lines of a rights-based approach for the needs of the target group and an appropriate foundation within the different geographic regions.

The holistic approach with the core components ‘living together in peace’ and ‘civil society and governance’ is especially appropriate in dynamic and fragile contexts, where HEKS/EPER is most involved. A holistic perspective incorporates and addresses key drivers of fragility, such as weak political institutions, violent conflict, competition for resources, economic decline and poverty.

Systemic perspective

The goal to achieve systemic change has become an important principle in the implementation of HEKS/EPER programmes and projects. Thereby, HEKS/EPER defines systemic change as transformations in the structure or dynamics of a system that leads to impacts on large numbers of people, either in their attitudes and values, material conditions, behaviour or access to information, services and products. Systems thinking helps to analyse the nature of self-reinforcing vicious circles and address the intermingling dynamics which hinder or boost development towards equality and prosperity. It provides better oversight on dynamics within complex systems and thus provides opportunities for being less reactive to changing circumstances and events and instead work on the real underlying dynamics that cause those events. Systems analysis which examines social, political and economic value systems, the diversity of different groups of stakeholders with different attitudes, interests and behaviours as well as their relationships, provides important entry points for interventions in terms of possible paths and channels to change the system. It provides insights where linkages or synergies between efforts need to be created to have stronger cumulative influence. It may reveal the need for further in-depth analysis of stakeholders in order to address key people and authorities. It may also help to identify why, despite our best efforts, it is so difficult to induce change and how we might more effectively induce change and alter non-enabling systems. Finally, it provides better insights for monitoring the validity and robustness of the theories of change developed and understanding of potential barriers.

This means that HEKS/EPER projects and programmes take into account the interconnectedness among different stakeholders in a system and their dynamic interactions, the fact that observed effects can often not be traced back to a single cause and that actors within a system adapt while at the same time external conditions are constantly changing.

Based on its experiences, HEKS/EPER pursues the following approaches, which proved to be successful in achieving systemic change:

- From bottom to top – influencing duty-bearers (governmental authorities, religious and political authority figures, economic stakeholders, etc.) through dialogue and/or cooperation; promising practices and the experience of community-based organisations help to change the framework of conditions at the local, regional and – where possible – national level (Chapter 2.4, HRBA).
- Every context is specific and different – local knowledge and networks created by local actors do matter, so be cautious when importing best practices.

---

• Development of ‘critically important’ effective and efficient role models and subsequent upscaling and integration in existing systems.
• Constant search for new cooperation models and working approaches.
• Creation of trust between all stakeholders.
• Convening and brokering – good results are more likely to be achieved by bringing together the relevant stakeholders in an iterative process of experimentation, failure and adaptation.
• Purposeful, parallel, and coherent ‘experiments’ facilitate failing, learning and adapting faster and is central to making systemic change happen. Lessons learnt need to have an immediate impact on projects and programmes. Allowing failures produces institutional risk but is an effective instrument to reveal constraints and facilitate innovative solutions.
• Designing long-term strategies for systemic change backed by the delivery of and access to short-term benefits.

2.4 Human rights-based approach

The human rights-based approach (HRBA) is the overarching working approach that applies to all projects and programmes of the HEKS/EPER International Programme. HEKS/EPER started to apply the HRBA in its work in 2005 and will continue to systematise it in the 2017–2020 implementation phase.

Working with human rights as a base, HEKS/EPER aims to achieve more sustainable and systemic development changes by analysing and addressing violations of rights, inequalities and unjust power relations. International civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights as well as national and local legislation and values (in line with universal human rights) provide a guiding framework for the HEKS/EPER International Programme. Human rights standards and principles – such as participation and empowerment, accountability and advocacy, equality and non-discrimination, and links to human rights mechanisms – frame not only HEKS/EPER’s results, but are also integrated into all stages of the programming process (analysis, planning, implementation and impact measurement).

The roots of poverty and inequality are complex sociopolitical, cultural and economic structures and dynamics that exclude certain individuals and population groups. To contribute to equal rights in law and in practice for all women and men, HEKS/EPER is focusing especially on excluded and vulnerable groups (e.g. ethnic minorities, rural communities), combating discriminatory mechanisms and practices, supporting temporary special measures for excluded groups and using disaggregated data in its programmes and projects (non-discrimination and equality).

HEKS/EPER is facilitating the active and meaningful participation of vulnerable women and men in society and representation of their interests in a responsible and self-determined way, so that they can impact their social and economic development and live a self-determined life in dignity (participation and empowerment). Committed to the HRBA, HEKS/EPER enables dialogue and therefore works with rights-holders and duty-bearers (e.g. state authorities, those with economic power) so that they are accountable towards people and communities and thus take their duty seriously to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. Moreover, duty-bearers are given the skills, persuaded and pressured to ensure access to redress and

---

remedies when rights have been violated or abused, to be answerable to rights-holders for what they do (or don’t do) as well as to ensure adequate access to information.

However, the distinction between rights-holders and duty-bearers is rather conceptual, since every person has rights and duties. A state official in the department for agriculture, for example, is in his function a duty-bearer towards farmers, but at the same time he is also a rights-holder as a normal citizen. The farmer, on the other side, is a rights-holder towards the state but also a duty-bearer towards his children (e.g. make sure that they are nourished). Thus, empowering rights-holders means also making them aware of their obligations and demanding accountability from duty-bearers implies respecting and promoting their rights as well – HRBA is not a ‘one-way path’, but a mutual iterative process from both sides (see also Chapter 3, page 16: ‘Who HEKS/EPER works for and with’).

The HRBA implementation concept adopted in 2011 contains practical guidance for analysis, planning, implementation and impact measurement.

Advocacy is an integral part of the human rights-based work. This includes the facilitation of advocacy work contributing to the programme objectives in the countries and advocacy work in Switzerland according to HEKS/EPER’s concept.7

HEKS/EPER strives to enhance cooperation between various relevant duty-bearers and civil society – especially vulnerable people and communities. DevCo objective 6 and Chapter 7.9 on alliances and networks describe the importance of this dialogue to achieve the HIP objectives towards a systemic change.

---

3 Theory of change and objectives of development cooperation

Developed in 2011, and already included in the previous HEKS/EPER International Programme 2013–17, the theory of change for HEKS/EPER’s development cooperation section for 2017–2020 reveals again its vision of a systemic perspective and the indivisible nature of its nine overarching objectives. HEKS/EPER’s vision of a world where people and communities enjoying equal rights and prosperity despite shocks⁸ and stresses⁹ is to be achieved with a holistic perspective and interconnectedness of all objectives.

This theory of change is based on the belief that current systems based on discriminations and inequalities undermine the possibility of certain individuals and population groups developing their own full potential, which would otherwise allow them to sustain their livelihoods and to live free from fear and want¹⁰. To

---

⁸ Shocks come in the form of rapid onset or slow onset shocks that impact on the vulnerability of the system and its components. There are many different types of disaster-related shocks that can strike at different levels. These include disease outbreaks, weather-related and geophysical events including floods, high winds, landslides, droughts or earthquakes. There can also be conflict-related shocks such as outbreaks of fighting or violence, or shocks related to economic volatility.

⁹ Stresses are long-term trends that undermine the potential of a given system or process and increase the vulnerability of stakeholders within it. These can include natural resource degradation, loss of agricultural production, urbanisation, demographic changes, climate change, political instability and economic decline.

HEKS/EPER International Programme 2017–2020

achieve ‘equal rights and prosperity despite shocks and stresses’. HEKS/EPER follows nine distinct operative objectives which interact with each other and combine to make activities progress further (see figure 3).

In order to change those systems, a certain space to act is needed. This space includes the possibility of speaking out, cooperating and linking up with others without fear of being threatened or even physically attacked. This is a precondition for empowering rights-holders and holding duty-bearers accountable. A foundation of values which entails commitment and public attitude of striving for equal rights and living together in peace provides a backing for vulnerable groups to claim rights and the motivation of duty-bearers to stick to their responsibilities of fulfilling rights. Once vulnerable people are able to claim rights and the degree of cooperation with duty-bearers allows a mutual constructive dialogue, inclusive and participatory governance structures can be institutionalised. Participation in decision-making and influence in policy dialogue among vulnerable groups enhances access to services or supports the approval of claims made. The enhanced commitment of individuals and public attitudes towards peace are the basis for linking different interest groups and to creating trusting relationships.

All of these components foster possibilities for people and local communities to access land and other resources as a basis and precondition for engaging in sustainable production. These products and services are finally embedded in functioning, inclusive and efficient market systems (agricultural and non-agricultural), which provide opportunities for cooperation for all.

**Development cooperation – theory of change**

HEKS/EPER strengthens civil society and inclusive governance structures, living together in peace, the pursuit of access to land and resources as well as sustainable production and inclusive market systems. Thus, HEKS/EPER contributes so that all people and communities enjoy equal rights and prosperity despite shocks and stresses.

**Figure 4:** DevCo’s theory of change, objectives and cross-cutting issues including the people and communities who HEKS/EPER works for and with.

**Who HEKS/EPER works for and with**

HEKS/EPER works in favour of people and communities who do not enjoy equal rights and prosperity due to being socially, politically or economically disadvantaged, such as the landless, smallholders, marginalised indigenous/traditional/rural communities, the underrepresented, the oppressed, the disaster-prone, conflict-affected people, etc.
And thus HEKS/EPER works with:

- **Rights-holders**, individuals entitled to enjoy human rights (for individuals and groups), to claim these rights (and be protected if they do so peacefully) and to redress when rights are violated, as well as with the obligation to respect the rights of others.

- **Duty-bearers**, stakeholders with the responsibility to respect, promote and ensure rights such as state authorities, local or national leaders and representatives in politics, economics, religion or communities.

To improve the situation of people and communities, HEKS/EPER does not exclusively work with the most vulnerable or those who are discriminated against, but also with people and grassroots organisations close to them that have a significant impact on the fight against poverty and in securing economic security, fostering social inclusion or creating peace. Women are still amongst the most marginalised, certainly single mothers or elderly women without supporting relatives; therefore gender remains important as cross-cutting issue. In the next phase, creating better prospects for young people suffering from economic, political or social deprivation will be a higher priority. As stated above, in the HRBA Chapter 2.4 and in objective 6, HEKS/EPER strives to create a dialogue between rights-holders and duty-bearers to create win-win situations.

**Where HEKS/EPER works**

HEKS/EPER focuses on **rural areas**. Poor people and communities mainly live in rural areas (Appendix, Chapter 2.4) and depend on agriculture or other local income-generating activities and small-scale production. Often, they are also disadvantaged in term of rights or social inclusion and are highly vulnerable if affected by disasters or conflicts. There are clear linkages to (semi-)urban areas with push/pull factors from rural to urban areas influencing the context and which are of significance for the people and communities HEKS/EPER works with. Furthermore, cities or regional centres are important parts of market systems. In order to strive for wider impact, HEKS/EPER also works on national or international level forming alliances and networks to advocate for the concerns of its target groups. (Geographic coverage of HEKS/EPER in Chapter 7.3)

### 3.1 Access to land, resources and services

Land rights empower people and provide a sense of dignity. It is widely recognised that secure and equal rights to land and natural resources are central to this effort. Access to land and natural resources is also fundamental to guaranteeing individual’s food sovereignty. Furthermore, in most countries around the world, land rights discriminate against girls and women. In addition, it is estimated that non-marketed services derived from the use of land and natural resources comprise 50 to 90% of all sources of livelihoods of rural households living in poverty worldwide. Thus, for HEKS/EPER, access to land, resources and services is key for achieving its goals of equal rights and prosperity.

#### 3.1.1 Objective 1: Secured access to land & resources

**Access to land**

As a consequence of the urgent need to secure access to land and HEKS/EPER’s longstanding experience in development work, a substantial number of projects focus on enhancing access to land and resources for people and communities.

Access to land and resources means, in the view of HEKS/EPER, that people have secured rights to land ownership and/or land use, and that they can control, manage and use the land and affiliated resources in the long term. Depending on the context, HEKS/EPER’s work focuses on four aspects:

- Supporting people and communities in their legitimate endeavours to have secured access to land and resources.
- Enhancement of processes and institutions resolving land conflicts and harmonisation of rules and laws.

---

12 TEEB. 2010. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Mainstreaming the Economics of Nature: A synthesis of the approach, conclusions and recommendations of TEEB (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity).
• Assisting populations that have access to land and that use its resources in safeguarding it against outside interests on the basis of the laws in force.
• Supporting people and communities in investing in land and in managing their land more productively and sustainably.

HEKS/EPER has identified weak capacities on land issues as one of the core problems for people and communities that do not enjoy equal rights and prosperity. As such, documenting facts and evidence – regarding injustices concerning access to land – is a precondition for serious advocacy and legal work for claiming secured access to land. Accordingly, well-documented evidence from selected flagship projects and an organised constituency claiming rights on the national and – to a lesser degree – at the global level are intermediary milestones of the 2017 to 2020 programme period and address the lack of recognition of land use and tenure of people and communities.

Particularly in the case of people and communities (e.g. indigenous people, traditional communities and pastoralists), whose customary and collective rights to their territories (land and natural resources) are often not respected, HEKS/EPER follows a territorial working approach. This is an important component of the programme work, which opens space to promote innovative land governance systems and instruments in order to face or minimise pressures over land and resources like water, seeds and biodiversity.

Furthermore, HEKS/EPER sees a great need to link up people and communities with local, regional, national as well as international networks.

Another key lesson from experience is for sustainable and productive use of secured resources to be addressed in early stages of interventions. HEKS/EPER does not assume it will happen on its own. By incorporating a production perspective from the onset, gains in access to land being lost to quick lease- or sell-back arrangements can be avoided.

Interventions on access to land and resources need an assessment of the attitudes and needs of all stakeholders involved in order to address the prevailing concerns and to avoid fragmentation of the community, which often hinders rights-holders successes. It may also open up opportunities to explore common interests in unbalanced power dynamics such as, for example, with private sector companies. Last but not least, enhanced land governance requires appreciation of and harmonisation between different rules and laws; specifically customary and formal rights.

Therefore, HEKS/EPER will further expand its existing project portfolio of interventions facilitating access to land and resources for the most vulnerable based on its extensive experience gained in recent years. The support of projects and initiatives which target the development of sustainable land governance systems for peasants and rural communities based on equitable access to the natural resources of the land and the territories will receive specific attention in the next programme period.

Key Indicators for access to land

To provide evidence of its impact on access to land, HEKS/EPER has defined the following key indicators and integrates them into its projects and country programmes dealing with the topic of access to land:
• Number of hectares of land to which a given number of people have received secured access (legal title, long-term right to use, etc.).
• Ability of people to enjoy their rights to cultivate their land.
Institutional objective 1 for access to land

The topic of access to land is of strategic importance to HEKS/EPER. As such, in addition to DevCo’s objective 1 above, the following institutional objective 1 has been set:

‘The results of HEKS/EPER’s interventions on access to land and resources are acknowledged in the development sector and are publicly visible’ (see also Table 1, page 11).

HEKS/EPER’s recognition and legitimacy – primarily in Swiss, but also in international networks – concerning access to land will be increased through thoroughly documenting experiences of innovative projects and programmes on the ground. This increased recognition also increases opportunities to make our target group’s concerns and voices heard and influence policy development accordingly.

To achieve this in the phase 2017–2020, HEKS/EPER will be pursuing the following sub-objectives:

- Significant increase in innovation potential through active portfolio management of projects and initiatives concerning access to land in its country programmes, including the documentation of flagship projects and providing evidence of impact related to access to land.
- Consolidation of in-house understanding on access to land, regular publishing experiences and positions related to access to land and strengthening cooperation with other development stakeholders, research institutions and experts in the field of access to land and related issues.
- Strengthen linkages with relevant national, regional and international processes related to access to land including active contributions in related networks and working groups (e.g. the Global Network for the Right to Food and Nutrition) and linking partner organisations and projects to these processes (e.g. the Global Convergence of Land and Water Struggles, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People in Rural Areas, the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests, and the Environmental Cooperation for Peacebuilding Programme, ECP of the UNEP).

Access to resources

Access to seeds and conservation of agrobiodiversity: Access to animal and plant genetic resources and the conservation of agrobiodiversity is fundamental to ensuring food and nutritional security and sovereignty for rural and urban people. Vital conditions for access to seeds and the conservation of agrobiodiversity are the land and territorial rights of individuals and rural communities, their access rights and free use and management of natural resources. Of equal importance are understanding of local/regional rationales for using and managing agrobiodiversity, based on the context-specific farming systems and the circuits for exchange and circulation of plant and animal genetic resources. The conservation of diverse species and varieties is also of vital importance in light of climate change, as it allows for adaptation to new climatic conditions.

HEKS/EPER campaigns for the fulfilment of the right of local communities and smallholders to retain seeds for the next sowing season, to exchange and sell seeds and the right to fair sharing of benefits and participation in decision-making at the international, national and regional level.

As such, within this objective, HEKS/EPER wants to strengthen local agrobiodiversity management strategies which include, among others, the recovery and conservation of genetic variability in key crops for food and nutritional security, the strengthening of family and community seed banks, access to public seed banks and the management of diversified production systems based on agro-ecological principles (see also Chapter 3.2.1). In addition, HEKS/EPER will work in several contexts on issues related to the identification and assessment of local animal and plant species which are better adapted to changing climatic conditions and the multiplication and distribution of GM-free varieties.

In addition, HEKS/EPER seeks to expand access and influence government policies and programmes on the use and conservation of agrobiodiversity, food and nutritional security, and enhance regulatory frameworks to expand opportunities and to ensure farmers’ rights, including those which protect their traditional knowledge. The foundation for this is a context-specific systematisation and dissemination of information on existing legal frameworks at the international, national and communal level.

---

13 Agrobiodiversity as understood by HEKS/EPER covers the broad spectrum of cultivated and native species managed by different groups’ farming systems.
Access to water: Water is at the core of sustainable development. Water resources, and the range of services they provide, are key to achieving poverty reduction, inclusive growth, public health, food security and environmental sustainability\(^{14}\). A main issue regarding access to water is control by the communities and good governance as crucial mechanisms for maintaining the availability of water and preventing conflicts. HEKS/EPER supports strategies, which provide sufficient, safe, reliable and affordable water supply and sanitation services to meet every person’s basic needs, supported by equitably expanded and efficiently managed infrastructure. Water resources management, infrastructure and service delivery must be sustainably financed. Securing access to water is not only enhanced by “pure” water projects and therefore HEKS/EPER strives to include this aspect more systematically and holistic in project/programme planning and implementation.

HEKS/EPER is working with its partner organisations to achieve the goal of access to sufficient and safe water by:

- Strengthening the capacities of partner organisations and key stakeholders in the water sector in HEKS/EPER’s countries (local communities, local and national government, private sector) to use the water resources in a sustainable way.
- Improving water schemes for human and agricultural use and strengthening the capacity of communities to maintain, upscale and expand them.
- Strengthening the knowledge of partner organisations and local communities to more efficiently use water for food production by following agroecological principles.
- Strengthening the awareness of partner organisations and key stakeholders in the water sector and their capacity to monitor and advocate for access to water as a human right.
- Actively participating in national and international water-related networks with the goal of strengthening the methodological and technical knowledge base with regards to access to water, coordination among like-minded stakeholders and awareness about access to water as a public good and a human right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key indicators 'access to water and resources’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals with access to improved drinking water sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (no. of hours) spent collecting fuel or water, disaggregated by sex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Objective 2: Secured access to basic services

In different contexts, especially in those where HEKS/EPER is working for disenfranchised and vulnerable groups (e.g. Roma, Dalit, Adivasi, elderly people and pastoralists) and communities in remote areas, access to basic services is often not guaranteed. HEKS/EPER projects strive to strengthen services and facilitate access to those services by both establishing hard infrastructure as well as targeted lobbying and advocacy work. These services are seen as a prerequisite on the way towards prosperity, as well as a consequence of inclusive governance structures and thus complement HEKS/EPER activities within its other objectives.

The projects cover, among others, the access to the following basic services:

- Basic infrastructure benefitting communities/groups and/or individuals/households including sanitation, drainage, electricity, roads and transport, schools and irrigation.
- Social assistance for individuals/households and communities/groups including the facilitation of shelter construction/renovation, old-age pensions, sanitation facilities, food rations and widow pensions.
- Healthcare, including birth registrations/certificates, health cards, immunisation and home care services.
- Advocating for formal and informal education such as afterschool programmes, stipends for schoolchildren, vocational skills and training programmes and education services.

**Key indicator ‘secured access to basic services’**

- Number of individuals with access to basic services.

### 3.2 Production & market systems

HEKS/EPER sees sustainable agricultural production and the development of inclusive and efficient market systems as core components for increasing livelihood opportunities for people and communities.

#### 3.2.1 Objective 3: Sustainable agricultural production

In rural areas, livelihoods largely depend on agricultural production. Even though access to resources – such as land, water and other agricultural inputs – may have been successfully achieved by individuals, families and communities, farming conditions for families are often difficult due to unfavourable locations, insufficient or unproductive land, inappropriate techniques and lack of skills, knowledge and access to efficient advisory services.

As such, HEKS/EPER strives for customised, agroecological land management and production practices in accordance with the location, which are based on the five agroecological principles as defined by Miguel Altieri (2002)\(^\text{15}\): 1) recycling biomass and balancing nutrient flows and availability; 2) securing favourable soil conditions for plant growth by enhancing organic matter; 3) minimising losses of solar radiation, water and nutrients by managing the microclimate and soil cover, and practising water harvesting; 4) enhancing biological and genetic diversification on cropland and 5) enhancing beneficial biological interactions and minimising the use of pesticides and fertilisers.

In the literature\(^\text{16}\) the following production systems are listed as examples of agroecology: integrated pest management (IPM), conservation agriculture (CA), organic farming, mixed crop-livestock/fish systems, agroforestry and permaculture, low external input sustainable agriculture (LEISA) and low input agriculture (LIA).

As a bottom line, HEKS/EPER strives to ensure that at least good agricultural practices are implemented by promoting those approaches and by holding duty-bearers accountable to deliver advisory services in accordance with those approaches and by pursuing solutions, which lead to an upscaling of them – e.g. through holding duty-bearers accountable to deliver advisory services or by payment for ecosystem services schemes.

**Key indicators ‘sustainable agricultural production’**

- Number of farmers / households applying agroecological production practices.
- Percentage of people reporting a change in their agricultural and/or non-agricultural yields.

---


3.2.2 Objective 4: Inclusive and efficient market systems

HEKS/EPER projects and programmes promote an integrated market-systems development approach that strengthens the accountability of rural families and communities, and aims to upgrade value-chain governance for the benefit of producers and consumers. The market systems development approach ultimately aims at increasing the income of people and at market systems delivering products or services more efficiently.

As such, HEKS/EPER strives for changes to structures and dynamics of market systems under the following areas such as: a) development / creation of new and efficiently functioning networks, associations and/or businesses; b) changes related to access to information and services; c) changes in the rate of adoption and/or implementation of ideas and good practices within and between specific groups and actors within a market system; d) changes in investment patterns; e) shifts in power dynamics and scope of action for communities in the market system and f) changes in rules and framework conditions of the market system.

HEKS/EPER adopts a systemic approach to market development. Systemic concepts of interconnectedness, interdependency and interaction of system elements, and the inherent feedback loops which promote and inhibit change mean that in practice, HEKS/EPER and its partners take into account relevant stakeholders, the relationships among them and the context that influences how they behave and interact in the market system. Pursuing systemic changes in market development involves developing a vision for a more efficient, inclusive and equitable market system and working from a number of angles with critical market stakeholders to achieve this goal (systemic perspective chapter). For an implementing agency, this implies that they refrain from providing market services and instead stick to their role as facilitators.

Agriculture-based market systems development

In most HEKS/EPER priority countries, agriculture-based markets play an important role for improving the livelihoods of rural communities, smallholders, indigenous and traditional people. Based on improved agricultural production (holistic & systemic perspective, Chapter 2.3), HEKS/EPER’s interventions in this field strive for lasting market-system changes at the local, national or international level. This includes strategies to empower farmers to get mobilized and organized as well as strategies to facilitate access to sustainable agriculture related knowledge, inputs, services and finances, and developing new products.

In the 2017–2020 programme period, HEKS/EPER will strive to adjust its project portfolio to include more projects that focus from the onset on addressing systemic constraints and opportunities in the entire market system and not remain focused on agricultural production.

Employment and self-employment in market systems, including non-agricultural markets

Even in rural areas, there are considerable opportunities in both the agricultural and the non-agricultural sectors for increasing incomes by providing employment and entrepreneurship. For disadvantaged communities that either do not have any agricultural background and/or access to arable land, the non-agricultural sector needs to be targeted in particular.

As such, HEKS/EPER strives to enhance and improve employment and self-employment possibilities for people and communities by focused skills development programmes and/or vocational education and training projects. Thereby, HEKS/EPER follows a strategy of strengthening existing private or public institutions offering skill-development services and vocational education and training by, among others,

17 More details on HEKS/EPER’s approach on market-systems development are described in the HEKS/EPER document ‘Market Systems Development: Guideline to plan and facilitate market system changes’ developed in 2015.
improving their curriculums, facilitating linkages to experts at other schools and access of interested people to these services.

### Key indicators ‘inclusive and efficient market systems’
- Percentage of people stating a change in their incomes.
- Observed changes in structure and dynamics of market systems.
- Percentage of people stating a change in their livelihoods.
- Perception of the effectiveness of training programs, especially related to economic security.
- Number of people who increased their practical knowledge about (a) value-chain development; and b) value-chain development supporting areas / non-formal education.
- Quantitative change in hours of household labour and care work by time and task allocation, disaggregated by sex.

### 3.3 Civil society & governance

HEKS/EPER’s theory of change considers inclusive and strong civil society and governance structures as key components for enhancing sustainable development. A vibrant civil society which is able to participate at the sociopolitical level as well as structures which provide space in order to negotiate differences to enhance mutual respect is a cornerstone towards ensuring equal rights for all and human rights in of itself.

Civil society’s achievements in governance and development have been recognised widely and are very broad: civil society organisations (CSOs) facilitate representation of a wide range of voices in policy and development debates. They enable citizens to identify and articulate their values and rights and struggle for greater citizen participation. In particular, they represent and empower those who are vulnerable and marginalised. CSOs are often at the forefront of law and policy reforms and advance social, political, economic and environmental agendas. Their policy analyses bring important knowledge and facts to public discussions and to decision makers. Monitoring state performance – human rights violations, but also state budgeting, macro-economic policy, national production, employment etc. – promotes transparency and provides the basis for holding duty-bearers accountable. This is of benefit to all stakeholders, as it enhances mutually trusting structures improving justice and equal rights through inclusive governance structures and development benefits that reach all.

### 3.3.1 Objective 5: Enhanced security and space for civil society

Partner organisations, people and communities have been affected by the narrowing space for sociopolitical action for more than a decade. Although this topic has been a focus of HEKS/EPER endeavours, it has proven difficult to protect and expand non-profit organisations’ room for manoeuvre. Governments have become increasingly authoritarian in several priority countries. Restrictive regulations that undermine key freedoms according to international human rights laws were signed into law in many countries. The scope for civil society associations to provide input and feedbacks, e.g. to newly drafted NGO laws, has been very limited. According to findings of the Special Rapporteur for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, ‘a growing number of defenders point to backtracking in countries in which the law seems designed to criminalise them and to thwart what they do.’ Vulnerable people speaking up and human rights defenders are increasingly threatened and subject to violence. The high degree of impunity in those cases increases the insecurity felt and increases self-censorship. Security, freedom from fear and freedom from want for all are the basis to creating the space for civil society stakeholders to enhance development and justice. Therefore, preventing direct violence and supporting victims is essential. As also outlined in the New Deal Peace and

---

18 The important role of civil society for sustainable development has been highlighted in numerous UN documents since the 1990s and reiterated at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan in 2011.
19 E.g. Cambodia, South Sudan, Zimbabwe and Azerbaijan.
20 ICNL: [http://www.icnl.org/research/monitor/](http://www.icnl.org/research/monitor/)
21 Threats faced by civil society and individual human right defenders come in many guises (physical, psychological, economic, and social) and reflect the interaction of multiple factors (poor governance, impunity or the absence of the rule of law and are triggered by a variety of political, economic, religious, state or private actors. (Special rapporteur Human Rights Defenders Report A/70/217)
State Building Goal ‘strengthening people’s security’ is crucial for overcoming fragility. Combined protection, monitoring and advocacy activities are relevant and effective functions of civil society in building peace. It needs to be part of a coherent strategy not only working on the effects but also on the causes of human rights violations and include cooperation with national and international networks.

Based on these developments, experiences in the 2013–2017 programme phase and findings and recommendations of a collaborative research on ‘strategies to enhance and uphold civil society space for action’, HEKS/EPER has identified the following goals and approaches as most relevant:

- Enhancing civil society participation in policy development. Strengthening civil society’s capacity to gather and analyse information relevant for the programmes and communities they work with. This enables more effective contributions to national planning and policymaking processes and influence over / challenges to government policies and actions.
- Enhance the strength and legitimacy of CSO movements. Strengthening consultation and coordination with a wide variety of stakeholders and networks that represent different interests. Bridging the gap between those who work on development and those who work on human rights and social justice as well as faith-based organisations. Capitalising and disseminating promising practices to strengthen civil society. Another means to strengthen legitimacy is by ensuring accountability towards vulnerable communities.
- Enhancing the protection of CSOs and human rights defenders. Further cooperation to strengthen security and protection mechanisms for CSO representatives and human rights defenders at risk. These protection plans include legal aid, measures to fight impunity and facilitate the right to remedies. They should not only focus on emergency situations but also include preventive as well as long-term coping measures.
- Holding governments accountable for provide space by respecting and protecting the aforementioned civil societies’ rights. Access to information for CSOs and human right defenders enables them to claim and use their right to seek, obtain, share and hold information. This also provides the basis for lobbying against legislation constraining COs’ space.
- Supporting national endeavours through international advocacy. Dynamics in neighbouring countries, as well as international organisations and their policies impact on civil society space at the national level. As such, in collaboration with ACT Alliance, HEKS/EPER aims to influence relevant policies and guidance as well as joint lobby endeavours targeting specific governments in order to be able to strengthen the voice of local CSOs through the international community.

**Key indicators ‘enhanced security and space for civil society’**

- Ability of people of our concern, civil society and partners to influence policy development and implementation.
- Degree of self-perceived security.
- Number of physical attacks.

### 3.3.2 Objective 6: Empowered rights-holders & accountable duty-bearers

The HIP aims at holding duty-bearers accountable in order to obtain justice and the fulfilment of human rights and ensuring they are answerable for the observance of human rights standards. Governments are the principal legal duty-bearers. Other authority figures also have duties and responsibilities, e.g. NGOs, traditional leaders, religious leaders and international organisations.

Accountability means that duty-bearers are answerable to rights-holders for what they do (or don’t do) towards fulfilling their human rights obligations. Therefore, accountability also requires the development of frameworks (laws, policies, procedures, practices, and resource allocations) and changes in attitude to ensure that human rights are respected, protected and fulfilled for all men, women, boys and girls.

In addition, the HIP strives towards empowering rights-holders, especially the most vulnerable. Empowerment is the process by which the capabilities of people and communities to demand and use their

---

24 The recognition of the ACT community of practice in the field of enhancing an enabling environment (e.g. through the advisory status in the intergovernmental organisation, Community of Democracies, and the Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness) is of great advantage.
rights are strengthened. The goal is to ensure that all have the power and capabilities to change their own lives and hold those responsible to account for their obligations.

The starting point for empowerment and accountability is the transfer of information on human rights, equality and conflict transformation to both rights-holders and duty-bearers. Although a lot of capacity building has taken place in recent years, it has proven to be essential to put more efforts into follow-up actions. As such, HEKS/EPER has piloted training of trainers with longer-term coordination and/or coaching between trainees in order to assist partners with putting the newly gained knowledge in practice, encouraging peer-to-peer learning support and tracking outcomes of training. To enhance ownership of such processes, it is key to promote individuals’ and communities’ own initiatives and to act as a facilitator in the background. The concentration on training of trainers and longer-term learning processes enhances broader dissemination and stronger cooperation between rights-holders and with duty-bearers. HEKS/EPER aims at addressing duty-bearers from the early stage onwards. This could mean direct involvement in capacity building measures as well as advocacy and lobbying endeavours. The peace building approach identifies interests that the government and other authority figures have with civil society and the most vulnerable in particular, aiming at enhancing cooperation between both parties. However, extreme power imbalances require a more confrontational approach in order to ‘convince duty-bearers to adhere to human right standards’. A key milestone on the way to the fulfilment of rights is the fact that advocacy plans have been made in an inclusive manner and claims are officially brought forward. Empowerment and accountability for the fulfilment of human rights are not only anchored in this specific HIP objective 6, but also further strengthened and mainstreamed through the human rights-based approach which is compulsory for all projects.

Key indicators ‘empowered rights-holders and accountable duty-bearers’

- Number of rights and conflict transformation education events conducted and/or funded.
- Number of activities striving for equality and non-violence taken up by participants of rights and conflict transformation education on their own initiative.
- Degree of cooperation between government/duty-bearers and civil society/vulnerable groups (rights-holders).
- Number of official claims reflecting the interests of people made/accepted with the contribution of HEKS/EPER and partners.
- Percentage of women (self-perceived) decisively taking part in key decision-making about household income allocation.

3.3.3 Objective 7: Inclusion & participatory governance structures

Generally speaking, discrimination and exclusion are the key underlying causes of vulnerability. As such, the topic of inclusion has been and continues to be at the core of HEKS/EPER’s commitments. Enhancing inclusion and participation is one of five fields of intervention in its conflict transformation concept. Inclusion is determined firstly by economic, judicial and societal structures secondly by cultural psychological social values (which are dealt with under objective 8 and 9). The former dimension of inclusion describes the manner and scope in which people and communities can access economic, social and political institutions, resources and services to their benefit. Hence, objective 7, inclusion and participatory governance, is closely interlinked with the objectives concerning access to resources, services and markets above. Moreover, investments in infrastructure (e.g. under HIP objectives 1 and 2) imply a functioning governance system. HIP objective 7 fosters inclusive and transparent governance at the community level. Infrastructure projects should be used as entry points to strengthen participatory governance structures.

Minorities, migrants, persons with disabilities, children and the elderly need to be heard and included. Empirical experience as well as the international debate are confirmation of the importance of safeguarding inclusion and meaningful participation – mainly as a goal in its own right but as well as a vehicle for enhancing sustainable development (compare with SDG 10 and the UN Report on the World Social Situation 2016 – Leaving no one behind). True representation and participation in particular of these vulnerable parts of the population in local and national development plans and budgets may ensure the fulfilment of rights for all. In order to achieve this, power structures would have to be challenged, the rule of law enforced and the mechanisms for participation established.

The new HIP, as did the former, puts a particular focus on discriminated minority groups such as Dalit, Roma, Adivasi and other indigenous or traditional communities in Latin America and Africa. Active, free and
meaningful participation for all is a human right and social, political and economic inclusion a strategy to prevent and/or mitigate violent conflict. The lack of recognition and respect of individuals’ identity may cause long-standing grievances, insecurity and violence.

To enhance social and economic inclusion, individuals and communities have to be able to analyse their own context and rights. Based on these analyses, individuals and communities have to be made capable of contributing to decision-making and policy development. It’s crucial that the concerns voiced are taken seriously by responsible duty-bearers and that the proper implementation of agreed plans is monitored. HEKS/EPER’s aid in enhancing inclusion is considered a long-term process and provides accompaniment in all stages throughout the cycle. Mobilisation and agreement at the local level are the basis for multi-level advocacy which aims at fostering inclusive and legitimate politics in the sense of the first New Deal and its peace and state building Goals HEKS/EPER’s experiences in setting up and institutionalising structures to enhance peaceful transformation of conflicts at the local level has proven to be effective. Linking these results at the local level with advocacy measures that strive to change regional and/or national governance structures remains a major challenge.

Furthermore it has proven important to consider local hierarchies and fragmentations while supporting advocacy endeavours. ‘The vulnerable’ are far from homogenous. It may be mainly micro power structures which are the key obstacle to enhancing equal rights for those subject to multiple forms of discrimination. Therefore, HEKS/EPER attempts to build truly inclusive, strong, agreed upon voices before making claims at higher levels. The subsequent milestones to be achieved are inclusive institutionalised bodies providing space to openly bring in views and influence policy and action. Inclusive and transparent processes are furthermore key to enhancing the enjoyment of equal rights.

Promoting social inclusion requires not only the removal of barriers to equal participation but also actively ‘bringing people in’ and addressing the institutions, norms, behaviours and values that perpetuate exclusion. An inclusive education system may lead to better relations or to the social inclusion of discriminated-against or disadvantaged people (e.g. Kosovo, where afterschool classes for Roma in Roma settlements are to become fully inclusive after-school government modules for majority and minority pupils).

‘Positive discrimination’ is often necessary to increase the capacities of minority groups, to enable equal participation and inclusion. However sometimes in order not to reconstruct or sharpen stereotypes it may highly beneficial to address minorities as ‘the most vulnerable’ – which may also include some deprived representatives of mainstream society – instead of naming certain minority groups. Entry points for incorporating mainstream society in social inclusion processes have to be identified and used from the very beginning.

Key indicators ‘inclusive and participatory governance structures’

- Percentage of women that report effective participation in decision-making bodies at the community level.
- Activities have made progress towards the creation or reform of institutions and policies which handle grievances and the enforcement of equal rights.

3.4 Living together in peace

Direct violence does not just happen but is embedded in the cultural and structural set-up of a society and its governing systems. HEKS/EPER’s conflict transformation (CT) approach\(^25\) aims at addressing all forms of direct, cultural and structural violence. CT focuses on change, addressing two questions: ‘What do we need

\(^{25}\) HEKS/EPER (2011). Conflict transformation implementation concept. Zürich
to stop?’ and ‘What do we hope to build?’ HEKS/EPER includes the starting point as well as the goal, but certainly focuses on the transformation process itself. Different from conflict resolution, which focuses on the de-escalation of conflict and diffusion of crises, CT allows for ebb and flow in conflict, and sees the presenting problem as a potential opportunity to transform the relationship and the systems in which the violence is embedded, thereby overcoming a culture of violence and addressing the root cause of the problem. Justice and equality are at the core of conflict transformation. The central question is not whether justice is achieved, but rather how one goes about promoting it in ways that can foster positive relationships between parties that live with or close to each other. Equal rights and dignity are a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for reconciliation. CT takes the concern for equality and justice a step further and aims to rebuild a more liveable and psychologically healthy environment between former enemies, where the vicious cycle of hate, deep suspicion, resentment and revenge does not continue to intensify. HEKS/EPER’s in-depth context analysis (for example Zimbabwe, Cambodia and South Sudan) revealed the negative impact of past experiences trauma on development endeavours. The lack of trust within communities hindered a necessary cooperation for implementing sustainable development projects. Therefore, HEKS/EPER is taking efforts to develop sensitive means to deal with recent and past trauma.

To achieve positive peace in a society, values and attitudes which promote mutual recognition and respect as well as constructive non-violent approaches to deal with conflict are crucial. Therefore, HEKS/EPER is not only active in civil society, governance structures and rights (see Chapter 3.3) but also in cohesion within and between different groups and public commitment towards peace (Chapter 3.4).

3.4.1 Objective 8: Improved intra- and inter-group relations (different identity/interest groups)

Fragmentation within communities and cleavages between communities have been identified as key obstacles to development endeavours. Promoting mutual recognition, respect and cohesion within and between groups means building and reinforcing shared values. Common visions and a sense of belonging create identity while different individual and sociocultural backgrounds are appreciated and constructive relationships between different people persist. Moreover, vulnerable groups often fall victim to the divide and rule approach of authority figures26. This fragmentation weakens any advocacy endeavour to claim rights and cause additional grievances, which may trigger cycles of violence. There is a close link between objective 7 regarding social inclusion (that focuses on equal access to resources and institutions) and objective 6 related to social cohesion (that focuses on joint values, norms and positive relationships).

HEKS/EPER aims at improving intra- and inter-group relations through the establishment of dialogue and both horizontal and vertical linkages. Horizontal linkages serve to either avoid duplication, enhance

---

26 ‘Divide and rule’ is gaining and maintaining power by breaking up larger concentrations of power into pieces that individually have less power than the one implementing the strategy. The concept refers to a strategy that breaks up existing power structures and prevents smaller power groups from linking up.
coordination, create synergies, or overcome fragmentation in order to create social cohesion and a more effective movement for justice. HEKS/EPER facilitates exchange, cooperation and networking between different groups and organisations. A lack of cooperation and misunderstanding between NGOs based in capitals and local ones has been identified as an obstacle to success in numerous focus countries. Vertical linkages aim to connect different levels, from local up to international, and to support exchanges between civil society and duty-bearers, either governmental or other social, religious or economic power holders. In these efforts, the role of HEKS/EPER is one of mediation facilitation. HEKS/EPER makes use of its involvement in different spheres, from local to international, to foster constructive dialogue.

The HEKS/EPER diapraxis approach goes further and combines practical work, such as vegetable gardening, towards joint aims, such as increased income, in order to enhance positive relationships. A joint goal and joint practical work is the means to enhance trust and having antagonistic groups living together in peace. This concept can be applied to counter conflicts within smaller communities as well as between broader identity groups. Efforts in this regards include the provision of space for exchange and the deconstruction of stereotypes which are often used as instruments for martial propaganda.

Key indicators ‘improved intra- and inter-group relations of different interest/identity groups’

- Percentage of projects which aim at overcoming grievances between two or more concrete identity groups through ‘diapraxis’.
- HEKS activities have made progress towards the creation or reform of institutions and policies which handle grievances and the enforcement of equal rights.

3.4.2 Objective 9: Commitment and public attitude towards peace

A ‘culture of violence’ has been identified as one of the key drivers keeping violent conflict alive in HEKS/EPER analysis conducted to develop the conflict transformation implementation concept. Violence is hidden in structures, beliefs and value systems and manifests itself in deeply rooted power asymmetries. To comprehend violence one must look at the society as a whole. Social, political, and economic networks that form between individuals, communities, institutions and organisations are a particular focus. Structures manifest themselves in a variety of forms from the local to the international level. Social structures include sexism and racism, as well as class-based constructions. Structural violence asserts that individuals and states do not make decisions solely on the basis of rational choice. Instead, individuals are embedded in relational structures that shape their identities, interests and interactions. Cultural violence is understood as those aspects of moral culture that are referred to in order to justify or legitimise the application of direct or structural violence.

To prevent violence and transform conflicts peacefully, HEKS/EPER acts on the assumption that values and attitudes – not only of selected rights-holders and duty-bearers, but of the populace – towards peace are crucial. Core values of non-violence and social justice are central to fighting direct, structural and cultural violence in a society and thus to achieving positive peace.

One central role of HEKS/EPER and its partners is the promotion of a constructive conflict culture which enhances mutual respect, non-discrimination and non-violence. This includes the reflection of values which guide everyday life and behaviour. The deconstruction of stereotypes of ‘the other’ as well as the assessment of attitudes, positions, needs and interests of adversary groups are important. A constructive approach in dealing with conflicts will be elaborated, practised and internalised. Efforts such as peace education and social cohesion endeavours are relevant means in preventing social conflicts from becoming violent, since these efforts prompt people to increasingly resist violence and provocations to violence.

A particular focus is placed on the integration of the voice of young people into those initiatives. In a number of HEKS/EPER focus countries, a generational conflict between young people and older people and authority figures have been revealed to create a serious risk to non-violent conflict transformation as a frustrated young person is an easy target for becoming used as an instrument for violence.

In the coming phase, HEKS/EPER aims at more systematically exploring the potential of new media technologies to create peace. The goal is to effectively use means to actively create public discourse for peace. HEKS/EPER is building the foundation of a peace movement from the bottom up, but aims at securing the link to higher sociopolitical peace endeavours.

HEKS/EPER’s peace education endeavours are built on enhancing attitudes and subsequent initiatives for peace, put forward and organised by the participants itself. HEKS/EPER aims at providing space to analyse
and acknowledge the benefits of equality, non-violence and justice and the creation of a widely shared vision and strategies for peace. In order to enhance the power of these peace education endeavours, HEKS/EPER stresses the link to the political level. Therefore, key individuals who have the power to influence the wider public, as well as media representatives, are targets of advocacy for peace and justice.

**Key indicators ‘commitment and public attitude towards peace’**

- Number of rights and conflict transformation education events conducted and/or funded by HEKS/EPER.
- Quality of representation of discrimination (of minorities) in public discourse and the media.
- People increasingly speaking out for justice and peace and resisting violence and provocations of violence.

**Honduras: „La Voz de Zacate Grande“ addressing peace and land rights issues.**
4 Theory of change and objectives of humanitarian aid

The Humanitarian Aid Implementation Concept 2015–19 is the guiding document for all humanitarian aid interventions in the coming years, outlining how HEKS/EPER understands humanitarian aid and how HEKS/EPER and its partner organisations respond to emergencies.

Humanitarian aid aims to relieve human suffering and provides support strictly on the basis of need. Therefore, HEKS/EPER refers to the four humanitarian principles\(^\text{27}\) of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence. It is committed to the SPHERE and Core Humanitarian Standards, the code of conduct of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement as well as the ‘do no harm’ principle.

Humanitarian interventions respond to conflicts and disasters, either man-made or due to environmental hazards, and encompass a number of areas in different phases. As a relatively small organisation, HEKS/EPER has decided to set the subsequent focus in the selected areas and will not engage in health, education or camp management:

- During the initial relief phase, HEKS/EPER focuses on life-saving relief interventions in the sectors of food, WASH, shelter and non-food items (NFIs).
- In the early recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction phases, the focus is on the sectors of livelihood, WASH and reconstruction of private and public infrastructure (houses, schools and evacuation centres).
- Prevention and preparedness activities with the aim of ‘building/bouncing back better’ are integrated as early as possible in all phases to increase the resilience of the affected populations.

### Humanitarian aid – theory of change

HEKS/EPER’s humanitarian aid saves lives, alleviates suffering, restores livelihoods and rehabilitates infrastructure by providing and improving access to life-saving resources and basic services, livelihood opportunities, private and public infrastructure as well as increasing resilience of people and communities prone to or affected by disasters.

![Figure 5: HA’s theory of change, objectives, cross-cutting issues including the people and communities HEKS/EPER works in favour of and with.](https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM_HumPrinciple_English.pdf)

\(^{27}\) OCHA (2010). On message ‘Humanitarian Principles’
HEKS/EPER works in favour of people and communities affected by natural disasters and/or conflicts and thus, HEKS/EPER works with rights-holders and duty-bearers (definition see Chapter 3).

All emergency interventions give special attention to the needs of the most vulnerable members of society, e.g. women, children, people with disabilities, elderly and minority groups, while promoting gender equality and applying a conflict-sensitive programme approach as outlined in Chapter 6.2. Also committed to the human rights-based approach in emergency settings, HEKS/EPER facilitates dialogue between rights-holders and duty-bearers so authorities take their duty to support affected people seriously and respect, protect and fulfil human rights (Chapter 6.1).

Empirical studies and former experiences have confirmed a strong correlation between poverty and vulnerability of a population towards disasters: the poorest are also usually the most vulnerable. In this context it is essential to link relief to reconstruction, rehabilitation and long-term development (LRRD, see also Chapter 2.2) in order to increase the resilience of people living in disaster prone areas. Disasters also open a window of opportunity to start with the first steps to achieving greater economic security and development, especially for poorer households. HEKS/EPER’s aims at strengthening LRRD in coming years in the targeted areas, mainly in the priority countries where there is a permanent presence (Chapter 2.2). This approach can also be applied in countries where HEKS/EPER does not have a permanent presence with a priority programme through follow-up interventions such as rehabilitation of livelihoods, resilience building and local capacity building as well as through a multi-stakeholder approach involving other stakeholders.

Focus of HEKS/EPER humanitarian aid interventions

HEKS/EPER HA interventions will focus on livelihood (objective 2) and to strengthen the resilience of the affected people and communities (objective 4 and Chapter 6.3), especially in the 2nd phase of recovery and rehabilitation. Incorporating HEKS/EPER expertise of DevCo is an added value for HA interventions – mainly related to the respective DevCo objectives 1 to 4 (Chapter 3).

HEKS humanitarian interventions will take place predominantly in ...

- **16 priority programmes** (with a permanent HEKS/EPER country office).

If HEKS/EPER has the capacity, financial means and valid partners, it may also intervene in ...

- **Partner countries** (where HEKS/EPER currently is working through partners, but has no office).
- **Standby countries** (where HEKS/EPER worked until recently and still has contact to partners able to implement).

In few, well justified cases, HEKS/EPER will also intervene outside of priority, partner and standby countries. Without previous experience in and links to a country, HEKS will work through the ACT Alliance network which gives HEKS/EPER access to strong international NGO partners with experience in humanitarian aid and a larger reach than HEKS/EPER and its local partners would have alone. HA interventions will address needs in rural and urban settings.

Including resilience building

As half of the people living in extreme poverty worldwide also live in fragile states28 and natural disasters affect vulnerable/at-risk groups to a greater extent, humanitarian aid interventions need to include resilience-building activities from the beginning to address both immediate needs as well as promote development and structural changes to increase prevention and preparedness.

To achieve the objectives above and to respond quickly and efficiently to the needs of the people affected, HEKS/EPER needs to strengthen its capacities in the field and at HHQ by:

- Increasing the institutional preparedness of country offices and partners by developing country disaster response plans (DRPs).
- Continuing to build the capacity of its country offices and local partners to identify humanitarian needs and provide humanitarian assistance, especially in countries which are prone to natural disasters.
- Intensifying collaboration with network partners (e.g. ACT Alliance members) to increase response capacity and effectiveness.
- Elaborating key indicators for all 4 HA objectives ready to be implemented by 2017.

---

HEKS/EPER is committed to implementing downward accountability mechanisms in all humanitarian aid projects such as, but not limited to, participation of the affected population, informing them on aid entitlements and targeting criteria and establishing complaint response mechanisms (community help desk or help lines). Partners are also encouraged to and supported in the introduction of accountability mechanisms.

4.1 Objective 1: Saving lives through access to water, food, shelter and sanitation

After a natural disaster or during a protracted crisis caused by conflict, the needs of the affected population are primarily focused on access to drinking water, food and shelter, since these are the most essential for survival. Only if these basic needs are met will humanitarian agencies also address other needs (e.g. livelihood). Depending on the type of disaster it is often also essential to distribute non-food items (e.g. cooking utensils, matrasses and blankets).

HEKS/EPER is committed to providing needs-based humanitarian assistance in contexts of both natural and man-made disasters, utilising the partners and infrastructure available in the countries in which HEKS/EPER works as well as international network partners in countries where HEKS/EPER does not have a permanent presence.

With regard to life-saving interventions, HEKS/EPER will continue to adapt these to the needs of the specific context.

These interventions will focus on the provision of basic services and in kind assistance such as food, water and shelter. If external pre-conditions allow (e.g. functioning banking system and competitive markets), HEKS/EPER will also consider applying a cash- or voucher-based approach, which gives the recipients more flexibility and dignity when responding to their respective needs. This can be either conditional assistance (e.g. cash for work) or unconditional assistance.

Irrespective of the nature of the live-saving interventions, HEKS/EPER will put a strong emphasis on linking these with the subsequent phases of rehabilitation, livelihood and DRR, keeping the focus in the planning on increasing the resilience and recovery of the affected population.

**Key indicators ‘life saving’**
- **Relief items**: Number of individuals who got access to water, food, non-food items (NFIs), emergency shelter, hygiene / sanitation, cash / vouchers, and Cash-for-Work (CfW).
- **Satisfaction**: Percentage of project participants stating their satisfaction with the received resources / services.
- **Knowledge**: All user groups know how to utilize NFIs appropriately.
- **Food security**: There is adequate access to a range of foods that are culturally acceptable and locally produced (where possible), including a staple (cereal or tuber), pulses (or animal products) and fat sources, that together meet nutritional requirements.
- **Water**: Average water use for drinking, cooking and personal hygiene in any household is at least 15 litres per individual per day (emergency phase) / safe and equitable access to sufficient drinking water (rehabilitation phase).

**Practices in ‘cash’ and ‘cash for work’ activities**

In recent years, HEKS/EPER has successfully applied projects based on a ‘cash approach’ such as:
- **Lebanon/Syrian crisis**: Cash assistance via debit cards.
- **Iraq crisis**: Cash for work opportunities for IDPs in host communities to complement the distribution of food packages.
- **Philippines, typhoon response**: Cash for work in the rehabilitation of shelters. Community members were mobilised to rehabilitate the shelters of the most vulnerable community members.
- **Niger drought response**: Farmers in HEKS/EPER DevCo areas were not able to harvest crops, losing their source of income. To bridge the gap until the next harvest season, HEKS/EPER provided cash for work for planting and maintaining doum palms, helping to confine desertification. This is an example of how HEKS/EPER’s development programmes can be complemented by a humanitarian intervention.

HEKS/EPER will continue in the HIP phase 2017-2020 to implement ‘cash’ activities, if adequate.
4.2 Objective 2: Rehabilitated livelihood opportunities

The negative impact of disasters on the livelihoods of affected populations is increasing. This is especially true for groups who are already below or just above the respective poverty lines before a disaster, normally going from bad to worse afterwards and who seldom have the capacity for self-rehabilitation. The impact of conflicts on the livelihoods of the affected, and often displaced, population is even more drastic. Displaced people are strongly limited in their livelihood options. Formerly viable livelihoods become unreliable or not feasible anymore. Alternative livelihoods have to be found and/or external support needs to substitute, at least temporarily, for former income strategies.

Feasible solutions can only be found through a joint participatory partnership process as early as possible, in the relief/early recovery phase. The affected population and their representatives (NGOs, local and state authorities) together with international organisations have to assess the situation on the ground and identify possible livelihood options, existing and lacking capacities and assets and decide on the responsibilities of the different stakeholders.

Different phases require different livelihood support: immediately after a disaster, cash-for-work programmes can be a measure to ensure that the most vulnerable households receive a regular income and channel money into local communities and markets. As market systems are vital in supplying goods/services and providing income, they are an essential element of people’s livelihoods. Therefore, immediately after disasters, market assessments need to be carried out to determine the state of the relevant markets and to identify the best-suited response options (in-kind, voucher, conditional or unconditional cash transfers).

During the relief/early recovery phase, HEKS/EPER works with the most vulnerable groups in the society such as small-scale farmers, fishers, seasonal workers, landless and micro-entrepreneurs to rehabilitate their livelihoods by replacing lost/damaged assets and providing additional inputs. During the rehabilitation phase, HEKS/EPER humanitarian aid interventions aim at strengthening and diversifying the livelihoods of the most affected and most vulnerable groups by enabling secured access to land and resources (Chapter 3.1.1), establishing sustainable agricultural production (Chapter 3.2.1) and integrating/establishing inclusive and efficient market systems (Chapter 3.2.2).

HEKS/EPER will support livelihood recovery and rehabilitation activities at the household level and link them with disaster preparedness and prevention measures (refer also to Chapter 5.4. Objective 4) to enable the population to build their assets and to establish more sustainable and resilient livelihoods.

Key indicators ‘livelihood opportunities’

- **Livelihood**: Number of individuals who participated in livelihood opportunities.
- **Satisfaction**: Percentage of project participants stating their satisfaction with the received resources / services.
- **Food security**: All households with assessed needs have access to the necessary inputs to protect and restart primary production to the level pre-disaster, when justified, and in accordance with the agricultural calendar.
- **Food security**: All the targeted people generate incomes through the activities supported by the intervention to contribute to meeting their basic household needs.
- **Livelihood**: Percentage of individuals continuing their new livelihoods by project completion (ex-post = after project completion).

4.3 Objective 3: Reconstructed public and private infrastructure

In many countries where HEKS/EPER works, public infrastructure is mostly not designed to withstand large-scale disasters (earthquakes, floods and typhoons) due to lack of knowledge, capacities or the high costs involved. When disasters destroy public infrastructure, local governments and communities are seldom in the position to rehabilitate the destroyed infrastructure on their own. Moreover, they often lack the knowledge to build earthquake- or flood-resistant infrastructure. Therefore, HEKS/EPER puts special emphasis on ‘building back better’, ensuring that the rehabilitated infrastructure can withstand a disaster of similar magnitude (e.g. floods, earthquakes and storms) and incorporating traditional construction techniques where possible. The aim is also to put the recipients into a position where they can

**Philippines**: Reconstruction of family homes after typhoon Haiyan.
maintain the infrastructure by themselves (Pakistan, Niger and South Sudan) after HEKS/EPER and its partners have withdrawn from the target area. Rehabilitation work is most effective when it is accompanied by disaster preparedness training for the respective communities. This focus has accompanied HEKS/EPER reconstruction interventions in the past and will continue to be a strong focus in years to come. Best practices from various INGOs have shown the added value of providing disaster preparedness training to affected communities.

Key indicators ‘infrastructure’

- **Infrastructure**: Number of reconstructed infrastructure / Number of individuals benefitting from reconstructed infrastructure.
- **Satisfaction**: Percentage of project participants stating their satisfaction with the received resources / services.
- **Shelter**: All construction is in accordance with agreed safe building practices and standards.
- **Shelter**: Construction activities demonstrate the involvement of the affected people and communities and the maximising of local livelihood opportunities.
- **Shelter**: Percentage of individuals living in their shelter by project completion. (ex-post = after project completion)
- **Hygiene promotion**: All user groups can describe and demonstrate what they have done to prevent the deterioration of hygiene conditions.
- **Hygiene promotion**: All facilities provided are appropriately used and regularly maintained.

Objective 4: Increased prevention and preparedness

Since the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action in 2005, disaster risk reduction has been in the spotlight and multi-faceted progress has been achieved. Countries have often enhanced their capacities in disaster risk management and comprehensive legal frameworks have been developed at the national level. However, the capacity for disaster risk reduction at the provincial and/or local government level often remains weak. The lack of qualified staff and funds impedes the implementation of necessary activities on the ground. Also, the Sendai Framework (adopted in 2015) recognises that the state has the primary role in reducing disaster risks but also emphasises that responsibility should be shared with other stakeholders.

Therefore, HEKS/EPER, together with local partner organisations, supports the prevention, mitigation and preparedness efforts of governments, especially at the local and municipal level within humanitarian aid projects. Also, HEKS/EPER aims to strengthen civil society structures so that communities are able to withstand shocks and stresses. In the aftermath of disasters, the capacity gaps of existing structures are often revealed and are a starting point for improvement. Only if authorities, individuals and communities in hazard-prone areas are well-prepared and ready to act, and are equipped with the knowledge, capacities and tools for effective disaster management impact, will losses be substantially reduced during disasters.

HEKS/EPER will continue to integrate disaster preparedness and prevention measures whenever possible in all relief, early recovery and rehabilitation interventions. Furthermore, HEKS/EPER will increase the capacity of its country offices and partner organisations in the most disaster-prone countries through a series of training courses.
Key indicators ‘prevention and preparedness’

- **DRR:** Number and type of community based resilience building measures integrated into the project.
- **Preparedness:** Number of community members who are able to describe measures to approach community needs and capacities regarding disaster risk reduction.
- **Preparedness:** Number of emergency committee members or members of volunteer groups in the project area showing skills in carrying out relevant response tasks according to minimum standards in a coordinated manner.
- **Prevention:** Number of new/existing homes and critical community infrastructure built/retrofitted with appropriate technologies for multi-hazard-resilient construction.
- **Prevention:** Number of new/existing homes and critical community infrastructure built/retrofitted with appropriate technologies for multi-hazard-resilient construction that are maintained properly.
- **Mitigation:** Number of women and men in the project area adopting sustainable environmental management practices (soil and water conservation, forest and biodiversity protection) to avoid building of existing/new risk.

**Ethiopia:** Land degradation, droughts and floods affect the Borana region.
5  Theory of change and objectives of church cooperation

Church cooperation (CC) as the third section of HEKS/EPER ID is a direct mandate from the constituency of HEKS/EPER, the Federation of the Swiss Protestant Churches (FSPC). Switzerland as a focal country of the reformation had through its church reformers and their successors a big influence on other reformed churches throughout the world. Amongst those reformed churches are also the partner churches of HEKS/EPER in Eastern Europe, the Hungarian Reformed Church in Hungary and neighbouring countries such as Romania (Transylvania), Ukraine (Transcarpathia), Slovakia and Serbia as well as the Evangelical Church of the Czech Brethren in the Czech Republic. Right up to today, Switzerland and the Swiss Protestant churches are an important point of reference for those churches. Being aware that the Swiss Reformed Churches are close relatives to their sister churches in Eastern Europe, the FSPC aims to strengthen, as part of HEKS/EPER’s CC, the relevance of these partner churches and their diaconal institutions in their respective societies. FSPC and HEKS/EPER are convinced that the commitment to social justice in society is crucial for reformed churches and an important reason for their existence.

Since 2011, CC uses the same instruments as DevCo to manage, develop, implement and monitor its projects/programmes. An aim during HIP phase 2017–2020 will be to further strengthen the capacities of the church organisations to implement projects according to DevCo’s programmatic and administrative/financial standards.

For decades, CC focused on Eastern Europe. In the phase 2017–2020 there is a now a strategy to expand to the Middle East. After an exploration visit in Lebanon in 2015, HEKS/EPER entered 2016 into a pilot phase until the end of 2017 to evaluate whether CC will work with partner churches in the Middle East with a long-term perspective. A main insight of the exploration visit was, that the reformed partner churches in this region can play an important role in the process of conflict transformation and enhance dialogue between different religious and ethnic groups.

Figure 6 shows the objectives of CC as well as its main target groups, intervention areas and cross-cutting issues. The overall objective of CC 2017–2020 is to support reformed churches and their organisations in

![Church cooperation – theory of change](image)

Figure 6: CC’s theory of change, objectives, cross-cutting issues including the people and communities HEKS/EPER works for and with.
being recognised as relevant organisations in their respective societies, fostering open dialogue, social inclusion and enabling living together in peace. Therefore, HEKS/EPER clearly strengthens the bodies and the members of the Reformed churches, enhances their self-reflective thinking on their values and theological foundations and opens exchange with other confessions, fosters relations between Reformed church communities in Switzerland and abroad and encourages and enables churches to actively and professionally engage in projects to strengthen and include disadvantaged people. These four interlinked components will – as the CC theory of change assumes – lead to hoped-for recognition of the churches in their respective society.

DevCo logic is to assess needs, to define a ToC and then to choose the partner portfolio. The CC logic is to work with a by the FSPC designated partner and to assess, how they can contribute to social needs in their respective society. HEKS/EPER clearly wants to strengthen partner churches and their social institutions to work professionally as well as effective and to up-scale their social services and to work towards a systemic change. Furthermore, HEKS/EPER aims to enhance linkages between CC, DevCo and HA programmes, enabling church organisations to implement HA or DevCo projects. CC partners may cooperate with DevCo partners, specifically in projects dealing with home care services and the social inclusion of minorities.

5.1 **Objective 1: Strengthening and inclusion of the disadvantaged**

As churches have a social responsibility in their societies, the main focus of CC is to strengthen the capacities of the partner churches in this field. In their respective countries, HEKS/EPER’s partner churches care for people who are excluded from society and/or neglected by state social services. As the partner churches are well-established and rooted in their respective societies, the churches can be a forerunner in social projects according to the needs within their context. In the HIP 2017–2020 phase, the main activities to achieve this objective are as follows:

- In the Czech Republic, the Diakonia of the Evangelical Church of the Czech Brethren informs migrant workers about their rights and protects them in emergency cases.
- In Hungary and Slovakia, church congregations implement projects to promote Roma inclusion.
- In Romania, the Diakonia of the reformed church offers home care services, implements projects for victims of domestic violence and provides workshops for people with disabilities.

*Romania: Counselling and shelter for women and their children in Brasov.*
HEKS/EPER contributes to the development, implementation and upscaling of these projects wherever possible with a systemic perspective (see also Chapter 0). At the same time, the institutional development of the partners as well as the process to promote these diaconal projects in a state co-financed system is the aim of the cooperation.

Whilst systemic change is more likely to be achieved in Romania, Hungary and the Czech Republic, it will be more challenging in the Ukraine due the existing state structures and the performance of the partners.

5.2 Objective 2: Strengthening church life

HEKS/EPER’s partner churches and reformed churches in Switzerland face similar challenges. As societies are becoming more secular, the church continues to lose members and is in competition with other forces of civil society for attention in society. Additionally, HEKS/EPER’s partner churches struggle with infrastructure problems like poorly maintained buildings, which are important for an active church life and the implementation of social projects.

The focus of HEKS/EPER’s to achieve this objective lies on activities for children and young people, who will in future be active members of these churches. A second focus is on the development of active parishes through the renovation or construction of appropriate infrastructure for project and church activities.

Furthermore, HEKS/EPER encourages churches to break out of their inner circle and make a contribution to society with their facilities and church activities, such as the inclusion of disadvantaged/minority groups or hosting cultural/social events.

5.3 Objective 3: Churches in dialogue with differing confessions

Apart of strengthening the role of the partner churches in their societies, the ‘mission’ of HEKS/EPER’s CC is for partner churches to be open-minded towards different theologies, confessions and beliefs. With this attitude, churches can play an integrative role – an approach which could be very important if HEKS/EPER is to engage with partner churches in the Middle East. Through specific projects like the inclusion of Roma or the support for victims of domestic violence, HEKS/EPER encourages its partner churches to be open-minded towards non-reformed individuals and communities, which are excluded or taboo in their societies. Particularly in the field of the attitude of Eastern European countries towards refugees, HEKS/EPER currently sees potential for such dialogue to further explore the role churches can play dealing with this issue.

5.4 Objective 4: Sense of belonging to the same church family

As CC signifies solidarity within the same church family, a part of HEKS/EPER’s project work and critical dialogue, relationships between the churches and congregations in Switzerland and abroad are important. HEKS/EPER’s CC encourages Swiss parishes to establish long-term partnerships with congregations in countries where HEKS/EPER’s CC programme is active. Through group and exchange visits and events in Switzerland, HEKS/EPER’s CC aims to establish and maintain a lively exchange, also contributing to objectives 2 and 3 in creating an open-minded atmosphere and a lively church life. An exchange on social projects and the role of the church in society is also vital (objective 1).
6 Cross-cutting issues

HEKS/EPER aims to mainstream its three cross-cutting issues gender, conflict sensitivity and resilience building through its guidelines and tools which accompany the implementation of DevCo, HA and CC programmes. Mainstreaming means, to consider these issues on institutional level (e.g. in strategies and policies, through strengthening organisational capacities, in the selection of and cooperation with partners) as well as on programme and project level (e.g. in planning, budgeting, implementation and monitoring). To ensure that ID programme work is relevant, effective and implemented professionally (see institutional objective 1, chapter 2.2), the mainstreaming of gender, conflict sensitivity and resilience building is essential.

Due to the proven relevance of the three cross-cutting issues within the previous HIP 2013-2016 and the initiated mainstreaming processes, all three issues remain cross-cutting for this programmatic period. In the implementation phase 2013-2016 a strong focus was put on facilitating resilience building, for example by enhancing the capacities of HEKS/EPER and partner organisations and by elaborating indicators to measure progress on organisational as well as on project level. The mainstreaming process with regards to gender and conflict sensitivity is less advanced and will be furthered the coming years. Especially, measuring the progress of the mainstreaming process and providing evidence on outcome level will be intensified within the HIP 2017-2020 (incl. elaboration and validation of HKIs for cross-cutting issues).

The following chapters provide more detailed information about the status quo, strategy and planned steps regarding the mainstreaming processes of the cross-cutting issues gender, conflict sensitivity and resilience building.

6.1 Gender

Gender equality is an essential prerequisite and enabling part of HEKS/EPER’s overarching goals for equal rights and prosperity for rural communities. HEKS/EPER is committed to gender equality as an integral part of all its work.

HEKS/EPER strives for gender equality, i.e. equal and just power relationships between women and men, girls and boys, in society as a whole; as well as for changes in structural conditions towards more equitable and non-discriminatory power structures, equal participation, and voice and agency of both men and women at all levels of society. Women and men are supported so that they can achieve their potential as agents of change.

Gender interacts with other social categories such as caste, ethnicity and age, which can lead to multiple forms of discrimination against women. In the International Programme, HEKS/EPER places emphasis on empowering women to take on decision-making and leadership positions and on raising awareness among community leaders and (local) authorities to promote women’s participation and build more equitable power structures. In the current programme phase, men are increasingly involved in order to construct a gender-sensitive environment and fair gender relations. Furthermore, harmful gender stereotypes will be challenged and combatted. Gender will no longer be a barrier to application of one’s rights.
HEKS/EPER considers gender as a cross-cutting issue and consistently applies the strategy of gender mainstreaming, meaning that a gender equality perspective is integrated at organisational level, in all policies as well as at all levels and stages of the PCM cycle.

Mainstreaming gender will lead to more effective, meaningful and sustainable programmes and projects. To support staff and partners at headquarters and in the countries where the application of gender mainstreaming is in practice, HEKS/EPER will continue to work according to its Gender Implementation Guidelines.

To effectively mainstream gender in the field of evaluation and monitoring, HEKS/EPER places special emphasis on the generation and use of sex-disaggregated data as well as specific gendered key indicators, e.g. women’s effective participation in decision-making bodies at the community level. Impact on gender equality and power relations will be monitored consistently.

In order to combat gender inequalities in agriculture and acknowledging women’s key roles in agroecology, HEKS/EPER fosters gender-specific measures for capacity development and training in sustainable agriculture (e.g. Brazil, Cambodia and Senegal) as well as vocational training (e.g. Zimbabwe and DR Congo), income generation (e.g. South Sudan and India), and the integration of women and women’s groups in local markets (e.g. Colombia, Niger and the South Caucasus).

Although women spend much of their time on agricultural production, they rarely hold land titles or have restricted rights to use land, sometimes also due to customary laws and cultural traditions. Therefore, HEKS/EPER and its partners also focus particularly on women’s access to land, their knowledge of laws and land reforms, and their effective participation in land committees (e.g. India, Brazil and Senegal). Likewise, HEKS/EPER promotes women’s and men’s equitable access to other resources and services such as water and sanitation (e.g. Ethiopia, South Sudan and Niger), seeds (e.g. Honduras), and credit.

6.2 Conflict sensitivity

Working in a conflict-sensitive way, HEKS/EPER strives to understand the context, the interaction between programmes and that context, and act upon that understanding in order to avoid unintentionally feeding into further division, and to maximise the potential contribution to strengthening social cohesion and peace. HEKS/EPER acknowledges that by intervening in other contexts (with positive and negative effects) the organisation becomes part and parcel of this context and, as a consequence, part of its (potential) conflict configurations. Conflicts include not only violent incidents, but also any social, economic or political tensions and/or situations where two or more parties disagree and/or are acting on the basis of perceived incompatibilities. Based on this understanding, HEKS/EPER will continue to systematise conflict sensitivity as a cross-cutting issue in all projects and programmes in the 2017–2020 implementation phase.

Conflict sensitivity tools (like conflict analyses, stakeholder mapping, analyses of intergroup tensions and ‘dividers’ as well as ‘connectors’ with the potential to mitigate a conflict, etc.) should help to ‘solidify’ HEKS/EPER’s concept of conflict sensitivity. However, HEKS/EPER understands conflict sensitivity not only as a set of working tools but as a cross-cutting issue that aims at including appropriate attitudes and expertise into the organisation’s culture, structure and processes – this applies to HEKS/EPER as well as its local or national partner implementation organisations. Operational guidance for conflict sensitivity should not come

in the form of ‘correct’ one-size-fits-all ‘tools’, but rather as a range of options that can be adapted, localised, and developed as the context and purpose demands. Together with Swisspeace, Caritas, Helvetas and SDC, HEKS/EPER has developed the Swiss Online Course on conflict sensitivity. This online course will be further used to intensify learning processes within HEKS/EPER in the 2017–2020 programme phase.

Due to the fact that since 2012 many donors in development cooperation have started to allocate more funds to conflict-prone and fragile states (‘New Deal’), the interest in conflict sensitivity and conflict transformation has increased globally. HEKS/EPER participates in and facilitates exchanges and networking in the field of conflict sensitivity (e.g. as a working group member of the global network ‘Conflict Sensitivity Community Hub’).

For HEKS/EPER, the understanding of the differences and relationship between conflict sensitivity and conflict transformation is essential. Conflict sensitivity and conflict transformation are based on distinct concepts, but are closely related. Both begin with conflict analysis and a sound understanding of (potential) conflict causes and dynamics. However, conflict transformation projects are not conflict sensitive per se. They sometimes tend to focus on the conflict itself, without analysing the wider context. Thus, all HEKS/EPER projects and programmes should as a minimum be conflict sensitive, while the decision to intervene in conflict transformation depends on the project and country context.

### 6.3 Resilience building

Increasing disaster trends worldwide, the increasing number of people living in fragile and conflict-affected contexts (see Appendix 1, context analysis) coupled with the effects of climate change, the exploitation of natural resources and economic shocks seriously impede progress towards sustainable development in general and HEKS/EPER’s goal of striving for equal rights and prosperity more specifically.

To counter the fact that the people and communities HEKS/EPER works for face the impacts of shocks, stresses and an increasing degree of uncertainty on a daily basis, HEKS/EPER follows a comprehensive resilience-building approach.

---

Figure 7: HEKS/EPER resilience framework (adapted from DFID 2011)

---

30 [http://www.swisspeace.ch/e-learning/](http://www.swisspeace.ch/e-learning/)

31 The working group with experts from international organizations working on conflict sensitivity establishes a global CSC-Hub convening the conflict sensitivity community for joint learning, evidence building and for promoting conflict sensitivity at policy and operational levels.

32 HEKS/EPER’s understanding of shocks includes slow- or fast onset ‘natural’ disasters, man-made disasters or outbreaks of violent conflict; stresses are processes that increase the vulnerability of stakeholders, such as impacts of climate change, natural resource degradation, fragility, economic decline, etc.
resilience-building approach in its programmes and projects. The aim of mainstreaming resilience building is to secure equal rights and prosperity for people, households and communities on a continuous basis, even while suffering from shocks, stresses and uncertainty. In its work, HEKS/EPER follows a livelihood-centred approach to resilience building, referring to the resilience framework and definition of DFID (2011): ‘Resilience is the ability of countries, communities and households to manage change, by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks and stresses without compromising their long-term prospects’.

The starting point for the integration of effective resilience-building measures in HEKS/EPER programmes/projects is always a risk assessment to identify the predominant shocks and stresses in a given context. In fragile and conflict-affected contexts, it is sensible to combine a risk assessment with a conflict-sensitivity assessment. The assessment forms the basis of how the adaptive capacity (asset base, livelihood strategies, beneficial structures and processes) of disaster-prone individuals/communities can be strengthened within the scope of a programme/project and where coordination or cooperation with other stakeholders has to be sought in order to ultimately decrease their sensitivity and lead them to a resilience pathway (Figure 7).

Measures for disaster risk reduction, risk management, climate change adaptation and social protection, but also conflict transformation and striving for inclusive governance and strong civil society form an integral part of a livelihood-centred resilience-building approach. Moreover, interventions to sustain and protect livelihoods against shocks, stresses and uncertainty can take place at any stage of the disaster cycle and hence, need to be addressed in both longer-term development cooperation and shorter-term humanitarian aid. According to the context and the scope of the programme/project, implemented activities can be measures of preparedness, prevention/mitigation or response or adaptation strategies to longer-term changes. Examples of resilience-building measures in the scope of HEKS/EPER programmes/projects are, among others: sustainable environmental and natural resource management; conservation agriculture; building of seed, harvest and fodder reserves and safe storage facilities; community early warning systems (for disasters or violent incidents); community contingency planning; diversification of income; access to credit; risk financing mechanisms; creation of disaster preparedness/management committees; creation of neighbourhood self-help networks; disaster-proof (re)construction; disaster drills; lobbying local authorities for better land management, land-use planning, disaster management structures, risk governance and the inclusion of vulnerable groups.

To guide the mainstreaming process of resilience building, HEKS/EPER created the ‘Building Resilient Communities’ guidelines in 2014, accompanied by comprehensive capacity building among its staff in Switzerland and in the field. In the 2017–2020 strategic phase, HEKS/EPER will continue its mainstreaming efforts in resilience building. In order to do so, HEKS/EPER has recently started a pilot process in Latin America, where a regional strategy for resilience building was developed in dialogue with partners and communities affected by climate change and environmental degradation. Moreover, HEKS/EPER will further develop its strategies and interventions for resilience building in conflict contexts. And lastly, HEKS/EPER will work towards better impact monitoring of its resilience building efforts.

**Key Indicator for resilience building**
- Number and type of community-based resilience-building measures integrated in the project.
- Observed changes in the adaptive capacity of rural communities.
7 Management

‘International Division programme work is relevant and implemented professionally’ is HEKS/EPER’s institutional objective which applies for all three sections. This chapter and also Chapter 8 on monitoring, evaluation, learning and steering outlines how to achieve it.

7.1 Institutional evolution

Professional implementation of HEKS/EPER’s international programme is an institutional objective with various management challenges, which the International Division (ID) has been committed to working on in recent years and will continue to do so in the HIP 2017–2020 phase.

Considerable resources were invested in building up a team of thematic advisers and expertise. Different thematic and methodological guidelines and concepts were created and HHQ as well as CO staff trained in their implementation. Currently, the focus has shifted towards improving management processes with the revision of the Field Finance and Administrative Guidelines (FFAG) as well as the introduction of the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software environment (‘myCompany’).

ID constantly increased its budget from CHF 31 million in 2013 to a budgeted CHF 38 million for 2016, even with the parallel process of geographic focusing which meant phasing out programmes in South Africa, Guatemala, Eritrea, Albania, Vietnam and the Philippines during this period. Despite the increase in programme volume in recent years, with the growth in HHQ staff, challenges in the areas of efficiency and keeping reasonable overhead vs programme volumes ratios at the global level as well as at the country level have become more pronounced. Moreover, the fundraising market in Switzerland has become highly competitive as private donors are more critical towards development cooperation and foundations and institutional donors are more demanding regarding the quality and details of proposals and reports. Another trend seems to be that bilateral agencies like SDC are diverting more funds into multilateral channels and from development cooperation into humanitarian aid.

Despite the process of geographic focusing in recent years, HEKS/EPER intervention countries are still numerous and distributed over four continents. The thematic concentration has contributed to sharpening our profile and defining our competences. Nevertheless, HEKS/EPER is not a highly specialised niche player in the development sector, but is instead a generalist that covers several important topics pursuing a holistic and integrated approach.

In view of these developments and challenges and in order to remain a relevant development organisation in the long term, the Executive Board – approved by the Board of Trustees – decided to pursue a growth strategy for HEKS/EPER in general and target a yearly ID programme volume of CHF 45 million by 2020.

7.2 ID management 2017–2020

Headquarter set-up

HEKS/EPER’s strength is a decentralised, competence-based and context-adapted management set-up with a strong steering, monitoring and learning centre at HHQ. It has to provide sound management and steering, a thematic advisory role and innovation capacity. Further competences required are solid networking and distributing of evidence-based learning examples, as well as providing evidence of impact via methodologically sound assessments and studies. The HHQ will also act as a coordination and support centre for acquiring mandates, financed by Swiss and international donors such as the EU, ECHO and other development agencies.

Besides managerial and technical competences, HHQ staff must have the necessary mobility and qualifications for transfers within HHQ and COs as part of professional development and individual career paths. This fosters a better mutual understanding of processes, requirements and restrictions at HHQ as well as at the CO level.

Becoming an efficient operational NGO that is competitive in the international market and able to manage increased volumes will only be possible with strong, professional and internationalised back-office services in HR, IT, Finance/Controlling and Security. The current services division at HHQ need to be developed further in this regard and interfaces improved. Lean processes at HHQ and decision-making authority attributed to the competent hierarchical position are additional requirements to be adapted during this
phase. Enterprise Resource planning tools (ERP), cloud-based document management systems (DMS) and other back office systems will provide key management information, ratios and benchmarks in order to steer, learn and proof programme impact in the programme phase 2017-2020.

The ratio between HHQ costs and the total ID programme volume cost shall become more efficient and reach a value between 11 and 12 % by 2020.

Country offices and key figures

Competitive and competent country offices with adequate resources to implement the DevCo country programmes are key and the platform for steering, learning and quality assurance. To fulfil these tasks, CO teams with sound analytical and conceptual/strategic competences as well as management skills in PCM, finance, administration, M&E is essential. Also, thematic know-how in access to markets / value chain, conflict transformation and peacebuilding as well as in HRBA and the cross-cutting issues is needed. To deliver a coherent programme implementation, more and more international working experience is required in the country offices, especially in countries with bigger programme volumes.

Despite the growth ambitions, not all priority programmes are in a position to reach and maintain a programme volume level over CHF 1 million as it was defined in the 2013–17 phase. At least in 13 of them, this target shall be achieved by the end of 2016. A solid, diversified project and partner portfolio is the precondition for increased programme volumes. HEKS/EPER strives to work with 7 to 10 POs per country and to implement 2 or 3 projects per country with a budget of over CHF 250,000 per year. The ratio between HHQ costs and the total ID programme volume cost will become more efficient. CO budgets should not exceed 15-20% of the programme volume.

Further increase of programme volume and effectiveness will be achieved by establishing 3 to 5 hubs until 2020 with potential for a programme volume of CHF 3 to 5 million per year. In an existing priority programme the CO design and manage by its own or with POs regional projects, e.g. cross-border implementations or large scale volume projects within one country. Managing such a programme, a CO team with sound management experience and international profile is needed. A hub office can also provide advisory support to other country programmes in the region and might therefore be strengthened by thematic advisers. The hub office team is strong in networking, donor relations and responsible for regional fundraising. The identification and launching of hubs start in 2017 and show results in 2018 onwards. The financial planning on expenditures 2017–2020 allocates increasing amounts for hubs in the continents of Asia, Africa, Americas and Europe (Chapter 7.4). Hub volume growth is either financed by new mandates (e.g. national donors, EU, SDC), by specific contributions of Swiss or international foundations or by HEKS/EPER own means.

The humanitarian aid set-up follows a similar logic (Chapter 4). All programmes or projects with a volume over CHF 1 million per year need to be managed by staff with international background (expats). Direct implementation, or projects implemented by a national NGO or by an international partner organisation, is also an option (preferably the iNGO would belong to the ACT Alliance)33.

The church cooperation collaboration scheme follows a different approach. The programme volume as a whole for the CC might increase through new project initiatives in Eastern Europe and expanding to the Middle East. The partnership in CC is based on church partners and their social bodies. Strengthening institutions and fostering their role as a relevant church and participant in social services and the inclusion of disadvantaged is an important objective of CC activities within HEKS/EPER (Chapter 5).

7.3 Geographic coverage

Figure 8 provides an overview of the global activities of HEKS/EPER in 2016, which will be the basis for the phase 2017-2020. The focus strategy in DevCo of the HIP 2013-17 is, at its core, finalised. In the phase 2017-2020 HEKS/EPER will continue with its 16 DevCo programmes in 18 countries. However, phasing out of countries with limited potential and opening a new country that offers more opportunities must be considered if useful and effective. To enable exchange, learning and advocacy, HEKS/EPER keeps its presence in four continents with at least three countries.

33 HEKS/EPER Humanitarian Aid implementation concept 2015–19, Zürich (2014)
Implementing humanitarian projects in six countries in 2016, adaptations will evolve according to the existing phasing-out plans (e.g. Philippines in 2017) and to rising emergencies according to the strategic priorities of the HA concept. Future interventions will focus on countries with DevCo programmes or where HEKS/EPER has a functioning network of reliable long-standing partnerships. (Chapter 4)

CC continues in the same countries in Eastern Europe and will grow with its own ToC logic in Syria and Lebanon (Chapter 5).

In 2016, HEKS/EPER ID delivered its results with 140 international and 38 HQ staff member together with more than 100 partner organisations with more than 200 projects in 31 countries. For details including factsheets of all DevCo programmes and relevant HA and CC projects check Appendix 2.

Figure 8: Countries HEKS/EPER is working in with its three sections (2016).

7.4 Financial planning

HEKS/EPER aims to use the funds entrusted to it effectively and efficiently and have a lasting positive impact. Moreover, HEKS/EPER provides transparent information on the progress of projects and the use of funds.

HEKS/EPER aims to reach an overall HIP volume of CHF 45 million per year in 2020, which is a significant increase from CHF 30.2 million in 2014 and 34.5 million in 2015 and a budget 2016 of CHF 36.7 million (Table 2). Financial planning in DevCo (south and east, without management costs) anticipates a raise from CHF 18 million in 2014 and 19.4 million in 2015 up to 28 million in 2020. Achieving this means having investments of more than one million Swiss francs in at least 13 DevCo priority programmes.

A key component of DevCo growth will be the ‘hub strategy’ (chapter 7.2). This will also enhance our impact and therefore, allow us to become a more relevant actor on national and international levels, as well as be competitive when applying for mandates (see institutional parameters, Appendix 1, Chapter 1.6.3).
The funding gap for humanitarian aid is widening with new crisis, protracted conflicts and increasing migration flows. To respond more adequately to these increasing needs, the HA unit of HEKS/EPER will substantially increase its commitment – financially and programme-wise by 2020 (up to CHF 10 to 12 million per year in 2020).

CC will remain stable with a decent increase of CHF 300,000 up to CHF 2 million; mainly with slow growth in the Middle East and re-allocations in Eastern Europe (Slovakia and Ukraine).

Management costs will stay just above CHF 5 million per year, which means a better ratio (overhead vs project/programme cost) will be achieved till 2020.

Apart from optimizing the use of the traditional funding base of HEKS/EPER – mainly individual private donors, church partners, foundations, SDC and Swiss Solidarity – additional sources of financing are required for the planned growth. An important part of the budget increase shall be based on mandates of donors such as SDC, EU and other agencies of international cooperation. More efforts will be invested to tap into the potential of new sources: e.g. international foundations.

Table 2: HEKS/EPER ID financial plan on expenses 2017–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Programme</th>
<th>plan 2017</th>
<th>plan 2018</th>
<th>plan 2019</th>
<th>plan 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development cooperation South (without SDC mandates)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine/Israel</td>
<td>1'500</td>
<td>1'600</td>
<td>1'700</td>
<td>1'700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'200</td>
<td>1'200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia DevCo programme</td>
<td>4'400</td>
<td>4'550</td>
<td>4'750</td>
<td>4'600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1'050</td>
<td>1'050</td>
<td>1'050</td>
<td>1'050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa DevCo programme</td>
<td>5'600</td>
<td>5'800</td>
<td>5'900</td>
<td>6'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The AMERICAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'200</td>
<td>1'200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas DevCo programme</td>
<td>3'900</td>
<td>4'300</td>
<td>4'400</td>
<td>4'400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme DevCo South</td>
<td>13'900</td>
<td>14'650</td>
<td>15'050</td>
<td>15'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management DevCo South</td>
<td>3'200</td>
<td>3'200</td>
<td>3'200</td>
<td>3'200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total DevCo South</td>
<td>17'100</td>
<td>17'850</td>
<td>18'250</td>
<td>18'200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC contribution*</td>
<td>6'300</td>
<td>6'600</td>
<td>6'800</td>
<td>6'800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC contribution in %</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mandates and hub costs of development cooperation South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDC mandates</td>
<td>1'500</td>
<td>2'500</td>
<td>2'500</td>
<td>2'500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hub Asia</td>
<td>1'300</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1'350</td>
<td>1'500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hub Africa</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1'500</td>
<td>1'700</td>
<td>2'300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hub America</td>
<td>1'300</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1'100</td>
<td>1'300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total SDC mandates &amp; hubs</strong></td>
<td>4'800</td>
<td>5'750</td>
<td>6'650</td>
<td>7'600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total DevCo South</strong></td>
<td>21'900</td>
<td>23'600</td>
<td>24'900</td>
<td>25'800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Development cooperation East (without SDC mandates)

### EUROPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>plan 2017</th>
<th>plan 2018</th>
<th>plan 2019</th>
<th>plan 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia/Kosovo</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>programme DevCo East</strong></td>
<td>2'400</td>
<td>2'500</td>
<td>2'500</td>
<td>2'500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>management DevCo East</strong></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total DevCo East</strong></td>
<td>3'200</td>
<td>3'300</td>
<td>3'300</td>
<td>3'300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDC Contribution</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDC Contribution in %</strong></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mandates and hub costs of development cooperation East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDC mandates</td>
<td>1'500</td>
<td>1'500</td>
<td>1'500</td>
<td>1'500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hub Europe</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total DevCo East</strong></td>
<td>4'900</td>
<td>5'100</td>
<td>5'800</td>
<td>6'200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Humanitarian aid South (no SDC mandates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>plan 2017</th>
<th>plan 2018</th>
<th>plan 2019</th>
<th>plan 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>programme HA South</td>
<td>5'500</td>
<td>7'000</td>
<td>8'000</td>
<td>9'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management HA South</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total HA South</strong></td>
<td>6'100</td>
<td>7'700</td>
<td>8'750</td>
<td>9'800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDC Contribution</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDC Contribution in %</strong></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Humanitarian aid East (no SDC mandates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>plan 2017</th>
<th>plan 2018</th>
<th>plan 2019</th>
<th>plan 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>programme HA East</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management HA East</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total HA East</strong></td>
<td>1'150</td>
<td>1'150</td>
<td>1'150</td>
<td>1'150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDC Contribution in CHF</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDC Contribution in %</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Church cooperation (no SDC mandates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Programme</th>
<th>plan 2017</th>
<th>plan 2018</th>
<th>plan 2019</th>
<th>plan 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>programme CC</td>
<td>1’700</td>
<td>1’800</td>
<td>1’900</td>
<td>2’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management CC</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total CC</td>
<td>1’900</td>
<td>2’000</td>
<td>2’100</td>
<td>2’200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC Contribution in CHF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC Contribution in %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overview on costs of HEKS/EPER international programme (not linked to SDC contributions/contract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Programme</th>
<th>plan 2017</th>
<th>plan 2018</th>
<th>plan 2019</th>
<th>plan 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme DevCo South/East &amp; HA (without mandates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total programme DevCo S/E &amp; HA</td>
<td>22’800</td>
<td>25’150</td>
<td>26’550</td>
<td>27’500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total management DevCo S/E &amp; HA</td>
<td>4’800</td>
<td>4’900</td>
<td>4’950</td>
<td>5’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total DevCo S/E &amp; HA</td>
<td>27’600</td>
<td>30’050</td>
<td>31’500</td>
<td>32’500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC Contribution*</td>
<td>7’500</td>
<td>7’800</td>
<td>8’000</td>
<td>8’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC Contribution in %</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HIP DevCo South/East & HA & CC (incl. Mandates) | | | |
| total programme HIP | 31’000 | 34’500 | 37’600 | 40’000 |
| total management HIP | 4’950 | 5’050 | 5’100 | 5’150 |
| total HIP | 35’950 | 39’550 | 42’700 | 45’150 |

*including SDC contributions to HHQ human resources, IT, managing board / no contribution to communication & fundraising. 2017: 370’000 / 2018: 390’000 / 2019: 400’000 / 2020: 400’000

1) management = programme management costs at HHQ / programme = programme implementation costs in the countries.
2) yearly reporting will distinguish between planning, budget, actual expenditures and identify SDC contributions.
3) Hub = no additional countries, but budget reserved for one of the existing priority countries being defined as regional hub (Chapter 7.2).

### 7.5 Implementation methods and partners

According to context and sector, HEKS/EPER uses different implementation methods. In general, HEKS/EPER continues with its approach to act close to local realities in mainly rural areas through qualified staff. The main stakeholders are the people and communities we work with, rural families organised in locally rooted organisations of civil society such as CBOs, associations and producer groups. Implementing partners are local or national NGOs or lobbying platforms and networks. If there is no specific qualified partner organisation present in the programme region, HEKS/EPER can act as a self-implementer through a project implementation unit (PIU), as is already the case in a few priority countries.

In DevCo and HA, HEKS/EPER selects POs and works to build a coherent partner portfolio to achieve its objectives. POs must have valid competences, capacities, resources and credibility to professionally implement projects and make progress. Stronger efforts need to be undertaken, either to build the capacities of existing partners – HEKS/EPER will continue investing substantial resources in training – or to find new partners in order to meet HEKS/EPER’s requirements and be able to handle projects of up to CHF 250,000 or more per year. The aim is also to implement mandates in cooperation with other iNGOs or acting as a
Chapter 5.

Subcontractor. Acting as part of a multi-stakeholder approach, with a main partner organisation and various service providers (government, private sector, partner NGOs, research institutes, etc.) is a promising option. HEKS/EPER, being a faith-based organisation (FBO) has in many contexts access to churches, church leaders and local FBOs which, with their specific broad-based networks and proximity to people, often enjoy credibility, with potential for promoting equal rights, social inclusion and conflict transformation. Nevertheless, critical analysis is essential to avoid negative impact (some may be close to restrictive authorities) and to ensure support regardless of religion, origin and nationality as well following a conflict-sensitive approach as a result.

Being part of the civil society itself, HEKS/EPER implements pre-dominantly through relevant and professionally acting organisations representing the respective civil society or parts of it. Most of them are not FBOs. For risk management and development purposes HEKS/EPER strives for a mix of different partner organisations in its partner portfolio with regard to size, capacity and outreach. Stronger, well established POs are needed in order to successfully participate in competitive tender processes as well as to absorb larger volume projects. Additionally and complementary HEKS/EPER continues to invest in smaller POs as well as CBOs in order to maintain grassroots links, promote new and innovative approaches and utilize local networks. Currently, HEKS/EPER cooperates with and invests in 150 partner organisations.

CC has a different partner approach, seeking cooperation with members of the reformed church. Here, HEKS/EPER explores how to contribute to the needs of people and communities as part of HEKS/EPER’s four CC objectives (Chapter 5).

7.6 Fundraising, acquisition and mandates

Fundraising and acquisition competences need to be strengthened and efforts need to reach beyond the Swiss market. Only an international competitive team at HHQ (ID fundraising and acquisition desk) and in the programme countries can result in bigger volumes in mandates and funds from international donors.

To further support its growth ambitions, HEKS/EPER will continue to build its capacity and knowledge to respond to calls for proposals and to participate in competitive tenders. Between 2012 and 2015, HEKS/EPER participated in several tenders from the SDC, EU and national donors. Despite not having a full-time acquisition specialist on staff, HEKS/EPER has allocated some personnel and financial resources to screen calls/tender announcements, to do assessments and consulting missions and to facilitate the decision and planning process together with management, desk officers and HOs in response to calls. The different successful and unsuccessful applications have led to new dynamics at HHQ and in country offices. Country directors and CO staff of HEKS/EPER are becoming more acquisition- and growth-conscious without becoming donor-driven. Furthermore, tenders as well as mandates are opportunities of expanding knowledge and capacities which do benefit other programmes and projects of HEKS/EPER.

HEKS/EPER will primarily react to calls for proposals where it fits our mandate and country strategy and where we have a competitive edge to offer in terms of expertise, implementation capacity and partner structures. Where possible and advantageous, HEKS/EPER will join consortium applications with like-minded partners, e.g. the ACT Alliance Network. Major investments are required to streamline application processes and gain more experience in submitting offers to improve the success rate.

7.7 Controlling

The ID controlling department strive to keep investments secure via adapted financial and administrative guidelines incorporated into capacity training in countries and with sound risk management and strict and transparent controlling of all financial flows. Key elements of controlling are:

- **Transparency and preventing corruption:** A workshop on corruption issues was held in 2015 in cooperation with Transparency International. A corruption and whistleblowing concept will be introduced at HHQ and COs at the end of 2016. The Cos will also be responsible for raising awareness of the issue amongst our partner organisations. A whistleblowing contact point is being set up specifically for this purpose at HHQ. Since 2012, HEKS/EPER has had a transparency code. HEKS/EPER commits itself to using its funds effectively, economically, for the purpose indicated and also to being transparent on how funds are collected. The communication on activities and use of fund has to be transparent, with reference to ZEWO, Swiss GAAP FER21 and Swiss NPO-Codes3 standards.
• **Field Financial and Administration Guidelines (FFAG):** The handbook introduced in 2011 is being completely revised. Particular attention is being paid to logistics and human resources, in addition to general accounting and administrative guidelines. A new chapter is to be specifically dedicated to humanitarian aid.

• **Controlling via indicators:** Management based on indicators is also becoming increasingly important at HEKS. It enables business-related aspects to be clearly presented and the targets are clear and measurable. Key indicators are used in the management of cost centres and project management.

• **Capacity building in priority countries:** The controlling team regularly visits the individual country offices and selected partner organisations. In addition to an internal audit where compliance with internal guidelines is evaluated, the team also focuses on the training and coaching of local managers in finance and accounting. They represent the ‘extended’ arm of controlling at HHQ as they are responsible for supporting partner organisations with finance and administration in addition to financial operations in the country offices.

• **Controlling cycle:** Many financial processes abroad have interfaces with other areas within HEKS. In order to improve coordination and communication, a ‘controlling cycle’ has been set up. Participants include the area controllers from the communications and service department as well as ID Controlling. This ensures that processes run properly and efficiently throughout HEKS.

• **Enterprise resource planning (ERP):** A new ERP programme was launched in mid-2016 for HEKS/EPER in its entirety. This makes project management and controlling more efficient and simplifies processes. The country offices are also to be incorporated into the system. They will be given access to most ERP applications. Controlling will receive direct access to accounting and the files in the countries. This should largely eliminate the sometimes-arduous email exchange. The reports can be accessed directly at any time. Controlling hopes to achieve faster and simpler consolidation of the country offices in addition to other benefits.

### 7.8 Security

HEKS/EPER ID works mainly in fragile contexts, which involve risks such as lack of security, trust and/or reliability and lack of progress, combined with difficulty in providing proof of impact. In summer 2015, HEKS/EPER introduced a new security policy, setting up processes and structures to safeguard HEKS/EPER’s personnel in Switzerland and abroad, as well as its assets. This also facilitates responsible and safe implementation of programmes in insecure contexts. Overall policy is specified in three separate guidelines:

• **Headquarters Security Guidelines:** Instructions for HQ staff before, during and after travelling abroad.

• **Field Security Guidelines:** Country security plans with regularly revised country risk assessments and contingency planning.

• **Task Force Security Guidelines:** Crisis management at HQ and in the field in case of severe security incidents.

The implementation of these guidelines requires training at the various levels. HEKS/EPER management follows a training cycle with simulation exercises on crisis management. HQ staff travelling to countries with security risks participate in training, preparing them for different incidents. The training of country teams will be of equal importance and local/regional training opportunities need to be evaluated. The administrative management of these guidelines is supported by a new focal point on security.

### 7.9 Alliances and networks

HEKS/EPER formulates its programmatic and institutional objectives in all three sections in order to deliver professionally implemented and relevant work. To achieve this, it is and will be key to link up with and inter-link partners and to foster sound cooperation with other like-minded NGOs, e.g. ACT Alliance members, Swiss INGOs other local NGOs and CBOs. Furthermore, well-functioning local, national and international networks and platforms are necessary to enhance advocacy endeavours, knowledge sharing and capacity building.

To achieve growth HEKS/EPER, also needs competitive alliance partners for joint programming in specific country contexts – primary partners are the members of ACT E8 and other competent international NGOs whose expertise supplements HEKS/EPER’s own expertise. The GOAT initiative of ACT E8 pushes for more and bigger international alliances and joint programming aiming at effectiveness, sharing competences and access to regions with people in need.
All forms of exchange and cooperation are an opportunity for greater aid effectiveness and achieving systemic changes as postulated in Chapter 2.3 in favour of the people and communities addressed. Therefore, HEKS/EPER seeks strategic exchange and/or cooperation at three levels: a) cooperation with implementing partners; b) alliances with other stakeholders in civil society more broadly to achieve shared objectives; c) strategic exchange/contact with relevant stakeholders, especially duty-bearers, to advocate for systemic change.

HEKS/EPER fosters contact with like-minded stakeholders and positive duty-bearers as well as with relevant counterparts who are hindering prospects for improved rights and prosperity.

### Strategic cooperation
Since HEKS/EPER often works with community-based organisations and local partners, and it is itself a rather small player – also when implementing directly – the integration of its activities into thematic or advocacy/lobbying networks is of crucial importance. HEKS/EPER strives to bring communities, partner organisations and other stakeholders into contact with each other. HEKS/EPER’s endeavours to openly search for and cultivate cooperation, partnerships, dialogue and networking contributes to a more effective and efficient achievement of its set objectives. Through networking, HEKS/EPER is committed to expanding knowledge and expertise for the benefit of its own international cooperation work, to lobby for the interests of the people and communities we work with.

All forms of cooperation have to be adequately strategic and practical to serve HEKS/EPER in achieving its theory of change in each of the three sections. Therefore, HEKS/EPER analyses the added value of a partnership, an alliance or a platform in terms of the following five distinct areas:

- **Participation:** Cooperation are always an opportunity to learn which needs, perceptions, approaches and/or values various stakeholders have. Analysing them contributes to a more comprehensive, targeted, effective and a more conflict-sensitive programme implementation.
- **Knowledge and competences** of the HHQ, COs and POs shall be increased.
- **Resources, effectiveness and relevance:** Cooperation will create synergies, achieving good results via implementation using fewer resources/funds (e.g. lower overhead costs from sharing infrastructure with others) lowering the cost/output ratio (e.g. being effective only if reaching a certain scale).
- **Systemic perspective:** Cooperation must enable systemic change e.g. by incorporating duty-bearers and following a multi-stakeholder approach in the development process or intervention logic, or through broad alliances securing steps towards a more developed society/economy.
- **Protection:** Shrinking space, criminality, conflicts endangering people and communities, as well as CBO and NGO staff such as human-right defenders or HEKS/EPER staff. Strategic cooperation and advocacy can lower risks, protect and enlarge space for civil society actions and enhance security.

HHQ and COs also strive to strengthen relevant alliances or platforms and facilitate cooperation between partners and communities with other stakeholders – networks contain essential know-how and relationships for consulting, connecting and protecting each other. Cooperation relevant to enhancing the objectives of a country programme can be facilitated at the local, national, and international level by COs and/or POs in the respective countries. In addition, HHQ seeks cooperation at the Swiss or international level (Table 3, page 52).

### ACT Alliance
HEKS/EPER is a member of ACT Alliance and seeks to create synergies with other member organisations:

- At the international level with knowledge sharing, communities of practice and global networks.
- At the national level using ACT platforms for exchange, joint programming where useful and sharing infrastructure to minimise costs (e.g. the Act Alliance GOAT-initiative in Bangladesh).

At the project level for joint activities or to implement through an international or national ACT partner (e.g. Humanitarian Aid).

**ACT Alliance:** [http://actalliance.org/how-we-help/](http://actalliance.org/how-we-help/)
Table 3: The major networks and specialist groups HEKS/EPER participates in. On country level COs engage in additional networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Benefits / Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT Alliance (global network of more than 140 FBOs and churches active in 140 countries in development cooperation, humanitarian aid and advocacy)</td>
<td>Development policy, cooperation, CoP, working groups: Rights and Development, Acquisition and others. Cooperation at the country level (joint projects, knowledge exchange, advocacy, etc.).</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, networking, joint activities on DC. Joint advocacy, local and international level with intergovernmental institutions. Joint capacity building in HRBA and joint studies/analysis and work on enabling environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Sud (policy platform of 6 big Swiss iNGOs advocating for just global structures)</td>
<td>Programme group and different working groups on development policy, lobbying.</td>
<td>Joint public relations, knowledge sharing on policy and DC principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss NGO Platform (incl. subgroups)</td>
<td>Policy development, lobbying and cooperation.</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, networking, joint activities on DC, development of an online course and setting up a capacity building and advocacy hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Network for the Right to Food and Nutrition</td>
<td>Right to food, access to land and resources, advocacy).</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, joint activities, documenting good practices, coordination of actions/exchange (also for CBOs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss NGO DRR platform</td>
<td>Specialist group on DRR/CCA.</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, setting standards in the field of DC and HA, collaboration and partnerships, advocacy work. HEKS is a member of the platform core group and carries out mandates in the name of the platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC networks</td>
<td>Professional groups: Agriculture and Food Security, Conflicts &amp; Human Rights, Climate Change and Environment, Decentralisation &amp; Governance, Employment &amp; Income, Water, Gender, Disaster Risk Reduction (Resilience).</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, reflecting on our own work. Joint capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Forum on Rural Advisory Services</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Advisory Services</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing on good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguasan</td>
<td>Specialist group on water</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing on water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Water Partnership</td>
<td>Thematic network on water</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing on water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOFF / Swisspeace</td>
<td>Specialist group on peacebuilding</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing on peacebuilding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread for all</td>
<td>Development policy and cooperation</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing and cooperation on climate change, gender, religion and right to food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFECW</td>
<td>Ecumenical Women’s Network</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDE</td>
<td>Specialist group on gender</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing on gender and DC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO NGO Working Group</td>
<td>FAO processes, agriculture and food systems in general</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, development policy development and networking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Sensitivity Community HUB</td>
<td>International NGO coalition fostering conflict sensitivity</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing, reflection on conflict sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Havelaar Foundation</td>
<td>Foundation for fair trade</td>
<td>Strengthening fair trade in Switzerland. HEKS is a founding member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVAL (Swiss Evaluation Society)</td>
<td>Evaluations</td>
<td>Experience sharing on evaluations and networking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Monitoring, evaluation, learning and steering

Discussions around aid effectiveness and value for money have for many years been dominating the way we think about and approach development cooperation. Specifically, the discussions on the following:

- How to handle the implications increasing complexity and conflict sensitivity (fragile contexts) have for standard concepts such as the logical framework approach and project cycle management.
- The meaning of ‘impact’, how it is measured and how to balance out the growing interest in (and costs of) research with the practical application of a mixed-methods approach.
- The trend of digitalising data collection and data management processes embedded in shared, globally accessible open-source systems.

Proof of impact or progress is a clear quality requirement for professional work in development cooperation and humanitarian aid. It allows programmes to be steered and financing is tied to it. How HEKS/EPER analyses and describes progress in the 2013–17 phase is documented in the ID annual reports with a ‘progress summary’ presented in Appendix 1, Chapter 1 of this document.

‘The increased results orientation corresponds to a general political trend and is increasingly demanded by institutional and private donors from NGOs’ (Egli, p. 8). Doug Horton even speaks of ‘Impact Mania’ and argues that evaluations should focus more on learning and should use participatory evaluation processes from the outset in order to improve programmes and their impact. He sees the balancing act between accountability and simultaneous learning, which every evaluation has to apply nowadays, as not feasible. The ‘big push forward’ initiative is along the same lines and advocates alternative constructive concepts and methods for proof of impact. In the 2017–2020 phase, HEKS/EPER will fully implement its adapted PCM, allowing for progress reports and learning for steering.

On this basis, HEKS/EPER, as one of the first development organisations in Switzerland, introduced its Effectiveness Report in 2010. The main purpose of this initiative was to ‘show effectiveness/impact’ at the global level, thereby strengthening the accountability, learning and steering capacity. It is part of a still-ongoing institutional process, a comprehensive overhaul of our M&E concept in general (for more details see our global M&E systems paper) and our instruments for the management of the project and program cycles in particular. Substantial participation and commitment at all levels have been informing this process.

Between 2008 and 2012, HEKS/EPER introduced its impact hypothesis, a draft evaluation policy, the concept of key indicators and complexity-aware monitoring through the most significant change (MSC) method. With the same pace and energy, this process was pursued in the HIP 2013–2017; and based on the first experiences gained, the above-mentioned M&E instruments have been further upgraded. Specifically, the following efforts have been made:

- Considerable work has gone into establishing and mainstreaming a common approach/handbook for programme/project cycle management. It includes a much larger yet standardised variety of M&E concepts and tools that are more flexible and provide more consistent support for each other in terms of management. For example, it offers alternatives to the log frame approach such as outcome mapping and theory of change; it includes impact analyses and meta-evaluations and it promotes complexity-aware monitoring through capitalising on experience, MSC stories, institutionalised learning spaces and context- and conflict-sensitive M&E plans. The increased flexibility and variety facilitate the integration of a continuous review of the project/programme developments and results into future project/programme design and steering. It should be noted that for the sake of institutional clarity, HEKS/EPER’s PCM handbook integrates and interconnects all the important M&E instruments and concepts (listed below) that HEKS/EPER works with!
- Regarding the practice of evaluation, in recent years there has been a shift away from routine exercise towards improved quality and a stronger learning focus with greater benefits for everyone involved. As

34 Message on Switzerland’s International Cooperation 2013–2016: Chapter 5.6 Impact measurement and evaluation.
36 The big push forward: http://www.bigpushforward.net/
38 Programme managers and the country directors carry out interviews about the most significant changes (MSC), which have been observed by a selection of people and employees of the partner organisations that often go beyond the narrow scope of projects. These interviews are fed into, processed by HEKS/EPER’s global M&E system and eventually incorporated in a concentrated form into effectiveness report.
a consequence, HEKS/EPER further refined its Evaluation Policy by including an important section on ‘rigorous’ impact analysis. ‘Measuring impact’ in a dynamic context is a major methodological challenge but is not impossible. Rigorous impact studies help to explore the direct relation between HEKS/EPER interventions and the observed changes more systematically. For example, HEKS/EPER commissioned quasi-experimental impact analyses (in Georgia, Bangladesh and Lebanon), and will continue to do so on a regular basis. In turn, learning from this forms the basis for impact hypotheses, the intervention strategy of new projects and the adaptation strategies for ongoing projects and programmes. In addition, a meta-evaluation of nearly 30 evaluations (2007–2015) was commissioned in 2015, analysing their methodological quality as well as the effectiveness of HEKS/EPER’s holistic approach.

- The key indicators concept has been profoundly refined, also including qualitative and quantitative indicators at the outcome level. In this regard, for each of its three working sections, HEKS/EPER has further defined impact hypotheses through respective results frameworks, as outlined in this proposal.

- HEKS/EPER has institutionalised a global learning cycle, including ‘learning spaces’ that all country programmes have to implement and capitalise on during their yearly cycles. In addition to HEKS/EPER’s existing standard regional meetings and bi-annual forums, the main learning spaces include: the annual partner meeting, country offices’ rolling portfolio review, the country programme summary workshop and ID’s annual HHQ-based summary workshop. On this basis, the yearly lessons learnt by all operational countries are pulled together, analysed in a participatory manner, condensed and then fed back and shared between all institutional levels (i.e. HHQ, country programmes, projects/partners, individuals and communities). This forms an important input into the HEKS/EPER annual report describing progress and lessons learnt. Furthermore, knowledge sharing systematically offers various interactive platforms of learning and documents the results which are included in steering decisions on programmes and overall strategy. This reflective approach enables HEKS/EPER’s to achieve its ambition to be a learning organisation using its M&E system to learn and steer in a self-critical, but affirmative manner.

- In order to provide more scope for rolling planning (‘prototyping’), learning, adjustment and steering of projects and programs in complex environments, HEKS/EPER has carefully considered different options to render the implementation of projects/programmes more flexible, including the use of inception phases, pilots, phase-outs and especially, the internal project/programme approval procedure. Regarding the latter, programmes/projects are scrutinised based on the findings obtained from the tools described above and checked for their strategic, substantive, technical and financial coherence. With the introduction of the HPK, this process is now better structured, has become leaner and is more effective.

In order ‘to walk the talk’, HEKS/EPER has a global M&E capacity building strategy. It promotes a common understanding and the technical capacity needed for the ownership and professional application of the M&E tools by programme officers and staff at country offices and implementing partner organisations. Some of the essential elements of our capacity building strategy include training workshops, face-to-face and online mentoring and coaching, external backstopping, and a helpdesk in order to provide timely and needs-based support to all HEKS/EPER operational countries and staff at headquarters.

At this point of time (2015), most of these M&E instruments are in place, and compulsory for all new projects and country programmes. Pending and concluding M&E processes include the digitalisation of our refined PCM-handbook and the key indicators through a shared, globally accessible open-source system (ERP). Crucially, a global M&E plan will also have to be developed in 2016/2017. In addition, the introduction of a PCM guideline and key indicators in the Humanitarian Aid working section are included.

These final steps are needed to ‘conclude’ our global M&E initiative, as they will enable us to create and manage a full-fledged ‘body of evidence’ and to report systematically against HIP’s global objectives. At the same time, the consolidation and effective implementation of all the concepts, policies and tools developed in recent years in the practical work by HEKS/EPER together with the country offices and partner organisations remain top priorities.

HEKS/EPER’s global M&E system will be in place and functional from 2017 and largely embedded in a shared, globally accessible open-source system (ERP). The main target is that by 2018, at least 60% of HEKS/EPER’s global project/programme portfolio apply and fully benefit from our comprehensive functioning global M&E system, and correspondingly contribute to HIP’s annual reports.

39 Systematic and digital data collection against HKI, for example, is expected to start in 2016.
9 Communication in Switzerland

The basis for HEKS/EPER’s communication, advocacy and fundraising are the policy papers on communication, advocacy and transparency.

HEKS/EPER’s communication is designed to inform and raise awareness among the public and to mobilise public interest in our causes and project work. It is crucial that we reach various target groups in a language understandable to them and via their preferred channels. We want to be clear and comprehensible to people without explicit specialist knowledge and for HEKS/EPER to convey consistent core messages and present a clear profile of the organisation. In this way, it is possible to enhance name recognition and mould our image. HEKS/EPER’s style of communication is transparent, honest, understandable and practice-oriented. It conveys positive messages, cultivates dialogue with our stakeholders and places people at the centre of our communication.

To complement the project/programme work abroad (and in Switzerland), HEKS/EPER draws public attention to social and social policy issues and endeavours to influence legislation and the administration of justice. Our legitimacy rests on the experience and insights gained from our project work. As part of an annual campaign we work for equality of opportunity and build public awareness of the concerns of the socially disadvantaged. HEKS/EPER seeks to raise knowledge and to create positive connotation of the Swiss public on key issues of international cooperation fostering the ToCs.

HEKS/EPER’s fundraising is meant to secure the financing of its project/programme work and its lobbying on social policy issues. HEKS/EPER strives for a highly diverse range of donors and we stand out from our competitors thanks to our innovative and creative initiatives. In an ever-more competitive environment, we adhere consistently to ethical principles and do not allow donors to restrict our independence. The communication division publicly states the purpose of fundraising drives. Donors can be assured that their contributions will go towards the purpose they specify.

The challenges facing HEKS have further increased over recent years. The shrinking church sector, growing advertising and fundraising pressure owing to generally intensified competition on the donation market, technological developments and changes in the use of media, the development of the media landscape itself and convergence of profit and non-profit services highlight the importance and need for differentiated, independent and strong positioning of HEKS in Switzerland.

HEKS/EPER has succeeded in raising its organisational profile both internally and externally over recent years. Characteristics of the organisation, such as proximity to people, professionalism, impact-oriented project work and the commitment to Christian values and universal human rights have been firmly established in the consciousness of broad sections of the population.

Fundraising and sensitization: Cido, a Brazilian small-scale farmer, was the face of the annual campaign in 2015.
The current 2013–2017 communications strategy provides for the focus set out below to ensure improved strategic positioning: the public visibility and recognition of HEKS’ expertise and work in the field of land access in its work abroad is being targeted.

Careful attention needs to be paid to the measurement of performance and impact in operational work, communication and how this is conveyed externally. However, the proportionality of the expenditure required must always be ensured.

Transparency at all levels of action open to scrutiny at all times is regarded as a vital source of trust from donors, partners, project participants and employees. Credible reporting on the effectiveness of HEKS’ activities is a key factor. Reviewing the reasons for the defined HIP targets, such as land access, with foundational and background information and analyses with experience and effectiveness reports and circulating these documents on a target-group-specific basis is a declared objective and appropriate resources have been set aside for this purpose. This will be achieved using analogue and digital publications as well as through events for the public, specific target groups, such as in the church sector, or specialist audiences.

HEKS has been conducting targeted advocacy work in Switzerland for some years on selected topics of its work abroad. This adopts a long-term approach and draws its legitimacy directly from HEKS’ programme work, e.g. land right issues (Brazil) or peacebuilding and human rights work (Palestine/Israel).

Tools to inform, raise funds, campaign and advocate have to be adapted to the message and the audience and do vary. Key tools are for this are:

- TV and radio spots.
- Poster campaigns.
- Events.
- Online advertising/information including email newsletters.
- Mailings (physical) with various products (fundraising flyers, event info, magazine, etc.).
- Media/public relations.

Monitoring communication

With a questionnaire the communication department addresses HEKS/EPER’s donors, but also samples of Swiss population to monitor various indicators on attitude, sensitization and appraisal of HEKS/EPER’s activities. The indicators listed contain specific questionnaires and are part of targeted surveys - all are ‘only’ relevant for the HEKS/EPER overall strategy phase from 2013-2017. In 2017 new indicators for the strategy phase 2018-2022 will be elaborated, et al with more emphasis on advocacy and sensitization.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators for communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude / sensitization of Swiss population towards “Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals who are aware on thematic priority of HIP (access to land).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals in Switzerland who agree that HEKS/EPER contributes towards development of rural communities (access to land, sustainable agricultural production, inclusive and efficient market system).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of hampering factors of rural development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of communication and transparency of HEKS/EPER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals who support specific advocacy measures (e.g. ‘Farbe bekennen’, ‘Siedlungsgüter Palästina’).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 Note that next ID’s international programme phase (2017-2020) varies from the next HEKS/EPER ‘overall strategy’ phase (2018-2022).
**Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Action by Churches Together (ACT Alliance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BfA</td>
<td>Bread for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Church cooperation (by HEKS/EPER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-based organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Country Director (HEKS/EPER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Change monitoring system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country office (HEKS/EPER coordination office for a priority programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Conflict transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DevCo</td>
<td>Development cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAPPI</td>
<td>Ecumenical Accompaniment Programme in Palestine/Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith-based organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDFA</td>
<td>Federal Department of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFAG</td>
<td>Field financial and administrative guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAN</td>
<td>Food First Information and Action Network (iNGO for the right to food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSPC</td>
<td>Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Genetically modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>Humanitarian aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHQ</td>
<td>HEKS/EPER headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIP</td>
<td>HEKS/EPER international programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA</td>
<td>Human rights-based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>International division (HEKS/EPER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNGO</td>
<td>International non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKI</td>
<td>HEKS/EPER key indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOFF</td>
<td>Kompetenzzentrum Friedensförderung (Centre for Peacebuilding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4P</td>
<td>Making markets work for the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Most significant change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Project cycle management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIU</td>
<td>Project implementation unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEWO</td>
<td>Swiss certification foundation for non-profit organisations collecting donations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEKS/EPER – Swiss Church Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEKS Ausland</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>+41 44 360 88 00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminarstrasse 28</td>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>+41 44 360 88 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfach</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@heks.ch">info@heks.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8042 Zürich</td>
<td>Web</td>
<td><a href="http://www.heks.ch">www.heks.ch</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEKS is a member of actalliance
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PROGRESS & CONTEXT ANALYSIS

APPENDIX 1 OF THE HIP 2017-2020

ZURICH/LAUSANNE, SEPTEMBER 2016
Introduction

To fulfil an adequate and relevant role as well as to define an adequate programme HEKS/EPER has to understand the international context and the results of its previous activities in an increasingly complex and multi-polar world. Thus, based on a thorough analysis of the progress of the previous programme phase (Appendix 1, Chapter 1) and the context (Appendix 1, Chapter 2) the ID elaborated the International Programme 2017-2020 outlining the programmatic and management framework. All objectives of the three sections of ID – Development Cooperation (DevCo), Humanitarian Aid (HA) and Church Cooperation (CC) – aim to tackle the identified challenges and strive to seize the opportunities in order to enhance human security, equal rights and prosperity. Key findings are of the progress & context analysis according to HEKS/EPER are summarized in this Appendix of the HIP 2017-2020.

HEKS/EPER strives to contribute to the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development in a coherent way according to its competence and the interconnectedness of HIP’s fields of actions with the SDGs. This document shows in Appendix 1, Chapter 2.9 the SDGs and its corresponding targets HEKS/EPER works towards.
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1 Progress of the International Programme 2013-17

1.1 HIP achievements 2013–2015

This chapter provides an overview of the main achievements of the current HIP covering the period 2013 to 2015. The proposed HIP 2017–2020 has largely been informed by the relating findings.

In order to assess the main achievements, a variety of mutually complementary information sources were used, including: ID annual/effectiveness reports; most significant change stories; country programme annual reports; ID development patterns, i.e. opportunities and challenges; yearly key data and annual project and country programme evaluations. In addition, a meta-evaluation was commissioned, assessing 27 evaluations conducted between 2007 and 2015, revealing that on average HEKS/EPER’s evaluation practice is up to the mark, and its holistic approach, employed by most projects and country programmes, is very effective. The progress reflected here is measured against the current HIP’s – mainly qualitative – baseline (2012/2013), mostly established based on project and country programme evaluations and annual reports and identified emerging patterns and MSC stories.

In view of the proposed HIP 2017–2020, a coherent global M&E plan will be established (2016/2017) in order to be able to systematically report progress made in our global objectives and indicators.

The theory of change (ToC) of the current HIP states that: ‘By strengthening the structures of civil society, HEKS/EPER enables the pursuit of access to land and resources, the building of sustainable value chains (production, processing, marketing, knowledge transfer) as well as peaceful coexistence. HEKS/EPER is thus making a contribution towards equality and more prosperity for rural communities.’ According to its ToCs, the current HIP (2013–2017) has been striving for the objectives outlined below 41.

1.2 Achievements in ‘Development of rural communities’

Analysis in 2012 generally indicates that during the previous HIP’s period (2008–2012) progress was made with regard to most – though not all – planned objectives. For instance, this holds true for the promotion of access to resources, especially land and basic/public services and seeds. A key success factor in this regard was that a growing number of country programmes and projects had started to replicate and upscale promising practices based on experience gained in the HRBA, indicating a strong positive link between applying the HRBA and rights-holders’ negotiation power and duty-bearers’ fulfilment of their obligations.

Furthermore, analysis conducted in 2012 also indicates that between 2008 and 2012 progress had been made in terms of increased agricultural production. However, comparatively little progress was made with regard to enhancing expertise in value chain development within country programmes and projects. Accordingly, based on the experience we gained, HEKS/EPER started, for instance, to invest in designing and mainstreaming a ‘holistic approach’ in order to improve the effectiveness of projects and country programmes by combining HEKS/EPER’s two main focal themes of conflict transformation and developing rural communities.

41 Several – partly overlapping – objectives have been bundled for the sake of providing a comprehensive progress report.
1.2.1 Objective: Improved secured access to land and resources

In terms of secured access to land, between 2013 and 2015 the trend of projects taking up the issue of ‘access to land’ more systematically in their strategies – a trend which had set in between 2008 and 2012 – has been further pursued in the majority of HEKS/EPER’s focal countries (12 out of 16). This is indicated for instance by the average yearly increase in the numbers of people with improved access to land (Figure 1). Accordingly, the number of projects focusing on access to land has increased from 36 (20%) in 2013 to 51 (nearly 30%) in 2015.

Through HEKS/EPER’s newly developed analytical framework to systematically assess and enhance land tenure security, it has been revealed that the greatest success is possible in the more stable hybrid governments (e.g. Brazil, Senegal, Philippines and India) in which a rights-based approach with reference to national law has proven an adequate strategy. However, circumstances are different in fragile countries (Cambodia, DRC and South Sudan) and are subject to change; accordingly progress has been slower.

In order to be able to continue effectively promoting people’s access to basic and public services, and water and seeds, a growing number of country programmes and projects had started to replicate and upscale promising practices based on experience gained with the HRBA, indicating a strong positive link between applying the HRBA and rights-holders’ negotiation power and duty-bearers’ fulfilment of their obligations. Since 2013, this trend has been further pursued in the majority of HEKS/EPER country programmes (11 out of 16). This is also indicated for instance by the yearly increase in the number of the most vulnerable people, including women, accessing basic/public services. Within three years the numbers have nearly doubled from 44,434 to 79,583 individuals.

Moreover, since 2013 the number of countries has increased in which emphasis is placed on programme/project activities targeting access to seeds through the promotion of ‘seed keepers’ and local varieties, in countries such as Brazil, Honduras, Guatemala (phased out 2014), Colombia, the Philippines, Niger, Senegal, India and Cambodia. The registration of new local seed varieties at the municipal level in Honduras and cooperation with research institutes like the Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária (EMBRAPA) in supporting local seed banks and in-situ seed conservation in Brazil are important results aiming in the right direction. Meanwhile, systematic exchanges on access to seeds at Headquarters level has increased, and the same holds true for south-south exchange among HEKS/EPER partners and other like-minded organisations.

Most HEKS/EPER water projects focus on the issue of drinking water. In this regard, the SDC-funded Water Consortium (launched in 2013 and still ongoing) has made a considerable contribution. In Africa alone, in 2014 more than 90,000 people benefited from improved access to water through 13 WASH projects. The long-term effects of HEKS/EPER’s water projects were evaluated in Ethiopia for the first time through a participatory ‘beneficiary assessment’ (in collaboration with Helvetas Swiss Intercooperation). In addition, in 2015 the project on defluoridation in Ethiopia won a national best practice award.

---

42 The figures exclude projects implemented in the Church Cooperation working section, as they usually do not address land issues.
1.2.2 Objective: Improved sustainable agricultural and non-agricultural production

The trend of increasing agricultural production observed between 2008 and 2012 has been maintained since 2013. In 2015, more than half of HEKS/EPER’s projects contribute to improving agricultural production, compared to about one third in 2012/2013. This entails an increasing number of country programmes (e.g. Niger, Senegal, India, Brazil, Zimbabwe and Ethiopia) and projects addressing the regeneration of degraded land in order to promote agricultural production. It furthermore entails the promotion of agro-ecological production, promoted by an increasing number of projects in various country programmes. Achievements include: fewer problems in dealing with drought-instigated food crises (e.g. Honduras in 2014); improved soil quality (e.g. India and Niger); tested seed varieties and production techniques for millet and black-eyed peas, including bio-pesticides, and substantially increased yields (e.g. Niger); augmented quality and quantity of yields in hazelnut orchards (e.g. Georgia); and ongoing organic certification processes (e.g. Senegal, Colombia, Brazil and Honduras).

1.2.3 Objective: Improved access to markets

Acknowledging the relatively little progress made between 2008 and 2012 with regard to increasing expertise in value chain development, HEKS/EPER developed and published guidelines on market systems development. It also – and importantly – invested considerable resources in designing and mainstreaming a ‘holistic approach’ in order to improve the effectiveness of projects and country programmes: correspondingly, since 2013, an increasing number of projects and country programmes have been launched in order to promote in-depth analysis of conflict situations within local and international structures. A conflict analysis combined with a context analysis is therefore a prerequisite for all planned project interventions. In 2012, HEKS/EPER reinforced its by then already ongoing cooperation with KOFF and ACT in order to further build up expertise in order to analyse and intervene professionally.

On this basis, HEKS/EPER has furthermore been putting significant efforts into strengthening and selecting partner organisations in order to build projects with a strong focus on improving market access through improved production and the development of inclusive value chains: the number of value chain projects has increased from 37 projects (21%) in 2013 to 54 projects (30%) in 2015. Accordingly, a number of value chain projects have been launched and implemented, including: milk and meat market system development projects (Georgia, Azerbaijan and Moldova), pro-poor value chains (in India for Adivasi for finger millet and cashew nuts, in Cambodia for landless people for rice, and in Bangladesh for Dalits and Adivasi for bull fattening), fruit value chains with focus on institutional markets (Honduras and Brazil) and a variety of vegetable and fruit value chains (Niger, South-Sudan, Ethiopia, Senegal, Armenia, Cambodia and DR Congo). In addition, promising international value chain projects were started and/or further developed, including a hazelnut value chain (Georgia), coffee and cocoa value chains (Haiti); non-timber forest products value chains (Brazil); an organic banana value chain (Philippines) and table grape and berry value chains (Moldova).

Furthermore, aiming at ensuring that people and communities gain improved access to a more inclusive, efficient and production market system, HEKS/EPER’s partner organisations have also been trying to foster employment opportunities and monetary income, partly through the above-mentioned value chains. Progress in this regard, however, has been comparatively low, indicated for instance by the fact that when compared to the 2012 base value (101,161), the number of project participants with improved income in 2015 (103,358) indicates no significant improvement.

1.3 Achievements in ‘conflict transformation’

With particular reference to HEKS/EPER’s conflict transformation (CT) core business, two of the former HIP’s (2008–2012) key objectives were specifically meant to promote in-depth analysis of conflict situations within priority countries and projects in order to improve their effectiveness and adapted methods to increase the quality of work in the field of peace and human rights. Analysis in 2012 showed that some progress had been made in this regard, indicated by the following:

- Between 2008 and 2012, direct physical violence had increasingly been playing a major role in the majority of our priority countries. The causes of these conflicts are complex and interwoven in a complex structure, in-between local and international structures. A conflict analysis combined with a context analysis is therefore a prerequisite for all planned project interventions. In 2012, HEKS/EPER reinforced its by then already ongoing cooperation with KOFF and ACT in order to further build up expertise in order to analyse and intervene professionally.

- A slowly growing number of country programmes and projects had taken up a more systematic HRBA, indicating that peacebuilding efforts yield results when designed and applied in a systematic manner, and when working with a specific target audience (South Caucasus, Bangladesh, Honduras and...
Accordingly, dialogue and mutual trust between groups that are hostile to each other and between rights-holders and duty-bearers were successfully encouraged in various project contexts. Efforts to make links with the socio-political level and to implement the results on a political strategic level, however, represented a major challenge.

On this basis, HEKS/EPER reflected on how to further integrate its peacebuilding theories of change into its global operations portfolio and correspondingly further refined the concerned objectives of the HIP, as indicated below (10.3.1–10.3.4). In addition, since 2013, HEKS/EPER has been putting significant efforts into strengthening thematic advisory services at headquarters and in our country offices in order to make programmatic support more systematic and holistic (i.e. combining DevRC, CT and HRBA). This is indicated, for instance, by the fact that between 2013 and 2015 the number of country programmes applying state-of-the-art conflict analysis has increased from only a few initially (e.g. Palestine/Israel and Honduras) to ten (including also Cambodia, Ethiopia, South Caucasus, South Sudan, Zimbabwe, Bangladesh and Moldova).

1.3.1 Objective: Strengthened social cohesion between different interest and identity groups

The HIP 2013–2017 has been ambitious in contributing to this objective by facilitating rival interest groups developing ownership for and taking up practical work toward common goals, referred to here as ‘diapraxis’. The understanding of what diapraxis means and how it is applied in project and programme management has been significantly enhanced since 2012, partly through the development of HEKS/EPER’s new implementation concept on CT. Moreover, the number of country programmes and projects reinforcing and implementing diapraxis has increased significantly (now including Bangladesh, Palestine/Israel, Honduras, Moldova, Cambodia, Kosovo, Serbia, Zimbabwe and India) and there are more in the pipeline (e.g. South Sudan). To mention but a few examples, in Niger, diapraxis has successfully diminished and prevented conflicts through well-balanced water supply for pastoralists and farmers; in Kosovo it fostered drainage and water supply systems, benefitting mainstream society and Roma minorities; and in Bangladesh, social inclusion of Adivasi and Dalit communities has been promoted through integrative beef and chicken value chains. Despite these positive developments, there are of course examples (e.g. South-Caucasus, Bangladesh and Palestine/Israel) indicating that efforts to connect to the socio-political level and to implement the results on a political strategic level are still major challenges, similar to HIP 2008–2012. Another challenge is that since inter-group and intra-group cleavages are often extremely sensitive, it remains difficult to proactively bring those stakeholders together without revealing the intention (e.g. Zimbabwe).

1.3.2 Objective: More people engaging actively for peace and equal rights

The objective of more people engaging actively for peace and equal rights has been approached through contributing to improved knowledge about how to cope constructively with conflict and reflecting on different values. In the previous HIP (2008–2012), most country programmes and projects applied a piecemeal approach, rather than a systematic programmatic approach. Considering that HEKS/EPER’s implementing partner portfolio also includes churches, it was and is still a challenge for many of them to move from a charity-based approach to a systemic and rights-based approach.

Since 2013, significant adjustments and improvements have been taking place in this regard. The CT and HRBA advisory services have been reinforced significantly in order to systematically provide thematic backstopping to programme operations. Promising results include an increased number of programmes (from 3 out of 16 in 2013 to 10 out of 16 in 2015) addressing root causes of conflicts and thus drivers of fragility systematically through new projects or programme components. Implementing partner organisations are by now much better equipped to link capacity building in CT and HRBA with advocacy work in order to promote people’s own initiative and make efforts to trace it. Correspondingly, partners are more aware of the need to systematically link training with advocacy. General training/capacity building curricula developed by HEKS/EPER have been refined and adjusted in order to fit different particular local contexts.

Additionally, more countries have placed a focus on building non-violent conflict transformation skills and reflecting on and deconstructing stereotypes. In fact, there are quite a few examples where people’s own initiative has been proven effective, including Zimbabwe, Cambodia, the South Caucasus, Palestine/Israel, and Colombia. In a similar vein, joint programs/capacity building together with ACT (e.g. the HRBA enabling environment project) were sought and built, and networks for peer-to-peer learning – cooperation synergies in capacity building – were set up.
1.3.3 Objective: Reduced emergence and escalation of violent conflicts

To reduce emergence and escalation of violent conflicts HEKS/EPER has contributed effectively to the integration of the intermediary objective of promoting the inclusion of marginalised fringe groups and minorities as well as the implementation of equal rights. HEKS/EPER’s HRBA has been serving as a solid methodology to go about social inclusion, thereby facilitating an increasing number of country programmes and projects to make the need for social inclusion much more visible. HEKS/EPER’s thematic advisory services have substantially increased their backstopping of country programmes in terms of designing more holistic and rights-based approaches (from 3 out of 16 DevCo priority programmes in 2012 to 10 in 2015).

Indications that some progress has been made in this regard are, for instance, the regional programme on social inclusion of Roma in Eastern Europe, the youth and leadership project in Colombia, the pastoralist project in Niger, the longer-term TOT project in Zimbabwe, the joint capacity building initiative with the ACT community of practice and the Dalit and Adivasi projects in India and Bangladesh.

Despite the aforementioned institutional efforts and the increased number of promising practices, projects which aim at enhancing social inclusion in many cases still face challenges in meaningfully integrating mainstream society. Further, it is also a challenge to effectively move from capacity building to action, and the same holds true for shifting from individual action to the broader socio-political level and public commitment. Creating attitudes towards peace is a complex long-term process, partly challenged by shrinking space, hindrance to people acting and speaking out on human rights issues (e.g. Cambodia, Palestine/Israel, Zimbabwe and Bangladesh); a climate of militarisation countering peace education and positive face-to-face encounters (e.g. South-Caucasus); and the political use of new media providing false information and leading to arrests among activists (e.g. Palestine/Israel).

1.3.4 Objective: Enhanced space for social and political actions by civil society

During HIP 2013–2017 the planned objective of enhanced space for social and political actions by civil society has been approached at partly through the use of strategic networks and through knowledge transfer about rights and rights violations. During the reporting period, a variety of important intermediary steps and results in this direction were achieved, including the following:

- HEKS/EPER has been putting a lot of effort into systematically analysing the manifold problems revolving around shrinking space from the perspective of CSOs. This includes the joint organisation of experience sharing workshops with the ‘ACT rights and development community of practice’ between ACT constituencies, like minded NGO members as well as the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Association and Peaceful Assembly in Malawi, workshops on responsible governance and rights-based programming in collaboration with DCA, ICCO and Diaconia, and an important publication on ‘Space for Civil Society – how to protect and expand an enabling environment’ made in cooperation with ACT based on practical experience in four countries. A particularly alarming finding of this joint research was the negative trend around the participation of CSOs in designing and implementing development policy and plans and the level of government effort to involve them.

- International advocacy has been promoted in concerted manner especially through ACT Alliance, for example by bringing in HEKS/EPER’s experiences and concerns in international advocacy as an active member (e.g. Cambodia). In a similar vein, HEKS/EPER, with the members of the Honduras Network, successfully contributed to lobbying for the opening of a permanent office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in Honduras.

- At the institutional level, HEKS/EPER, together with Swisspeace, Caritas, Helvetas and SDC, has developed and introduced an online course on conflict sensitivity (which is about to be mainstreamed in at least 10 of our 16 country programmes). Related to this initiative is also the establishment of a conflict sensitivity hub with Swisspeace and other NGOs around the globe.

On the basis of these achievements at international level, HEKS/EPER has been putting an emphasis on local strategies to enhance the space for civil society. In the fragile context of Zimbabwe, the country programme is in the midst of being redesigned, involving three newly launched peace projects, including cooperation with and training for duty-bearers concerning HRBA and enabling environment. In Palestine/Israel, the country programme’s ToC has been revised in a participatory manner by involving the bulk of partner organisations in identifying progress markers / indicators of envisioned change, partners are strongly challenging the spaces of freedom of speech and peaceful assembly, and a study on enabling environment was conducted jointly with DCA. In the Honduras country programme, a shrinking space study was conducted as part of a broad joint learning and study process with Peacewatch and KOFF. In South Sudan and the DRC, conflict sensitivity assessments were starting points for peace projects. In the Ethiopia, the
restrictive NGO laws of 2009 have been evaluated through a comprehensive conflict-sensitivity assessment (which does not yet mean, however, that there is a controlled dialogue). In the Brazil country programme, a new advocacy strategy is enhancing an enabling environment. In the Colombia country program, women’s organisations have successfully created a constructive dialogue between CSOs and the government.

1.3.5 Objective: Rural communities create their own solutions to withstand current and future shocks and stresses and adapt to changes that are difficult to predict

As regards resilience building, HEKS/EPER has come a long way since the HIP 2008–2012. Analysis in 2015 indicates that working strategies for adapting to climate change and preparing for climate and disaster risks have been integrated to a large extent as cross-cutting themes into an increased number of development and humanitarian aid programmes and projects.

Considering that the systematic integration of risk reduction and resilience building is a recent working area of HEKS/EPER, 2013 was a year of setting the scene in DRR. As a first step, a thematic adviser for DRR was appointed. Then, the guidelines on mainstreaming community-based risk reduction were gradually introduced in 2014. In addition, DRR has been integrated into HEKS/EPER’s humanitarian aid implementation concept. Since then, the guidelines are being implemented and DRR is being mainstreamed into DevCo (e.g. the Moldova, India, Bangladesh and Colombia country programmes) and humanitarian aid projects. This process has been further supported by various resilience building basics workshops in five countries (Ethiopia, South Caucasus, Bangladesh, India, and Cambodia), as well as by exchange and knowledge sharing on good practices in resilience building (e.g. Colombia, Honduras and Brazil). Accordingly, there are various indications that the implementation of preventive measures and preparedness of vulnerable groups has increased, including for example:

- In Haiti, the reconstruction of 400 earthquake- and hurricane-resistant houses was completed in 2013. Accompanying DRR-measures included the rehabilitation of degraded slopes at irrigation canal and dam sites which protect the newly reconstructed houses from erosion and flooding.
- In North Sumatra, Indonesia, the local emergency assessment and response network (LEARN) proved its readiness and capacity for the first time during a major disaster when the Mount Sinabung volcano erupted in September 2013.
- Independently, disaster preparedness committees were successfully formed in the Philippines, in Indonesia and in Pakistan, and disaster management plans were drawn up accordingly.
- Soil and water conservation measures (e.g. reforestation, slope stabilisation, erosion control, rangeland management, rainwater harvesting and selection of seeds and varieties adapted to changing climatic conditions) have been adopted in drought-, flood- and erosion-affected areas in the Niger, Senegal, Ethiopia, Honduras, Brazil, Haiti, Cambodia, Brazil and Colombia country programmes.

1.4 Achievements in humanitarian aid

- HEKS HQ has increased personnel resources to respond to disasters adequately.
- The HEKS humanitarian aid implementation concept 2015–2019 was developed, approved and implementation started.
- HEKS has defined the following intervention criteria for responding to disasters: a) humanitarian need; b) proximity of HEKS/HEKS partners to affected regions and population groups, and the capacity to respond efficiently; c) financing and fundraising opportunities such as Swiss Solidarity (Glückskette), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC, cantons and parishes.
- In priority countries, emergency relief and rehabilitation interventions are integrated with or linked to existing development projects. Available knowledge and existing structures are used.
- HEKS/EPER provided lifesaving resources and access to basic services to populations in Palestine/Israel, Ethiopia, Niger, the Philippines, South Sudan, Lebanon, Hungary, northern Iraq and Serbia (all related to the Syrian refugee crisis).
- Livelihood interventions took place in Haiti, Niger, Honduras, Indonesia and the Philippines.
- HEKS Humanitarian Aid repaired and built houses for disaster-affected populations in the Czech Republic, Haiti, the Philippines and Serbia. In Haiti, schools and irrigation infrastructure were built, while in Pakistan and South Sudan WASH infrastructure was created.
- All early recovery, reconstruction and rehabilitation projects contained a DRR component.
- All work was carried out according to the relevant standards (Sphere and Swiss Solidarity minimum standards).
1.5 Achievements in church cooperation

CC aimed to strengthen reformed churches and their social organisations in ‘living up to their social and societal responsibilities’ in playing a relevant role in social inclusion of the disadvantaged. HEKS/EPER challenged its partners to draw up country programmes in Hungary, Romania and the Czech Republic with the same standard of DevCo programmes enabling a more coherent implementation and monitoring with newly introduced planning templates and M&E tools.

An important asset to strengthen church life are contributions for improving infrastructure such as multifunctional community premises, churches, vicarages, etc. HEKS/EPER encouraged organisations to present concepts on how to finance and run the infrastructure and to include components on how these can serve not only the constituency, but the broader society. CC partners active in implementing the HEKS/EPER Roma Strategy launched projects on Roma Inclusion in Romania and Hungary. In the Czech Republic, a project to inform, support and protect migrant workers made an important contribution towards a more equitable society. In addition, shelters as well as homes for the elderly, handicapped or women with young children in Romania, Hungary and Ukraine helped to protect the disadvantaged and enhance social inclusion. Also successful were home care projects in Romania, expanding from 4 (2012) to 7 (2015) regions and covering 168 villages. In Hungary, the Czech Republic and Ukraine, the objective of holding camps and events for young people was achieved. The flexible response at the appropriate level to humanitarian crises and disaster prevention was remarkable in the Czech Republic (flooding) and Hungary (refugees). The number of people supported by CC grew from 17,600 in 2013 to 18,300 in 2014 and nearly 20,000 in 2015; all with a yearly budget of CHF 1.6 million. The facilitation of important linkages to between parishes in Switzerland and Eastern Europe continued on a rather basic level, being intensive to initiate, but very enriching for both sides once established.

Overall, HEKS/EPER states that CC has become a well-structured, more accountable and a relevant participant in social inclusion and social services in all countries with a CP. Furthermore, HEKS/EPER took steps to assess and launch CC projects in the Middle East.

1.6 Insights through monitoring, evaluation and learning

While implementing its International Programmes (2008–2012 and 2013–2017) HEKS/EPER has continuously been learning from its programme interventions and adapting them correspondingly. This broad learning and adaptation process has to a large extent been informed by complexity-aware monitoring, including instruments like most significant change (MSC) stories and pattern analysis. Within HEKS/EPER’s global M&E system, MSC is integral to HEKS/EPER’s reporting policy, and pattern analysis is embedded in various institutionalised learning spaces (regional meetings, ID forums, ID summary workshops, etc.).

The resulting lessons learnt and steering decisions from using the aforementioned instruments have systematically been elaborated and documented on a yearly basis, and accordingly been shared through feedback loops between all institutional levels and stakeholders. They are shared because they are relevant not only to HEKS/EPER as an institution in order to be able to remain dynamic and flexible in an increasingly complex environment, but also to country offices managing country programmes, to partner organisations implementing projects within country programmes and to people taking part in projects.

Accordingly, the proposed HIP 2017–2020 has been drawn up informed by the main patterns and findings from MSC stories identified during the current HIP. They are summarised in the following sub-chapters.
### 1.6.1 Patterns identified (2011–2015)

Patterns may be promising opportunities or hampering challenges influencing context, programme work and progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pattern/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Taking into account the many dimensions of 'access to land'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Networks / Partnerships to be effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Link short-term and long-term support for 'meaningful' projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Focus on young people / migration / urban vs rural …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Striving for systemic change for sustainable change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 1: At knowledge-sharing workshops during the reporting process HEKS/EPER identified recurring patterns affecting its work.

- Abuse of drugs, alcohol, and increased domestic violence
1.6.2 Lessons learnt from most significant change stories (2012–2015)

Finding 1: Comparative analysis MSC stories from multiple years confirmed the relevance of certain parts of our theory of change in the DevCo working section. In particular, it showed that although getting ‘access to resources’ is an essential factor for improving people’s livelihoods, it is by no means a guarantee of success. Accordingly, through analysing different MSC stories, we identified nuances of different types of ‘access to resources’ (e.g. access to land as right to shelter for peri-urban Dalits and access to land as right to food for farmers). This facilitated, for example, HEKS/EPER headquarters differentiating its thematic implementation concepts and it facilitated projects and programmes spotting bottlenecks in their theories of change, adjusting them accordingly, and identifying potential and solutions.

Lesson learnt: On this basis, we saw essential parts of our impact hypothesis confirmed and in this sense we continue focusing on facilitating ‘access to land’ as one of our main priorities. However, this prioritisation comes with implications, including the challenge to strike a balance between the need to be able to apply a broad and flexible approach (covering multiple thematic areas, applying a range of working approaches, etc.) with the need to stay focused as an organisation, with a specific role, niche/profile, etc.

Finding 2: MSC stories helped us further differentiate between a range of basic analytical instruments we use for managing projects/programmes, especially our holistic approach, context analysis, stakeholder analysis and conflict analysis. The MSC method – which in essence tries to capture the context beyond the narrow project framework – revealed the importance of taking a ‘systemic view’, on top of the aforementioned instruments.

Lessons learnt: Although state-of-the-art PCM provides clear guidance on how to use context analysis, stakeholder analysis and conflict analysis, the added value projects/programmes get from also applying a systemic approach is invaluable as it spurs in-depth comprehension of stakeholders’ given incentive schemes, helps differentiate between stakeholders’ needs and incentives and promotes effectiveness and outreach. Our experience in an increasing number of projects and programmes (e.g. in Georgia, Serbia, Kosovo, Honduras, India, Zimbabwe, Bangladesh and Cambodia) confirms this. In addition, a systemic view enhances differentiating the way we employ the holistic approach in our projects/programmes: an increasing number of projects/programmes use it primarily to ‘think holistically’ during the design stage, in order for then to implement ‘focused’ interventions. The recently conducted meta-evaluation re-confirms this vital differentiation and refers to it as one of the key strengths of our holistic approach. Accordingly, we will promote its replication by other projects and programmes in future.

Finding 3: MSCs have indicated that where project/programme success takes time to materialise, a mixed approach of short-term support (e.g. distribution of livestock and seeds, or short-term income-generating activities) and long-term support (e.g. advocacy campaigns on government land distribution) is advisable. However, short-term support generally carries the risk of donor dependency and lack of sustainability, whereas long-term support often carries the risk of undermining people’s ownership and contribution, due to the lack of tangible short-term results.

Lesson learnt: The combination of short-term and long-term support is essential for successful projects in many contexts. Successful projects are interventions that are ‘meaningful’, which essentially means that they must be motivating and make sense to target communities. An increasing number of projects (Bangladesh, India, Palestine/Israel, Zimbabwe, Ethiopia, Senegal and Brazil) are investing in designing meaningful interventions by systematically combining short-term and long-term approaches.
**Finding 4:** A recurring pattern identified through our MSC stories is that HEKS/EPER and a considerable number of its local implementing partner organisations still struggle with the required **shift away from a short-term, charity-based mind-set to a development approach** based on long-term visions (wide-ranging theories of change, including exit strategies), thematic and managerial inter-project synergies (beyond information sharing) and the drive for systemic change and outreach. *It should be noted that the above-mentioned finding number 3 on combining short-term and long-term support may to some extent make it challenging to enact the required shift.*

**Lessons learnt:** The required shift in mind-set is a process that takes a long time, absorbs many resources, and has various implications in terms of HEKS/EPER strategic planning, our comprehension and application of PCM and the way we measure results and success. As development organisations, HEKS/EPER and its implementing partners need to be patient in terms of implementing HEKS/EPER’s growth strategy, pragmatic in terms of demanding adherence to state-of-the-art PCM standards and we have to keep a constructive organisational culture when it comes to handling these challenges.

![Ethiopia: Discussions in a village.](image)

**Finding 5:** From numerous MSC stories, we found that project **initiatives aiming at ‘breaking with taboos’ and ‘bringing up new topics’ in public** often triggered unexpected negative as well as positive changes. Examples include: discriminated minority groups (e.g. Dalits in Bangladesh and India) raising their wish to not strive for social integration into mainstream society (it should be noted however that this concern was raised at the initial stage of the concerned projects, when beneficiaries’ had not yet been made more aware of their rights); or challenging historical ‘facts’ via empirical and archaeological research (e.g. in Palestine/Israel), causing strong counter-reaction by the Israeli public, which however eventually led to improved acknowledgment of the Nakba43; or, as indicated by various examples in Cambodia, Bangladesh and India, the recurring abuse of drugs, alcohol and the related issue of domestic violence ‘doing harm’, thereby undermining projects’ effectiveness and sustainability.

**Lessons learnt:** projects striving for breaking with taboos and raising new topics have the potential to spur public attention, awareness and discussion about change-provoking issues at the socio-political level, which, in turn, can promote positive change. However, it is often difficult to channel that change, let alone foresee how it will influence other project activities (in order to avoid violating the ‘do-no-harm’ principle). In order to be able to specifically and pro-actively identify constructive new topics and taboo-breaking interventions, it is of utmost importance for HEKS/EPER to work with local partner organisations with strong local legitimacy, solid knowledge about the context and high conflict sensitivity. These are key pre-conditions for being able (i) to spot constructive ‘new topics’ and ‘taboo-breaking initiatives’, and (ii) in case of negative unexpected changes, to handle the challenges through effective negotiation between conflicting stakeholders.

---

43 The 1948 Palestinian exodus, also known as the Nakba (Arabic for ‘disaster’, ‘catastrophe’), occurred when more than 700,000 Palestinian Arabs fled or were expelled from their homes during the 1948 Palestine war. The term nakba also refers to the period of war itself and events affecting Palestinians from December 1947 to January 1949.
1.6.3 Progress of institutional parameters

One of the key institutional objectives of each HIP phase cycle has been that HEKS/EPER’s programmatic work is relevant and implemented professionally. The following outlines some of the main corresponding geographic, thematic, financial, and M&E&L targets and achievements (◻ on-track; ◻ off-track):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical, thematic and financial targets 2013-2017</th>
<th>Progress/achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2017, the programme volume is above CHF 1 million in 14 priority countries/regions.</td>
<td>5 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2017, operating in 16 priority countries</td>
<td>20 20 16 (Philippines, Eritrea, Guatemala, Albania closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2017, on average 7–10 projects per country</td>
<td>Out of 20: 9 are below target; 5 above; 7 in line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2017, better mix of large (supporting) and small (innovative) projects</td>
<td>Since 2013 the mix of large and small projects in country programmes has improved gradually, with less than 30% large projects in 2012/2013 and more than 50% in 2015/2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2017, improved no. of projects/partners with thematic synergies, contributing to implementing CP theory of change</td>
<td>Since 2013 the no. of projects/partners with thematic synergies has improved yearly, with less than 20% in 2012/2013 and more than 50% in 2015/2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E&amp;L targets 2008-2015</th>
<th>Progress/achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives 2008-2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative and adapted evaluation approaches (methodologies, guidelines) are defined to ‘show’ impact (outcome level)</td>
<td>We developed and tested the first elements of our refined global M&amp;E system, i.e. key data/indicators, evaluation and reporting policies, MSC, and ID summary workshops and ID forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing knowledge sharing within the ID leading to greater exchange and knowledge transfer on two thematic issues, especially among coordinators, and further development of strategy and organisational integration</td>
<td>Continuous learning with a variety of adapted tools was applied in a consolidated manner. KS is institutionalised within the ID, but needs to be further embedded in all processes. ID regional meetings, an HQ study day (both carried out for the first time in 2012) and various ID workshops maintained the KS flow between the biannual ID Forums. Developing the ID and the annual reports are also learning processes. Several exchange workshops between countries furthered the knowledge of staff and partners. A future challenge will be to interconnect M&amp;E with KS to strengthen continuous learning and capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives 2013-2017</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The systematic analysis of our impact hypothesis and the corresponding global performance measurement and reporting processes (effectiveness report) are promoted through more coherent logic models, institutionalised learning and an improved global approach to M&amp;E</td>
<td>We created a comprehensive global M&amp;E system (M&amp;E policy), expected to allow for systematic assessment of HIP’s global objectives achievements (see ID Annual Reports). The main building blocks are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonised PCM tools and integrated complexity</td>
<td>One coherent results framework per working section (DevCo, HA and CC); including substantially refined key indicators (HKI) that better reflect HEKS/EPER’s holistic approach and effectiveness (from April 2015, new interventions are required to integrate relevant HKIs into logic models and accordingly, systematic data collection related to HKIs will start in 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved evaluation guidelines</td>
<td>Improved evaluation policy, including a section on impact studies and improved reporting policies and instruments, including most significant change (MSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated and implemented policies and instruments (which had been developed in recent years) in the practical work by HEKS/EPER together with the country offices and partner organisations</td>
<td>Improved institutionalised learning, partly through HEKS/EPER’s global learning cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active transfer of good practices from leading HEKS/EPER countries to other countries</td>
<td>To implement these mutually complementing M&amp;E elements, we finalised the revision of our global standard/handbook of programme/project cycle management, including complexity-aware monitoring based on MSC, patterns analysis and complexity-aware M&amp;E plans. In order to mainstream the revised standard in all focal countries, 20 training courses on PCM/HKI were provided to country office teams and concerned partner organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Context of international cooperation

With its international programme, contributing to prosperity and equal rights, HEKS/EPER aims to address some of the complex global challenges described in this context analysis. It has to be stressed that factors hampering development are complex, multiple and interlinked such as poverty, inequality, conflicts, shrinking space, fragility, disasters, climate change impacts and environmental stresses, poor governance, gender imbalance, lack of prospects and migration.

2.1 Poverty and inequality

State of poverty

For the last few decades, three regions, East Asia and the Pacific, South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, have accounted for some 95 per cent of global poverty. Yet, the composition of poverty across these three regions has shifted dramatically. In 1990, East Asia accounted for half of the global poor, whereas some 15 per cent lived in sub-Saharan Africa; by 2015, this is almost exactly reversed: sub-Saharan Africa accounts for half of the global poor, with some 12 per cent living in East Asia. Poverty is declining in all regions but it is becoming deeper and more entrenched in countries that are either conflict-ridden or overly dependent on commodity exports\(^{44}\).

An analysis of global multidimensional poverty – measured by the Multidimensional Poverty Index\(^{45}\) – reveals that 1.6 billion people are living in multidimensional poverty, of which 54% live in South Asia, 31% in sub-Saharan Africa, whereas 52.5% of the population in South Asia (844 million people) and 61.1% of the population in sub-Saharan Africa (496 million people) are poor according to the MPI. In countries classified as high alert by the Fragile States Index, on average 72% of people are multidimensionally poor. In total, 70% of multidimensional poor people live in middle income countries. The SDC refers to about 2 billion people earning less than USD 2 per day in Africa, where 80% of these poor people will live by 2025.\(^{46}\)

A new World Bank report\(^{47}\) shows that climate change is an acute threat to poorer people across the world, with the power to push more than 100 million people back into poverty over the next fifteen years. The poorest regions of the world – sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia – will be hit the hardest. The report states that climate impacts will affect agriculture the most, a key sector in the poorest countries and a major source of income, food security, nutrition, jobs, livelihoods and export earnings. By 2030, crop yield losses could mean that food prices would be 12% higher on average in sub-Saharan Africa. The resulting malnutrition could lead to an increase in severe stunting in Africa of 2%.

Increasing inequality

Recent studies from Credit Suisse and Oxfam\(^{48}\) provide evidence that the richest 1% now have more wealth than the rest of the world combined. Gaps are widening, both within and between countries. The poorest 10% only earn between 2–7% of total global income. In a sample of 116 countries, household income inequality increased by 11% for low- and middle-income countries between 1990 and 2010. More than 75% of households are living in societies, where income is more unequally distributed than in 1990.\(^{49}\)

While the world has made progress in reducing income poverty, many people remain vulnerable to it and persistently high income inequalities hinder progress towards the eradication of poverty. The UN report on


\(^{45}\) The Global Multidimensional Poverty Index measures the nature and magnitude of overlapping deprivations in health, education and living standards at the household level. The Global MPI was developed in 2010 by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). See also http://www.ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/multi-index/


An Oxfam report on inequalities shows that ‘where income inequality is high and/or increasing, the evidence is clear that economic growth has significantly less impact on poverty.’

Despite constant growth, in these countries the number of people living in poverty hardly fell. Inequality and discrimination are hurdles in alleviating poverty: ‘While around the world economic growth is picking up pace, deep challenges remain, including poverty, environmental degradation, persistent unemployment, political instability, violence and conflict. […] People, especially young people, excluded from the mainstream end up feeling disenfranchised and become easy fodder of conflict.

This, in turn, reduces the sustainability of economic growth, weakens social cohesion and security, encourages inequitable access to and use of global commons, undermines our democracies, and cripples our hopes for sustainable development and peaceful societies.’

The UN ESA study of 2013 on inequality matters clearly said: ‘Despite a general trend towards narrowing the disparities in life expectancy, child health and mortality, and primary and secondary school attendance and completion, health and educational outcomes still differ markedly across, and within, countries. There is growing evidence and recognition of the powerful and corrosive effects of inequality on poverty reduction, economic growth, social cohesion and stability.’

Poverty is not caused simply by a shortage of economic resources but results from inequalities and differences in the levels of access that people have to resources and entitlements and the freedom to choose and achieve the type of life the person or groups wants. Barriers to accessing land, resources and services form multiple forms of discrimination and result in structural exclusion of people on the basis of such identity markers as sex, gender, ethnicity, age, social group, etc., institutionalised in political, economic, social and cultural institutions. The exclusion of developmental processes and benefits comprises the denial of various human rights.

Inequalities and disenfranchisement are also drivers of violent conflicts. This, in turn, reduces prosperity, weakens social cohesion and security, encourages inequitable access to land, services and resources, and hamper sustainable development and peaceful societies. Gary A. Haugen provides evidence of how violence is not only a result of armed national or geopolitical conflict, but often a result of more powerful players including criminality. Those harmed are weaker individuals, mainly people living in poverty: ‘Violence

the World Social Situation 2016 says: ‘While nearly half of the world’s population lived on less than $1.25 a day in 1990, the proportion had declined to 14 per cent by 2015’, but ‘there has been little success in raising the standard of living or consumption floor of those living under half of $1.25 a day, with most of the progress against poverty coming from a reduction of the number of people living just above such a floor. In South Asia alone, 44.4% of the population, 730 million people, live just above the international extreme poverty line, earning between $1.25 and $2.50 a day, and could easily fall into poverty with a sudden change in circumstances. […] Employment inequalities persist and are, at times, growing. […] Factors beyond an individual’s skill and effort, such as ethnicity, age, disability or gender, affect access to opportunities, resources, and participation in political, civil and cultural life. However, the effect of these characteristics is not uniform across countries.'

Amina Mohammed, Secretary-General’s Special Adviser on Post-2015 Development Planning, United Nations, and Vice-Chair of the Global Agenda Council on Sustainable Development.

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2013). Inequality Matters.


is as much a part of what it means to be poor as being hungry, sick, homeless, or jobless. Violence is a core reason for why people are poor and the primary reason why they stay poor. Haugen further argues that we will simply never be able to win the battle against extreme poverty unless we address it.

**Gender**

Gender inequality remains a major barrier to human development, prosperity and living together in peace. Of the people living in poverty (less than USD 2 per day), 70% are female. In low-income countries, women are hit far harder by social, political or economic inequalities, facing discrimination and violence.

Legally binding international human rights treaties[^57] require states to respect, protect and fulfil women’s rights. Gender equality and women’s rights are also anchored in the international development Agenda 2030 (cross-cutting throughout all 17 SDGs and the stand-alone gender equality goal 5). However, not all these international claims are translated into national legislation and even where gender equal laws have been put into place, inequalities remain in practice, e.g. due to social and cultural norms, stereotypes and practices.

For example in agriculture gender inequalities remain high: While women comprise an average of 43 per cent of the agricultural labour force in developing countries, many women in rural areas derive their livelihoods from small-scale farming, often informal and unpaid. In developing countries, only 10 to 20 per cent of all land holders are women[^58]. Gender differences exist not only in access to land but also in access to resources and services, including education, technology, water, livestock, seeds, expansions and financial services[^59]. The FAO (2014) estimates that if women had the same access to inputs and services as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20–30 per cent. Furthermore, women differentiate risk by mixing food crops to ensure overall stability and resilience of the farming system as a whole[^60].

Analyses of total hours worked in time-use surveys show that women contribute 52 per cent of global work to men’s 48 per cent. While 72 per cent of working-age men were employed, only 47 per cent of women were[^61]. On average, women in the labour market still earn 24 per cent less than men globally. Moreover, women do almost two and a half times as much unpaid care and domestic work as men[^62]. However, when women control additional income, they spend more of it on food, health and education for their children. This has positive implications for well-being and human capital through improved health, nutrition and education outcomes.

Effectively ensuring gender equality requires a comprehensive understanding not only of the legal situation and economics but also of the power relations and social structures. Most relevant for HEKS/EPER, working with rural communities and duty-bearers, is for example the lack of female participation in communities as well as in regional and national decision-making bodies. As of August 2015, only 22 per cent of all national parliamentarians were female[^63]. This is crucial since several studies have shown that greater representation of women in politics increases investments in and prominence of development issues like employment, health, education and measures against gender-based violence[^64].

Violent conflicts threaten men and women in particular ways. For example, women and girls are more often subject to domestic and sexual violence, rape, sexual slavery and human trafficking. Boys and young men, on the other hand, are often exposed to forced recruitment. In times of war, constructions of masculinity and womanhood are often exploited to keep conflict violent. In post-conflict situations, rape and sexual violence traumatise and break down the social fabric of families, communities and societies. Men and positive role models of non-violent masculinity are often missing. This may increase not only the workload of women and girls, but also gender-based violence (due to a lack of safety and protection networks) and negative gendered stereotypes. Experience shows that women can play a crucial role in conflict transformation. Therefore, particular attention must be paid to the different situations, security needs and roles of women and men.

[^57]: Such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).
[^58]: FAO (2014): The state of food and agriculture.
[^60]: Farming matters (12/2015): Women showing the way with agroecology.
2.2 Dynamics of violent conflicts

‘According to the IISS armed conflict survey, the number of armed conflicts have decreased by one third between 2008 and 2014 while the number of fatalities has tripled in the same period – from 56,000 to 180,000; less conflicts, but becoming more deadly.’\(^65\) Mainly because of the emerging conflicts in Syria, Iraq, Libya, Yemen, the Central African Republic, Mali, Sudan and the Ukraine.

According to the global terrorism index since the beginning of the 21st century, the number of deaths from terrorism has been rising from 3,329 in 2000 to 32,685 in 2014. Of those deaths, 82 per cent occurred in just five countries: Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria and Syria. Terrorism also affected peaceful countries, with attacks occurring in France, Denmark and Australia in 2015.\(^66\) However, the number of people murdered each year in ‘acts of criminality’ is over 13 times higher than the number of victims of terrorism. Estimates, reported in successive editions of the Global Burden of Armed Violence, show a continuous drop in the average annual number of violent deaths worldwide: from 540,000 violent deaths for the period 2004–07 to 508,000 for 2007–12. At the same time, figures from the Geneva Declaration show that, out of these violent deaths, only 70,000 per year (14%) were directly related to armed conflicts.\(^67\)

Analysing and comparing the prevalence of different forms of violence (see figures above), it’s obvious to concentrate on the prevention of violence more broadly. There should be no contradiction in dealing with present catastrophes and preparing for looming threats on the one hand and learning from the overall decline in violence to promote peace on the other hand.\(^68\)

The Twitter revolution and massive use of new technologies allow new means of aggression. Destabilising information warfare and hybrid wars have brought important institutions to their knees, bypassing conventional defence mechanisms. At the same time, new communication opportunities provide important means for peacebuilding and participatory governance.

2.3 Shrinking space for civil society

The global trend of shrinking spaces for civil society action has increasingly become one of the key obstacles to implementing development or humanitarian aid projects. The situation is particularly severe if strategies touch on the distribution of resources or particular and religious values.\(^69\)

Civil society’s importance and political participation in international processes and national development is widely acknowledged. As critical development actors, civil society organisations (CSOs) play a vital role in advocating for the respect of human rights, in shaping development policies and in overseeing their implementation. The international community has recognised CSOs as development actors in their own right\(^70\) and the UN Secretary General recently stressed that ‘civil society acts as a catalyst for social progress and economic growth. It plays a critical role in keeping governments accountable, and helps represent the diverse interests of the population, including its most vulnerable groups.’\(^71\) The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development acknowledges the role of the civil society in implementing the SDGs in several paragraphs.\(^72\) As a provider of social, education, health and other services to vulnerable populations, civil society organisations are expected to support the implementation of the goals as development actors by improving the living conditions of all. Another expectation is that civil society in its role as watchdog will critically and constructively accompany the national responses to the SDGs at the national level and contribute to monitoring of the implementation (Agenda 20230, §79). Also, through participation in multi-stakeholder...
partnerships, it is anticipated that CSOs will contribute. Sustainable Development Goal 17 – ‘Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalise the global partnership for sustainable development’ – recognises multi-stakeholder partnerships and civil society as part of these processes as important vehicles for mobilising and sharing knowledge and expertise to support the achievement of the SDGs in all countries.

On the other hand, the role of civil society is disputed by new and more restrictive laws, including NGO regulations73, which shrink the manoeuvring room for local communities and community-based organisations. For example, criminal acts that can be carried out by private businesses’ security forces with impunity and low protection of human rights activists threaten civil society’s ability to assert its rights, hindering participation and ownership as well as socio-economic improvements. The denial of the freedom of speech, peaceful assembly and protest among others undermine constructive dialogue between different civil society groups and enhance fragmentation and internal conflict, which in turn again hinder broader cooperation and ownership for the implementation of development endeavours.

In the light of the terrorist threat, government fear of the power of social movements, in particular since the Arab Spring, causes reactions like the curtailing of civil societies and democratic rights. Measures to counter suspected or real violent terrorism have been (mis)used by a number of governments to restrict space for civil society. Central values such as freedom of speech, expression, assembly and participation are curtailed. Even ‘western’ governments curtail rights and do not fully hold other states accountable for adhering to human rights anymore, which puts the global human rights cause in danger.

Fragmentation of society in various interest groups without sufficient instruments for dialogue and a fair legal framework also hinder development. The reconfiguration of public and private power due to privatisation/deregulation or directive non-inclusive governments, the altered capacities and roles of the state and the complexities of governing modern societies have contributed to a paradigm shift of power towards strong economic enterprises or political elites. Corruption, poor governance or even the complete lack of governance, favour inequalities.

2.4 Food sovereignty, sustainable agriculture and inclusive markets

About 80% of the rural population engages, at least to some extent, in the primary sector labour. Typically, the poorest are most dependent on the agricultural-based economy. At the same time, 75% of the world’s population suffering from hunger live in rural areas74. Therefore, a key element to fight poverty and hunger as well as enhance food sovereignty and self-determination on agricultural production is inclusive sustainable agriculture. Access to productive resources such as land, water, seeds, credits, etc. is as crucial as coping mechanisms for environmental stresses.

At present, the number of people without access to drinking water is estimated at 800 million. Furthermore, 2.5 billion people live without adequate sanitation facilities and 1.1 billion still defecate in the open. The disparities between rural areas and urban centers remain glaring. These poor sanitation conditions alone are responsible for 80% of the diseases prevalent in developing countries. Around the world, one child under the age of five dies from diarrhoeal diseases every 20 seconds. However, the problem is not due to a shortage of water but rather to the absence of national and international funding commitments to enable sustainable access. The primary sector is a major user of water resources, accounting for almost four-fifths of world consumption. Food security therefore invariably depends on the availability of a sufficient quantity of water for agriculture.75

At the same time, the promotion of non-agricultural activities and production cycles in rural and peri-urban areas is increasing as they are important for diversifying income sources, creating employment and contributing to food security for families (small businesses, artisans or other service providers, which are important for a functioning society)76. Therefore, agricultural and development policies need to incorporate multi-functionality in rural areas into their actions and thinking.

---

74 WFP (March, 2016). Website: https://www.wfp.org/hunger/who-are
Scientific evidence shows that smallholder agriculture, adequately supported by policy and public investments, has the capacity to contribute effectively to food security, food sovereignty, and substantially and significantly to economic growth, the generation of employment, poverty reduction, the emancipation of neglected and marginalised groups and the reduction of spatial and socio-economic inequalities. Within an enabling political and institutional environment, it can contribute to sustainable management of biodiversity and other natural resources while preserving cultural heritage. The report of the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE) of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) identifies three action lines to enhance smallholder investments and capacities: i) increasing smallholders’ access to natural and productive assets; ii) improving smallholders’ access to markets and iii) making institutions work for smallholders.

Growth and its limits

From a development policy point of view, continuous economic growth of poor countries is indispensable. To achieve this development goal would mean that in future, industrial, developed and developing countries would move towards the same living standards and resource consumption. If all people had a ‘western lifestyle’ in 2012, seven-times the world GDP would have been needed. But in 2012, the world already exceeded the ecological potential of the planet. If all people had had the same living standard, more than ten earths would have been necessary. Such a world would look dramatically different: ‘peak everything’ would be long behind us, many non-renewable natural resources would be depleted and many renewable natural resources would be beyond repair.

Asia already uses more than double the biological capacity per capita; Africa fully uses its biological capacity without the huge industrialisation and economic wealth push. Countries in both continents would have to put the management of their natural resources and equitable access of all to them at the centre of their development strategies. The first ideas in this direction have been proposed. For example, from Latin America, the idea of ‘buen vivir’ as an alternative to the common development perception is emerging. But practical politics is for the time being pursuing a ‘business as usual’ approach – in both the Global South and in the Global North.

2.5 Increasing risk exposure

As Figure 2 shows, disaster trends (geophysical and weather-related disaster events) are increasing worldwide. Poverty and inequality push women and men to live in marginalised contexts, in places with a high exposure to disaster risk, such as alongside rivers or floodplains, in marginal and degraded lands or on slopes. Over the past ten years, more than 700 thousand people have lost their lives, over 1.4 million have been injured and approximately 23 million have been made homeless as a result of disasters. Overall, more than 1.5 billion people have been affected by disasters in various ways, with women, children and people in vulnerable situations disproportionately affected. The


total economic loss was more than USD 1.3 trillion.⁷⁹ There are clear indices that exposure of individuals and assets in all countries has increased faster than vulnerability has decreased. Already today, more than one-third of the world’s poor live in multi-hazard zones and low-income countries account for more than 70 per cent of the world’s disaster ‘hotspots’.⁸⁰

One important driver of the increase in disaster risk is climate change. The Fifth IPCC Assessment Report (AR5)⁸¹ as well as the IPCC Special Report – SREX⁸² – show clear indices that climate change is increasing the frequency, intensity and magnitude of disasters. According to the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), in the past 20 years, 90% of major disasters have been caused by weather-related events such as heatwaves, storms, floods and droughts.⁸³ Climate change also leads to more gradual changes, which will again have an impact on women and men’s vulnerability. Climate change will significantly impede progress towards sustainable development. Another important risk driver is the ongoing land degradation. About 30 per cent of land globally, which is home to about 3.2 billion people, has experienced significant degradation. The poor are especially affected by land degradation because their livelihoods heavily depend on natural resources, which again increases their vulnerability and exposure to natural hazards.⁸⁴ Increasing scarcity of natural resources also increases tensions over these, which can lead to confrontations between different land users.⁸⁵ Besides the above-mentioned risk drivers, population growth and migration, inadequate land-use planning and poor infrastructure are underlying factors, again leading to further risk concentration. Lack of governance and conflict multiply the impact of hazards on affected people and communities.⁸⁶

### 2.6 Rural urban migration

Globally, more people live in urban areas than in rural areas, with 54% of the world’s population residing in urban areas in 2014. By 2050, 66% of the world’s population (6.4 billion) is projected to be urban.

Today, the most urbanised regions include North America (82% living in urban areas in 2014), Latin America and the Caribbean (80%) and Europe (73%). In contrast, Africa and Asia remain mostly rural, with 40% and 48% of their respective populations living in urban areas. All regions are expected to urbanise further over the coming decades. Africa and Asia are urbanising faster than the other regions and are projected to become 56% and 64% urban, respectively, by 2050.⁸⁷ This means, all growth in the world’s population over the next few decades of another 2.5 billion is expected to be in urban areas in low- and middle-income countries, particularly in Africa and Asia.

Push and pull factors of rural urban migration are similar across the world. Cities offers an escape from the hazards of a fragile rural livelihood. People looking for economic and social opportunities, such as jobs, modern amenities, access to education and health. The growing industrialisation of farming or the expansion of cities into rural areas drives rural communities off their land and forces them to move into the cities, where they often end up settling in slums. The growth of slums or illegal settlement is furthermore a cause of inner-urban migration, where people are forced out due to urban development. The number of people living in slums reached 863 million in 2014 – an increase of more than 200 million since 1990.

The fast rate of urbanization, and rising migration to cities, brings with it both risks and opportunities for the migrants, communities and governments. Poorly managed migration results in ever more competition for space, jobs, water and energy. Traffic and water pollution, poor sanitation, poor building standards and
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waste management are further problems which cities are facing. But cities can also turn urban diversity arising from migration into social and economic advantages.

The number of internal migrants globally is at least 740 million, nearly four times the number of international migrants (UNDP, 2009). Migration is a livelihood strategy pursued by poor households in order to spread livelihood risks. International and internal remittances are important to the poorest regions. But, rural urban migration leads in rural areas to brain drain, decreasing basic services, shrinking economic and social power and fewer prospects, especially for the young people. DevCo programmes have to deal with migration sensitive.

2.7 Refugees

Currently, nearly 60 million people are refugees or displaced people in need of aid, having been forced from their homeland by conflict and disasters. In addition, many more people seek to gain individual and/or economic security abroad due to poverty and limited prospects in their countries.

Every day sees an increasing number of people caught up in the crossfire of armed conflicts. International conflicts have decreased, however internal armed conflict and protracted, long-term violence are increasing as are fragile contexts in less-developed and middle-income countries. In 2014, 13.9 million people had to leave their homes due to violence and persecution. Driven by conflicts in Syria and Iraq, there are now more displaced people in the Middle East region than in Africa and more displaced people in middle-income countries (MICs) than in low-income countries (LICs).

In the second half of 2015, the Syria refugee crisis started to affect European countries directly as the number of Syrians heading to Europe to seek protection increased drastically. Syrian monthly visa applications in 37 European countries increased from 12,747 in January 2015 to 143,355 applications in October 2015. However, only a small number of Syrian refugees are seeking protection in Europe compared to Syrians in neighbouring countries such as Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, etc. The increase in numbers of refugees has led to extensive media coverage and intense discussions have started in European countries about capacity and willingness to integrate refugees. Fear of what an influx of asylum seekers would mean for their societies has led many governments to introduce restrictions and close their borders. A polarising ‘us-versus-them’ rhetoric threatens to move from the political fringe to the mainstream. Blatant Islamophobia and demonization of refugees have become the currency of an increasingly assertive politics of intolerance – values of equality, democracy and human rights are at risk.

In addition to people migrating due to conflict and economic despair, an average of 26.4 million people are displaced by sudden-onset disasters alone each year, while the global number of people displaced by slow-onset disasters like drought is not known. The international humanitarian system is currently not adequately prepared to meet the global challenge of disaster displacement. There is broad agreement among scientists that climate change is projected to increase displacement in the future, both internally and across international borders.

---

92 Data from 37 European countries reporting to UNHCR. [http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/asylum.php](http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/asylum.php)
2.8 Changing aid landscape

In a multipolar world, international development thinking and practice as well as the donor landscape is changing significantly. With the structural shift in the organisation and exercise of economic and political power with the rise of emerging economies, new actors in development cooperation also emerge. Such actors are Middle Eastern countries, Brazil, China and India which have their own political and economic interests and new approaches; not all of them work according to humanitarian principles.

States having received humanitarian aid for many years now have the possibility of deciding for themselves how and by whom they want to be supported during crises. The ‘western’ orientated system of development cooperation and humanitarian aid is increasingly coming under scrutiny, and its acceptance in certain regions is diminishing. To some extent, the economic and political interests of a donor have always been conditions for support, but there is a clear change from conditions such as acceptance of human rights towards straight-forward donor interest, often contributing to a non-enabling environment or economic exploitation.

The new role of business and the private sector is taken into the development sphere in order to provide the funding that countries do not want to provide. However, the private sector does not come with the same responsibility governments that had – the private sector is invited but with little in the way of responsibility. More drastic scenarios interpret the current discourse of development aid and the role of the private sector with decline of official development assistance (ODA). Nevertheless, there are approaches on business and peace which aim at exploring the positive role which the private sector can play. For example, the M4P approach includes private partnership but with clear conditions to enable prosperity for the poor. However, mutual benefit has to be monitored well. With new donor countries and the influence of the private sector, the risk of weakening the influence of civil society and its organisations is increased.

Unfortunately, the implementation of human rights have become less important than defining or financing development goals.

2.9 Responses of the international community

In a world that is increasingly socio-politically and economically interlinked and with challenges not only being restricted to local areas, but being influenced and influencing contexts abroad, only common efforts can tackle challenges. Therefore, to answer the challenges of poverty, environmental stresses or disasters, shrinking space or conflicts and to pursue the opportunities of cooperation, development and humanitarian aid, the international community and its stakeholders (governments, private market actors, international bodies, NGOs, civil society, etc.) agreed on such strategies.

2.9.1 Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

In September 2015, the UN countries agreed the comprehensive document called ‘Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’94. The ‘2030 Agenda’ lays out a vision for the future of all humanity, and describes a process of international collaboration for achieving it. The 17 goals, known as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and the 169 targets that accompany them, are the specific expression of that vision. The goals integrate poverty reduction in a comprehensive agenda which is aligned to sustainable development and recognises that poverty can only be ended by 2030 if the dimensions of environmental protection, equality, peace, an inclusive society and human rights are considered – or in other words; the SDGs are impartial and have to be tackled as a whole.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development tries to address the most burning issues of our times and to improve the situation of everybody worldwide. They came into effect on 1 January 2016 and should guide decisions made by states over the next fifteen years. These extremely aspirational goals can only be achieved if many actors work jointly to achieve them. The main responsibility to implement the SDGs lies with the different states. However, together with the private sector and the UN system, civil society has a crucial role to play in the implementation of the SDGs. Civil society cannot be limited to professionalised non-governmental organisations (NGOs), but instead covers a much broader range of pluralistic social actors. It is also composed of autonomous associations, social movements, activists, local groups, volunteer organisations, community-based organisations, labour unions, religious and cultural organisations, sports clubs, informal groups, etc. The key feature of civil society is its separation from the state, the market and the family. What makes civil society so important for development and the SDGs is not only its expertise and

proximity to local and marginalised communities, but also its capacity to promote transparency, accountability, openness, effectiveness and human rights.

The Millennium Development Goals, were a ‘development logical framework’ put together by a small number of western technocrats for the Global South. The SDGs, on the other hand, are a political statement with legitimacy. Whether or not the SDGs are perfect, the process in itself with loops of consultations including the Global North and the Global South looking at internal and external responsibilities was mainly inclusive. Regarding content, HEKS/EPER supports the acknowledgement of the interconnectedness of current and future challenges. With its holistic approach, it clearly outlines that without looking at the social fabrics, considering topics such as equality and inclusive governance, the aims to halt the negative consequences of climate change and enhance prosperity are not achievable and vice versa. The focus on equal rights and prosperity of HEKS/EPER’s holistic approach and systemic perspective is also at the core of the SDGs, as can be read in the preamble.

Based on analysis of its programmes and the contexts HEKS/EPER is working in, the sustainable development goals and targets have to be understood as a non-dividable overall intervention strategy. Within the SDG framework, HEKS/EPER can contribute in a coherent way to achieve some of the goals and corresponding targets according to its competence and objectives (see Chapter 3). Figure 3 shows the interconnectedness of the SDGs and the corresponding targets and towards which SDGs and targets HEKS/EPER contributes to. In Appendix 1, Chapter 3 these relevant SDGs are listed.

**Figure 3** HEKS/EPER contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals and the corresponding targets.95
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95 Adapted from: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2015). Towards integration at last? The sustainable development goals as a network of targets. DESA Working Paper No. 141
2.9.2 The Paris Climate Agreement (COP21)

On the 12 December 2015, after more than 20 years of climate talks, 195 states and the EU agreed to the legally binding Paris Agreement, to join forces and address both the factors that lead to anthropogenic climate change and its adverse impacts. A broad coalition of scientists, civil society, politicians and the media were able to create the momentum to set ambitious targets for restricting global warming to between 1.5°C and 2°C, in combination with the long-term goal to achieve climate resilience.96

Approaches to enhance climate resilience and climate risk management are strengthened significantly by the Paris Agreement. With the agreement, a process to better balance mitigation and adaptation and to more comprehensively address climate risks has been initiated. It can be expected that with the Paris Agreement, approaches to climate adaptation, loss and damage will be better integrated into achieving the goal of climate resilience. Climate risk assessments will gain momentum and adaptation planning will be scaled up in order to meet the requirements under the review and ambition mechanism, i.e. regular country reports and inclusion of adaptation in the global stock-take. However, much work remains to be done towards national level ratification and the development measures, especially for the provision of sufficient and immediate support to the most vulnerable communities. No specific action was agreed to bridge the gap between intended actions and what is needed to keep temperature rise well below 2°C, let alone below 1.5°C. Similarly, the commitments made for the provision of financial support for emissions reductions and adaptation in developing countries is rather vague.97

2.9.3 The Sendai Framework for disaster risk reduction

In March 2015 the world community gathered in Sendai, Japan to adopt a new framework for disaster risk reduction. The present framework aims to achieve the following outcome over the next 15 years: ‘The substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries.’ It follows four action priorities: 1: understanding disaster risk; 2: strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk; 3: investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience; 4: enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to ‘Build Back Better’ in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.98

From the point of view of the civil society, the new framework lacks tangibility; critical points are the vague formulation of targets and the lack of commitment for financial agreements. Furthermore, conflict is not mentioned anywhere in the agreement despite the fact that disasters and conflict are often correlated and the issue of displacement by disaster was withdrawn from the framework at the last minute.

2.9.4 World Humanitarian Summit

On 23/24 May 2016 the first ever World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) took place in Istanbul, Turkey, which brought together stakeholders of humanitarian aid and various other fields such as development cooperation, peace building or the private sector. WHS took place in the light of the biggest refugee crisis of our times, where every 113th person on the globe is displaced by conflict and persecution99 (UNHCR 2016) or where El Niño highlights yet again the rising tide of disasters affected by climate change.

The summit clearly identified key opportunities that exist for more effective collaboration among the diverse set of stakeholders that operate in the humanitarian sphere and saw some small successes, particularly relating to:

- the Grand Bargain, which saw commitment to increasing funding to local and national responders as directly as possible.
- the importance of cash-based systems in meeting people’s needs.
- the need to increase the involvement of local and national responders in crises.

---


However, while the opportunities to better deliver to affected populations in crises were highlighted, questions still remain in terms of action, implementation and monitoring strategies as the next steps of the process.\textsuperscript{100}

2.9.5 Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development

Between 10 and 12 July 2015 the third Financing for Development conference was held in Addis Ababa, which agreed on the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The conference assessed the challenges and the progress made in the implementation of the 2002 Monterrey Consensus and the 2001 Doha Declaration and addresses new and emerging issues in development finance.

Many express concerns that, while the Agenda sets out the principles and narrative to finance efforts to help eradicate extreme poverty, it fails to outline concrete actions to do so. The civil society response\textsuperscript{101} to the Agenda highlights several shortcomings in the agenda saying that it lost the opportunity to tackle structural injustices in the current global economic system and ensure that development finance is people-centred and protects the environment. In addition, the negotiations diminished the Financing for Development mandate to address international systemic issues in macro-economic, financial, trade, tax and monetary policies, while also failing to scale up existing resources and commit new financial ones. Thus, the Agenda is inadequate to support the operational means of implementation for the 2030 Agenda.

\textsuperscript{100} ACT Alliance (2016) \url{http://actalliance.org/act-news/}

3 SDGs and targets HEKS/EPER contributes to

HEKS/EPER contributes to the following SDGs and corresponding targets with its International Programme 2017–2020 …

SDG 1: End poverty in all its forms
- Target 1.1: By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day
- Target 1.2: By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions
- Target 1.4: By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance
- Target 1.5: By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters

SDG 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
- Target 2.1: By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round
- Target 2.3: By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment
- Target 2.4: By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality
- Target 2.5: By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels, and promote access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed

SDG 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
- Target 4.3: By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university.
- Target 4.4: By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship.
- Target 4.5: By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.
- Target 4.7: By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.
SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- Target 5.1: End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere.
- Target 5.2: Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation.
- Target 5.4: Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate.
- Target 5.5: Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life.

SDG 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
- Target 6.1: By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all
- Target 6.2: By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations
- Target 6.4: By 2030, substantially increase water-use efficiency across all sectors and ensure sustainable withdrawals and supply of freshwater to address water scarcity and substantially reduce the number of people suffering from water scarcity
- Target 6.5: By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate

SDG 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
- Target 8.2: Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value added and labour-intensive sectors
- Target 8.3: Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services
Target 8.5: By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value

Target 8.6: By 2020, substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training

Target 8.8: Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment

Target 8.10: Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all

**SDG 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation**

- Target 9.1: Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including regional and trans border infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all
- Target 9.3: Increase the access of small-scale industrial and other enterprises, in particular in developing countries, to financial services, including affordable credit, and their integration into value chains and markets.

**SDG 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries**

- Target 10.1: By 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average
- Target 10.2: By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status
- Target 10.3: Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard.
- Target 10.7: Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies.

**SDG 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, sustainable**

- Target 11.1: By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums.
- Target 11.5: By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations.

**SDG 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns**

- Target 12.2: By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources.
- Target 12.3: By 2030, halve per capita global food waste at the retail and consumer levels and reduce food losses along production and supply chains, including post-harvest losses.
- Target 12.8: By 2030, ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature.

**SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts**

- Target 13.1: Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries.
- Target 13.3: Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning.
SDG 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.

- Target 15.1: By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements.
- Target 15.2: By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.
- Target 15.3: By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world.
- Target 15.5: Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species.
- Target 15.6: Promote fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and promote appropriate access to such resources, as internationally agreed.
- Target 15.8: By 2020, introduce measures to prevent the introduction and significantly reduce the impact of invasive alien species on land and water ecosystems and control or eradicate the priority species.
- Target 15.9: By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts.

SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

- Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere.
- Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all.
- Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms.
- Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.
- Target 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.
- Target 16.8: Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance.
- Target 16.9: By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration.
- Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements.
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