



## Report on the workshop series

# Opportunities, challenges and approaches to implementing the HDP Nexus at country level

October/November 2023

### **Brief overall summary**

In autumn 2023, the Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF) organised a three-part workshop series on implementing the Humanitarian – Development – Peace (HDP) nexus at country level. The first two parts of the workshop were attended by over 30 representatives from 25 German organisations that implement humanitarian aid, development cooperation and peace work on the ground or conduct research in this area. The participants included non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW), foundations and think tanks. The aim of the workshop series was to create a space for German stakeholders to exchange experiences on the opportunities, potential and challenges of implementing the HDP Nexus approach at country level. Based on their experiences, the participants developed concrete recommendations for the operationalisation of the HDP Nexus, which were addressed to the organisations themselves and to the responsible Nexus departments at the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) and the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

On 23 November, the results and recommendations on the topics of localisation, peace, coordination and financing in the HDP nexus were presented to employees of the GFFO and BMZ during the third part of the workshop series. This report provides an overview of the developed recommendations and initial reactions from the relevant ministries.

Building on the successful collaboration in the workshop series, as a next step ZIF would like to initiate a community of practice of German stakeholders involved in the implementation of the HDP Nexus. The mutual exchange is to be continued on a six-month interval. The aim is to also create space for the inclusion of local perspectives. ZIF will implement this initiative in 2024 in close coordination with the participating organisations and ministries.

### **Kick-off event on 19 October 2023**

The workshop series began with a virtual exchange to get to know each other and set the scene. A mural board developed by ZIF served as the basis for this, on which all participants could share information about themselves. After a brief introduction of the participating individuals and organisations, Dan Schreiber, former OECD expert, presented the key points of the DAC recommendation on the HDP nexus and gave an insight into the progress made in its implementation. He discussed questions with the participants on *area-based*

*approaches*, localisation, coordination mechanisms at country level and trade-offs between the multi-stakeholder aspiration of the HDP nexus and project-based intervention logics. Subsequently, the participants defined the following topics for in-depth work in working groups during the main workshop on 9 November: coordination, peace pillar, localisation and financing.

In the weeks between the kick-off event and the main workshop in Berlin, the ZIF team worked with four moderators from among the participants (Caritas International: localisation, GIZ: peace pillar, Plan International: financing, Welthungerhilfe: coordination) to develop a methodological approach and thematic overviews for the working groups.

### **All-day workshop in Berlin on 9 November 2023**

At the beginning of the workshop, representatives of GFFO and BMZ briefly introduced the newly created "Nexus units" S01 (Core Issues of Division S, Nexus Humanitarian Aid - Development Cooperation - Peace) and G24 (Fragility and Nexus) and their mandates. They emphasised the importance of the approach, particularly in fragile contexts, and highlighted the need to focus more on political and comprehensive solutions for protracted crises. The representatives informed the participants that, among other things, the crisis guidelines from 2017 are to be revised with a stronger focus on the HDP nexus. However, they also emphasised that many questions still need to be clarified, for example regarding the local adaptation of strategies (moving away from a focus on the capital level). Both units also have the task of strengthening the knowledge and possible applications of the HDP nexus approach within their respective ministries. New impetus and concrete ideas arising from the workshop, which may also be integrated into future guidelines for action, were therefore very welcome. In the following sessions, the workshop participants exchanged experiences and developed recommendations in the coordination, peace pillar, localisation and financing working groups (see Annex 1).

In the **coordination working group**, the discussion concentrated on two levels. On the one hand, it focused on coordination with national and international actors in specific country contexts. Secondly, the group dealt with specific types of cooperation between German stakeholders, especially NGOs. The tension between the multi-actor approach of the HDP nexus and project-based intervention logics was discussed. Participants emphasised that in the medium term, implementation should move away from HDP nexus "projects" towards cross-actor country-/area-based approaches. The exchange of practical experiences made it clear that there is a lack of multi-actor structuring mechanisms on the ground that are not dependent on short-term initiatives but are designed for long-term and project-independent processes. Only a few of the participating organisations had previous experience with national Collective Outcome processes or participation in Nexus coordination structures.

The group developed recommendations for strengthening and financing coordination mechanisms, joint analyses, standardisation to facilitate multi-actor programming and possible "tools for coordination".

The participants in the **peace pillar working group** agreed in their exchange that localisation is essential for the peace pillar. Local structures should be used, as this is where most of the knowledge and expertise on peace approaches is available. However, organisations,

especially humanitarian actors, often have little time to deal with concrete peace measures, as they must move from one emergency situation to the next and implement short-term mitigating measures. Another question that remains challenging is what the instruments and projects of the peace pillar actually look like and what defines them. It was discussed that there are projects in humanitarian aid or development cooperation that contribute to the peace pillar and contribute / have an impact on peace. It was further essential to link the peace pillar with the topic of coordination. According to the group, solutions to many of the challenges mentioned could be found in the pooling of funds and the formation of strategic partnerships. Another topic which came up repeatedly was the perceived overburdening of organisations caused by the assumption that they must cover all three pillars in their work. It was emphasised that no organisation should feel forced to implement all three pillars by themselves. Rather, they should be encouraged to work together with organisations from the respective other areas of the HDP nexus in order to implement an integrated HDP nexus approach focused on cooperation and comparative advantages. In addition, joint context and conflict analyses are needed, which should be provided across organisations. To make this possible, however, there are still numerous obstacles that need to be overcome.

The working group developed recommendations for a broader approach to peacebuilding (from "do-no-harm" to "do-some-good"), for strengthening peace actors within the HDP nexus, e.g. by developing targeted expertise at embassies, and for mainstreaming peace potentials.

The **localisation working group** agreed that localisation should be seen as a cross-cutting issue and that the HDP nexus should essentially be dealt with by local actors. According to the group, the success of localisation in the nexus can only be assessed through direct consultation with local civil society actors<sup>1</sup>. The working group therefore recommended a direct survey of local civil society actors. Participants also emphasised the following strengths of local actors in the HDP nexus: their multiple mandates as humanitarian aid, development cooperation and peace actors, their diversity (from established welfare actors to activist organisations) and the integrative effect this can have. Some local civil society actors have been working on the HDP nexus for decades without naming it as such. In addition, the group noted the continuous context-sensitive work (constant application of "do-no-harm" in order to be able to work at all) as well as the long-term impact through decades of presence, even independently of donor decisions.

The group developed recommendations on strengthening the role of local actors in the HDP nexus, on the tension between the state and civil society and on compliance issues and the capacities of local actors.

The **financing working group** exchanged on many experiences and challenges regarding the implementation of the HDP nexus. Two topics were mentioned repeatedly: First and foremost, participants emphasised that the funding modalities and existing funding pools represented a major challenge for all stakeholders - the funding system being inflexible

---

<sup>1</sup> National NGOs - those operating in the developing country where they are headquartered, working in multiple subnational regions, and not affiliated to an international NGO. Local NGOs - those operating in a specific, geographically defined, subnational area, without affiliation to either a national or international NGO; this grouping can also include community-based organisations (Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2016).

and creating false incentives. The group also noted that many deadlines are not aligned, and that rigid yearly budgeting was ill adapted to programming in fragile contexts. Participants discussed to which extent geographical funding pools would bring advantages over the existing funding system. In particular, the existing system organisations often look at needs through the lens of available funding opportunities rather than flexibly adapting programming (and funding) to the actual needs. Many organisations interpret guidelines flexibly to make meaningful nexus work possible. Another challenge and recurring point of discussion in the group was the lack of coordination. For example, there was no overview of the activities and operations of (German) organisations in the HDP nexus area. Such an overview would reduce duplication of work and facilitate better cooperation with regard to HDP nexus projects. The participants argued in favour of the creation of a platform that captures the work of all actors, enables synergies, reveals points of contact and could therefore contribute to better coordination of various projects.

The group developed concrete recommendations to improve the financing of the HDP nexus and joint programming as well as the German "Nexus Chapeau approach".

Regarding evaluation, participants pointed out that the HDP nexus should not be an end in itself. Instead, the focus should ultimately be on the benefits for those affected (not the implementation of an abstract concept, mostly at a macro level). However, to date there are few scientific studies and impact-related evaluations of the HPD nexus. This makes it difficult to assess the actual benefits of the approach. The recently completed evaluation of the Nexus Chapeau approach by the GFFO and BMZ is a welcome exception here.

Participants also emphasised that the competitive commissioning logic stands in the way of cooperative collaboration at country level (in the "field") and leads to unnecessary inefficiencies. Joint commissioning, increased transparency in the selection process and improved planning for longer-term implementation in the HDP nexus could counteract this. The promotion of a culture of making mistakes ("Fehlerkultur") and greater focus on learning was also recommended. Participants further agreed that the link between the HDP nexus and feminist foreign policy and gender-transformative approaches should be examined more closely in the next steps.

Feedback on the workshop series was very positive. In particular, the diversity of the participating organisations and the creative formats that enabled an open and constructive exchange were underscored. The participants also suggested transforming the format of the workshop series into a community of practice, with the involvement of the relevant ministries. The idea of establishing a "German Nexus Academy" was also raised to enable more stakeholders to participate.

### **Presentation and discussion of the results and recommendations on 23 November 2023**

The results and recommendations were presented to GFFO and BMZ employees on 23 November and put up for debate. Almost 50 people took part in this final part of the series both in person and virtually. Seven different departments from GFFO and BMZ were represented, as well as a number of organisations that had participated in the first two parts of the workshop. After an opening statement by ZIF's Managing Director, Dr Astrid Irrgang, the moderators of the working groups presented the results and recommendations.

In an initial reaction, representatives of GFFO and BMZ subsequently stated that some of the points could be accepted or passed on within the ministries. There was agreement, for example, that not every organisation needs to cover all pillars of the HDP nexus. Better networking, analysis, exchange, and coordination should rather be the guiding principle. Furthermore, there was agreement on the importance of localisation and the implementation of a culture of making mistakes (“Fehlerkultur”).

Another part of the recommendations was generally agreed by the ministries but would be more difficult to implement (technically). These include, for example, the introduction of geographical funding pools, as joint budget titles are not feasible in the foreseeable future. The ministries disagree with another part of the recommendations, for example the inclusion of civil society actors or humanitarian actors in internal government consultation formats. The capacities of many employees both in Germany and at the embassies are also heavily stretched, which makes e.g. the establishment of additional coordination committees unrealistic. The adaptation of existing dialogue platforms appears more likely.

The units emphasised that they would continue to contribute to information sharing and advocacy on the HDP nexus within their respective ministries. The organisations were encouraged to also share the recommendations in their exchanges with ministerial country desks.

At the conclusion of the event, the ministries and participating organisations agreed that a further exchange within the framework of a community of practice would be of great benefit. An immediate next step for this group will be to prioritise and concretise the presented recommendations.

#### **Attachments:**

1. Results and recommendations from 9.11.
2. List of participating organisations and ministries

Supported by:



Federal Foreign Office

The workshop series was funded by the German Federal Foreign Office.

Imprint  
Author: Barbara Kobler  
Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF)  
December 2023

## **Annex 1: Results and recommendations from the working groups (9.11.)**

### **Working Group “Coordination”**

#### **Coordination mechanisms**

**K1.** Coordination takes time and requires capacity: strengthening coordination capacities on the ground

- Ownership: Strengthen coordination capacities of governments (national / local), for example at local government level for qualitative *area-based* coordination;
- Strengthen national NGO forums and promote active participation in coordination mechanisms (*see working group Localisation*);
- Strengthen capacities at the German embassies:
  - Increased capacity at the embassies, e.g. through Nexus teams (which combine development cooperation officers with those responsible for humanitarian aid and stabilization portfolios);
  - Embassies should encourage German actors to actively participate in collective outcome processes and Nexus coordination mechanisms.

**K2.** Coordination costs money: financing higher quality coordination in the field

- Strengthen organisational capacities (e.g. through financial / personnel support for secretariat structures);
- Create capacities for high-quality documentation, moderation, exchange, language, and transparency of communication.

#### **Joint analysis and programming**

**K3.** Joint analysis or sharing of studies and analyses (Peace and Conflict Assessments (PCA), gender, etc.)

- Create a German-funded open portal for joint analyses to avoid duplication and enhance synergies;

**K4.** Facilitate multi-actor programming: standardisation

- Implementing partners can increase mutual interoperability by using common templates and documents, as well as harmonising IT and accounting systems. The signing of standardised cooperation agreements between organisations would be desirable.
- The ministries can support standardisation by aligning reporting and submission periods of the various instruments.
- It should be made possible to submit proposals and reports in English or French to facilitate co-operation with international and local stakeholders.

**K5.** IT for improved coordination: Mappings and visualisation tools

- Mappings are considered best practice / basis for coordination and planning as well as *area-based coordination*; examples: Yemen, Cameroon, DR Congo; but so far each country has designed its own (often very costly) system.
  - The ministries could finance the development of a simple mapping tool that could then be used in different contexts.
- Greater use of other visualisation tools such as mural boards.

## **Working Group “Peace Pillar”**

### **Broadening the scope of peacebuilding**

*Do no harm* is considered the minimum standard and many actors implement conflict-sensitive programming. However, peacebuilding goes further and should be considered more broadly in the HDP nexus. Peace potentials should be identified (“do-some-good”) as well as a clarification of expectations: Not every actor has to serve all pillars!

- P1.** Strengthening complementarity between H-D-P actors, creating incentives for cooperation (*see Call for Proposals / Financing working group*), putting comparative advantages of individual organisations into value;
- P2.** If no capacities and expertise for peace work are available in an organisation, then promote strategic cooperation for this (“Doing what we do best” - returning to core and partner competencies), *resort to consortium projects or complementary commissioning*;
- P3.** Better (possibly more efficient) linking of existing approaches/instruments by taking a holistic view with the aim of improving connectivity. For instance, interfaces can be identified between the following approaches:
  - Development cooperation, Peacebuilding Fund
  - Technical approaches to social cohesion, transitional justice, dealing with the past;
- P4.** Stronger commitment to political solutions of violent conflicts (Track 1) and a more systematic dovetailing with HDP nexus measures (e.g. development cooperation measures);
- P5.** Greater promotion of professional exchange between the H-D-P actors regarding the peace component and the instruments / approaches used;
- P6.** The dynamics of processes (peace efforts) must not be slowed down and / or thwarted due to lengthy consultations and coordination efforts at a higher level; speed and flexibility at a local level are essential, especially in crisis contexts.

### **Strengthening peace actors in the HDP nexus**

Peace actors are hardly or not at all represented in coordination mechanisms (such as humanitarian clusters, sectoral working groups, UN Country Team, etc.).

- P7.** Promoting the visibility and acceptance of the civilian aspects of peacekeeping in order to reduce existing reservations and strengthen cooperation;
- P8.** Strengthening governmental and/or civil society capacities for coordination with peace actors in addition to the Cluster System & UN Resident Coordinators, depending on the context;
- P9.** At embassy level, strengthen peace capacities (and the Triple Nexus in general) in order to recognise/identify windows of opportunity, ensure coordination and financing (*see Coordination working group*).
- P10.** The funding titles in S03+S04, part of the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO) and the Civil Peace Service, part of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) should be included in the coordination of the Nexus as core elements of German funding for civil peacebuilding.
- P11.** Local peace actors and approaches/mechanisms should be prioritised and given higher consideration in the peace component of the HDP nexus. Bottom-up approaches should be strengthened as a bridge between local essential knowledge (context and conflict) and international interventions/measures for successful peacebuilding through the active inclusion of their expertise, funding and cooperation efforts.

### **Peace mainstreaming potential:**

- P12.** Promoting the mainstreaming of do-some-good approaches by analysing peace potentials in donor guidelines, capacity building and financing (*link to the recommendations of the Financing working group*)
- P13.** Create incentives and remove obstacles for joint (H-D-P actors) and regular conflict analyses (coordination and financing through coordination function in embassy, see recommendation above).
- P14.** Joint context and conflict analyses between H-D-P stakeholders, which form the basis for project design, should be financed and promoted through incentives. In the context of adaptive management, such analyses should also be promoted and supported as a regular element of project/programme implementation.

### **Working Group “Localisation”**

#### **Building on the strengths of local actors in the Nexus**

- L1.** Promoting the inclusive involvement of local civil society actors at all decision-making levels (strategic, conceptual, operational, financial) (*link to Coordination working group*), especially in the context of fragile statehood.
- L2.** To date, local civil society actors have primarily been involved at the operational level (as implementers). They remain marginalised in strategy processes (in humanitarian aid, in donor dialogues, in humanitarian country teams (HCTs), in government negotiations about development cooperation and programme planning). Quota participation would ensure participation.
- L3.** Local civil society actors must be allowed and able to help set boundaries, especially when contexts transition from a humanitarian to a development context (where partnerships are often not continued naturally). When decision-making bodies and project types change (from HCTs/clusters to government-led negotiations), evidence is often ignored, and local perspectives are marginalised in comparison to political interests.
- L4.** One possible solution would be **civil society control committees** for Nexus projects implemented by government, the UN or NGOs. These should be staffed by organisations that are familiar with humanitarian aid/development cooperation/peace context from previous projects.

**Tensions between state and civil society:** Humanitarian aid organised by civil society and development cooperation and peace work organised by civil society (e.g., church development cooperation and civil peace service) usually have a different understanding of the interplay between civil society and the state than UN- or state-centred development cooperation and peace work. Localisation is often understood differently (either as civil society empowerment in measures organised by civil society – or as ownership by state bodies in UN-, state-centred development cooperation and peace projects). Successful implementation of Nexus projects requires realising the fact that local civil society can and must contribute to state-run building of structures. Localisation is not an end in itself but should be seen as the means to strengthen state structures in fragile contexts.

- L5.** Bilateral donors (such as the German government) must clarify the extent to which they wish to prioritise civil society over government support in humanitarian aid, development cooperation and peace measures. **Funds should be used where they are most effective.** To recognise the positive impact that civil society can have on



strengthening state structures in fragile contexts, the proportion of funding for civil society should be increased.

- L6. Resources must be more accessible to enable local actors to participate in discussions on humanitarian aid, development cooperation and peacebuilding strategies, e.g., by accepting higher indirect funding or specific budget lines for this purpose.
- L7. Civil society organisations must be empowered to interact directly with their governments. **Dialogue (whether strategic, operational or financial) should rely less on the UN**, which often acts on behalf of local civil society.
- L8. Equal promotion of state and non-state actors improves the Nexus impact
  - **The BMZ's Transitional Development assistance title should be opened up to (local) civil society actors on a large scale in order to** enable a more balanced impact of Nexus projects.
- L9. Networks between local civil society must be strengthened, and synergies/cooperation increased in order to reduce the frequently prevalent and provoked competition between local actors as implementers for UN and INGOs. Local NGO networks must be respected and involved in strategic decisions and mapping exercises regarding the HDP nexus in their contexts.

**Compliance and local capacities: There are too many prejudices against local actors** (e.g., lack of neutrality, corruption risks). Increasing project volumes and regionalisation of programmes can lead to tensions with or exclusion of actors who are more locally/nationally oriented. "Local actors" are also often defined differently/unclear (governmental vs. non-governmental, degree of organisation, "affected populations" vs. organisations/institutions).

- L10. Nexus-related projects can better utilise the diversity of local stakeholders through a broader understanding of local actors. From welfare organisations to activist groups, various project objectives can be covered in a complementary manner. **Using local NGO networks to identify partners, flanked by an analysis of the local stakeholder landscape as a prerequisite for potential projects**, can create better links to relevant partners.
- L11. Conflicting goals of scaling up vs. localisation. Larger project volumes must not lead to the marginalisation of local actors and more direct implementation by international actors. In addition to the acceptance of higher coordination costs for local actors, bureaucratic hurdles to the inclusion of local actors must also be removed and local actors must be institutionally strengthened in order to cope with larger project volumes.
- L12. Targeted **capacity sharing** on the Nexus, including at local level, to enable mutual learning. Local actors must shape the debate and should take a leading role in the conceptualisation of the Nexus. Direct communication between donors and local actors is strongly recommended.
- L13. Local actors understand the actual needs better than international actors, but sometimes need support to participate in more theoretical discourses at the international level.

## **Working Group “Financing”**

- F1.** Joint regional priorities and common objectives through coordination between (German) actors, in particular GFFO (S03, S08), BMZ, GIZ and links with bilateral development cooperation and in dialogue with NGOs.
- Stakeholder platform for an overview of "who does what" before submitting a proposal (facilitates coordination)
  - Joint trilateral crisis-related planning between GFFO, BMZ, and implementation partners
- F2.** Flexible financing and budget contingency (e.g., 10% for crisis modifiers) freely available to be shifted between H, D and P to enable agile reactions.
- Scenario-based planning (worst case to best case), strategic approaches regarding the reality of increasing short term funds (“Barmittel”) and decreasing commitment appropriations (“Verpflichtungsermächtigungen”) for the following years and what this means for the financing of D and P activities.
- F3.** Geographically oriented funding pools and performance-based financing (e.g., according to expertise in the country, beneficiary satisfaction, target achievement)
- F4.** In-house alternative funding suggestions for high quality (HDP nexus) ideas (e.g., if S03 rejects a proposal, GFFO could make an alternative funding suggestion), more proactive donors;
- F5.** German funding law/funding guidelines must enable the interlinking of HDP nexus instead of distinction (so that P can be taken into account);
- If necessary, in consultation with existing working groups such as the co-funding and humanitarian aid working groups at VENRO;
  - Important to maintain flexibility;
- F6.** Standardised planning cycle with uniform deadlines
- F7.** Consider joint programming in the planning of funds:
- Promote joint programming through Nexus-based *call for proposals* from donors; strengthen programming according to comparative advantages (e.g., *Denmark: in a call for proposals, stakeholders had to organise themselves according to comparative advantages. The proposal with the best "fit" won*).
  - In the case of consortia, the costs of necessary coordination expenses should also be considered.
- F8.** Expand knowledge about the various funding instruments available:
- Ministries and implementation partners should foster dialogue on possible synergies and linkages between the funding instruments (e.g., Nexus-Chapeau approach (NGOs) and complementary commissioning (GIZ, UN)).

## **Nexus Chapeau approach**

- NC1.** Ministries and implementation partners should exchange on the possible further development / sharpening of the Nexus Chapeau approach, especially with regard to the recently conducted Syspons study.
- For example, create the opportunity to expand the approach into a HDP nexus with a framework for strategic cooperation with peace actors;
  - If necessary, go beyond one organisation (consortium concept); promote strategic partnerships;
  - Integrate D and P more clearly (not only transitional development assistance, also (bilateral) development cooperation);
  - Assume costs for coordination (facilitate consortium formation, etc.).

## **Evidence / Evaluation**

- E1.** Development of quality criteria for good coordination:

- Creation of an analysis grid/analysis matrix that takes various criteria into account in the evaluation (see EU report) following Nexus success indicators;
- E2.** Promotion of long-term monitoring studies/evidence (cost-benefit) of the implementation of the HDP nexus;
- E3.** Local stakeholders should be involved in the discussion about impact measurement. Firstly, to set realistic standards for potential Nexus projects and, secondly, to select the right level of analysis. Collective outcomes as expected from Nexus projects are probably more easily measured at the local level.

### **Further points**

- X1.** Transforming the format of the workshop series into a community of practice (e.g., with two meetings per year) with the involvement of the relevant ministries;
  - If necessary, joint concretisation of the recommendations;
  - Expansion of the community of practice to the local level;
- X2.** Implementation / establishment of a "German Nexus Academy" to enable more stakeholders to participate, possibly via multipliers;
- X3.** A competitive commissioning logic often stands in the way of cooperative collaboration at country level (in the "field") or requires active countermeasures in the working methods and thought patterns of the individual players, which leads to unnecessary frictional losses. Joint commissions, increased transparency in the selection process and improved planning for long-term implementation in the HDP nexus would counteract this.
- X4.** Promote a culture of making mistakes / learning and reduce competition between organisations (obstacle to coordination);
- X5.** The link of the HDP nexus with feminist foreign policy and gender-transformative approaches should be included in the next steps.

## **Annex 2: List of participating organisations and ministries**

1. German Federal Foreign Office
2. Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
3. Berghof Foundation
4. Bonn International Centre for Conflict Studies (BICC)
5. Care Germany
6. Caritas International
7. CBM Christoffel-Blindenmission
8. Centre for Humanitarian Action (CHA)
9. Diakonie Katastrophenhilfe
10. Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst (ForumZFD)
11. Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
12. Help – Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe e.V.
13. Hoffnungszeichen
14. International Red Cross Germany (IRC Germany)
15. Johanniter
16. Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)
17. Kindernothilfe
18. Malteser International
19. Misereor
20. Oxfam Germany
21. Plan International Germany
22. Save the Children
23. Stabilisation Platform
24. Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP)
25. Syspons
26. Venro
27. Welthungerhilfe
28. World Vision Germany
29. Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF)