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# BACKGROUND

## Introduction and background

The International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) is currently implementing a project supported by the European Union – *Improving Migration Management in the Silk Routes Countries* – which runs from 1st August 2017 until 31st July 2021. The project is in the process of requesting a no-cost extension until end of December 2021.**The overall objective (impact) of the project is to** **strengthen the management of migration and mobility movements that concern countries in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions**.

**Previous project “Support to the Silk Routes Partnership for Migration under the Budapest Process” from 2014 – 2017**

This intervention is a follow up to “Support to the Silk Routes Partnership for Migration under the Budapest Process” which was launched in February 2014 as the first big step and multilateral pledge to contribute to the implementation of the Budapest Process’ Istanbul Declaration adopted in 2013.

During its three years of implementation the project strengthened the migration management capacities of authorities in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan at national level and at regional level also including Bangladesh and Iran. It also initiated the development of sustainable training systems, enhanced data management and expertise and supported migration policy development frameworks. First Migrant Resource Centres were set up in Pakistan and the initiative Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation Silk Routes and Turkey (RELEC) was launched.

**The Silk Routes Region: context in 2017**

The Silk Routes Countries (SRCs) include [Afghanistan](https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5b28f4294.pdf), [Bangladesh](https://policy.asiapacificenergy.org/sites/default/files/National-Sustainable-Development-Strategy.pdf), Iran, [Iraq](http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/planipolis/files/ressources/iraq_national_development_plan_2013-2017.pdf) and [Pakistan](https://www.pc.gov.pk/uploads/annualplan2018/Annual.pdf).

The Central Asian Countries (CACs) include Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, [and Tajikistan](https://nafaka.tj/images/zakoni/new/strategiya_2030_en.pdf).

*N.B. Hyperlinks refer to the National Development Plans at the time of the beginning of the intervention for the countries where the intervention has set-up project offices.*

***Snapshot of the regional sectoral dynamics in 2017***

Because of the long standing historical, cultural and ethnic ties connecting Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan, there has been a history of migration between these three countries due to the nature of the borders and the presence of tribal communities. However, there is a necessity for a new approach in the management of these informal cross-border movements in particular between Afghanistan and Pakistan and this challenge is complicated by the deteriorating security situation. In addition, the protracted refugee situation of Afghans in Iran and Pakistan continues. Iran also is the major transit country together with Turkey for the nationals of Afghanistan and Pakistan directed towards the EU.

Apart from the Afghanistan- Iran-Pakistan triangle, Bangladesh shares a difficult history with Pakistan and there are considerable numbers of Bangladeshis in Pakistan. As two major labour sending countries, the two countries share similar problems in this area, but are also competitors for labour markets especially in the Gulf region. Bangladeshis also work in considerable numbers in Iraq and Iran, the latter being a country of transit for Bangladeshis too on the way towards the EU.

Iraq and Iran have also been hosting refugee populations of each other. They also host labour migrants from Bangladesh and other South-Asian countries. Furthermore, Iraq is facing multiple security, political, humanitarian and economic challenges and hosts, at present, 3.3 million internally displaced persons, result of the internal conflict and approx. 250 000 Syrian refugees. There is a risk of a significant increase in the migration flow in the near future, in particular in the wake of the military campaign to retake Mosul, over and above the 121 535 asylum applications that Iraqi migrants lodged in the EU in 2015, as compared to 14 845 in 2014. Iraq is also marked by increasing pressures for return from Europe as well as the neighbouring countries. Iraq has similar security problems as Afghanistan and Pakistan, which undermines efforts to create sustainable return conditions and livelihoods in general.

Turkey has been the Chair of the Budapest Process since 2006 and initiated the expansion to the Silk Routes Region in 2010. Turkey has always had strong cultural and political ties with the countries in the region and often paved the way to form closer relations with the countries (e.g. Iran). Through the EU – Turkey relationship in the area of migration, Turkey plays furthermore a central role in the region.

The relationship between the Central Asia and the Silk Routes Region has been marked by most important land route connection between Europe and Asia: the Silk Routes. The significance of these routes remains partly valid until today (n.b. 2017): on the one hand there are strong cultural and ethnic ties among Iran, Tajikistan, Afghanistan and Turkmenistan, on the other hand there are significant migration and refugee flows from Afghanistan through Central Asia towards Russia and Europe, with some remaining in Tajikistan and Kazakhstan. Similar to the Silk Routes Region, most Central Asian countries are marked by strong labour emigration flows, which often brings along the negative side effects of brain drain and labour force shortage in country.

Before the intervention began, the situation in the countries of focus is as described below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Afghanistan** | The Solutions Strategy for Afghan Refugees (SSAR) signed in 2012 seeks to preserve asylum space in Iran and Pakistan, but also to facilitate the reintegration of returnees in Afghanistan. Despite several reintegration and capacity building programmes and the reduction in the protection space in the neighbouring countries, emigration from Afghanistan has not slowed down, with the security situation taking direct effect on the number of people leaving.  The Government of Afghanistan established a high-level High Commission for Refugees in 2015 with the aim to coordinate migration management including returns and reintegration. Despite the ongoing efforts to adopt a National Labour Migration Strategy (currently pending approval), Afghanistan is facing a lack of interest to recruit Afghan workers among some receiving countries because of perceived terrorist threats.  The EU has initiated a High Level Dialogue on Migration with Afghanistan to cooperate among other issues, on return, readmission and reintegration. In this regard, the EU has proposed and is negotiating a Joint Way Forward (JWF) with Afghanistan, covering practical procedures for return. |
| **Bangladesh** | In Bangladesh, the main legal framework governing migration is the Overseas Employment and Migrants Act (2013), mainly regulating the management of labour migration and the security and welfare of expatriate workers. There are growing political pressures on the state to take on a more vigilant and effective role in ensuring the rights and well-being of its citizens abroad. The Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking Act (2012) is not fully in line with the international standards and implementation is rather weak. The Government has established Counter Trafficking Committees (district to sub-district level).  The EU funded the establishment of 23 migration information/migrant resource centres at local level in Bangladesh. Bangladesh is one of the priority countries for the EU for the establishment of a High Level Dialogue on Migration. |
| **Iraq** | In Iraq, an inter-ministerial High Committee on IDPs is functioning since June 2014. The Ministry is planning an awareness raising campaign to warn IDPs on the dangers of migrant smuggling and human trafficking. Another focus lies in the reintegration of voluntary returnees. It is the policy of Iraq to support returnees – also with financial incentives – and encourage them to contribute to the development of the country.  In May 2012 a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement was signed between the EU and Iraq, inter alia covering the joint management of migration flows and establishment of a comprehensive dialogue on all migration-related issues, including irregular migration. However, the Agreement is still being ratified and is only being applied provisionally. No dialogue on migration-related issues has as yet been initiated. The conclusions of the EU Regional Strategy for Syria and Iraq as well as the ISIL/Da'esh threat identified the priority areas in which the EU and its Member States needed to engage in Iraq to tackle the ongoing crisis and many of the measures implemented under the strategy also aim to mitigate the risk of a significant increase in the migration flow. The need for further EU engagement in Iraq was reiterated at by EU Foreign Ministers in May 2016. The options for further engagement are currently being explored, not least in view of the very real risk of a significant increase in internal displacement and the migration flow from Iraq, in the near future, in particular in the wake of the military campaign to retake Mosul. |
| **Pakistan** | The Government of Pakistan has three main priorities concerning migration in the country: (a) to solve the unclear situation of Afghan refugees still residing in Pakistan, (b) to continue supporting labour emigration of Pakistani nationals, and (c) to curb irregular migration.  Although migration plays an important role in the country’s political, economic and social life, migration governance is weak and fragmented. The area of labour migration is better regulated, but lacks a comprehensive policy. The draft National Policy for Overseas Pakistanis, if adopted, will provide for the facilitation of sustainable reintegration of Pakistani migrants and for the enhancement of existing skills development facilities and services.  The EU and Pakistan concluded a Readmission Agreement in 2010, but implementation remains difficult. An EU cooperation platform in support of measures aimed at tackling migrant smuggling has now been launched in Pakistan in July 2016 (as foreseen in the EU Action Plan against migrant smuggling 2015-2020). In July 2016, the EU Cooperation Platform on Migrant Smuggling was launched in Pakistan aiming at enhancing EU-Pakistan exchange of information and cooperation on migrant smuggling. |

**The Silk Routes Region: current intervention and complementary interventions in the region**

At present, the intervention mainly takes place in the following regions of each country:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Regions involved in the intervention** |
| Afghanistan | Project office: Kabul Coverage: national  MRC office: Kabul |
| Bangladesh | Project office: Dhaka Coverage: national  MRC offices: Dhaka, Cumilla |
| Iraq | Project office: Baghdad Coverage: national  MRC office: Baghdad |
| Pakistan | Project office: Islamabad Coverage: national  MRC offices: Islamabad and Lahore |
| Tajikistan | Coverage: Dushanbe (Khudjand, Bokhtar, Khorog)  MRC office: Dushanbe |

The current intervention falls under a wider strategy of the European Union (EU) towards the Silk Routes Region. The EU funds since 2017 three regional projects in the Silk Routes Region of equal funding. Aside from the current intervention the two other regional projects are:

1. [“Global Action against Trafficking in Persons and the Smuggling of Migrants - Asia and the Middle East” 2018-2022 implemented by UNODC in partnership with IOM](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/human-trafficking/glo-act2/overview.html)
2. [“Integrated Border Management in the Silk Routes Countries” 2019-2021 implemented by ICMPD](https://www.budapestprocess.org/integrated-border-management-in-the-silk-routes/165-integrated-border-management-in-the-silk-routes-countries)
3. The displacement matrix projects implemented by IOM in [Afghanistan](https://dtm.iom.int/afghanistan), [Bangladesh](https://dtm.iom.int/bangladesh), [Iraq](https://dtm.iom.int/iraq) and [Pakistan](https://dtm.iom.int/pakistan)

## The intervention to be evaluated

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of the intervention to be evaluated | * Improving Migration Management in the Silk Routes Region |
| Budget of the intervention to be evaluated | * 12,511,832 EUR * Component 1 - Dialogue: 1,631,928 EUR * Component 2 - Facility: 4,477,293 EUR * Component 3 - Flagships: 6,402,611 EUR |
| Dates of the intervention to be evaluated | * Start: 01/08/2017 * End: 31/07/2021 |

Please note, that the Intervention Logic described in this chapter of the ToR is based on existing documents and shall be subject to the evaluators’ scrutiny and reconstruction during Inception. The full Logical Framework of the intervention is available in the Annex V. It was revised in 2019 and the previous logframe will be made available to the selected tenderer. The indicators in the logframe are mostly quantitative and data is available in our project monthly reports and annual reports and other means of verification.

The project has three components with the following specific objectives:

1. Strengthened regional dialogue, coordination and cooperation on migration and mobility between Silk Routes and Central Asian governments participating in the Budapest Process, and EU counterparts.
2. Improved governance of migration and mobility in the countries of the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions and with EU counterparts
3. Improved operationalisation of the priorities set out in the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration

**Component 1 – Dialogue**

The Dialogue contributes to ensuring regular dialogue meetings and focused information exchange between the five SRCs as well as with the Budapest Process participating countries especially through the Silk Routes Regional Working Group, but also through two other Regional Working Groups, thematic meetings and annual meetings at Senior Officials level. The Budapest Process is one of the longest standing cooperation frameworks on migration between more than 50 countries and provides an informal and flexible framework for states and other stakeholders to meet on an equal footing and address issues of common concern. In addition, it supported the preparation and organisation of the 6th Ministerial Conference in 2019 “The Istanbul Commitments on the Silk Routes Partnership for Migration and its Call for Action – a five year plan”. The component provides concrete support to the organisation of the regular meetings as well as ad-hoc events and also contribute to maintain the Budapest Process momentum and policy dialogue. The network of national focal points is beneficial for all countries participating in the Budapest Process and the Silk Routes authorities. The component also aims to strengthen the knowledge base and support the dialogue through (desk) research, studies and surveys.

*The Dialogue’s expected results are:*

* + *Strengthened participation of national authorities and other relevant regional stakeholders in the regional response to migration and mobility in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions*
  + *Reinforced evidence and knowledge supporting regional decision-making on migration and mobility in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions*

**Component 2 – Silk Routes Facility**

The Facility Component has two areas of work: the Short Term Assistance or STA and the Long-Term Initiative through the Call for Proposals. The aim of the STA is to facilitate demand-driven and needs-based actions to ensure quick and tailor-made capacity building and other forms of support for the five SRCs and CACs. This will enhance inter and intra-regional cooperation on migration and mobility and ensure the concrete implementation of commitments taken in the Dialogue.

The Call for Proposals aims at funding concrete and targeted projects to strengthen the cooperation between one or more EU Member States and the responsible state authorities of one or more of the five SRCs and CACs. A call for proposals has been organised at the beginning of the project and open to EU Member States, international organisations and CSOs for actions implemented jointly with any of the five SRCs and CACs. Proposals are in the range from 150,000 to 250,000 EUR and have a duration of 6 to 18 months. Eligible applicants were invited to submit their proposals related to enhancing implementation of the priorities set out by the 2013 Istanbul Ministerial Declaration of the Budapest Process: Migration and Mobility, Integration, Migration and Development, Irregular Migration, Trafficking in Persons, and International Protection, as well as of additional priorities: Female Migration and Climate Change Induced Migration.

*The Facility’s expected results are:*

* *Improved capacities of national authorities and other relevant stakeholders to engage in the implementation of the commitments arising from the dialogue between Silk Routes and Central Asian countries and European counterparts*
* *Enhanced knowledge on migration and mobility available to country stakeholders, including issues pertaining to labour migration; integration of migrants; return, readmission and reintegration; migrant smuggling and trafficking in persons; border management; assistance to migrants and their families; international protection and respect for the rights of refugees and asylum seekers as per international obligations*

**Component 3 – Flagship Initiatives**

With a view to specifically foster the concrete implementation of the priorities set out in the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration and Silk Routes Partnership on Migration, Component 3 aims at developing three Flagship Initiatives, which will build upon the pilot initiatives implemented in the previous project phase.

The first is on Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs) which are physical structures for managing migration through various activities, foremost of which is to raise awareness on migration at individual and community level. At the individual level, MRCs provide for individual counselling for outgoing and potential migrants and pre-departure orientation as well as referral to skills training, support structures, etc. The reliable information and targeted empowerment will aim to reduce migrants’ vulnerability to exploitation and will thus complement the actions under the Flagship Initiative 3. At the community level, MRCs seek to create awareness on safe and regular migration and on the dangers and consequences of irregular migration. The MRCs also work to increase awareness of governmental and non-governmental actors on migration.

The second Flagship Initiative – Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation or RELEC – aims at developing national guidelines on inter-agency statistical data exchange on irregular migration, trafficking in human beings and smuggling of migrants. It will help maintain and enlarge the regional network of officials from law enforcement agencies trained on standardised in formation analysis and exchange. Furthermore, it will enhance regular channels of communication among law enforcement on smuggling and trafficking networks both regionally as well as with European counterparts and providing space for trust building and bilateral cooperation development. Activities include national training programme on migrant smuggling, human trafficking and border management.

The third Flagship Initiative on the protection of migrants’ rights (MIGRAP) aims to contribute to the establishment of effect labour migration management strategies in the SRCs which includes, among others: enhancement of the skills and competencies of labour migrants; expansion of labour and social security arrangements between SRCs and major destination countries; raise awareness among aspiring and outgoing migrant workers and their families about their potential living and working conditions abroad, their rights and how to seek help in situations of need; and review of the recruitment process and assisting the responsible authorities in monitoring, regulating and eventually sanctioning private recruiters. This Flagship Initiative shall also contain a targeted research component in order to gather additional evidence on the complexities of labour migration and migrants’ rights within and outside the region.

*The Flagship Initiative’s expected results are:*

* *Strengthened service delivery capacity, resources and infrastructures in the partner countries of the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions.*
* *Expanded opportunities for international cooperation of law enforcement authorities in the Silk Routes region to contrast irregular migration and the criminal networks active in trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants.*
* *Increased awareness of migration and protection issues among government stakeholders, the migrants and the general public.*

In addition, over the course of the intervention, bilateral funding has been secured to support additional activities or strengthen existing activities in the Silk Routes Countries:

* from Switzerland for MRC Bangladesh (2019 – 2021)
* from Germany for MRC Iraq and Pakistan (2019)
* from Germany for MRC Pakistan (2020-2021)
* from Germany for MRC Bangladesh (2020)
* from Norway for MRC Iraq (2018 – 2021)
* from Switzerland for capacity building in Iraq (2020 -2021)
* from Denmark for capacity building for long-term reintegration of returnees to Afghanistan and Iraq (complimentary to ERRIN) (2021-2023)
* from DG Home (AMIF), Austria and Bulgaria for awareness-raising on migration in Pakistan (2021-2022)
* from DG Home (AMIF) and Austria for awareness raising on migration in Afghanistan, Iraq and Western Balkan (2021-2022)

## Stakeholders of the intervention

The **main beneficiaries are national and local government authorities of the SRCs which have roles and responsibilities in the area of migration management** as well as non-governmental actors such as civil society organisations (CSOs) active in the field of migration.

Depending on the government structure of the SRCs, the following institutions will be particularly targeted: Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Interior or Home Affairs, Labour and Social Affairs, Justice and the specific Ministries in charge of links with the diaspora and migration issues, and national agencies for migration and asylum issues.

* **Afghanistan**: Administrative Office of the President, Office of the First Vice-President, the Ministry of Refugees and Repatriation (MoRR), the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA), the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MoIA) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA);
* **Bangladesh**: the Ministry of Expatriates Welfare and Overseas Employment (MEWOE), Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA);
* **Iraq**: Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Migration and Displaced (MoMD), Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Kurdish Regional Government;
* **Pakistan**: the Ministry of Interior (incl. Federal Investigation Agency), the Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resources Development (MOPHRD), Ministry of Law and Justice, and the provincial governments, specifically Department of Labour Punjab;
* **Tajikistan**: Ministry of Labour, Migration and Employment of Population (MoLMEP), Migration Service (MS) and the Agency for Employment Abroad (AEA)

**Other stakeholders include:**

* All [Budapest Process participating and observer countries](https://www.budapestprocess.org/about-us/members-and-participating-states) and organisations at large
  + They benefit from the learning of the project which is flanking the wider political dialogue
* Non-governmental organisations active in the Silk Routes Region: Action Aid International (office in Bangladesh), Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI Pakistan), Climate Action Network South Asia (CANSA) (Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Pakistan), Tadbeer Consulting and Research Organisation (Afghanistan), Danish Trade Union Development Agency (DTDA), Bangladesh Institute of Labour Studies (BILS), CARE International Bangladesh, Welfare Association for the Rights of Bangladeshi Emigrants Development Foundation (WARBE DF), International Legal Initiative Public Foundation (Kazakhstan), MercyCorps Tajikistan, Helvetas Intercooperation gGmbH, and its branch in Tajikistan.
  + They are mostly involved in the implementation of the SR Facility projects and can benefit from the acquired knowledge

## Covid-19 and its impact on the intervention

The intervention has been affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. Since the Covid-19 outbreak, the project team provided a section related to Covid-19 in their monthly reports and prepared contingency planning. The contingency planning included, and is not limited to, shifting activities to a virtual setting, setting up an online training platform, procuring equipment for Silk Routes countries, continuing awareness-raising activities and counselling over social media / radio / TV / rowing/ miking / hotlines/WhatsApp/ skype, supporting implementing partners in the field with large-scale Facilities initiatives.

Countries within the region are confronted with the fundamental challenge (and dual shock) in having to balance the immediate need to contain and reverse the spread of the virus with the overwhelming task of addressing existing factors of instability; these include conflict and security threats, poverty and unemployment, political unrest (and isolation in the case of Iran), a dire economic situation, and significant challenges rooted in forced/conflict-driven migration.

## Achievements so far

From August 2017 to March 2021, the following are the major activities, progress and achievements of the project:

**Component 1 – Dialogue**

* Adoption of the Istanbul Commitments on the Silk Routes Partnership on Migration and its Call to Action – a five year plan in February 2019
* Endorsement by Senior Officials of the Strategic Document of the Budapest Process and the Implementation Plan of the Call for Action in December 2019
* A project kick-off meeting
* Four preparatory meetings at Senior Official level for the Ministerial Conference
* A Ministerial Conference
* Two Regular Senior Official Meetings
* Four Regional Working Group meetings
* Seven Ad-hoc meetings: virtual group discussions, webinars, thematic meetings, study visit
* Impressions of the 6th Ministerial Conference
* A factsheet with the Budapest Process achievements and its links to the other components
* Two Background documents:
  + For the Joint meeting of the Silk Routes and the South East Europe Working Groups in May 2018: Working Paper on Return and Reintegration
  + For the Expert Thematic Meeting Return and Reintegration in March 2020: Return and Reintegration: what works, what doesn’t – A few examples
* Five Budapest Process briefing papers and reports to complement meetings:
  + A snapshot of some trends and aspects of the Gig economy in Budapest Process countries
  + On the way to skills partnerships
  + Attitudes to migration: Budapest Process post-webinar debrief
  + Labour Migration Visa Regimes: a case study approach
  + Understanding and explaining attitudes to migration in the Silk Routes and South Asian countries - The state of the art and recommendations for next steps

**Component 2 – Silk Routes Facility**

* Short-Term Assistance
* Comprehensive Migration Policy for Afghanistan
* Policy on Engagement with Iraqis Abroad
* National Emigration Policy for Overseas Pakistanis
* Capacity building for Federal Investigation Academy of Pakistan
* Call for Proposals
* 34 Concept Notes were received and reviewed by PSC between April 2018 and July 2019.
* 14 Applicants were invited to submit proposal for full Grant Application
* 6 project has been awarded with grants under CfP with duration of 18 month each and total amount of 1,5 mio EUR:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. ICMPD/2019/SRP-277-001: International Legal Initiative Public Foundation;   *Project: Promotion of the harmonization of policies of Central Asian countries on regulation of labour migration*  *Duration: 1 January 2019 – 30 June 2020.*  *Geographical coverage: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan* | 1. ICMPD/2019/SRP-277-003A and 003B: ActionAid Bangladesh and Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)   *Project: South Asia Migration and Climate (SAMAC) project*  *Duration: 1 July 2019 – 31 March 2021*  *Geographical coverage: Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Pakistan* |
| 1. ICMPD/2019/SRP-277-004: MercyCorps Tajikistan   *Project: Reintegration of Returning Migrants in Tajikistan*  *Duration: 1 August 2019 – 28 February 2021*  *Geographical coverage: Tajikistan* | 1. ICMPD/2019/SRP-277-005: HELVETAS INTERCOOPERATION GmbH, Branch in Tajikistan   *Project: Improving the well-being of labour migrants and their families in Tajikistan*  *Duration: 1 November 2019 – 30 April 2021*  *Geographical coverage: Tajikistan* |
| 1. ICMPD/2019/SRP-277-006: CARE Austria   *Project: Promoting Safe Migration for the Women of Bangladesh*  *Duration: 1 November 2019 – 30 April 2021*  *Geographical coverage: Bangladesh* | 1. ICMPD/2019/SRP-277-007: Danish Trade Union Development Agency (DTDA)   *Project: Social Reintegration of the Returnee Female Migrant Workers in Bangladesh*  *Duration: 1 November 2019 – 30 April 2021*  *Geographical coverage: Bangladesh* |

**Component 3 – Flagship Initiatives**

1. Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs)

* Operationalisation of 7 MRCs in 5 countries
* Various awareness campaigns and strategies from national to local level covering all forms of media (print, visual, social)
* Over 40,000 people have been counselled, over 113,000 people have received orientations on migration through community outreach activities, and over 21 million people have been reached through social media.
* One 5-year and one 2-year MRC strategy have been developed (AFG and BGD)
* Five needs assessment conducted and one MEL framework developed

2. Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation Initiative (RELEC)

* Two regional workshops in Ankara and Istanbul
* One regional training in Antalya
* One national workshop for Iraq
* One national workshop for Afghanistan

3. Protecting Migrants’ Rights (MIGRAP)

* Various capacity building conducted (3 for Iraq, 2 for Afghanistan, 2 for Bangladesh, 1 for Pakistan)
* Various operations manuals, guidelines and regulations, and related documents for Afghanistan, Iraq, Bangladesh and Pakistan on areas of: regulating recruitment processes, skills development, labour migration compliance, crisis management
* Online modules for migrants and migrant workers developed covering various phases of the migration cycle

## Other available information

Annex II contains the list of documents to be provided.

In addition, the following information is available online:

* Component 1 [Budapest Process political framework](https://www.budapestprocess.org/about-us/mission-and-vision-statement/6th-ministerial-conference)
* Component 1 [Meeting minutes of the Budapest Process meetings](https://www.budapestprocess.org/resources/meeting-documents/category/3-general-documents-and-publications?download=174:budapest-process-strategic-document-and-implementation-plan-english)
* Component 2+3 [Reports, analyses and guidance produces](https://www.budapestprocess.org/resources/reports-analyses-guidance)
* Component 2 [Online Training Platform](https://srotp.budapestprocess.org/)
* Component 2: [Executive Summary: Comprehensive Migration Policy for Afghanistan](https://www.budapestprocess.org/silkroutesfacility/short-term-technical-assistance/244-afghanistan)
* Component 2: [Policy Brief: National Emigration and Welfare Policy for Overseas Pakistanis](https://www.budapestprocess.org/silkroutesfacility/short-term-technical-assistance/245-pakistan)
* Component 2: [Policy Brief: Climate migrants pushed to the brink: South Asia is unprepared to protect climate migrants, even as it battles the COVID-19 crisis](https://www.budapestprocess.org/silkroutesfacility/projects-in-the-silk-routes-countries/183-samac)
* Component 3: Online modules for migrants and migrant workers in Silk Routes <https://www.icmpdsilkroutesmodules.com/>
* Component 3: All MRC websites and FB pages
  + <https://www.facebook.com/mrcafghanistan/>  and <https://www.mrcafghanistan.af/en/>
  + <https://www.facebook.com/bangladeshmrc/> and <https://www.mrc-bangladesh.org/en/>
  + <https://www.facebook.com/mrc.iq/> and <https://www.mrciraq.iq/>
  + <https://www.facebook.com/PAKMRC/> and <https://www.mrc.org.pk/en/>

## Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)

The European Union is committed to the achievement of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development adopted by the UN in September 2015; as a consequence, all interventions co-financed by the European Union should reinforce and make explicit their contributions to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), the core of Agenda 2030.

The intervention to be evaluated is expected to contribute to the following SDG:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goal 5 | Gender equality |  |
| Goal 8 | Decent work and economic growth |  |
| Goal 10 | Reduce inequalities |  |
| Goal 13 | Climate |  |
| Goal 16 | Peace, justice and strong institutions |  |
| Goal 17 | Partnership for the goals |  |

# DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of evaluation | final |
| Coverage | Intervention in its entirety |
| Geographic scope | Vienna, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Iraq, Pakistan and Tajikistan pending travel restrictions due to Covid-19 |
| Period to be evaluated | From 01/08/2017 to present (or 31/07/2021)  *the entire period of the intervention to date* |

## Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[[1]](#footnote-2) of the European Commission[[2]](#footnote-3). The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results[[3]](#footnote-4)** of the intervention in the context ofan evolving cooperation policy withan increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDG**.[[4]](#footnote-5)

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to:

* Assess and document the achievement of the project’s objectives, activities and results; paying particular attention to its results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
* Evaluate the project in terms of its effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, coherence, sustainability and early signs of impact, with a priority on assessing the achievement of expected results, objectives and overall goal;
* Provide recommendation for areas for scale up and areas of focus for a follow-up project as well as potential spin-off project(s)

Generate lessons from the intervention to inform the design and implementation of future interventions and to support organisational learning at ICMPD The main users of this evaluation will be ICMPD as Contracting Authority as well as the relevant EU services namely: DG INTPA, DG HOME, EU Delegations in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Iraq, Pakistan and Tajikistan as well as EEAS. Furthermore, ministries from the Silk Routes Countries who are involved in the intervention may be presented with the recommendations of this evaluation. This evaluation will inform further initiatives and interventions in the Silk Routes Region as a follow-up to this intervention.

## Evaluation criteria and issues to be addressed

The evaluation will assess the intervention by using the six standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and (early signs of) impact and one EU specific evaluation criteria on the EU added value (the extent to which the intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only). The prime focus for this evaluation will however be on the Effectiveness and Sustainability criteria.

The evaluation team must consider to what extent and how **gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed and addressed by the intervention and the results of this intervention**. It shall furthermore consider whether the relevant SDGs (5, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17) and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the intervention, its governance and monitoring.

The **issues to be addressed** as formulated below are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager[[5]](#footnote-6) and propose in their Inception Note a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Note, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

The following evaluation questions have been identified:

1. **Relevance**: To what extent are the activities in line with the Silk Routes countries’ priorities, development goals and needs?
2. **Coherence**: To what extent has the intervention contributed to achieving EU migration objectives and Silk Routes countries objectives?
3. **Effectiveness**: What progress has the project made towards achieving its planned objective(s), taking into account the national contexts and available funding?
4. **Effectiveness:** To what extent are there unexpected positive achievements that the intervention might not have planned for? What are the unexpected negative results?
5. **Efficiency + EU added value**: To what extent has the project received support and cooperation from government counterparts?
   1. In the EU?
   2. In the Silk Routes Countries?
   3. In Central Asian Countries?
6. **Sustainability**: To what extent and under which conditions will the benefits and outputs of the project continue beyond the lifetime of the project?
7. **Sustainability**: What interventions/strategies are so far replicable or adaptable and have the potential for scale up?
8. **Early signs of Impact**: To what extent can early signs of impact be documented at the time of evaluation?

## Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases:

1. Inception
2. Field
3. Synthesis
4. Dissemination

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each of these phases and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

| **Phases of the evaluation** | **Key activities** | **Outputs and *meetings*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception Phase** | * Initial document/data collection * Document analysis * Inception interviews * Stakeholder analysis * Reconstruction of the Intervention Logic (based upon available documentation and interviews) and preparation of a Theory of Change * Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix * Planning of the Field phase | * Kick-off meeting with the Evaluation Manager(done remotely) * Inception report, including a stakeholder analysis |
| **Field Phase** | * Gathering of primary evidence with the use of interviews and/or the most appropriate techniques   *N.B. any and all in-person meetings and field visits might need to be replaced by alternative, virtual meetings depending on the evolution of the travel and meeting restrictions related to the COVID-19 pandemic.* | * Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase * Debriefing withthe Contracting Authority and the Reference Group (done remotely) |
| **Synthesis phase** | * Final analysis of findings * Reporting | * Draft Final Report * Final Report * Slide presentation * Final Report presentation tothe Reference Group |
| **Dissemination phase** | * Preparing the main outputs Validation Workshop at local levels and main findings to be used for the infographic with a focus of change | * Validation workshop at local level done remotely * Infographic/visual size A4/A3 |

### Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

It will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off meeting held virtually between the evaluators and the Evaluation Manager. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed. Further to this, and in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, the evaluators will reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the intervention to be evaluated and share a Theory of Change of the intervention.

Based on the Intervention Logic the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases. The methodological design of the evaluation will be summarised into an evaluation matrix (see Annex VII).

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception note. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report**; its content is described in Chapter 5. Please, see also Chapter 5.2.

The evaluation team will then, if needed, present the **Inception Report** to the Reference Group.

### Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Inception note by the Evaluation Manager. Please take note that any and all in-person meetings and field visits might need to be replaced by alternatives/virtual meetings depending on the evolution of the travel and meeting restrictions related to the Covid-19 pandemic and to the security situation. This phase includes on-site and online meetings with counterparts.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant national / local authorities and agencies; and with the relevant Civil Society Organisations. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the Field Phase the evaluators will prepare a Slide Presentation; its content is described in Chapter 5.

### Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of the Final Report, whose structure is described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the early phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and the preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will make sure that:

* Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
* When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
* The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in point 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver to the Evaluation Manager the **Draft Final Report** and, after addressing the comments consolidated by the Evaluation Manager, will finalise the **Final Report** (including the Executive Summary) [[6]](#footnote-7). Please refer to chapter 5.2 for a description of the process.

A minimum of two rounds of revisions will occur for the final report.

### Dissemination phase

For the dissemination phase, a validation workshop will take place through the final advisory board of the intervention where a slide presentation will highlight the learning and recommendations from the final report.

In addition, a visual/infographic shall be prepared to highlight the change incurred in the Silk Routes through the intervention. A minimum of 2 rounds of revisions is to be expected. The visual will then be shared over social media.

For the dissemination product mentioned here, please follow the ESS INTPA “How To Guides” available on Capacity4Devwebsite: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluations>

## Management and Steering of the evaluation

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of DG INTPA, DG HOME, EU Delegations from the Silk Routes and Central Asian Countries, ICMPD project managers of the intervention and the ICMPD Regional Coordinator for the Silk Routes.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

* To agree on the focus of the evaluation, including the evaluation questions at Inception Phase.
* To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the external stakeholders.
* To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the intervention.
* To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team.
* To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
* To support the development of a proper follow-up plan after completion of the evaluation.
* To support the Dissemination Phase.

## Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

# EXPERTISE REQUIRED

## Number of evaluators and of working days per category

A minimum of two evaluators shall be involved in the evaluation, one senior and one medium/junior. The full set-up proposal of the evaluation team is left to the discretion of the tenderer. The maximum amount of days per phase are as follows:

1. Inception Phase: 10 days
2. Field Phase (on-site and online): 30 days
3. Synthesis Phase: 15 days
4. Dissemination Phase: 5 days

In particular, the Team Leader (to be identified in the offer) is expected to possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 30 working days.

If the situation with regards to international travel allows it, a member of the evaluation team would travel to a minimum of 2 countries. The logistical arrangements of field missions to take part in project activities will be separately covered by the project funds. Tickets for air travel to the field missions will be provided by ICMPD for the most direct route and lowest available fare in economy class. No additional private destinations or stopovers shall be allowed. The consultant shall be entitled to receive a daily subsistence allowance (DSA) from ICMPD for authorised missions. The DSA shall be deemed to cover the costs of accommodation, breakfast and meals, transportation to/from airports, in-town transportation (such as train, bus, tram, metro, taxi) at the place of destination, gratuities and other incidental costs. A full DSA is applicable for each night spent at the place of destination. In case where accommodation and/or meals are provided free of charge by ICMPD, a government or a related institution, the amount of daily subsistence allowance will be reduced proportionately. Visa costs will be reimbursed by ICMPD. Receipts must be included with boarding passes.

## Expertise required

**Minimum requirements of the evaluator (or the Team Leader/Main evaluator and their team with cumulative experience):**

* Minimum of 7 years of proven experience in the evaluation of international projects including multi-country EU-funded projects;
* The expert (or at least one of the experts) shall have at least 5 evaluations conducted amongst which at least one being led by the expert in the last 10 years
* Good knowledge of different evaluation approaches and qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods including results-oriented monitoring (ROM) including through training and certification;
* Solid experience in the field of migration through at least one work experience or evaluation conducted in this area of work; previous work experience with international organisations and international multi-stakeholder projects with research components is an asset;
* Full working knowledge of English; Knowledge of any of the languages in the Silk Routes would be an asset;
* Excellent communication and drafting skills; and
* Ability to work flexibly, develop creative solutions and deal with multicultural environments.

**Language skills of the team:**

* English: at least all members of the evaluation team shall possess a level C2 expertise;

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

**Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended** and should be striven for.

# LOCATION AND DURATION

## Location(s) of assignment

The evaluation will be home-based, with field visits, Covid-19 restrictions permitting, in minimum two Silk Routes countries. Interviews with stakeholders will take place in person, by phone, email, Skype or other available means.

## Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar months

Maximum duration of the assignment: 4 calendar months.

This overall duration includes working days, weekends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, dissemination activities and distribution of outputs.

## Starting period and planning

Provisional start of the assignment is mid-April.

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV (to be finalised in the Inception report). The ‘Indicative dates’ are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as ‘0’).

# REPORTING

## Content, timing and submission

The evaluation deliverables must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of the intervention is required (to be attached as Annex).

**List of outputs**:

|  | **Maximum number of Pages *(excluding annexes)*** | **Main Content** | **Timing for submission** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception Report** | 10 pages | * Overarching revised Intervention logic and Theory of Change * Stakeholder map * Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: * Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods * Consultation strategy * Field visit approach [including the criteria to select the field visits] * Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures * Work plan of the entire evaluation | End of Inception Phase |
| **Slide presentation for the field phase** | 15 slides | * Key, preliminary findings of the field phase to guide the debriefing session with stakeholders | End of Field Phase |
| **Draft Final Report** | 30 pages | * Cf. detailed structure in Annex III | End of Synthesis Phase |
| **Final report** | 30 pages | * Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted | [2 weeks] after having received comments to the Draft Final Report |
| **Slide presentation for the Validation** | 15 slides | * Summary of findings and recommendations from the final report with a few Good practices examples and learning from these | 1 month after final report at the earliest / to be determined after final report |
| **Visual focused on change** | 1 (A3 or A4) | * Infographic highlighting the how the intervention changed in different areas/component | 1 month after the final report is endorsed |

## Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments (including those received from the Reference Group) or the approval of the report within 15 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

## Language

All reports shall be submitted in the official language of the contract, as indicated in Chapter 2.5.

## Formatting of reports and number of report copies

All reports will be produced using Calibri 11, 1.0 spacing 6pt after paragraph. They will be submitted both in Word and PDF formats.

# content of the offers

The offers to be submitted for the execution of this contract will include a Technical and a Financial Offer.

## Technical offer

The Technical Offer will compulsorily include:

* An introductory and short chapter detailing the comprehension by tenderers of the assignment and its main challenges.
* A chapter detailing the tentative methodology to conduct the evaluation; this methodology will then be finalised in the Inception Note. The proposed methodology will detail how the evaluation will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication messages, materials and management structures.
* A short analysis of the main risks and remedy measures of the assignment.
* A chapter detailing the relevance of the team composition and competencies to the work to be undertaken and how the tasks will be organised.
* Annex: the CVs of the proposed expert(s) in EuropeAid format (max length of each CV: 5 pages).
* Annex: a synoptic table detailing the work to be undertaken by each proposed expert and their role, based on the proposed methodology.
* Annex: the proposed timetable (Gantt chart).
* Optional annex: evaluation matrix revised and population (see Annex VII for a proposed template)

The maximum length of the Technical offer is 10 pages excluding annexes.

## Financial offer

The Financial Offer must respect the format of the attached Annex VI. Offers using a different format will be disqualified.

# budget of the present evaluation

The maximum budget allowed for the execution of the present contract is 55.000 EUR. This is inclusive of all fees and costs related to the assignment.

# Deadline for the submission of questions

Questions and requests for clarification are to be submitted by 31 March 2021 at 12:00 CET, local time of Vienna via email at [silkroutesevaluation@icmpd.org](mailto:silkroutesevaluation@icmpd.org).

The text of the questions received (once anonymised) and the responses will be sent to all tenderers to ensure equal treatment by 6 April 2021.

# Submission of the offers and their assessment

## Deadline for the submission of the offers

The offers for undertaking this assignment must be received by 9 April 2021 at 18:00 CET, local time of Vienna. Late submission of offers leads to their disqualification.

## Modalities for the submission of the offers

The technical and financial offers should be sent in English in .pdf format per email. The offers are accompanied by the Request for Quotation, signed by an authorised representative, dated and stamped and scanned in the same email. The offers and signed request for quotation should be submitted to: [silkroutesevaluation@icmpd.org](mailto:silkroutesevaluation@icmpd.org).

## Assessment of the offers

The offers will be assessed as detailed in the Annex I.

# invoicing and payments

The selected tenderer will need to submit an invoice following each of the four phases of the evaluation. Following the inception phase and approval of the inception report, the first payment will be issued. Every subsequent phase will be paid after completion of the outputs and their approval by the Contracting Authority. The invoices should be issued to the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD). Please note that in Austria and Belgium, ICMPD is VAT exempt.

The contracting modalities varies depending if the selected tenderer is a physical or legal entity. More information will be given to the selected tenderer.

Annexes

# Annex I: criteria to assess the offers

1. **Technical evaluation criteria**

The Contracting Authority selects the best offer with the best value for money.

The criteria is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **N** | **Criteria** | **Points** |
| **1** | **Clarity and presentation of the proposal: understanding of the TOR and the aims of the evaluation and its context** | **20** |
| **2** | **Experience and Qualifications: of the expert(s) and the tenderer** | **30** |
| **3** | **Methodology including work programme, evaluation tools used, quality control and time schedule:** | **30** |
| **4** | **Financial offer** | **20** |
|  | **Total points** | **100** |

Each quotation will be evaluated and scored individually. A qualitative assessment will be applied for the evaluation of each quotation for the evaluation criteria (1 - 3), whereby the maximum score under each category reflects the ideal situation. A quantitative comparison will be applied under the criteria 4, financial offer, with the best offer receiving the maximum score. Other scores will be proportionally reduced on the basis of the difference to the best offer.

Threshold

Any technical offer falling short of the threshold of 40 out of 80 points, is automatically rejected from the financial evaluation.

# Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluation team

* Action fiche
* Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
* Project document, including the logical framework
* Project outputs such as draft policies, training manuals, operating procedures, rules and regulations, information materials for MRC outreach, reports from workshops and trainings
* Annual project reports
* Budapest Process documents such as narrative reports, Ministerial declaration, Summaries from dialogue meetings and strategic guiding documents
* Financing agreement and addenda of the project
* Mid-term evaluation report
* MRC needs assessments
* Monthly reports submitted to European Union
* Meeting reports (pre and post) from the Project Advisory Board and Steering Committee
* Publications, visibility materials including infographics and factsheets
* Other relevant reports from the grant projects
* Other relevant documents to be agreed upon by the Regional Portfolio Manager and evaluator

***Note***: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the project.

# Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The structure of the evaluation report will be as follows.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

‘’*This evaluation is supported and guided by ICMPD and presented by [name of selected tenderer]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of ICMPD nor of the European Commission, which financed the evaluated* ’’.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Executive Summary** | | A tightly-drafted and to-the-point Executive Summary. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. |
| **1. Introduction** | | A description of the intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant. |
| **2. Answers to the Evaluation Questions** | | A chapter presenting the Evaluation Questions and conclusive answers, together with evidence (findings) and reasoning.  An overall assessment of the intervention is to be added, as well. It shall be based on the detailed response to the Evaluation Questions. |
| **3. Conclusions and Recommendations** | |  |
|  | **3.1 Conclusions** | This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.  A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.  The transferable lessons from this evaluation are to be included in this chapter. |
|  | **3.2 Recommendations** | They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new one for the next cycle.  Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels. |
| **Annexes to the report** | | The report should include the following annexes:   * The Terms of Reference of the evaluation * The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs can be attached, but summarised and limited to one page per person) * Evaluation methodology including tools utilised, analysis of the limitation of the methodology, remedy and degree of confidence in the conclusions. * Evaluation Matrix (a table presenting the tools used to respond to each evaluation question as well as the indicators used). * Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrix of the intervention. * Relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention took place * List of persons/organisations consulted * Literature and documentation consulted * Other technical annexes as relevant (e.g. statistical analyses, matrix of evidence, databases) |

# Annex IV: Planning schedule

This annex must be included by tenderers in their Technical Offer and forms an integral part of it. Tenderers can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

|  |  | **Indicative Duration in working days[[7]](#footnote-8)** | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Location** | **Team Leader** | **Evaluator …** | **Indicative Dates** |
| **Inception phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Field phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Synthesis phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Dissemination phase: total days** | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL working days (maximum)** | |  |  |  |

# Annex V: logical framework matrix (logframe) of the evaluated intervention(s)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Results chain*** | ***Indicator*** | ***Baseline***  ***(08.2017)*** | ***Target***  ***(07.2021)*** | ***Current value\****  ***(07.2020)*** | ***Source and mean of verification*** | ***Assumptions*** |
| ***Impact (Overall objective )*** | To strengthen the management of migration and mobility movements that concern countries in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions | OO1. Number of migration relevant policies, strategies and procedures have been accepted, per year and per country.  OO2: Number of human trafficking cases prosecuted per year, per country.  OO3: Number of cases on smuggling of migrants prosecuted per year, per country  OO4. Number of migrants who emigrate through legal channels over the total emigrant stock, per country of origin in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions.  OO5. Number of immigrants reaching EU Member States from the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions through legal channels over the total number of irregular entries recorded from countries from the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions, disaggregated by country of destination and origin, sex and age.  OO6. Number of foreign residents or migrants accessing existing public services to seek rights-based support and assistance, by country and public service addressed.  OO7. Variation in the allocation of financial resources for implementing the commitments taken in the Budapest Process, per region/country and source of funding. | n/a | 1. 5 policies, strategies, procedures accepted 2. 10% yearly variation of human trafficking cases prosecuted 3. 10% yearly variation of migrant smuggling cases prosecuted 4. 30% variation 5. 30% variation 6. 100 per country per year 7. 20% variation | n/a | Policy documents and guidelines; action plans; MoU;  TIP report, UNODC, national data, Eurostat  Labour attaches and embassies, unemployment services, etc.  projects funded in the region | *Not applicable* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Specific objective (Outcome) 1*** | | SO1. Strengthened regional dialogue, coordination and cooperation on migration and mobility between Silk Routes and Central Asian governments participating in the Budapest Process, and EU counterparts. | | SO1.1 Renewed political declaration on migration and mobility between Silk Routes and Central Asian governments participating in the Budapest Process, and EU counterparts  SO1.2 Number of specific action plans for regional cooperation are defined and validated by the participating governments for each of the 6 key priorities identified in the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration, with the indication of results and benchmarks, monitoring frameworks, responsibilities, timelines and financial resources.  SO1.3 Number of concrete actions identified in the implementation plan and action plans for cooperation designed and validated, with secured financial allocations and justification supporting design choices, disaggregated by priority and countries involved.  SO1.4. Number of concrete actions identified in the implementation plan and action plans for cooperation for which implementation has started, disaggregated by priority and countries involved.  SO1.5. Number of concrete actions identified in the implementation plan and action plans for cooperation whose outcomes have been fully achieved by the end of the project, disaggregated by priority and countries involved. | | | 1. 2013 Ministerial declaration as a basis for cooperation 2. none 3. 0 4. 0 5. 0 | | 1. Adopted new political declaration 2. Endorsed action plan(s) 3. 2 4. 2 5. 4 | | 1. Adoption on 20.02.2019 of “The Istanbul Commitments and its Call for Action – a five year plan” 2. Endorsement of the “Budapest Process Strategic Document and Implementation Plan” on 06.12.2019 3. 0 4. 2 5. 0 | | | Ministerial Declaration 2013  Ministerial Declaration 2019  “Budapest Process Strategic Document and Implementation Plan”  Concept notes for actions  Counter-signed grant contracts & memoranda of understanding  Mid-term and final grant reports | | | | | Active engagement of five SRC, CACs, as well as EU MSs in all components of the Action  Political stability in the SRCs  Increased security issues and natural disasters do not divert the attention of national authorities  The project components (dialogue, facility and the flagships MRCs RELEC and MIGRAP) are accepted by the beneficiary countries | | |
| ***Specific objective (Outcome) 2*** | | SO2. Improved governance of migration and mobility in the countries of the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions and with EU counterparts | | | SO2.1. Number of newly adopted or revised laws / strategies/ policies directly relevant to implement the commitments taken in the Budapest Process, which include enhanced provisions for rights-based solutions available to migrants and their families, including options for regular migration channels to another country, disaggregated by country.  SO2.2. Number of newly adopted or revised laws /strategies /policies /guidelines directly relevant to implement the commitments taken in the Budapest Process, which include enhanced provisions for the protection of and assistance to vulnerable migrants and their families, disaggregated by country.  SO2.3. Number of newly adopted or revised laws / strategies / policies directly relevant to implement the commitments taken in the Budapest Process, which have a reinforced gender and gender equity dimension.  SO2.4. Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks for an evidence-based monitoring of progress towards the agreed objectives and priorities.  SO2.5 Number of sustainable capacity building/training structures on migration management endorsed by relevant national institutions, disaggregated by country. | | | 1. n/a 2. n/a 3. n/a 4. Not used 5. n/a | 1. 3/3 2. 3 3. 5 4. Used in three countries for monitoring implementation of three policies (Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan) 5. 3 | | | | 1. 0/3 2. 1 3. 3 4. Not in use by countries 5. 1 | | | Laws/ policies/ strategy documents  Project implementation reports/Project evaluation reports | | Active engagement of five SRC, CACs, as well as EU MSs in all components of the Action  Political stability in the SRCs  Increased security issues and natural disasters do not divert the attention of national authorities  The project components (dialogue, facility and the flagships MRCs RELEC and MIGRAP) are accepted by the beneficiary countries | | | |
| ***Specific objective (Outcome) 3*** | | | SO3. Improved operationalisation of the priorities set out in the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration | | SO3.1. Yearly variation of the number of beneficiaries who have their case handled and remedies identified over the total number of individual requests received by Migrant Resource Centres, disaggregated by type of support and country of delivery.  SO3.2 Number of operational and fully equipped Migrant Resource Centres rehabilitated, enhanced or constructed with project support, per country;  SO3.3 Variation of national and local public and private entities, including NGOs, actively engaged in service delivery at Migrant Resource Centres, by year and by country;  SO3.4. Number of beneficiaries of the pre-departure briefings organised by the project who are now employed abroad, disaggregated by sex and country.  SO3.5. Number of new law enforcement cooperation standard operating procedures in use in the target regions. | 1. 441 outgoing, intending and potential migrants were counselled through the MRCs Pakistan in 2016-2017. 2. 2 MRCs were operational in Islamabad and Lahore, Pakistan 3. 8 public and private entities were actively engaged with the MRC 4. 8293 had people received pre-departure briefings before going abroad for work 5. None | | | | 1. Yearly increase of 20% of counselled migrants in 5 countries through personal and virtual/ phone counselling. 2. A minimum of seven MRCs are operational in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Iraq, Pakistan, Tajikistan 3. 20% increase / variation for MRC networks 4. RELEC: Silk Routes countries have SOPs and guidelines in place to facilitate international cooperation on irregular migration, human trafficking and migrant smuggling. | | | 1. Over 200,000 migrants have been counselled by the MRCs Afghanistan and Pakistan. Details of media campaigns will be provided in the next annual report. 2. 6 MRCs are in place in 4 countries. The MRC Tajikistan is currently under establishment 3. The MRCs currently work with over 30 public and private stakeholders 4. 0 | | | MRC client database reports  Photos, review reports, government certificate for MRC establishment  Procedure documents  Meeting reports | | Active engagement of five SRC, CACs, as well as EU MSs in all components of the Action  Political stability in the SRCs  Increased security issues and natural disasters do not divert the attention of national authorities  The project components (dialogue, facility and the flagships MRCs RELEC and MIGRAP) are accepted by the beneficiary countries | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SO1: Strengthened regional dialogue, coordination and cooperation on migration and mobility involving governments in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions and EU counterparts.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Outputs OC1*** | 1.1 Strengthened participation of national authorities and other relevant regional stakeholders in the regional response to migration and mobility in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions | | 1.1.1. Number of events and meetings tailored to the needs of the participating states organised by the project to promote debate, exchange of experience and identify concrete realms of regional cooperation, attended by government representatives with decision-making capacity  1.1.2. Number of participants with decision-making capacity at events and meetings by the project to discuss concrete realms of cooperation (disaggregated by sex, country, agency)  1.1.3. Number of concrete actions implementing the priorities of the Budapest Process whose design was validated supported by the project, per priority addressed and participating countries. | | | 1. 0 2. n/a 3. 0 | 1. 4 per year, 16 in total 2. 40 (considering an average of 70 participants) 3. 4 | | | | 1. 1 project launch conference, 1 ministerial conference, 5 Senior Officials Meetings, 2 Regional Working Group Meetings, 2 Thematic Meetings 2. n/a 3. n/a | | | Meeting agendas  Meeting summaries  List of Participants  Evaluation Reports  Project Reports  Background documents  Knowledge/policy outputs/products  Monitoring framework | | Political commitment to the dialogue  Active engagement in the dialogue and potential concrete actions to be developed by SRCs and CACs  Minimal staff turnover in SRCs and CACs  Active engagement from all partners to realise concrete outputs from the dialogue’s priority goals | |
|  | 1.2 Reinforced evidence and knowledge supporting regional decision-making on migration and mobility in the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions | | 1.2.1 Number of research outputs or evidence-based documents provided to participating states identifying shared problems and good practices, as well as evidence-based analysis, on relevant regional issues for the implementation of the Budapest Process.  1.2.2 Number of countries for which the dialogue has helped develop an evidence-based monitoring framework to report progress on the effectiveness of cooperative actions | | | 1. 0 2. 0 | 1. 4 (1 per year) 2. 4 (All Silk Routes countries) | | | | 1. 2 2. n/a | | |
|  | **SO2: Improved governance of migration and mobility in the countries of the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions and with EU counterparts** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Outputs OC2*** | 2.1 Improved capacities of national authorities and other relevant stakeholders to engage in the implementation of the commitments arising from the dialogue between Silk Routes and Central Asian countries and European counterparts | | | 2.1.1 Number of short-term assistance requests received from the target countries;  2.1.2 Number of short-term assistance completed with final outputs approved by the responsible authorities;  2.1.3 Number of new or revised strategies/policies/plans associated to the technical assistance delivered by the project that have become operational; | | 1. 3 2. N/A 3. N/A | | | 1. 6 2. 4 3. 4 | 1. 8 2. 4 3. 2 | | | Project implementation reports; Project evaluation reports; feedback from government counterparts | | Political relevance of strong migration management for the SR countries  Level of participation of government officials in implementation of the short-term assistance  Political stability in SR countries | | | |
| 2.2 Enhanced knowledge on migration and mobility available to country stakeholders, including issues pertaining to labour migration; integration of migrants; return, readmission and reintegration; migrant smuggling and trafficking in persons; border management; assistance to migrants and their families; international protection and respect for the rights of refugees and asylum seekers as per international obligations | | | 2.2.1. Number of short-term technical assistance actions delivered by the project that presented in the final report sound quantitative and qualitative evidence on the outcomes achieved by the action.  2.2.2 CfP: number of initiatives addressing climate change  2.2.3. CfP: number of initiatives addressing female migration  2.2.4 CfP: number of projects evaluated positively on effectiveness  2.2.5 CfP: number of projects evaluated positively on efficiency  2.2.6 CfP: number of projects evaluated positively on sustainability | | 1. N/A 2. N/A 3. N/A 4. N/A 5. N/A 6. N/A | | | 1. 6 2. 1 3. 1 4. 6 5. 6 6. 6 | 1. 5 2. 1 3. 2 4. N/A 5. N/A 6. N/A | | | Project Implementation Reports; Implementation reports of projects funded under the CfP; Project evaluation reports | | Quality of Grant Applications received under the CfP  Veracity of implementation capacities presented by the applicants in Grant Applications  Appetite among SR/CA countries for initiatives supported under the CfP | | | |
| **SO3. Improved operationalisation of the priorities set out in the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Outputs OC 3*** | 3.1 Strengthened service delivery capacity, resources and infrastructures in the partner countries of the Silk Routes and Central Asia regions. | 3.1.1 Number of migrants, potential migrants and individuals from host communities who have received protection and/or assistance at Migrant Resource Centres with project support, disaggregated by sex, country, type of support received;  3.1.2 Number of beneficiaries who have attended pre-departure briefings organised by the project at of Migrant Resource Centres, disaggregated by sex and country.  3.1.3 Number of information materials developed by the Migrant Resource Centres, adopted by government partners, by country  3.1.4. Number of media programmes conveying information aiming to promote understanding of migration with project support, by country and type of media. | | | 1. 441 outgoing, intending and potential migrants were counselled through the MRCs Pakistan in 2016-2017. 2. 6 flyers, 7 videos 3. 8,293 had people received pre-departure briefings before going abroad for work   None | | | 1. A minimum of 10,000 people received personal counselling 2. A minimum of 500,000 potential migrants and returnees provided with counselling and information. 3. A minimum of 50,000 individuals who attended pre-departure briefings 4. A minimum of 10 information materials developed, printed and disseminated per country. Active website and social media presence. Skills enhancement programmes available were applicable. 5. A minimum of one major social media and one radio/ TV campaign organised by country. | | | | 1. To be reported in the annual report 2. To be reported in the annual report 3. Development of 10 visa information documents for PAK, AFG, IQ, BGD developed, country specific information developed for 8 countries in PAK and BGD, information material developed on Covid-19 and migration and distributed on Facebook. Websites existing for all countries or under development and improvement. 4. Over 200,000 migrants informed through AFG, PAK and BGD. Over 1 million potential migrants reached through FB campaign in all SRCs 5. Social media campaign ongoing on AFG, BGD, IRQ, PAK 6. At least 5 other platforms and modes our outreach and awareness raising are conducted such as radio and TV campaigns, roving and miking, and orientation in schools and universities and local government institutions. | | | | | Political commitment to and active engagement in the project by SRCs  Minimal staff turnover in SRCs  Increased security issues and natural disasters do not divert the attention of national authorities  The project components (dialogue, facility and the flagships MRCs RELEC and MIGRAP) are accepted by the beneficiary countries | |
| 3.2 Expanded opportunities for international cooperation of law enforcement authorities in the Silk Routes region to contrast irregular migration and the criminal networks active in trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants. | 3.2.1 Number of law enforcement officials with decision-making capacity who participate actively in the project’s meetings and events (attendance of at least one meeting/event every year), disaggregated by sex, country, agency;  3.2.2. Database with contact details of law enforcement officials with decision-making capacity set-up and updated by the project;  3.2.3 Number of law enforcement officials who attended the regional trainings organised by the project who can point to at least 3 new issues learned in the trainings, disaggregated by sex, country, agency;  3.2.4 Number of new SOPs in place enabling regional cooperation for law enforcement agencies, including for the exchange of data and information on criminal activities concerning irregular migration, human trafficking and migrant smuggling. | | | 1. No SOPs in place 2. Focal points and agencies have been identified, but often change due to rotation of staff and responsibilities in Silk Routes countries law enforcement agencies 3. 8 regional meetings held 4. Regional trainings held, but no national programme in place | | | 1. SOPs in place for a minimum of 2 SRCs 2. Focal point system established and recognised by participating countries 3. A minimum of 8 regional meetings held to support trust building and direct cooperation 4. A minimum of 3 trainings held for each participating SRC | | | | 1. Focal points have been identified and need to be formalised 2. 6 regional meetings held 3. 1 national training held for AFG and IRQ | | | | |
| 3.3 Increased awareness of migration and protection issues among government stakeholders, the migrants and the general public. | 3.3.1 Number of government representatives participating in sensitisation activities on existing legal obligations concerning migrants and their families who can point to at least 3 new issues learned in the activities, disaggregated by sex, government authority and country;  3.3.2 Number of new or expanded migration related strategies, guidelines and procedures (particularly on protection migrants’ rights) accepted per country; and  3.3.3. Number of migrants and potential migrants participating in skills enhancement and awareness raising activities organised by the project who can point to at least 3 new issues learned in the activities, disaggregated by sex and country. | | | 1. 3 existing or draft laws, rules and regulation on labour or migration existing 2. 2 initiatives on recruitment processes, labour market analysis and related topics available 3. 2 awareness raising and skills enhancement initiatives for migrants and their families are available | | | 1. At least 5 capacity building on labour migration and related topics conducted 2. At least 3 policy, framework, rules or regulations on migrant protection prepared, revised or expanded 3. At least 4 awareness raising initiatives on migrant protection, better monitoring of recruitment processes and labour market analysis and related topics conducted 4. At least 5 knowledge products and activities conducted and prepared for migrants and their families 5. At least 2 initiatives on skills development conducted | | | | 1. Five capacity building activities conducted 2. Two set of rules and regulations on labour migration are pending approval by SRC (Iraq and Afghanistan) 3. Five training or orientation modules developed | | | | |

# Annex VI: financial offer template

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item / Output** | **Specify units** | **Number of units** | **Price per unit in EUR  (without VAT)** | **VAT rate and other taxes applied (%), if applicable** | **Total Price in EUR  (with VAT), if applicable** | **Notes** |
|  | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d)= (a)\*(b)\*(c) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total price per service/product (excluding VAT)** | | | |  |  |  |
| **Total price per service/product (including VAT)** | | | | |  |  |

# annex vii Evaluation Matrix

All proposals can include an evaluation matrix. The evaluation matrix should include primary evaluation questions, any proposed sub-questions (suggestions below can be modified and changed), planned indicators and data sources for addressing each proposed question. It is not necessary, however, to include and adapt all questions in the evaluation matrix; the tenderer should include only those relevant to the proposed evaluation. The tenderer is encouraged to refine and adapt these questions to the priorities of the proposed evaluation.

**Sample Evaluation Matrix and Research Questions**

| **Evaluation Question** | **Sub-questions** | **Indicators** | **Method 1** | **Method 2** | **Method 3** | **Method 4** | **Method 5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevance** | | | | | | | |
| To what extent are the activities in line with the Silk Routes countries’ priorities, development goals and needs? | * If so, how? If not, why not? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coherence** | | | | | | | |
| To what extent has the intervention contributed to achieving EU migration objectives and Silk Routes Countries objectives? | * Which objectives have not been met in each project? * What factors contributed to their achievement/non-achievement? * How well positioned is each project or its results to achieve objectives over time? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** | | | | | | | |
| What progress has the project made towards achieving its planned objective(s), taking into account the national contexts and available funding? | * Which objectives have not been met in each project? * What factors contributed to their achievement/non-achievement? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent are there unexpected positive achievements that the intervention might not have planned for? What are the unexpected negative results? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency + EU added value** | | | | | | | |
| To what extent has the project received support and cooperation from government counterparts? | * In the EU? * In the Silk Routes Countries? * In Central Asian Countries? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** | | | | | | | |
| To what extent and under which conditions will the benefits and outputs of the project continue beyond the lifetime of the project? | * What conditions are needed to ensure achievements will be sustained? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What interventions/strategies are so far replicable or adaptable and have the potential for scale up? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **(Early signs of) Impact** | | | | | | | |
| To what extent can early signs of impact be documented at the time of evaluation? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. COM(2013) 686 final “Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation” - <http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf>; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", <http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf> ; SWD (2015)111 “Better Regulation Guidelines”, <http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf> ; COM(2017) 651 final ‘Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results’, <https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 “Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external ” - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\_cir.pdf. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. ICMPD is committed to compliance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data. Any personal data stated in or provided under this evaluation shall be treated confidential by the supplier and processed for the purpose of fulfilling this contract only. All personal data collected or processed shall be deleted by the supplier after the fulfilment of all the obligations under this contract.

   Transmission of personal data between the Contractor and ICMPD has to be technically secured against unwanted dissemination to or interception by unintended/unwanted parties. For communication via a mailing system it has to be ensured that transport encryption based on TLS (v.1.2 or higher) is being used. Wherever possible communication with end-to-end encryption is preferred. It must be ensured that only those who should be granted access have access with appropriate authentication services. Emails including personal data must not be sent via/to any private mail accounts. Web based transfer systems have to use HTTPS protocol based on TLS (v.1.2 or higher) encryption. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Add one column per each evaluator [↑](#footnote-ref-8)