

Terms of reference

Ex-post evaluation of the "Prevention of and fight against crime" 2007-2013 programme (ISEC) and the "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related risks" 2007-2013 programme (CIPS)

Request for services No 11

with a view to the assignment of a specific contract under the Framework Contract HOME/2015/EVAL/01/LOT 2

1. SUMMARY

The evaluation will examine the implementation of the "Prevention of and fight against crime" 2007-2013 programme (ISEC) and the "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related risks" 2007-2013 programme (CIPS) and assess their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU added value.

The legal basis for the evaluation of the ISEC programme is Article 14(4) of Regulation (EU) No 513/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 establishing, as part of the Internal Security Fund¹, the instrument for financial support for police cooperation, preventing and combating crime, and crisis management and repealing the Council decision No. 2007/125/JHA, and Article 15(2) and (3) of decision No. 2007/125/JHA of the Council of 12 February 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013, as part of the General Programme on Security and Safeguarding Liberties, the Specific Programme "Prevention of and fight against crime"².

The legal basis for the evaluation of the CIPS programme is Article 2(4) of Council Decision No 2015/457 of 17 March 2015 repealing Council Decision (EU, Euratom)³, and Article 14(2) and (3) of Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom establishing for the period 2007-2013, as part of General Programme on Security and Safeguarding Liberties, the Specific Programme "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related risks"⁴.

2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

2.1. Legal basis for the ISEC evaluation

According to Article 15(2) of Council Decision No 2007/125/JHA, "*the Commission shall ensure regular, independent and external evaluation of the Programme*".

¹ OJ L 150, 20.5.2014, p. 93.

² OJ L 58, 24.2.2007, p. 7.

³ OJ L 76, 20.3.2015, p. 1.

⁴ OJ L 58, 24.2.2007, p. 1.

According to Article 15(3) of the Decision, *"the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and the Council an ex-post evaluation report no later than 31 March 2015"*.

When Decision No 2007/125/JHA was repealed by Regulation (EU) No 513/2014, the obligation for the Commission to submit the ex-post evaluation report concerning the period 2007-2013 was included among the transitional provisions defined by Article 14(4) of the Regulation. The deadline for the submission of an ex-post evaluation report was extended to the end of 2015.

2.2. Legal basis for the CIPS evaluation

According to the Article 14(2) of Council Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom, *"the Commission shall ensure regular, independent and external evaluation of the Programme"*.

Article 14(3) of the Decision stipulated that *"the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and the Council an ex-post evaluation report no later than 31 March 2015"*.

When Council Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom was repealed by Council Decision No 2015/457, the obligation for the Commission to submit the CIPS ex-post evaluation report to the European Parliament and the Council was included in Article 2(4) of Decision No 2015/457 which stipulates that *"the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and to the Council, by 31 December 2015, a report on the results achieved and on quantitative aspects of the implementation of Decision 2007/124/EC, Euratom for the period from 2011 to 2013."*

However, as Article 14(3) of Council Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom does not specifically mention to cover only the 2011-2013 period by an ex-post evaluation report and as there are significant benefits in evaluating the whole programming period 2007-2013, in particular because the CIPS 2010 actions were only partially covered by the mid-term evaluation, the CIPS ex-post evaluation will cover the whole programming period 2007-2013.

2.3. Objective of the evaluation

This evaluation has the objective to examine the implementation of the ISEC and CIPS programmes and assess their relevance⁵, effectiveness⁶, efficiency⁷, coherence⁸ and EU added value⁹.

2.4. Ownership and use of the evaluation

The European Commission's Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs is the commissioning body of this evaluation, which will be used by the Directorate-General itself and by other Commission's departments.

⁵ Relevance: The extent to which intervention's objectives are pertinent to needs, problems and issues to be addressed.

⁶ Effectiveness: The extent to which objectives set are achieved.

⁷ Efficiency: The extent to which the desired effects are achieved at reasonable cost.

⁸ Coherence: The extent to which the intervention does not contradict other interventions with similar objectives.

⁹ EU added value: The extent to which EU funded interventions bring additional value compared to what could have been achieved with beneficiaries' resources.

The aim of the ex post evaluation is to analyse the results and the impact of the programmes. The evaluation reports will be widely shared within the EU Institutions and also published, thus feeding their results into the design of new programmes. Public consultations are carried out as part of the evaluation exercise.

Rights concerning the evaluation reports and their reproduction and publication will remain the property of the European Commission. No documents based, in whole or in part, upon the work undertaken in the context of this contract may be published except with the prior written approval of the European Commission.

The Commission (DG Migration and Home Affairs) will ensure that the evaluation results are disseminated. As part of the dissemination, the Commission will draft, on the basis of the evaluation report, a report on the implementation of the ISEC 2007-2013 programme and a report on the implementation of the CIPS 2007-2013 programme and submit them to the European Parliament and the Council. The evaluation results will be also communicated to the general public.

The publication of the deliverables will be accompanied by a judgment of the quality, carried out by the DG Migration and Home Affairs on the basis of criteria specified in section 11.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ISEC AND CIPS PROGRAMMES

3.1. Legal basis of the ISEC programme

The ISEC was established for the period 2007 to 2013 by Decision No 2007/125/JHA as part of the General Programme on Security and Safeguarding liberties.

3.2. Objectives of the ISEC programme

Article 2 of Decision No 2007/125/JHA defined the general objectives of the ISEC as follows:

1. The Programme shall contribute to a high level of security for citizens by preventing and combating crime, organised or otherwise, in particular terrorism, trafficking in persons and offences against children, illicit drug trafficking and illicit arms trafficking, corruption and fraud.
2. Without prejudice to the objectives and powers of the European Community, the general objectives of the Programme contribute to the development of the policies of the Union and of the Community.

Article 3(2) of Decision No 2007/125/JHA stipulates that the programme shall contribute to the following specific objectives:

- (a) To stimulate, promote and develop horizontal methods and tools necessary for strategically preventing and fighting crime and guaranteeing security and public order such as the work carried out in the European Union Crime Prevention Network, public-private partnerships, best practices in crime prevention, comparable statistics, applied criminology and an enhanced approach towards young offenders;

(b) To promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies, other national authorities and related Union bodies in respect of the priorities identified by the Council in particular as set out by the Europol's Organised Crime Threat Assessment;

(c) To promote and develop best practices for the protection and support witnesses; and

(d) To promote and develop best practices for the protection of crime victims.

Article 3(1) of the Decision defined also the following four themes for the ISEC:

(a) Crime prevention and criminology;

(b) Law enforcement;

(c) Protection and support to witnesses;

(d) Protection of victims.

3.3. Types of actions supported under the ISEC programme

According to Article 4(2) of Decision No 2007/125/JHA, financial support under the ISEC programme may have been provided for:

a) Actions improving operational cooperation and coordination (strengthening networking, mutual confidence and understanding, exchange and dissemination of information, experience and best practices);

b) Analytical, monitoring and evaluation activities,

c) Development and transfer of technology and methodology;

d) Training, exchange of staff and experts;

e) Awareness and dissemination activities.

3.4. Implementation modalities of the ISEC programme

The ISEC programme has been implemented via actions under the 2007-2013 Annual Work Programmes.

The ISEC Union financial support was implemented under the direct management mode: either via projects supported by grants awarded by the Commission or via contracts for services concluded following calls for tenders published by the Commission or via administrative arrangements with the Joint Research Centre (JRC).

3.5. Legal basis of the CIPS programme

The CIPS was established for the period 2007 to 2013 by Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom as part of General Programme on Security and Safeguarding Liberties.

3.6. Objectives of the CIPS programme

Article 3 of Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom defined the general objectives of the CIPS as follows:

1. The Programme shall contribute to support Member States' efforts to prevent, prepare for, and to protect people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security related incidents.
2. The Programme is intended to contribute to ensuring protection in the areas such as the crisis management, environment, public health, transport, research and technological development and economic and social cohesion, in the field of terrorism and other security related risks within the area of freedom, security and justice.

Specific objectives of the CIPS, corresponding to the general objectives, were defined by Article 4 of Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom as follows:

1. Within the general objectives, and unless covered by other financial instruments, the Programme shall stimulate, promote and develop measures on prevention, preparedness and consequence management based, inter alia, on comprehensive threat and risk assessments, subject to the supervision by the Member States and with due regard to existing Community competence in that matter, and aiming to preventing or reducing risks linked with terrorism and other security related risks.
2. With regard to prevention and preparedness of risks linked with terrorism and other security related risks the Programme aims at protecting people and critical infrastructure, in particular by:
 - (a) Stimulating, promoting, and supporting risk assessments on critical infrastructure, in order to upgrade security;
 - (b) Stimulating, promoting, and supporting the development of methodologies for the protection of critical infrastructure, in particular risk assessment methodologies;
 - (c) Promoting and supporting shared operational measures to improve security in cross-border supply chains, provided that the rules of competition within the internal market are not distorted;
 - (d) Promoting and supporting the development of security standards, and an exchange of know-how and experience on protection of people and critical infrastructure;
 - (e) Promoting and supporting Community wide coordination and cooperation on protection of critical infrastructure.

3.7. Types of actions supported under the CIPS programme

According to Article 5(2) of Decision No 2007/124/JHA, financial support under the CIPS programme may have been provided for:

- a) Actions on operational cooperation and coordination (strengthening networking, mutual confidence and understanding, development of contingency plans, exchange and dissemination of information, experience and best practices);
- b) Analytical, monitoring, evaluation and audit activities,
- c) Development and transfer of technology and methodology; particularly regarding information sharing and inter-operability,
- d) Training, exchange of staff and experts; and
- e) Awareness and dissemination activities.

3.8. Implementation modalities of the CIPS programme

The CIPS has been implemented via actions under the 2007-2013 Annual Work Programmes of the Commission.

The CIPS Community financial support was implemented under the direct management mode: either via projects supported by grants awarded by the Commission or via contracts for services concluded following the calls for tenders published by the Commission or via administrative arrangements with the JRC.

4. SCOPE

4.1. ISEC actions to be covered

All operational spending in 2007-2013 will be covered by the study. This includes:

Grants under the 2007-2013 annual work programmes

1. Action grants to co-finance specific initiatives awarded through open calls for proposals.
2. Action grants awarded through restricted call for proposals reserved to the public sector entities with which “framework partnerships agreements” have been established.
3. Operating grants aiming at supporting the activities of non-governmental organisations with a European dimension.
4. Direct awards which are action grants that may be awarded without a call for proposals to bodies with a “de jure” or “de facto” monopoly.

Procurement under the 2007-2013 annual work programmes

1. Public procurement contracts

2. Administrative arrangements with the Joint Research Centre (JRC)

4.2. CIPS actions to be covered

All operational spending in 2007-2013 will be covered by the study. This includes:

Grants under the 2007-2013 annual work programmes

1. Action grants to co-finance specific initiatives awarded through open calls for proposals.
2. Grants to standardization bodies.

Procurement under the 2007-2013 annual work programmes

1. Public procurement contracts
2. Administrative arrangements with the Joint Research Centre (JRC)

4.3. Other instruments to be considered

The evaluation will also have to consider (in particular in the context of the evaluation of the coherence):

- National policies of the Member States in the field of prevention of and fight against crime
- Activities of the EUROPOL
- Actions supported by any other EU financial instrument with a possible impact on the prevention of and fight against crime (Criminal Justice Support Programme – DG JUST, Hercule II Programme – OLAF, actions supported under the European Regional Development Fund, FP7 etc.)

The evaluation will consider whether the funds could have been better targeted and applied in a stronger integration of the fight against crime and terrorism at EU level. To this end, reference should be done to studies undertaken on the cost of non-Europe in the areas targeted by CIPS and ISEC, so as to carry out a more comprehensive assessment of effectiveness (Theme 2) and efficiency (Theme 3) of these programme.

4.4. Period covered by the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the period from January 2007 to 30 June 2016.

Some of the projects supported under the ISEC and CIPS programmes are unlikely to be finalized¹⁰ by 30 June 2016; as a result, final reports for these projects will not be available on time for the evaluation. However, unfinished projects should nevertheless be covered by the evaluations as much as possible, using other data sources (interim reports, when available,

¹⁰ Finalized meaning final report received and pre-info letter sent to the beneficiary.

primary data collection) for the evaluation of their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU added value.

The total number of projects covered by this period is approximately 500. For the purpose of this evaluation, the contractor shall propose a methodology to select the sample of projects, taking into account at least the distribution of Member States in terms of geography and size; projects representing different policy fields; value of the projects.

4.5. Geographical coverage

The evaluation will cover all 28 EU Member States¹¹ participating in the ISEC and CIPS programmes.

5. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

The ex-post evaluation of the ISEC and CIPS 2007-2013 programmes is the second evaluation of the ISEC and CIPS programmes. In accordance with Article 15(3)(b) of Decision No 2007/125/JHA, a mid-term evaluation of the ISEC and CIPS was carried out in 2011¹².

The Commission intends to carry-out an internet based public open consultation on the ISEC and CIPS programmes in 2016. The purpose of the consultation will be to collect the opinions of the general public on the importance / EU added value of the ISEC and CIPS funding for the security in Europe.

6. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Replying to the evaluation questions is the core of the evaluation work and the replies will constitute the main part of the final reports.

The answer to each evaluation question must be exclusively based on evidence and rigorous analysis. Different types of evaluation methods (quantitative and qualitative) and data sources must be combined to formulate the answers. The answers shall define key terms of the question, identify indicators and judgment criteria used for answering the question and fully disclose the reasoning followed in the analysis.

The evaluation questions are grouped under the following five evaluation themes: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU added value.

A) Evaluation questions for ISEC

Theme 1 Relevance

¹¹ Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.

¹² http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/fundings/pdf/com2011-318_final_16062011_en.pdf

A.1 To what extent did the objectives and the actual results of the ISEC programme correspond to the needs related to the prevention of and fight against crime?

Theme 2 Effectiveness

A2. Did the ISEC programme contribute to better security for citizens and if so, to what extent? To what extent did the ISEC programme contribute in the areas of preventing and combating crime, organised or otherwise, in particular terrorism, trafficking in persons and offences against children, illicit drug trafficking and illicit arms trafficking, corruption and fraud?

A3. To what extent did the ISEC programme contribute to the development of the policies of the Union and of the Community?

A4. To what extent did the ISEC programme contribute to promotion and development of horizontal methods and tools necessary for strategically preventing and fighting crime and guaranteeing security and public order, such as the work carried out in the European Union Crime Prevention Network, public-private partnerships, best practices in crime prevention, comparable statistics, applied criminology and an enhanced approach towards young offenders?

A5. To what extent did the ISEC programme contribute to promoting and development of coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies, other national authorities and related Union bodies in respect of the priorities identified by the Council, in particular as set out by the Europol's Organised Crime Threat Assessment?

A6. To what extent did the ISEC programme contribute to promoting and development of best practices for the protection of and support to witnesses?

A7. To what extent did the ISEC programme contribute to promoting and development of best practices for the protection of crime victims?

Theme 3 Efficiency

A8. To what extent were the results of the ISEC programme achieved at a reasonable cost in terms of financial and human resources deployed¹³? What kind of initiatives or approaches were adopted to simplify access to and implementation of the actions funded by the programmes?

Theme 4 Coherence

¹³ This question should be addressed, in particular, taking into account the budget management mode of the ISEC

A9. To what extent was the ISEC programme coherent with actions related to the prevention of and fights against crime supported by other EU financial instruments and/or by national resources of the Member States, and to what extent is it possible to identify synergies between the results of actions funded under the ISEC Programme and the results of similar actions supported under other EU Programmes (such as the Hercule Programmes), that were carried out by different organisational entities in the Member States and/or third countries?

Theme 5 EU added value

A10. To what extent would the beneficiaries under the ISEC programme (Member States, Universities, Institutes, Associations, etc.) be able to carry out the activities necessary for the implementation of the EU policies in the field of the prevention of and fight against crime without the support of the ISEC programme?

B) Evaluation questions for CIPS

Theme 1 Relevance

B.1 To what extent did the objectives and the results of the CIPS programme correspond to the needs related to the prevention, preparedness and consequence management of terrorism and other security-related risks?

Theme 2 Effectiveness

B2. To what extent did the CIPS programme contribute to support Member States' efforts to prevent, prepare for, and to protect people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security-related incident?

B3. To what extent did the CIPS programme contribute to protection in areas such as crisis management, environment, public health, transport, research and technological development, in the field of terrorism and other security-related risks?

B4. To what extent did the CIPS programme contribute to the protection of people and critical infrastructure, in the framework of the prevention and preparedness of risks linked with terrorism and other security related risks, by:

- a) Promoting and supporting risk assessments on critical infrastructure, in order to upgrade security;*
- b) Promoting and supporting the development of methodologies for the protection of critical infrastructure, in particular risk assessment methodologies;*
- c) Supporting shared operational measures to improve security in cross-border supply chains, in compliance with EU regulations on competition within the internal market;*

- d) *Promoting and supporting the development of security standards, and exchange of know-how and experience on protection of people and critical infrastructure;*
- e) *Promoting and supporting Union-wide coordination and cooperation on protection of critical infrastructure?*

B5. To what extent did the CIPS programme contribute to promoting and supporting exchange of know-how and experience related to the consequence management, in order to establish best practices so as to coordinate the response measures and to achieve cooperation between various actors in crisis management and security actions?

B6. To what extent did the CIPS programme contribute to promoting joint exercises and practical scenarios in consequence management, including security and safety components, in order to enhance coordination and cooperation between relevant actors at the European level?

Theme 3 Efficiency

B7. To what extent were the results of the CIPS programme achieved at a reasonable cost in terms of financial and human resources deployed¹⁴? What kind of initiatives or approaches were adopted to simplify access to and implementation of the actions funded by the programmes?

Theme 4 Coherence

B8. To what extent was the CIPS programme coherent with other actions related to the prevention, preparedness and consequence management of terrorism and other security related risks supported by other EU financial instruments and /or by national resources of the Member States, and to what extent is it possible to identify synergies between the results of actions funded under the CIPS Programme and the results of similar actions supported under other EU Programmes (such as the Hercule Programmes), that were carried out by different organisational entities in the Member States and/or third countries?,

Theme 5 EU added value

B9. To what extent would the beneficiaries of the CIPS programme (Member States, Universities, Associations, other bodies) have been able to carry out the activities necessary for the implementation of the EU policies in the field of the prevention, preparedness and consequence management of terrorism and other security related risks without the support of the CIPS programme?

¹⁴ This question should be addressed, in particular, taking into account the budget management mode for the CIPS.

7. EVALUATION TASKS AND METHODOLOGY

The contractor is requested to carry out, in four stages, the following tasks:

Stage 1 (approx. 1,5 months)

- Task 1a: Draft a short introduction** stating the purpose and scope of the evaluation for ISEC. The introduction shall not exceed 1 page.
- Task 1b: Draft a short introduction** stating the purpose and scope of the evaluation for CIPS. The introduction shall not exceed 1 page.
- Task 2a: Draft a chapter presenting/reproducing the evaluation questions** defined in section 6 for ISEC.
- Task 2b: Draft a chapter presenting/reproducing the evaluation questions** defined in section 6 for CIPS.
- Task 3a: Draft a detailed analysis of the evaluation questions for ISEC** and identify indicators to be used for answering them, building on and further developing the analysis presented in the contractor's offer. Key terms of the evaluation questions shall be defined by the contractor.
- Task 3b: Draft a detailed analysis of the evaluation questions for CIPS** and identify indicators to be used for answering them, building on and further developing the analysis presented in the contractor's offer. Key terms of the evaluation questions shall be defined by the contractor.
- Task 4a: Define the methodological approach to the evaluation for ISEC**, building on and further developing the methodology presented in the contractor's offer. This will include a description of the methods to be used in the evaluation and their limitations. The reasoning followed in determining the methodological approach, including the underlying hypotheses, has to be explained. This section will also explain how the collection and analysis of primary data and the desk research will allow to answering to all the evaluation questions.
- Task 4b: Define the methodological approach to the evaluation for CIPS**, building on and further developing the methodology presented in the contractor's offer. This will include a description of the methods to be used in the evaluation and their limitations. The reasoning followed in determining the methodological approach, including the underlying hypotheses, has to be explained. This section will also explain how the collection and analysis of primary data and the desk research will allow to answering to all the evaluation questions.

Task 5a: Define and create the evaluation tools necessary for the collection of primary data needed to answer to the evaluation questions **for ISEC**. For example: interview guides and templates for surveys; criteria for selecting the respondents to the questionnaires and/or surveys; the list of the bodies and people to be contacted. If modelling is used, define the scope and methodology for the simulations based on model(s) and the related data needs, and provide a detailed description of these tools, including their limitations and the contribution to answering the evaluation questions.

Task 5b: Define and create the evaluation tools necessary for the collection of primary data needed to answer to the evaluation questions **for CIPS**. For example: interview guides and templates for survey/s; criteria for selecting the respondents to the questionnaires and/or surveys; the list of the bodies and people to be contacted. If modelling is used, define the scope and methodology for the simulations based on model(s) and the related data needs. Provide as well a detailed description of these tools, including their limitations and the contribution to answering the evaluation questions.

The evaluation tools have to be validated by the Commission before the start of the primary data collection (tasks 11a, 11b).

Task 6a: Draft a descriptive chapter on the background of the ISEC 2007-2013. Provide a brief description of the ISEC (legal basis; the different implementation modalities with the different authorities involved in the management), its objectives and the needs the ISEC aimed to address. The information shall be summarized visually in an Intervention Logic diagram. In addition, a description of the policy context shall be provided, as well as a description of the baseline for the implementation of the ISEC 2007-2013 actions. The chapter shall not exceed 6 pages.

Task 6b: Draft a descriptive chapter on the background of the CIPS 2007-2013 actions. Provide a brief description of the CIPS (legal basis; the different implementation modalities with the different authorities involved in the management), its objectives and the needs the CIPS aimed to address. The information shall be summarized visually in an Intervention Logic diagram. The analysis of the needs shall take into account the relevant regulatory framework. In addition, a description of the policy context shall be provided, as well as a description of the baseline for the implementation of the CIPS 2007-2013 actions. The chapter shall not exceed 6 pages

Task 7a: Draft a detailed time schedule for the evaluation of ISEC.

Task 7b: Draft a detailed time schedule for the evaluation of CIPS.

Task 8a: Compile the inception report for reviewing ISEC including the outputs of tasks 1a-7a, and submit the report to the Commission.

Task 8b: Compile the inception report for reviewing for CIPS, including the outputs of tasks 1b-7b, and submit the report to the Commission

Task 9a: Revise the inception report for ISEC in line with the comments provided by the Commission and re-submit it to the Commission (if relevant) **for acceptance**

Task 9b: Revise the inception report for CIPS in line with the comments provided by the Commission and re-submit it to the Commission (if relevant) **for acceptance**

Stage 2 (approx. 4,5 months)

Task 10a: Desk research for ISEC. Collect and analyse at least the following documents:

- Decision No 2007/125/JHA;
- Regulation (EU) No 513/2014;
- Policy related documents on security area: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/index_en.htm
- Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 ISEC Union financial support
- Calls for proposals under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 for ISEC
- Calls for tenders under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 for ISEC
- Awarded projects for the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013
- Final Report for the projects awarded under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013
- Final results of the tender projects under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013
- The results of the administrative arrangement with the Joint Research Centre
- Reports on the audits carried-out on the ISEC 2007-2013 annual programmes;
- Final report of the Evaluation of "Prevention and Fight against Crime" and "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks" Programs - JLS/2010/ISEC-CIPS/001-F4
- Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the mid-term evaluation of the Framework Programme "Security and Safeguarding Liberties" (2007-2013) (COM(2011) 318)
- EUROPOL Reports
- Eurostat statistics
- Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and Council "Report on the achievement of the objectives of the Hercule II Programme" (COM(2015)221 final) as well as a sample of actions (and beneficiaries) funded under the Hercule Programmes

Task 10b: Desk research for CIPS. Collect and analyse at least the following documents:

- Decision No 2007/124/EC, Euratom;

- Policy related documents on security area: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/index_en.htm
- Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 CIPS the Community financial support
- Calls for Proposals under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 for CIPS
- Calls for tenders under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 for CIPS
- Awarded projects under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013
- Final Reports for the projects awarded under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013
- Final results of the tender projects under the Annual Work Programmes for the 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013
- The results of the administrative arrangement with the Joint Research Centre
- Reports on the audits carried-out on the CIPS 2007-2013 annual programmes;
- Final report of the Evaluation of "Prevention and Fight against Crime" and "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks" Programs - JLS/2010/ISEC-CIPS/001-F4
- Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the mid-term evaluation of the Framework Programme "Security and Safeguarding Liberties" (2007-2013) (COM(2011) 318)
- EUROPOL Reports
- Eurostat statistics
- Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and Council "Report on the achievement of the objectives of the Hercule II Programme" (COM(2015)221 final) as well as a sample of actions (and beneficiaries) funded under the Hercule Programmes

Task 11a: Collection and analysis of primary data on the ISEC implementation. The appropriate data collection methods (e.g. interviews, surveys, focus groups) and analytical tools proposed by the tenderer in the bid and further developed under task 4a should be used. The evaluation tools developed by the contractor under task 5a may be used only after validation by the Commission.

Task 11b: Collection and analysis of primary data on the CIPS implementation. The appropriate data collection methods (e.g. interviews, surveys, focus groups) and analytical tools proposed by the tenderer in the bid and further developed under task 4b should be used. The evaluation tools developed by the contractor under task 5b may be used only after validation by the Commission.

Task 12a: Analysis of data on ISEC received following an internet based public open consultation carried out by the Commission. The Commission intends to carry-out a public consultation on the ISEC (see section 5). The data received shall be analysed. The analysis shall cover an overview of the profile of respondents (distribution across the Member States and third countries, distribution by stakeholder category), analysis of the responses (incl. the relevance of the contributions, similarities or differences between responses etc.).

Task 12b: Analysis of data on CIPS received following an internet based public open consultation carried out by the Commission. The Commission intends to carry-out a public consultation on the CIPS (see section 5). The data received shall be analysed. The analysis shall cover an overview of the profile of respondents (distribution across the Member States and third countries, distribution by stakeholder category), analysis of the responses (incl. the relevance of the contributions, similarities or differences between responses etc.).

Task 13a: Draft a descriptive chapter summarizing the implementation of the ISEC 2007-2013 actions and their main results, on the basis of the outputs of tasks 10a-11a. The description shall include the presentation on the financial implementation of the programme. The chapter shall not exceed 10 pages. The use of visual supports (table, graphics...) is encouraged.

Task 13b : Draft a descriptive chapter summarizing the implementation of the CIPS 2007-2013 actions and their main results, on the basis of the outputs of tasks 10b-11b. The description shall include the presentation on the financial implementation of the programme. The chapter shall not exceed 10 pages. The use of visual supports (table, graphics...) is encouraged.

Task 14a: Draft answers to the 10 evaluation questions specified in section 6 for ISEC (questions A1-A10). The replies to the 10 evaluation questions must be based on evidence acquired during the implementation of tasks 10a, 11a and 12a. Each answer must include a definition of key terms of the question, based on the output of task 3a, identify indicators and information sources used for answering it and fully disclose the reasoning followed in the analysis and judgment. Different types of evaluation methods (quantitative and qualitative) and data sources must be combined to formulate the answers. The replies to the evaluation questions shall be structured by the evaluation themes (relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; coherence; EU added value). The chapter with the evaluation findings / replies to the evaluation questions shall not exceed 50 pages.

Task 14b: Draft answers to the 9 evaluation questions specified in section 6 for CIPS (questions B1-B9). The replies to the 9 evaluation questions must be based on evidence acquired during the implementation of tasks 10b, 11b and 12b. Each answer must include a definition of key terms of the question, based on the output of task 3b, identify indicators and information sources used for answering it and fully disclose the reasoning followed in the analysis and judgment. Different types of evaluation methods (quantitative and qualitative) and data sources must be combined to formulate the answers. The replies to the evaluation questions shall be structured by the evaluation themes (relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; coherence; EU added value). The chapter with the evaluation findings / replies to the evaluation questions shall not exceed 50 pages.

Task 15a: Draft an overview of the progress of the evaluation and the methodology used for ISEC. The overview shall describe the methodological approach actually applied for the evaluation and provide information on the evaluation

process. The description shall include the output of task 4a, revised in line with the actual situation. Any limitations on the reliability of the data shall be disclosed and mitigating measures presented. Any difficulties encountered in carrying out the evaluation (including deviations from the planning as elaborated under task 7a) and solutions proposed to solve them shall be presented.

Task 15b: Draft an overview of the progress of the evaluation and the methodology used for CIPS. The overview shall describe the methodological approach actually applied for the evaluation and provide information on the evaluation process. The description shall include the output of task 4b, revised in line with the actual situation. Any limitations on the reliability of the data shall be disclosed and mitigating measures presented. Any difficulties encountered in carrying out the evaluation (including deviations from the planning as elaborated under task 7b) and solutions proposed to solve them shall be presented.

Task 16a: Compile the interim report for reviewing for ISEC comprising the outputs of tasks 1a, 2a, 6a, 13a, 14a and 15a and submit it to the Commission. The output of task 12a shall be presented as an annex to the report.

Task 16b: Compile the interim report for reviewing for CIPS comprising the outputs of tasks 1b, 2b, 6b, 13b, 14b and 15b and submit it to the Commission. The output of task 12b shall be presented as an annex to the report.

Task 17a: Revise the interim report for ISEC in line with the comments provided by the Commission and re-submit it to the Commission (if relevant) **for acceptance**

Task 17b: Revise the interim report for CIPS in line with the comments provided by the Commission and re-submit it to the Commission (if relevant) **for acceptance**

Stage 3 (approx. 1 month)

Task 18a: Draft conclusions on ISEC. The contractor shall provide an overall judgement on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and the EU added value of the ISEC 2007-2013 programme, based on the outputs of task 14a. The conclusions shall not exceed 4 pages.

Task 18b: Draft conclusions on CIPS. The contractor shall provide an overall judgement on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and the EU added value of the CIPS 2007-2013 programme, based on the outputs of task 14b. The conclusions shall not exceed 4 pages.

Task 19a: Draft recommendations related to ISEC. The recommendations must correspond to the conclusions (output of task 18a) and be based on the analysis carried out under task 14a. The recommendations shall not exceed 2 pages.

Task 19b: Draft recommendations related to CIPS. The recommendations must correspond to the conclusions (output of task 18b) and be based on the analysis carried out under task 14b. The recommendations shall not exceed 2 pages.

Task 20a: Draft a chapter on the evaluation methodology and process followed (ISEC). This chapter shall be based on the output of task 15a, revised as appropriate. This chapter shall not exceed 4 pages.

Task 20b: Draft a chapter on the evaluation methodology and process followed (CIPS). This chapter shall be based on the output of task 15b, revised as appropriate. This chapter shall not exceed 4 pages.

Task 21a: Prepare an abstract for EC review for ISEC of no more than 200 words.

Task 21b: Prepare an abstract for EC review for CIPS of no more than 200 words.

Task 22a: Prepare an executive summary for EC review for ISEC of maximum 6 pages. The executive summary shall include a very brief presentation of the evaluation work and the methods used, together with a summary of the conclusions and recommendations arising from the exercise.

Task 22b: Prepare an executive summary for EC review for CIPS of maximum 6 pages. The executive summary shall include a very brief presentation of the evaluation work and the methods used, together with a summary of the conclusions and recommendations arising from the exercise.

Task 22bis a: Prepare a synthetic power point presentation for EC review summarizing the evaluation for ISEC

Task 22bis b: Prepare a synthetic power point presentation for EC review summarizing the evaluation for CIPS.

Task 23a: Compile the final report for EC review for ISEC and submit the report to the Commission.

The final report for reviewing has to include:

- The following standard disclaimer:
"The document has been prepared for the European Commission however it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein".
- Table of contents;
- Executive summary and the abstract (outputs of tasks 21a and 22a– max. 6 pages);
- Introduction (output of task 1a – max. 1 page);

- Descriptive chapter on the background of ISEC (output of task 6a – max. 6 pages);
- Chapter presenting the evaluation questions (output of task 2a – max. 2 pages);
- Chapter on the evaluation methodology and process (output of task 20a – max. 4 pages);
- Descriptive chapter on the implementation of ISEC (output of task 13a – max. 10 pages);
- Chapter presenting the evaluation findings / answers to the 10 ISEC evaluation questions (output of task 14a – max. 50 pages);
- Conclusions (output of task 18a – max. 4 pages)
- Recommendations (output of task 19a – max. 2 pages);
- Separate Annex with the analysis of the responses to the internet based public consultation (output of task 12a)

The report shall respect the requirements specified in the annexed template for the evaluation final reports, with the exception of the evaluation themes in chapter 7 of the report (Answers to the Evaluation Questions). The answers to the evaluation questions shall be structured according to the following evaluation themes: 1. Relevance; 2. Effectiveness; 3. Efficiency; 4. Coherence; 5. EU Added Value. The graphic requirements of the template (including the cover page) must be respected.

The report must be drafted in a clear and reader-friendly language in English. The presentation of the text, tables and graphs has to be clear and complete and correspond to commonly recognised standards for publication.

The report (without the annexes) shall not exceed 85 pages.

Statistical and background information may be presented in annexes of the report, but the main report must not contain references to the annexes.

Task 23b: Compile the final report for reviewing for CIPS and submit the report to the Commission.

The final report for reviewing has to include:

- The following standard disclaimer:

“The document has been prepared for the European Commission however it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein”.
- Table of contents;
- Executive summary and the abstract (outputs of tasks 21b and 22b– max. 6 pages);
- Introduction (output of task 1b – max. 1 page);

- Descriptive chapter on the background of CIPS (output of task 6b – max. 6 pages);
- Chapter presenting the evaluation questions (output of task 2b – max. 2 pages);
- Chapter on the evaluation methodology and process (output of task 20b – max. 4 pages);
- Descriptive chapter on the implementation of CIPS (output of task 13b – max. 10 pages);
- Chapter presenting the evaluation findings / answers to the 9 CIPS evaluation questions (output of task 14b – max. 50 pages);
- Conclusions (output of task 18b – max. 4 pages)
- Recommendations (output of task 19b – max. 2 pages);
- Separate Annex with the analysis of the responses to the internet based public consultation (output of task 12b)

The report shall respect the requirements specified in the annexed template for the evaluation final reports, with the exception of the evaluation themes in chapter 7 of the report (Answers to the Evaluation Questions). The answers to the evaluation questions shall be structured according to the following evaluation themes: 1. Relevance; 2. Effectiveness; 3. Efficiency; 4. Coherence; 5. EU Added Value. The graphic requirements of the template (including the cover page) must be respected.

The report must be drafted in a clear and easily understandable language in English. The presentation of the text, tables and graphs has to be clear and complete and correspond to commonly recognised standards for publication.

The report (without the annexes) shall not exceed 85 pages.

Statistical and background information may be presented in annexes of the report, but the main report must not contain any references to the annexes.

Stage 4 (approx. 1 month)

Task 24a: Revise the final report for ISEC addressing the comments provided by the Commission.

Task 24b: Revise the final report for CIPS addressing the comments provided by the Commission.

Task 25a: Prepare the abstract for ISEC (output of task 21a, revised to address the comments of the Commission, if relevant) **as a stand-alone document in English and French.**

Task 25b: Prepare the abstract for CIPS (output of task 21b, revised to address the comments of the Commission, if relevant) **as a stand-alone document in English and French.**

Task 26b: Prepare the executive summary for CIPS (output of task 22b, revised to address the comments of the Commission, if relevant) **as a stand-alone document in English and French.**

Task 26b: Prepare the executive summary for CIPS (output of task 22b, revised to address the comments of the Commission, if relevant) **as a stand-alone document in English and French.**

Task 26bis a: Prepare a synthetic power point presentation summarizing the evaluation for ISEC in English

Task 26bis b: Prepare a synthetic power point presentation summarizing the evaluation for CIPS in English.

Task 27a: Compile the final deliverable for ISEC and submit it to the Commission **for acceptance.**

The final deliverable shall consist of:

- 1) The final report with annexes (in English) structured exactly in the same way as the final report for reviewing (task 23a), but it shall incorporate changes agreed with the steering group as much as possible. When the content of the final report is accepted by the Commission, the contractor shall submit the report printed on paper (one copy in colour) and as electronic document (CD/DVD or USB).
- 2) An abstract in English and French (output of task 25a).
- 3) An executive summary in English and French (output of task 26a).
- 4) A synthetic power point presentation in English (output of task 26bis a).

Task 27b: Compile the final deliverable for CIPS and submit it to the Commission **for acceptance.**

The final deliverable shall consist of:

- 1) The final report with annexes (in English) structured exactly in the same way as the final report for reviewing (task 23b), but it shall incorporate changes agreed with the steering group as much as possible. When the content of the final report is accepted by the Commission, the contractor shall submit the report printed on paper (one copy in colour) and as electronic document (CD/DVD or USB).
- 2) An abstract in English and French (output of task 25b).
- 3) An executive summary in English and French (output of task 26b).

4) A synthetic power point presentation in English (output of task 26bis b)

8. ORGANISATION AND WORK PLAN

8.1. Overall management of the contract

Responsibility and management of the evaluation remain with the European Commission (Directorate General for Migration and Home Affairs). Under the coordination of the appointed project manager, a steering group will monitor the evaluation and follow the evaluation process, assess and decide on acceptance or rejection of the different reports that the selected contractor will submit. It will also be instrumental in the provision of information to the selected contractor. The contractor should take into account the comments and recommendations of the steering group and provide justification when some comments or recommendation are not taken into account. The main counterpart of the contractor will be the appointed evaluation manager in unit E2 who will liaise with the steering group and keep it informed on the progress of the work.

The contractor will be required, and should be prepared, to attend four meetings with the steering group at the Commission's premises in Brussels in order to monitor the evaluation exercise, in accordance with the timetable described in section below. Two additional ad hoc technical meetings in Brussels with the project manager (DG HOME unit E2) will be called by the Commission, with at least 5 working days advance notice, and when considered necessary during the period of validity of the contract.

8.2. Timetable for the work and deliverables

The work must be completed within **8 months** from the signature of the contract. The contractor is expected to start the work immediately after the contract has been signed.

The stages and the reports mentioned in the table below are those detailed under Section 7 Evaluation Tasks and Methodology:

Indicative timetable – subject to change

	DATE	MILESTONES	CONTENT
	T-Day zero	Signature of the contract	
Inception Report	T+Week 3	1 st /kick-off meeting and inception report for review	The contractor presents the inception report and raises specific questions or needs for complementary information. The meeting is used to discuss and clarify the tasks and the approach from the start, including the proposed working plan.
	T+Week 6	Inception report for acceptance	The contractor sends the inception report after integrating /taking into account /addressing all corrections and comments received
Interim Report	T+Week 21	Interim report for review	The contractor sends the interim report.
		2 nd meeting (within 10 days from	The interim report is presented by the

		the sending of the interim report)	contractor and discussed. The Commission provides preliminary comments.
		COM feedback on the interim report within 10 working days of receipt	The commission provides additional comments on the interim report.
	T+Week 27	Interim report for acceptance	The contractor sends the interim report after integrating /taking into account /addressing all corrections and comments received. (normally 20 days after the receipt of the DG HOME comments)
Final Report	T+Week 28	³ th meeting	The reviewed interim report is presented by the contractors and discussed in view of drawing the conclusions and recommendations for the Final report.
	T+Week 29	Final report for review	The contractor sends the final report.
		⁴ th meeting (within 10 days from the sending of the final report)	The final report is presented by the contractors and discussed.
		COM feedback on the final report within 10 working days of receipt	The commission provides additional comments on the final report.
	T+Week 34	Final report for acceptance	Within 20 days the contractor sends the final report after integrating/taking into account /addressing all corrections and comments received.

8.3. Physical location at which services have to be performed

The place of work will be at the contractor's premises. The contractor is also expected to carry out field work in different Member States. The meetings with the project manager and the steering group will take place at the designated Commission offices in Brussels.

9. DELIVERABLES

The timing and the contents of the deliverables to be submitted by the contractor are described in Sections 7 and 8.2.

Each deliverable will be examined by the steering group, which may ask for additional information or propose changes in order to redirect and/or deepen the work if necessary.

Deliverables must be accepted by the Commission. This is of particular importance for the deliverables to which a payment is linked.

All deliverables must be submitted by e-mail (to HOME-NOTIFICATIONS-E2@ec.europa.eu and HOME-FUNDS-EVALUATIONS@ec.europa.eu) and in an electronic format compatible with the Commission's computer facilities: MS-Word for texts, MS-Excel for tables and figures¹⁵.

¹⁵ MS-Office or in an equivalent format compatible with the Commission's computer facilities.

Once the content of the final deliverables is accepted by the Commission, it must be submitted also as follows:

a) Paper version (printed in colour):

- One copy of the final reports, with annexes submitted as separate documents (in English);
- One copy of the abstracts in English and French;
- One copy of the executive summaries in English and French.

b) Electronic form: one copy on CD or DVD or USB data storage device for reproduction, containing the final reports and all the annexes (in English), the abstracts in English and French and the executive summaries in English and French.

10. BUDGET

The maximum amount available for this evaluation is **300 000 €**.

11. QUALITY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The overall quality of the evaluation will be assessed by the European Commission on the basis of the following criteria

- Relevance;
- Appropriate methods;
- Reliable data;
- Sound analysis;
- Credible findings;
- Valid conclusions;
- Useful recommendations;
- Clarity.

Please also see the CHECKLIST – Quality Assessment for Final Evaluation Reports (Annex II).

12. INFORMATION SOURCES

The documents referred to under the tasks 10a and 10b which are not publicly available will be provided by the Commission upon the signature of the contract.

ANNEX I TEMPLATE FOR THE EVALUATION FINAL REPORT

ANNEX II CHECKLIST – QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS

ANNEX III LIST OF THE ISEC AND CIPS PROJECTS TO BE FINALISED BY 30 JUNE 2016