



Technical Annex
to the request for service under
Framework contract n° JUST/2015/PR/01/0003 on
Supply of Impact Assessment, Evaluation and Evaluation related services in
the policy areas under the responsibility of DG Justice and Consumers –
Lot 1

Request for service number - 2019/08

DG HOME Ref. HOME/2019/ISFP/FW/CRIM/0014

Terms of reference for the evaluation of the European Crime Prevention Network

CONTENTS

1.	BACKGROUND OF THE REQUEST	3
2.	CONTRACT OBJECTIVE	4
3.	TASKS	5
3.1.	Main task: evaluation of the EUCPN and answering the evaluation questions.....	5
3.2.	Sub-tasks for data collection and analysis.....	6
3.2.1.	Sub-Task 1: Developing the evaluation framework.....	6
3.2.2.	Sub-task 2: Data collection and analysis	6
3.2.3.	Sub-task 3: Literature review	7
3.2.4.	Sub-task 4: Consultation – interviews and surveys.....	7
3.2.5.	Sub-task 5: Case studies	8
4.	EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	8
4.1.	Effectiveness	8
4.2.	Efficiency	9
4.3.	Relevance	9
4.4.	Coherence.....	9
4.5.	European Added Value	10
5.	METHODOLOGICAL GUIDELINES.....	10
5.1.	Scope of the study	10
5.2.	Methodology	11
5.3.	Quality requirements	13
5.4.	Risks	13

5.5.	Graphic requirements	13
6.	DELIVERABLES AND ORGANISATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS	14
6.1.	Deliverables.....	14
6.1.1.	Services and/or products to be provided	14
6.1.2.	Inception report	15
6.1.3.	Interim reports	15
6.1.4.	Final report	16
6.1.5.	Format	17
6.1.6.	Approval of the reports.....	18
6.1.7.	Use of results	18
6.2.	Organisational arrangements.....	18
6.2.1.	Timing of meetings and reports.....	19
6.2.2.	Duration of the tasks and of the contract.....	20
6.2.3.	Composition of the team	20
6.3.	Communication and coordination requirements	20
7.	PRICE.....	20
8.	TENDERING PROCEDURE	20
8.1.	Submission of the tenders.....	21
8.1.1.	Deadline.....	21
8.1.2.	Questions on terms of reference.....	21
8.2.	Content of the tenders.....	21
8.3.	Award criteria.....	22
	ANNEX I – AWARD CRITERIA	23
	ANNEX II – QUALITY ASSESSMENT	25

1. BACKGROUND OF THE REQUEST

Crime prevention is an important pillar of a comprehensive internal security policy and can contribute to citizens' safety and security in the European Union. The Lisbon Treaty mentions crime prevention among the key building blocks to establish and maintain an area of freedom, security and Justice in Art. 2.

The European Crime Prevention Network (EUCPN or Network) was set up in 2001 by the Council Decision 2001/427/JHA¹ of the Council of the European Union, which was repealed and replaced in 2009 by Council Decision 2009/902/JHA². Its main objective is to develop a platform for the Member States to exchange knowledge and best practices in the field of crime prevention, e.g. by disseminating knowledge on crime prevention and supporting crime prevention activities at national and local level. The Network has – for example – developed prevention campaigns in the area of organised property crime. It also regularly collects best practices on certain crime phenomena from Member States and publishes Policy Papers and Crime Prevention Toolboxes on best practises to prevent such crime. Recent examples include the Toolbox on community policing that was drafted jointly with CEPOL (European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training) and Toolbox on preventing fraud against individuals.³ The EUCPN's work is guided by its Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020)⁴. The latter has set four overarching goals for the Network, namely:

- a) To be a point of reference for the target groups of the Network.
- b) To disseminate qualitative knowledge on crime prevention.
- c) To support crime prevention activities at national and local level.
- d) To contribute to the EU policy and strategy of crime prevention and to contribute to various aspects of crime prevention at EU level in respect of the strategic priorities of EU.

The EUCPN is chaired by the Member State holding the Rotating Presidency of the Council of the European Union. Since 2009, the Network has been supported by a full-time secretariat, which is hosted by the Belgian Ministry of the Interior and funded by the European Commission. The secretariat performs administrative duties for the Network but is also engaged in research, drafting of policy documents and the planning and implementation of prevention campaigns. It can also represent the network vis-à-vis third parties (e.g. at conferences or by participating in the EU Policy Cycle on serious international crime).

Over the last years, the Network has undergone key changes. For the first time, it has aligned its crime prevention activities with the priorities of the EU Policy Cycle on serious international crime 2018-2021 and it has participated in operational actions in 2018. 2017 also

¹ Council Decision 2001/427/JHA

² Council Decision 2009/902/JHA

³ <https://eucpn.org/knowledge-center>

⁴ <https://eucpn.org/document/eucpn-multiannual-strategy-2016-2020><https://eucpn.org/document/eucpn-multiannual-strategy-2016-2020>

saw an increase in staff at the secretariat to cope with the additional workload and intensify research as well as communication activities. Moreover, the Network's budget, which is funded through a direct grant of the 2017 Internal Security Fund - Police annual work programme⁵, has been increased in the last grant agreement between the European Commission and the Network.

When the Network was last evaluated in 2012, the analysis found the Network "has proven itself to be an increasingly useful instrument to support policymakers at EU and national levels and also with a considerable potential to create added value at local level"⁶. The evaluation showed positive results but also pointed out further improvements needed in terms of performance, impact, added value, organisation and governance. One of the recommendations from the last evaluation of the EUCPN was to re-evaluate the Network's activities after several years.

In the second half of 2020, the Network will adopt its next Multi-Annual Strategy (2021-2025). It is expected that if the Commission's evaluation of the actions undertaken under the current strategy is conducted now, the conclusions and recommendations will feed the next strategy and thus contribute to a comprehensive European crime prevention policy.

In its evaluation the Commission will assess, whether the current policy framework of the EUCPN, Council Decision 2009/902/JHA, provides an adequate base for the Network's activities and a European crime prevention policy.

All stakeholders and citizens will be able to provide their input as part of a public consultation (to be launched by the Commission). The public consultation will be open for a minimum of 12 weeks for all interested parties to provide their input. It will be available via the Commission's public consultation page⁷.

Additional targeted consultations of stakeholders will be carried out by the contractor.

The evaluation process will follow the Better Regulation rules⁸. The contractor is therefore, expected to be familiar with these and follow them throughout.

2. CONTRACT OBJECTIVE

The contractor is expected to conduct a study in support of the Commission's evaluation. The purpose of the study is twofold:

- Firstly, to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU added value of the European Crime Prevention Network in the period 2012-2020.

⁵ <https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/financing/fundings/security-and-safeguarding-liberties/internal-security-fund-borders/union-actions/docs/final-revised-annex-awp-isf-p-2017-4th-amm.pdf>

⁶ https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/documents/policies/organized-crime-and-human-trafficking/crime-prevention/docs/20121130_eucpn_report_en.pdf

⁷ https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say_en

⁸ https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation-why-and-how/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en

- Secondly, to outline concrete and useful lessons learned to enable the Commission to shape possible further policy developments in the field of crime prevention and the drafting of the EUCPN's next Multi-Annual Strategy.

The evaluation study to be produced under this contract shall contribute to the evaluation by assessing effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, EU added value. The results of the evaluation are expected to be used by the EUCPN, its Executive Committee and Board, the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council. They will be made available to the public.

According to the Better Regulation rules, at the end of the process the Commission will produce a Staff Working Document, which will present the Commission's interpretation of the contractor's study and communicate the results, their possible limitations and the conclusions of the overall evaluation to policy makers and stakeholders. The contractor's final report will be published alongside the Commission Report to the European Parliament and Council.

3. TASKS

3.1. Main task: evaluation of the EUCPN and answering the evaluation questions

The main task consists in evaluating the EUCPN as defined in section 2 of these Terms of Reference and, to do so, in refining, analysing and answering the evaluation questions referred to in section 4, in line with the Better Regulation Guidelines and Toolbox⁹.

More in particular, to collect the necessary information with a view to feed into the overall evaluation and respond to the general and specific questions referred to in section 4 (or as further developed, as required), the contractor is expected to perform the following sub-tasks:

- Sub-task 1: Developing the evaluation framework
- Sub-task 2: Data collection and analysis
- Sub-task 3: Literature review
- Sub-task 4: Consultation – interviews and surveys
- Sub-task 5: Case studies

Based on the analysis of the data, the contractor should identify lessons learned and provide operational conclusions, especially on the Network's next multi-annual strategy, e.g. in which area could European crime prevention policy have a larger impact, in which areas is it most needed and what would be the most urgent issues to be tackled in the European Union? The feasibility degree of the recommendations should be explained.

The contractor might design more research questions, group them or add new elements in order to carry out the analysis and consultations with the relevant stakeholders. However, the evaluation report must be drafted in such a way that detailed and justified answers are given at least to the questions below. In addition, the answers to the evaluation questions have to

⁹ https://ec.europa.eu/info/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en

clearly show the reasons and the rationale behind them. The answers have to clearly indicate the factors that influenced the outcomes in a positive or negative way.

Under status of implementation, the study should include a "traffic light" assessment of the degree of implementation of the 25 actions of the Action Plan annexed to the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020).

It will also assess to which extent the recommendations of the last evaluation of the EUCPN have been implemented.

3.2. Sub-tasks for data collection and analysis

3.2.1. Sub-Task 1: Developing the evaluation framework

The purpose of this first sub-task is to set the correct framework for the evaluation, notably by

- defining a baseline/points of comparison;
- reconstructing the intervention logic for the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020);
- refining the evaluation questions set out below and present the evaluation matrix with clear indicators, judgement criteria, sources of information;
- mapping the data available and outstanding data needs; to finalise an analytical framework for carrying out the study;
- supporting the Commission in the analysis of the public consultation and the targeted stakeholder consultations (on-line survey, interviews, case studies etc.).

3.2.2. Sub-task 2: Data collection and analysis

The contractor will propose a methodology for each task listed in section 3 that is appropriate to the objectives of the evaluation study. The contractor in all instances should use quantitative and qualitative data to support its findings, conclusions and recommendations. The methodological approach should be described in detail in the offer, including a justification of the choice of the methodological tools, how information will be collected and how results are triangulated. The contractor is expected to

- analyse the data and information obtained, using appropriate recognised methodological tools;
- measure and quantify results and impacts;
- answer all the evaluation questions;
- provide overall operational conclusions on each evaluation criterion, strictly based on the collected evidence pointing out clearly the lessons learnt and aspects that worked well and those that did not and why and the limitations encountered.

3.2.3. Sub-task 3: Literature review

The study should be primarily based on desk research starting from the information contained in the previous evaluation studies on the activities of the EUCPN, commissioned by the European Commission.

To respond to the general and specific questions referred to in section 4, the contractor will analyse the available (both online and offline) literature in the Member States, such as reports by public authorities, crime prevention bodies, academic organisations and practitioners. The contractor will also analyse relevant reports produced by international organisations which deal with crime prevention.

The contractor should consider existing reports, documents and decisions of Board Meetings and other available surveys, and academic work. Most of these documents are available on the website of EUCPN (access to the members area will be requested) or can be provided by the European Commission. In addition, the relevant national/regional strategies of the Member States will also be considered for the data collection and analysis.

3.2.4. Sub-task 4: Consultation – interviews and surveys

The contractor will collect information from national (including – to the extent possible – local and regional), European and international sources and will specify and justify the selection and scope of primary sources proposed.

To respond to the general and specific questions referred to in section 4, the contractor should rely on interviews and questionnaires to engage with identified relevant stakeholders. Consideration should be given to carrying out interviews with national representatives and/or contact points of networks, academics and crime prevention experts in general, local authorities specialised in crime prevention, representatives of specialised NGOs and representatives of EU bodies and institutions including the European Parliament, the European Commission, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, the rotating Presidencies of the Council of the European Union and the secretariat of the Council.

The content of the questionnaires shall be agreed with the Commission. Sufficient time should be allowed by the contractor for approval of these documents.

The contractor shall choose appropriate tools and methods to ensure the coverage of all areas selected for this evaluation and all relevant stakeholders in all Member States that are members of the EUCPN (see Section 5.1 for the scope).

In case the answers to the questionnaires are inconclusive (e.g. low response rate, lack of and/or conflicting data), the contractor should take the necessary additional steps to clarify uncertainties and acquire a sample of the opinions of relevant stakeholders. In particular, this may take the form of a series of follow-up interviews with relevant stakeholders.

The proposed sample of interviewees will be discussed with the Commission together with a proposed interview guide to be sent to interviewees in advance. The sample should be large enough to ensure a balanced representation of all types of stakeholders listed above. The final list of interviewees and the final interview guide will be agreed with the Commission based on the agreed methodology in the course of the contract. Sufficient time should be allowed by the contractor to take into account the Commission's comments on the list and interview guide.

Interview questions shall be tailored to the target groups.

Interview reports shall be drafted by the contractor to summarise the key points made during the interview programme. The contractor shall use the evidence collected therefrom in the conclusions of the study.

Summary of the online public consultation

The Commission will organise an online public consultation over a period of minimum 12 weeks. The contractor will translate the replies received in languages other than EN, FR, DE into English, analyse and summarise the responses submitted in this public consultation. It will prepare a separate summary of this online public consultation (not exceeding 10 pages) for integration into the final report.

Synopsis report of the consultation activities

The results of the aforementioned consultation activities should be reflected in the interim and final reports, in so far as they provide evidence that is relevant to answering the evaluation questions.

3.2.5. Sub-task 5: Case studies

The contractor will develop at least 4 case studies of selected actions under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) undertaken in specific Member States to better demonstrate some aspects of the evaluation, such as European Added value or Efficiency (as appropriate). The case studies will be agreed upon between the Commission and the contractor.

The purpose of these case studies is to summarise and demonstrate the evidence collected over the course of the evaluation study and to provide the reader with concrete insights into the different areas of European crime prevention policy.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In accordance with the Better Regulation rules, the Commission's evaluation will look at the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and coherence of the actions undertaken as well as at their achieved EU added value.

The following questions (non-exhaustive list) will have to be answered in the study:

4.1. Effectiveness

1. To what extent have the EUCPN activities contributed to achieving specific and general objectives laid down in the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020), in particular in:
 - a. supporting crime prevention activities at national and local level?
 - b. shaping the crime prevention debate at EU level?
 - c. developing an EU policy and strategy of crime prevention?

- d. disseminating qualitative knowledge of crime prevention?
2. To what extent and how have external factors influenced the effectiveness of the implementation of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020)?
 3. What steps have been taken to increase the visibility of EUCPN and its activities and have they been effective?
 4. What has been the impact of the Network's actions on crime prevention policy in the European Union?
 5. To what extent and with what result has EUCPN drawn lessons from the recommendations of the 2012 evaluation?
 6. Is EUCPN sufficiently equipped to reach its target group in an appropriate manner? Is it clear what EUCPN is seeking to achieve towards each of the target groups?
 7. Is there a sufficient flow of information, in an interactive manner, between board members and the local level as well as between board and secretariat?

4.2. Efficiency

8. What are the benefits and the costs of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020)? To what extent has the implementation of the strategy been cost-effective?
9. What are the factors that have influenced the efficiency of the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020)?
10. To what extent have the resources allocated to the Network through the Internal Security Fund been sufficient for reaching the objectives of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020)?

4.3. Relevance

11. To what extent has the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) been relevant in view of the EU needs/challenges? Is it still relevant in view of current needs and challenges?
12. To what extent has the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) been relevant in view of specific needs of stakeholders, in particular Member States and civil society?

4.4. Coherence

13. To what extent are the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) coherent with the objectives of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA?

14. To what extent are the objectives and activities determined by the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) coherent with other relevant EU policy developments, in particular in the fields of security, including notably the EU Policy Cycle on Serious and International Organised Crime?
15. To what extent are the objectives and activities determined by the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) coherent with other objectives and activities of EU agencies, including notably Europol, the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA), and the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL) and of Member States?
16. To what extent are the objectives and activities determined by the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) coherent with other objectives and activities of stakeholders active in the field of crime prevention?
17. Is the Council Decision 2009/JHA/902/JHA still an adequate basis of the actions of the EUCPN and a comprehensive European crime prevention policy?

4.5. European Added Value

18. What is the European added value of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020)? Could the main findings (results/outputs) presented in the evaluation have been achieved without EU intervention?
19. What is the additional value resulting from EUCPN activities, compared to what could be achieved by Member States at national, regional or local levels?
20. To what extent are the outcomes of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) sustainable? Are the effects likely to last after the intervention ends?
21. What would be the most likely consequences of not having an EU-wide crime prevention policy and a EUCPN?
22. Could the results, delivered through the implementation of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA and the actions carried out under the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020), have been achieved with no European funding? Could the use of other policy instruments or mechanisms, on European and/or national level, have provided better cost-effectiveness?

5. METHODOLOGICAL GUIDELINES

5.1. Scope of the study

Material scope

The study will assess the Network's performance. This should include – but not be limited to – the actions undertaken in implementing its current Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020), its contribution to the crime prevention at local, national and EU level, e.g. to the EU Policy Cycle on serious international crime 2018-2021, and the extent to which it has achieved the objectives set out in Council Decision 2009/902/JHA.

The Commission's evaluation will assess the Network's effectiveness as well as the adequacy of its legal basis to provide sufficient mandate, framework and resources. The contractor is expected to look at the efficiency, the relevance and the coherence of the actions undertaken as well as at the achieved EU added value of the EUCPN. It will review the working practices of the Network and its Secretariat, including information flow and assess to which extent the recommendations of the last evaluation of the EUCPN have been implemented.

The Commission's evaluation will also assess whether changes are necessary to improve the work on crime prevention and the Network's organisation and governance. The study is expected to provide lessons learnt in view of these objectives.

Temporal scope

The evaluation will cover the period since the last evaluation in 2012. A focus should be put on the period of the current Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020).

Geographical

The evaluation will cover activities within the territory of the members of the EUCPN and for the United Kingdom until its withdrawal from the Network on 1 December 2014.¹⁰

5.2. Methodology

The contractor is expected to propose an appropriate methodology for the work to be undertaken. The proposed methodology will be further refined in the kick-off meeting and the Inception Report in close collaboration with the Inter-service Group (referred to as 'Steering Group'), composed of representatives of Commission services.

The contractor must take the following into account, when gathering and analysing information and making the assessment:

- The study must be based on recognised evaluation techniques and triangulation methods are required.
- The choice and a detailed description of the methodology must form part of the offer submitted. Advantages, limitations and risks involved (including mitigation) in using the proposed tools and techniques should be explained. There should be a clear link between the evaluation questions addressed and the corresponding methodology proposed. The evaluation questions should be further elaborated, by providing operational sub-questions under each question.
- Considerable emphasis should be placed on the analysis phase of the study. The contractor must support findings and recommendations by explaining the degree to

¹⁰ All EU Member States except the United Kingdom are members of the EUCPN. The United Kingdom withdrew from the Network on 1 December 2014 as part of its 'opt-out' of EU Justice and Home Affairs instruments according to Protocol 36 of the Lisbon Treaty.

which these are based on opinion, case study, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence and qualify the robustness of evidence. Where opinion is the main source, the degree of consensus and the steps taken to test the opinion should be given.

The contractor must demonstrate that it has a good understanding of the task to be accomplished, to list relevant information sources, key informants and stakeholders, institutional and decision-making structures, prove how access to these sources will be secured and show how the information to be obtained would help answering the evaluation questions.

It is expected that the consultations run by the contractor will provide an opportunity to get quantitative and qualitative data from across the EU on crime prevention policy. The contractor should rely on interviews and questionnaires to engage with identified relevant stakeholders. Consideration should be given to carrying out interviews with national representatives and/or contact points of networks, academics and crime prevention experts in general, local authorities specialised in crime prevention, representatives of specialised NGOs and representatives of EU bodies and institutions including the European Parliament, the European Commission, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, the rotating Presidencies of the Council of the European Union and the secretariat of the Council.

The stakeholders will always be consulted on mandatory criteria for evaluation including effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, European added value and lessons learnt.

The Commission published a roadmap¹¹ outlining the evaluation of the European Crime Prevention Network. No relevant comments were received from stakeholders.

The Commission will also run, as part of the evaluation process, a 12-week online public consultation. It will take the shape of an online questionnaire addressed to the general public/all stakeholders and it will be shaped around the objectives of Council Decision 2009/902/JHA. The public consultation will take place as soon as possible during the implementation of the contract, so that its results are fully taken into account in the analysis. The contractor will be expected to produce a first factual report of the type of stakeholders that contributed to the public consultation and of the replies received. It is important to note that stakeholders can respond in any of the official EU languages to the public consultation, so the contractor must prove that he/she is able to process replies in all these languages.

The contractor will also be expected to produce the synopsis report of all consultation activities carried out.

The contractor shall keep records and proof of all contacts, in particular in the context of stakeholder consultations, and provide them to the Commission. These records shall be appropriately archived to enable verification of the data. Copies of all the documents collected/analysed by the contractor must be made available to the contracting authority when requested.

The relevant EU agencies will also be asked by the Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs (DG HOME) to provide any further relevant input they may have. Input from and contacts between the contractor and the relevant agencies will be supported by the Commission.

¹¹

https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/ares-2018-5655037_en
https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/ares-2018-5655037_en

Stakeholder consultation should be done according to the rules of the Better Regulation Guidelines, with which the contractor is expected to be familiar with and it is expected to be followed in the evaluation process. The contractor shall observe all data protection requirements at all stages of the evaluation.

5.3. Quality requirements

The overall quality of the evaluation will be assessed by the Steering Group on the basis of the Commission's quality assessment framework (annex 2). The Quality Assessment by the Steering Group will be done on basis of the final report submitted for review by the contractor. The contractor will have to take into account in its final report the comments made by the Steering Group to the extent possible and it will have to explain how it did so when submitting the final report. A summary of the changes requested/introduced by the Steering Group in Quality Assessment must be presented in the final report.

In view of its publication, the Final Report by the contractors must be of high editorial quality. In cases where the contractor does not manage to produce a Final Report of high editorial quality within the timeframe defined by the contract, the contracting authority can decide to have the final report professionally edited at the expense of the contractor (e.g. deduction of these costs from the final payment).

5.4. Risks

Most of the work will have to be conducted in a short period of several months. This requires a detailed planning, taking also into account the timetable at which relevant data becomes available.

At the time that this assessment will be carried out, the Multi-Annual Strategy (2016-2020) will not have been fully completed. This means that activities will be ongoing on a number of actions, which may complicate the assessment of some objectives and actions. The exact cut-off date will be agreed between the European Commission and the contractor at the latest at the inception meeting.

The contractor is expected to collect and analyse an important amount of data. Therefore, it must show how it expects to mitigate any risks (i.e. related to the methodology to be used and human resources to be involved) in relation to the tasks.

The contractor is expected to mitigate possible risks related to confidentiality and data protection issues.

5.5. Graphic requirements

The contractor must deliver the study and all publishable deliverables in full compliance with the corporate visual identity of the European Commission, by applying the graphic rules set out in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual, including its logo. The graphic rules, the Manual and further information are available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/services/visual_identity/index_en.htm

A simple Word template will be provided to the contractor after contract signature. The contractor must fill in the cover page in accordance with the instructions provided in the template. The use of templates for studies is exclusive to European Commission's contractors. No template will be provided to tenderers while preparing their tenders.

6. DELIVERABLES AND ORGANISATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Commission's approval will be granted after all its comments on the interim and final report and the deliverables have been effectively implemented by the contractor.

6.1. Deliverables

The overall duration of the tasks will not exceed 11 months, commencing from the date of signature of the contract by the last of the two parties (the day of signature of the contract is herein referred to as "T").

The Commission will require the contractor to submit electronic versions of the inception, interim and final reports, in English. The final report will include graphics and tables illustrating the key findings and an abstract (200 words maximum). It will be complemented by an executive summary (6 pages maximum) in a separate document. Both the abstract and the executive summary must be at least in English, French and German.

The contractor shall be required to submit the deliverables mentioned in Section 6.1.1.

6.1.1. Services and/or products to be provided

- Inception Report;
- Summary reports on the results of the open public consultation;
- Interim Report;
- Synopsis report on consultations carried out for the purposes of this evaluation study, including a summary of results of stakeholder interviews (including recordings and/or transcripts where available);
- Final Report;
- Power point presentations; to be prepared for the physical meetings with the Commission, the Inter-service group meetings and for the approved version of the final report.

All these products shall be in line with the Better Regulation guidelines¹².

The Commission will publish the final report. For this purpose, the contractor must ensure that there are no restrictions based on confidentiality and/or related to intellectual property rights held by a third party.

¹² https://ec.europa.eu/info/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en

6.1.2. Inception report

T + 4 weeks¹³, an **Inception Report (for review)** must be submitted. It must detail the proposed approach including: information on methods and techniques to be applied, the intervention logic, the evaluation matrix, envisaged data collection arrangements, key informants and stakeholders to be consulted, interview and survey guides, analytical tools and all other relevant methodological considerations. The inception report must include a clear work programme with an estimated timeline.

Within two weeks after submission, an **inception meeting** will be organised between the contractor and the Steering Group to review the work plan and the methodology for the work to be undertaken, and to discuss and clarify possible open questions and issues.

The inception report will be reviewed by the Commission who will provide comments if any to the contractor within 1 week of its receipt. The contractor shall have 1 week to submit additional information or a new **Inception Report**.

6.1.3. Interim reports

T + 18 weeks, an **Interim Report (for review)** must be submitted to inform the Commission on the progress of the work and on any problems encountered. The report will also present preliminary emerging conclusions.

The report must as a minimum provide:

- An overview of the status of the evaluation project;
- A description of problems encountered and solutions found;
- A description of preliminary findings and results of the data gathering and the interviews with stakeholders including a substantial part of the desk research;
- An assessment of the data collection process and of the quality of data collected, whether it meets expectations and will provide a sound basis for responding to the evaluation questions;
- A conclusion whether any changes are required to the work plan, or any other solutions should be sought in order to ensure that the required results of the evaluation are achieved. If any such issues are to be identified, they must be discussed in the meeting with the Steering Group dedicated to this report;
- A proposal for the final structure of the Final Report.
- Present a first consolidated rationale for preliminary conclusions and recommendations

Clear references on sources of information used or to be used are to be made.

The report shall not exceed 40 pages, annexes excluded.

Within two weeks after submission, an **interim meeting** will be organised between the contractor and the Steering Group to discuss and clarify possible open questions and issues. Following the meeting, the contractor will have 2 weeks, if not agreed otherwise, to submit the **Interim Report (for acceptance)** with the additional information or corrections as requested by the Commission.

¹³ Weeks are counted in calendar days, not working days (i.e., 2 weeks = 15 calendar days = 10 working days).

6.1.4. Final report

T+ 26 weeks, a **Final Report (for review)** presenting the conclusions and recommendations must be submitted.

The Final Report for review shall include:

- **Main report:** The main report must be limited to 60 pages and present, in full, the results of the analyses, conclusions and recommendations arising from the evaluation. It must also contain a description of the subject evaluated, the context of the evaluation, and the methodology used (including an analysis of its strengths and weaknesses).
- **Annexes:** These must collate the technical details of the evaluation, and must include questionnaire templates, interview guides, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources.

The Final Report should include a "traffic light" assessment of the degree of implementation of the 25 actions of the Action Plan, MAS 2016-2020 (i.e. each action should be marked red = not implemented; orange = partially implemented; and green = fully implemented; for each action this should also be accompanied by an explanation for the indicated degree of implementation).

The Final Report must show a clear connection between collected data, findings and conclusions and recommendations. It will be based on a thorough analysis of the data and it will ensure that findings and conclusions are supported by this analysis. The Final Report must also be easily readable for a non-specialist of crime prevention policies.

The Commission may also provide comments within 10 working days of its receipt. A meeting to discuss the final report will also be organised between the contractor and the Steering Group, which will also clarify possible comments. After review of the report, the contractor will also be required to deliver a PowerPoint presentation within 10 days after receiving the Commission's comments on the Final Report (for review). The presentation shall outline the main results of the evaluation in a professional and user-friendly way. The presentation must be suitable for the general public. The contractor will be asked to present its findings at the EUCPN Board Meeting in June 2019 (*exact date tbc*).

T+ 30 weeks: The **Final Report (for acceptance)**, together with an explanation on how the Commission's comments were taken into account, must be submitted within 8 months after the signature of the contract.

The final Report will be accompanied by an **Executive Summary** as a separate document, of no more than 6 pages¹⁴, as well as by and the Synopsis Report, following the Better Regulation relevant tool. The Executive Summary summarises the evaluation's main conclusions, the main evidence supporting them and the recommendations arising from them. The summary should give the reader an understanding of the conclusions reached. The summary must not be limited to explain the approach. After being approved by the Commission Services, the Report, the Executive Summary and the Synopsis Report should be translated into English, French and German.

The report should also include an **abstract** of no more than 200 words in English, French and German. The purpose of the abstract is to act as a reference tool helping the reader to quickly ascertain the evaluation's subject.

¹⁴ 1 page = 1500 characters.

The contracting authority will publish the Final Report, the Executive Summary, the Abstract, the annexes and the Quality Assessment Grid providing assessment of the evaluation final report on the Commission's website.

Within a month from the closure of the **public consultation**, the contractor will present an analysis report (factual summary) as described in section 5.2. Its results will also be taken into account by the contractor in carrying out the evaluation.

The **Final Report (for acceptance)** will be reviewed by the Commission within 20 calendar days. The contractor shall modify the report according to Commission's requests, or duly explain why they cannot be accepted; a modified version of the **Final Report** will be submitted within 15 working days after the submission of the Commission remarks. The contractor will be asked to present its Final Report at the EUCPN Board Meeting in September 2020 (*exact date tbc*).

6.1.5. Format

All reports (and annexes) should be in English language, although the executive summary – and abstract – must be provided in both French and German as well. They should be checked and corrected by a native speaker, and should be understandable without a special effort for an informed reader.

Reports will be submitted in an electronic version. All models, tables and reports need to be readable and editable by software that either the Commission uses (Microsoft® Word for Windows format and Adobe® Acrobat pdf format) or has free and unlimited (meaning the access is not restricted to specific officials) access to. The contractor is expected to verify compliance with this requirement before the first delivery.

Each report (except the final version of the Final Report) should have an introductory page providing an overview and orientation of the report. It should describe what parts of the document, on the one hand, have been carried over from previous reports or been recycled from other documents, and on the other hand, represent progress of the evaluation work with reference to the work plan.

The contractor must deliver the Final Report to the Commission in English in 10 hard copies and in electronic version. It will implement the Commission publication rules related to its "visual identity" policy by applying the graphic rules set out in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual, including its logo.

The presentation of the final report should also be made in the format of a PowerPoint presentation for a large audience in a session of about 30 minutes / about 25 slides.

The data in the reports shall be presented with an appealing layout, containing tables as well as appropriate graphics to illustrate the arguments including micro data such as SPSS files and excel datasheets.

All reports should have numbered paragraphs and pages and a clear identification containing:

- the contract number
- the version (draft, revision or final)
- and the date of submission to the EC

6.1.6. Approval of the reports

The deliverables have to be submitted to the Commission by the delivery date as indicated above. The Commission will confirm that the delivery occurred. This can be done by means of a confirmation e-mail sent to the contractor.

The deliverables must be on time and conform to the specifications as described in the Specific Contract.

Whenever the Commission considers that the submitted version of a deliverable can be accepted a formal acceptance form will be sent to the contractor.

The Commission will have 10 working days to review the reports and submit comments – except the final report, in case of which the Commission will have 20 working days to review the report. Once the comments have been addressed and each report has been approved, the Commission will issue a letter or email of formal acceptance.

Otherwise, the contractor shall modify the report according to Commission's requests, or duly explain why they cannot be accepted; a modified version of the report will be submitted within 1 week for the inception report, 2 weeks for the interim report and 3 weeks for the final report.

The report needs to be accepted by the Commission to allow full payment, in line with the applicable rules under the framework contract.

6.1.7. Use of results

Any document/data collected or created in electronic format in the context of this specific contract will be the property of the European Commission and will be delivered at the end of the specific contract to the contracting authority in an electronic format by e-mail and digital storage means. No document based, in whole or in part, upon the work undertaken in the context of this contract may be published except with the prior formal written approval of the European Commission.

The contractor will keep records and proof of all contacts and will timely produce them if they are requested from him. These records shall be appropriately archived to enable the verification of the data if the need arises.

Copies of all documents collected/analysed by the contractor must be made available to the contracting authority if requested.

6.2. Organisational arrangements

Responsibility and management of the evaluation remain with the European Commission (Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs). A Steering Group will be set up to monitor the evaluation and it will be the main interlocutor of the contractor – via DG HOME.

This Steering Group will follow the evaluation process, assess and decide on acceptance and rejection of the different deliverables that the contractor will have to provide. It will also be instrumental in the provision of information to the contractor. The contractor needs to take into account the comments and recommendations of the Steering Group as much as possible and keep it regularly informed on the progress of the work.

The contractor will be requested, and must be prepared, to attend at least the following meetings at the Commission's premises in Brussels:

- a kick-off meeting right after the signature of the contract;

- a meeting on the inception report;
- a meeting on the interim report;
- a meeting on the final report.

The contractor will also attend 4 meetings of the EUCPN (e.g. Executive Committee and Board Meetings) One of these will take place in Finland in December 2019, two in Croatia during the first half of 2020 and one in Germany during the second half of 2020).

If necessary, the contractor may be requested to attend a maximum of 2 additional meetings in Brussels The contractor must present the Commission with minutes of each meeting within 5 working days from the meeting date for agreement.

At the above meetings, the contractor may be requested to prepare presentations on the progress and results of the evaluation.

Considering the need to conduct interviews and gather information for this evaluation, the contractor will present in its offer a provisional overview of additional meetings that the contractor is planning to organise and/or participate in.

The contractor will be requested to stay in regular touch with the Commission to give an update on progress and potential problems at least on a monthly basis.

The contractor shall observe the deadlines for the deliverables irrespective of vacation periods and public holidays that may occur within the duration of the project.

6.2.1. Timing of meetings and reports

Deliverables/Meetings	Date
Kick-off meeting	T + 1 week
Inception Report (for review)	T + 4 weeks
Inception report meeting	T + 6 weeks
Inception Report (for acceptance)	T + 7 weeks
Interim Report (for review)	T + 16 weeks
Interim report meeting	T + 20 weeks
Interim Report (for review)	T + 22 weeks
Final Report (for review)	T + 26 weeks
Final report meeting	T + 28 weeks
Final Report (for acceptance)	T + 30 weeks
Presentation of the main findings at the EUCPN Board Meeting in June 2020	T + 32 (<i>exact date tbc</i>)
Commission comments on Final report (for acceptance)	T + 34 weeks
Final Report	T + 37 weeks
Presentation of the Final Report to the	T + 41 weeks (<i>exact date tbc</i>)

6.2.2. Duration of the tasks and of the contract

The duration of the tasks to be performed under the specific contract will not exceed 11 months.

6.2.3. Composition of the team

The contractor should propose an appropriate team to perform the specific services. The team delivering the service should include, as a minimum, the following profiles:

Project Manager: Preferably with the experience in managing projects in the field of home affairs policy.

Experts in crime prevention policy: In the offer, the contractor should propose a team of senior and junior experts. The team should be composed of at least one senior expert having experience in the field of crime prevention policy, with other proposed experts able to demonstrate relevant experience in home affairs and internal security policy.

Data collection and analysis experts: The team should cover all Member States and consist of researchers. Team members should have proven experience in survey techniques, data collection, interviews, stakeholders' consultations, statistical analyses and drafting reports and recommendations.

6.3. Communication and coordination requirements

The project leader in DG HOME is Tobias MAASSEN (tobias.maassen@ec.europa.eu).

The back-up colleagues are Michael VOLLPRECHT (Michael.vollprecht@ec.europa.eu) and Ute STIEGEL (ute.stiegel@ec.europa.eu).

The contractor will provide the contact details of the project leader on his side who will act as the single point of contact in relation to this project for the interactions with the Commission's project leader.

A Steering Group will be involved in assessing the quality of the evaluation work and reports submitted by the contractor.

7. PRICE

- The maximum contract price is EUR 180 000.

8. TENDERING PROCEDURE

The tendering procedure will follow the conditions set out in the FWC (article I.4).

8.1. Submission of the tenders

8.1.1. Deadline

The contractors have the obligation to respond to each request sent to them, by sending back the signed request for service form. If a contractor is not in a position to make an offer, he must provide a justification by the same deadline as for the tender submission.

Within 5 working days, the contractors shall express in writing, by e-mail, their availability to carry out the services required.

Within 21 working days, and with a minimum of 10 working days, after the date of sending the request for services, the contractors will provide the Commission with a written proposal for the tasks required, including an outline of the methodologies proposed, a work programme with a timetable and the total budget broken down by categories of experts, prepared on the basis of the price schedule annexed to the framework contract. Travel and subsistence expenses necessary to realise the tasks under the specific contract will be charged at a flat rate. These expenses will be taken into consideration in the total costs presented in the offer.

Contractors should submit their tender by email to the following email address:

HOME-TENDERS@ec.europa.eu

8.1.2. Questions on terms of reference

Questions on terms of reference submitted within the last 48 hours prior to the deadline for submission of offers will not be answered.

8.2. Content of the tenders

The tender should be split in **two separate files**:

Technical offer: contains all the information required for the tender, except the price. The page limit is 30 pages.

The **technical offer** should contain at least the following:

- a) A (retro-)planning.
- b) CVs of the team members assigned to the task. The tenderers should also provide with their proposal detailed curriculum vitae of each staff member responsible for carrying out the work, including his or her educational background, degrees and diplomas, professional experience, research work, publications and linguistic skills which are relevant for the assignment. The CVs shall be presented preferably in accordance with the Commission Recommendation on a common European format for curricula vitae, published in OJ L79 of 22 March 2002, p. 66.
- c) Description of work organisation including role/profile, name, short description of responsibilities and the number of man days dedicated to the project for each of the roles/profiles.

Financial offer: Prices are fixed amounts, including all expenses.

Travel and subsistence expenses: for each specific contract travel and subsistence expenses necessary to realise the tasks under the specific contract will be charged at a flat rate. These expenses will be taken into consideration in the total costs presented in the offer.

Tenders must be:

- Signed by the tenderer or his duly authorised representative.
- Perfectly legible so that there can be no doubt as to words and figure.

8.3. Award criteria

The contract will be awarded on the basis of the award criteria provided in annex I.

ANNEX I – AWARD CRITERIA

Quality criteria

N°	Award criteria	Weighting
1	Clarity, structure and presentation of the tender: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tender is self-standing and contains only essential information; additional evidence supporting the tender is provided in annexes • Clear and understandable language and structure • Good use of glossaries if relevant 	25 points
2	Proposed methodology and tools; Understanding of objectives and tasks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conformity with the Commission Evaluation and Impact Assessment guidelines • Coverage of relevant impacts • Quality and appropriateness of proposed methodology for data collection and analysis 	50 points
3	Appropriateness, composition and organisation of the team proposed in relation to the work to be performed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and appropriate definition of roles and responsibilities • Appropriate allocation of resources to specific tasks • Arrangements for quality control and validation of information received • Arrangements for quality control of reports (in particular language and accuracy of calculation) 	25 points
Total		100 points (minimum required 70)

Financial evaluation:

Each offer will be assessed in terms of the total price for the proposal on the basis of the specific unit prices set in the Framework Contract, broken down by categories of experts and travel and subsistence expenses. A template for the financial offer may be provided by the Commission.

Award of contract:

Only bids that have reached a total score of a minimum of 70% will be taken into consideration for awarding the specific contract.

The specific contract will be awarded to the tender which offers the **best-value-for-money**.

The contract will be awarded by weighing technical quality against price according to the following formula:

Quality/Price analysis = (Technical Score X 0.6) + [(Lowest price*/Price offered) x 100] x 0.4

*Lowest price = Price of the tender with the lowest price offer (provided the minimum quality threshold are met)

ANNEX II – QUALITY ASSESSMENT

[Quality Assessment (QA) is required for all external work before payment can be made. It is recommended to use to this end the quality assessment grid presented below and the attached guidelines for filling the grid.

The QA is led by the lead DG. For **work contributing to an evaluation**, the Interservice Group (ISG) is given the opportunity to contribute and sign off this assessment BEFORE payment is made. The ISG members provide their views on whether key aspects of the work conducted meet the required standards and submit related comments. A summary of the changes requested/introduced by the ISG's QA should be presented in the final report. The BR guidelines require the QA for **evaluation studies** to be published.]

Legend: ■ *very weak* = criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent ■ *weak* = criterion weakly or partially fulfilled ■ *acceptable* = criterion generally fulfilled, despite some gaps
 ■ *good* = criterion entirely fulfilled ■ *very good* = criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way

In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the report is:	<i>Very weak</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1. Meeting needs / relevance Does the study respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of reference?						
2. Appropriate design Is the design of the study adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?						
3. Reliable data Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?						

In relation to the criteria and sub-criteria below, the report is:	<i>Very weak</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Comment</i>
4. Sound analysis Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?						
5. Credible findings Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria and rational?						
6. Valid conclusions Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?						
7. Useful recommendations Are the areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the recommendations realistic and impartial?						
8. Clarity Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?						
Overall quality of the report						