

# Terms of Reference

**For the Evaluation of the EEA Grants Programmes in  
Greece**

**“Asylum & migration” and “Local development &  
Poverty reduction”**

**Athens, 05 September 2023 – ~~10~~ 30 October 2023**

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Programmes' Overview.....	4
2.1 Programme I:Local Development and Poverty Reduction.....	4
2.2 Programme II: Asylum and Migration.....	5
2.2.1 Programmes By Outcome, Budget, Project Promoter And Selection Process .....	6
3. Subject of the Evaluation .....	7
3.1 Scope.....	7
3.2 Evaluation Criteria & Evaluation Questions.....	7
3.3 Methods and tools.....	8
3.4 Available resources .....	9
3.5 Confidentiality and Research Ethics.....	10
4. Time plan and deliverables .....	10
5. Governance and accountability .....	12
7. Instructions for Tenders.....	12
7.1 Tender Submission.....	12
7.2 Content of tenders.....	13
6. Eligibility Criteria .....	13
7. Selection Criteria.....	14
8. Evaluation Criteria.....	14
8.1 Appeals.....	16
9. Volume of the Contract.....	16
10. Dispute Resolution.....	16
11. References .....	16
Annexes.....	16
Annex I: Table of similar services completed.....	16
Annex II: Template of the letter of intent for evaluation team members.....	17

## 1. Introduction

The EEA and Norway Grants represent the contribution of Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway to reducing economic and social disparities and to strengthening bilateral relations with 15 EU countries in Central and Southern Europe, and the Baltics, including Greece.

The **Financial Mechanism Office (FMO)** administers the EEA and Norway Grants, acting as a secretariat to the three donor states.

On 21st of February 2019, a Programme Implementation Agreement was signed between the Financial Mechanism Office (FMO) and SOLCrowe in partnership with HumanRights360. Both organizations, were selected by the Financial Mechanism Office (FMO), to act as the Fund Operator (FO) for two EEA (European Economic Area) Grants Programmes (2019-2024) in Greece: **The Asylum and Migration Programme** and the **Local Development and Poverty Reduction Programme**. Both programmes include also a component of strengthening **bilateral cooperation** between Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway and Greek.

The roles and responsibilities of the FMO and the FO are set out in the **Programme Implementation Agreement (PIA)** and its annexes, signed on 21/02/2019 between the parties<sup>1</sup>.

According to the two Programmes Implementation Agreement (PIA), *it is the responsibility of the Fund Operator to ensure that the resources necessary to carry out evaluations or reviews are available, to carry out an evaluation or review of the Programme and ensure that procedures are in place to produce and collect necessary data* (Art. 12.1). In addition, *evaluation or reviews shall be carried out by experts or entities independent of the Fund Operator in accordance with the provisions specified in the Results Guideline adopted by the FMC for the EEA Financial Mechanism 2014-2021* (Art. 12.2).

The current call is launched for the evaluation of the two abovementioned programmes. The Fund Operator intends to commission to an external evaluator **for two ex-post evaluations one for each of the two programmes** with a total budget of 30.000 (including VAT). The evaluation approach should follow the [2014-2021 Results Guidelines](#)<sup>2</sup>

The **Asylum & Migration Programme** aims to alleviate the suffering of the most vulnerable in Greece and address urgent needs for the reception and screening of asylum seekers and for the accommodation of vulnerable groups through capacitated experienced partners. The programme started on 20/02/2019 and ends programmatically on 31/10/2023 with a total budget 15.132.000€ euros. With regards the bilateral component of the Programme, the starting date is 01/9/2023 & ends on 31/10/2024 with a total budget of 125.000 euros.

The **Local Development and Poverty Reduction Programme** aims to strengthen social and economic cohesion by increasing opportunities for integration, social inclusion, and employability of vulnerable people in Greece. The programme started on 23/05/2019 and ends programmatically in 31/12/2023 with a total budget 6.418.000€ euros. With regards the bilateral component of the Programme, the starting date is 01/9/2023 & ends on 31/10/2024 with a total budget of 50.000 euros.

Both programmes are finalized contractu

---

<sup>1</sup> PIA general rules can be found [here](#).

<sup>2</sup> Article 10.1.3 of the Regulations on the implementation of the European Economic Area (EEA) Financial Mechanism and of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism 2014-2021; "Evaluation shall be carried out by experts or entities independent of the National Focal point, the Certifying Authority and the Programme Operator"

ally by the end of April 2024.

## 2. Programmes' Overview

### 2.1 Programme I: Local Development and Poverty Reduction

The Greek at-risk- of poverty rate is one of the highest ones in Europe while social transfers have one of the lowest impact rates on poverty reduction in the EU (15.8% in Greece versus 33.9% in the EU in 2017). With a high unemployment rate<sup>3</sup> and lack of access to basic services (food, shelter, education, medical services) the population at risk of poverty or social exclusion - especially those residing in urban areas - not only lacks the necessary capital but also finds it very difficult to acquire it, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of poverty and a downward recession spiral. Social Inequalities have resulted from the implementation of the Economic Adjustment Programme and the austerity measures that have been imposed to the Greek population.

Furthermore, an observed weakness of the Greek labor market, the lack a Diagnosis Labor needs mechanism at local level, results on vocational education and training programmes with limited connection with real labor market needs and lack of individualized support and empowerment of unemployed– especially vulnerable and long-term unemployed ones – to (re)access labor market and exit the “poverty trap” by targeting jobs for which they can offer qualifications and skills according to the current labor market needs.

During the programmatic period 2014-2023, the programme Local Development and Poverty reduction, aimed at alleviating the suffering of the most vulnerable in Greece and strengthen social and economic cohesion, following the following predefined programmatic areas:

- Social and economic development in specific geographic areas
- Anti-discriminatory activities focusing on groups vulnerable to social and economic exclusion.
- Interventions to increase job prospects.
- Interventions to increase job capacity, especially among the most vulnerable.
- Quality of and access to social/welfare services > Networking and policy exchanges between municipalities.

The Programme is implemented through three predefined projects:

1. **“Schools For All”** project is trying to address discrimination and integration difficulties for refugee children in Greek schools, by implementing capacity building activities through tailor-made action plans for school stakeholders. The trainings equip school directors and teachers with the appropriate educational tools, cultivate skills and all necessary competences, as well as the confidence to manage controversy and deal with issues concerning intolerance, discrimination, racism and hate speech in the context of school and local community. The project aims to establish a school network, which will represent the basic principles and values that emerge through the cultivation of a school democratic culture.
2. The **“Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals”** focuses on the effects of the economic crisis and the lack of effective integration policies. The project aims to support marginalised and vulnerable individuals living in and around Athens to become active and productive members of society through the provision of a comprehensive package of complementary services (free of charge), including psychosocial, legal advice and representation, job matching and accounting services.

---

<sup>3</sup> [Eurostat Unemployment by sex and age – annual data, last update 7-10-2020](#)

3. The “Skills on Demand” project seeks to address the exclusion of vulnerable groups from the labour market through activities that attempt to link labour supply and demand, matching the needs of employers with the skills of the available human resources of the vulnerable population, through personalized counselling and training, and job matching and placement services.

## 2.2 Programme II: Asylum and Migration

According to UNHCR data from 2017-2019 almost 150 thousand people arrived in Greece. Regretfully, more 250 more people are missing or dead. Due to EU-Turkey deal in 2016, a geographic restriction to the main islands of the Northern Eastern Aegean Sea (Lesvos, Chios Samos and some in small islands like Kos, Leros, and Tilos) is imposed to these people. The main nationalities are Afghans Syrians, Iraqis, Tunisia, and from other African countries while almost one third of the population are children. Although these are significantly decreased flows from the surge experienced in 2015-16 when more than 1 million persons crossed Greece in addition to already existing 600.000 migrants in Greece and more than 1 million persons have left Greece mostly for Germany and other North European Countries, the capacity of the Greek state to manage with the situation was weak. That is especially true when regards the reception of vulnerable people including unaccompanied and separated children<sup>5</sup>.

**Table 1: UNHCR population data, 2019<sup>4</sup>**

Previous years	Sea arrivals	Land arrivals	Dead and missing
2019	59,726	14,887	70
2018	32,494	18,014	174
2017	29,718	6,592	59
2016	173,450	3,784	441
2015	856,723	4,907	799
2014	41,038	2,280	405

To that end, building on the results of the EEA GR05 programme, in the last period 2009-2014 the objective of the Programme Area "Asylum and Migration" is to ensure the functioning of national asylum and migration system, and to safeguard the right to seek asylum. Particular focus is given to projects enhancing vulnerable asylum seekers' path to independence, encouraging their transition from supported living in centres, to their inclusion in the local community, as well as their path to return and re-integrate to the Countries of Origin (for rejected applicants).

The programme is implemented though 5 open-call projects and 3 pre-defined. The aim of the **Open-Call projects** is to provide accommodation places in open reception centers in urban and semi-urban areas mainly for unaccompanied minors (UAMs) and other vulnerable asylum seekers (not excluding other legal status i.e., undocumented, recognized refugee in case there is severe vulnerability). During the Programme implementation period, the intention is services to be offered to UAM and other vulnerable beneficiaries, as per the definition included in Article 21 of Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast) with a priority given to (a) pregnant women and (b) single-parent families with children.

While the 3 pre-defined projects are the following:

1. “Capacity building in Greece: Capacity development for dignified reception and protection of the rights of migrants and asylum seekers in Greece” with activities supporting the Reception and Identification Service (RIS) with experts deployed at the Headquarters, as well as at the camps in multiple locations all over Greece (Site Management Support Advisors) implementing on-the job trainings. Another component of the project is the set up and operation of the Greek National Referral Mechanism for the protection of

<sup>4</sup> <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/mediterranean/location/5179>

<sup>5</sup> 2250 in [June 2017](#), 3400 [June 2018](#), and 4129 [July 2019](#). Source: UNHCR

victims of human trafficking (NRM), deploying Anti-trafficking experts (including a legal advisor) at the responsible Authority, namely the National Center for Social Solidarity (EKKA), in order not only to develop and improve existing tools, but to deliver a series of trainings as well.

2. **“Quality assurance of asylum procedures and free legal aid to vulnerable asylum seekers”**, aims to support the asylum service in Greece by deploying experts at the Greek Asylum Service, implementing quality assurance of the relevant procedures, and providing legal aid support to asylum seekers in Greece.
3. **“Assisted voluntary return and reintegration of vulnerable groups”** aims to provide voluntary return and reintegration assistance to migrants who, being in a vulnerable situation, express their desire to return to their country of origin.

### 2.2.1 Programmes By Outcome, Budget, Project Promoter And Selection Process

Programme I: Local Development & Poverty Reduction (see expected results [here](#) )

Objective: Strengthened Social and Economic Cohesion				
Outcome	Description	Funding	Project Promoter	Selection
Outcome 1	Integration of Refugee Children in Greek Schools	€ 1,500,000	European Wergeland Center	Pre-defined
Outcome 2	Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals	€ 2.000.000	SolidarityNow	Pre-defined
	Increased opportunities for integration and social inclusion for vulnerable individuals	€ 450.000	SolidarityNow	Pre-defined
Outcome 3	Increased employment among recently unemployed people	€ 2,468,000	Municipality of Athens	Pre-defined
Bilateral Outcome	Enhanced collaboration between beneficiary and donor state entities involved in the programme	€ 50,000	PDPs	Pre-defined
<b>Total Funding:6.468.000,00 EUR</b>				<b>000</b>

Programme II. Asylum & Migration (see expected results [here](#))

Objective: Functional national asylum and migration management system ensured and the right to seek asylum safeguarded				
Outcome	Description	Funding	Project Promoter	Selection
Outcome 1	Improved Quality of accommodation and other services provided in open reception centres	€ 7,632,000	Metadrasi, Arsis, IRC, MDM, SMAN	Open Call
Outcome 2	Capacity of key institutions to ensure protection of vulnerable asylum seekers, particularly UAMs, is strengthened	€ 3,500,000	NORCAP	Pre-defined
Outcome 3	Quality assurance of asylum procedures and free legal aid to vulnerable asylum seekers”	€ 3,000,000	UNHCR	Pre-defined
Outcome 4	Orderly and humane voluntary return of migrants or vulnerable groups is secured	€ 1,000,000	IOM	Pre-defined
Bilateral Outcome	Enhanced collaboration between beneficiary and donor state entities involved in the programme	€ 125,000	Multiple	Open Call
<b>Total Funding: 15.257.000,00 EUR</b>				

More information on the history of the programmes and each project separately can be found in the FOs [website](#). Each programme has a bilateral relations outcome which is expected to be included in the evaluation.

### 3. Subject of the Evaluation

#### 3.1 Scope

The evaluation of the programmes “Asylum and Migration” and “Local Development and poverty reduction” will be conducted at the end of programmes implementation and completed not later than November 2024, and seek to provide an in-depth analysis of the actual achievements of the two programmes compared to the planned ones and to provide answers to questions related to why and how results were achieved. It shall contribute to increased understanding of how the EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms’ contributed to the improvement of the situation in the two programmatic areas and address the limitations and its potential to bring about social and economic development within the Beneficiary State (Greece). The evaluators should establish the extent to which the each programme was successful in relation to its objective and expected outcomes. The evaluators should refer to specific projects and establish which specific activities lead to which results. The evaluation team should be able to provide evidence to support findings on why each programme was successful or not, and consider what these results mean in a broader context (sectoral and/or national).

The evaluators should provide clear conclusions and recommendations, which will be used by stakeholders (i.e. FMO, EEA Grants National Focal Point, Greek public authorities and other interested parties) in the design of future interventions.

#### 3.2 Evaluation Criteria & Evaluation Questions

There is a high degree of international consensus with respect to criteria to be applied in evaluations<sup>6</sup>. For the Programmes and Funds supported through the EEA and Norway Grants in the 2014-21 Financial Mechanisms, the definitions of evaluation criteria are presented below, while more details and comments on the interpretation of each criterion can be found in the [EEA Grants results guidelines](#).

To that end, the FO presents below the selected evaluation criteria and the respective Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) per programme that the evaluations assignment should reply on, noting that these KEQs are subject of refinement by the selected evaluator during the preparation of the inception report.

#### **Evaluation Criteria Asylum and Migration Programme**

The programme Asylum and Migration is consisted by 5 projects awarded to national NGOs (ARSIS, IRC, MDM, Metadrasi, IRC) through an Open Call process to set-up 219 new places, and operate Open Accommodation Centers for UAMs and vulnerable women and 3 Predefined Projects implemented by two International Organizations (UNHCR and IOM) and an Norwegian INGO (NORCAP), focusing on the capacity building of partnering public authorities (MoMA and EKKA) and on voluntary returns of vulnerable migrants.

The primary scope of evaluation is to understand to what extent the programmes achieved what they were set to achieve (accountability) and what can we learn from this implementation period that may be useful in the design of

---

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. OECD, <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revise-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

a future programme.. For that reason, the evaluation of the **Asylum and Migration Programme** should focus on **three domains** in particular effectiveness, sustainability and impact:

Criterion	Key Evaluation Questions
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ To what extent the Programme performed as intended, and/or did the programmes achieved the expected results and why?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were the outputs produced and outcomes achieved to the desired quality (as opposed to quantity)?</li> </ul>
<b>SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ To what extent are the benefits and results of the Programme/Fund likely to continue in the next five years ?</li> </ul>
<b>IMPACT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Did the programme produce the intended results in the short, medium and long term?</li> <li>✓ What unintended results – positive and negative – did the intervention produce? How did these occur?</li> </ul>

### Evaluation Criteria Local Development and Poverty Reduction Programme

The Programme Local Development and Poverty Reduction is consisted by three Pre-Defined Projects, two of which intervene in the urban area of Athens (**Skills on Demand** and **Athens Solidarity Center**), and the third one's geographic coverage (**Integration of refugee children to education**) is the Greek mainland, with an important share of participating schools located in Attica region. Due to the characteristics of this programme, the FO prioritizes the **evaluation of impact** of the fund. In particular, the FO is interested to investigate the efficiency, the sustainability, and the impact at local level by assessing the extent to which the fund spur social and economic effects in the areas that the projects were implemented both in beneficiaries lives as well as on the rest of the local society.

The KEQs per selected criterion are presented below and include the mandatory KEQs that any evaluation has to include according to EEA Grants Results Guidelines, as well as some additional ones in cases deemed necessary. Tenderers are welcomed to propose additional KEQs under the five selected criteria that might be also compatible with the impact of the programmes.

Criterion	Key Evaluation Questions
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ To what extent the Programme performed as intended, and/or did the programmes achieved the expected results and why?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were the outputs produced and outcomes achieved to the desired quality (as opposed to quantity)?</li> </ul>
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ To what extent did the Programme/Fund delivered the planned results (outputs and outcomes in the results framework) in an economic and timely way?</li> <li>✓ Has the implementation of the Programme/Fund experienced any delays? If so, which?</li> <li>✓ How COVID-19 affected the programmes' efficiency?</li> </ul>
<b>SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ As regards the capacity building component of the programme to the public entities, are the produced results sustainable?</li> </ul>

The tenderers in their proposals are expected to elaborate on how the proposed methods and tools will be efficient in replying to the abovementioned KEQs.

### 3.3 Methods and tools

Tenderers, should propose the specific **evaluation methods and tools** to be used taking into account the evaluation specifications described in this call, in balance with the available financial and other resources to conduct the



assignment. A **mixed-method** approach is considered as optimum and some of the methods that the FO expects to see in the proposals are the following:

1. Desk Research: legal, political and contextual changes including emergency situations and COVID-19 during the implementation of the programmes that have potentially affected the expected results. Also, through desk research, the review of funds with similar purpose with specific objectives should be included (e.g. AMIF) to ensure that a comparative analysis of cost efficiency of EEA grants contribution is conducted. The candidate evaluators can suggest additional sources of information that will be reviewed during the desk research.
2. Secondary data sources review: programmatic data provided by the FO (e.g. financial data, progress reports, project indicators, ad-hoc assessments, progress monitoring reports, evaluation reports at project level where they exist). In addition, performance indicators will be made available for use per project at all levels (from activity to outcome level) (see section0). Communication material produced by the Project Promoters and the FO will be part of the secondary data sources review.
3. Primary data sources and organization of primary data collection: The tenderers should suggest targeted primary data collection where and when needed (e.g. survey, FGDs, KIIs or other) and indicatively describe the target population, the method and the expected contribution on evaluating specific outcomes.
4. Data analysis: As both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected from desk research, primary and secondary sources, the candidate evaluator should explain what are the expected methods of analysis and what are the tools and the expertise he/she offers towards conducting an valid analysis.
5. Validation of results process should be used to verify the findings with key stakeholders at different level of implementation (e.g. FO, Project Promoters or other).

### 3.4 Available resources

The successful tenderer will have access upon request on the programmatic records at project and programme level such as the following:

#### **Asylum and Migration Programme**

- Open Call documents
- Project Agreements between the FO and the Projects Promoters
- Contact details for Project Promoters implementing projects under the programme
- Quarterly Progress Reports (financial and implementation aspects including progress in results framework indicators)
- Quarterly Monitoring Review Reports prepared by the FO
- Final Project Reports (Financial and implementation aspects)
- Annual Reports to the FMO
- For Open Call projects, Assessment records on Compliance with EASO standards
- For INGOs projects (NorCap or European Wergeland Center), external auditors reports
- Cooperation Committee meeting minutes and disseminated documents
- Communication material developed by the FO or the project promoters during the projects implementation

#### **Local development and poverty reduction Programme**

- Project Agreements between the FO and the Projects Promoters
- Contact details for Project Promoters implementing projects under the programme

- Quarterly Progress Reports (financial and implementation aspects including progress in results framework indicators)
- Quarterly Monitoring Review Reports prepared by the FO
- Final Project Reports (Financial and implementation aspects)
- Annual Reports to the FMO
- Project Integrating Refugee Children in the Greek Schools: Project Evaluation report (University of Leeds)
- Project Municipality of Athens: Project Evaluation Report
- For INGOs projects (NorCap or European Wergeland Center), external auditors reports
- Communication material developed by the FO or the project promoters during the projects implementation

Access on the abovementioned material will be given to authorized evaluation team members which will have to sign a **confidentiality agreement** for the ethical use of the programme's data.

### 3.5 Confidentiality and Research Ethics

All information collected, whether from documents, questionnaires, or interviews should be kept strictly confidential. Sources of comment will not be disclosed, and questionnaires or other non-public data collected will not be attributed and will remain confidential to the team.

In case that data collection includes the participation of final beneficiaries (i.e. refugees, unaccompanied minors, children, vulnerable people etc.) the candidate evaluator need to describe the **research ethics principles** applicable when involving this population on research.

## 4. Time plan and deliverables

The suggested duration of the evaluations of the two programmes is **7 months in total**. An indicative timeline is presented below.

Deliverable	Deliverable description	Time after the contract signature
<b>D.1 Kick-off meeting</b>	Kick-off meeting Agenda and minutes of the meeting, discussion on the D.2	+1 week
<b>D.2 Inception report</b>	Structure of the Inception Report <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kick-off arrangements</li> <li>2. Deployment of evaluation staff</li> <li>3. Preliminary data collection (desk review, secondary data collection including programmes indicators)</li> <li>4. Observed Risks, constraints, and suggested mitigation measures</li> <li>5. Final Evaluation Plan               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Key questions and criteria</li> <li>b) Sources of evidence and data collection</li> <li>c) Fieldwork plan</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. Evaluation tools (Questionnaires, outline topic guides for interviews etc.)</li> <li>7. Proposed Structure of the final Evaluation Report</li> </ol>	+ 15 days
<b>D3: 1<sup>st</sup> Interim progress report</b>	A report describing the progress of implementation of the evaluation plan. Indicative structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results from desk research</li> <li>• List of secondary data sources reviewed and usability assessment for the purpose of evaluation</li> </ul> Final plan and tools of primary data collection per programme	+2 months

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization of the field work</li> </ul>	
<b>D4: 2<sup>nd</sup> interim report</b>	<p>A report describing the progress of implementation of the evaluation plan per programme. Indicative structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Evaluation tools used (Questionnaires, outline topic guides for interviews etc.) per programme</li> <li>Results from Primary Data collection: methods, tools, target population, sample reached per programme</li> <li>Report on data analysis (quantitative and qualitative), draft results including comments on data quality per programme.</li> </ol>	+4 months
<b>D5: Draft Evaluation Reports</b>	Draft of the final evaluation report with the indicative contents described in paragraph 4.1	+ 5 months
<b>D6: Final Evaluations reports and dissemination material</b>	See chapter 4.1	+ 6 months
<b>D7: Dissemination event</b>	See chapter 4.1	+ 7 months

Deliverable's language: English

Although some of the projects will close at the end of 2023, the evaluation ***must finish at the latest by the end of December 2024***, noting that there is zero flexibility to extend the evaluation timeline after that month. However, the tenderers can propose alternatives to extend the time plan i.e. by starting the evaluations earlier.

### Final Evaluation Reports and Dissemination

**Two separate Final evaluation reports** will be delivered by the selected evaluator as a result of the evaluation assignment, one for each of the programme under evaluation. These reports will be reviewed, commented and approved by the National Focal Point, the Programme Operator (FMO), the donor state(s), and the FO. Although the completion of the evaluation deliverables is a responsibility of the FO, the FMO, or the national focal point of EEA grants may participate, provide comments and suggestions on specific deliverables. Other relevant stakeholders may also be invited to comment on the draft final report.

The Final Evaluation Reports and dissemination material (D.6) should demonstrate impartiality and provide a balanced views of strengths and weaknesses. In case the conclusion from data analysis suggests conflicting views from different parties, the evaluation report should reflect and acknowledge all perspectives.

Each of the two Final Evaluation Reports and dissemination materials (D.6) should be consisted of one **(1) extensive Final Evaluation report** (maximum 50 pages without the annexes and the front page) and one **(1) summary in the form of printable infographic** (maximum 1 page) **or other form** (e.g. power point presentation), focusing on different parts of the evaluation that are of interest to particular audiences. The exact content of the infographics will be agreed between the evaluator and the Fund Operator. The structure of each of the **extensive Final evaluation report per programme** should be indicatively the following:

- Table of Contents
- List of Abbreviations
- List of Tables
- List of Figures
- Executive Summary (in English and Greek)
- Introduction
  - Background to the programmes
  - Background to the evaluation
- Methodology
  - Methods, tools and data sources used

- Stakeholders involved
- Findings
  - Findings presented per evaluation question by analysis of relevant data
- Conclusions
- Recommendations for future programming
- Annexes. (including data analysis results and informative tables)

The final evaluation reports should be drafted according to the EEA Grants [Communication and Design manual](#). In addition, the evaluator will be asked to present the results of the Programmes evaluation in a public event organized by the FO.

For the sake of transparency, the results must be publicly accessible, so the two **final evaluation reports** will be published, so as the soundness of the analysis can be checked, while the evaluator will have the overall responsibility for the contents of the final report. Upon the approval of the Final Evaluation Reports, the evaluator should present the results in the targeted audience through a dedicated event /meeting to be organized by the FO.

## 5. Governance and accountability

The applied governance structure of the EEA and Norway Grants can be found [here](#). The evaluation contract will be signed between the Fund Operator and the successful tenderer. The Fund Operator is responsible to monitor the progress towards the execution of the evaluation and that the deliverables are submitted by the evaluator in a timely and quality manner.

This final evaluation report will be subject for review, comments and approval by the National Focal Point, the relevant Programme Operator(s), the donor state(s), the FMO and the FO. Other relevant stakeholders may also be invited to comment on the draft final report.

## 7. Instructions for Tenders

### 7.1 Tender Submission

Tenders can be submitted in electronic form to the dedicated programme email: [info@asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr](mailto:info@asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr), signed and stamped by the legal representative of the legal entity or the natural person. The proposal for Section A should be submitted with the subject "**Tender for EEA Grants Programmes Evaluation**".

The deadline for submission of tenders is **10 30/10/2023 at 17:00 Athens time**, as evidenced by the date of receipt by the Fund Operator. Fund Operator shall not consider any tender that arrives after the deadline for submission of tenders. Any tender received after the deadline for submission of tenders, shall be declared late, rejected and returned unopened to tenderer.

### FAQs

Any requests for additional information will be accepted in writing in the tender functional mailbox: [info@asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr](mailto:info@asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr) not later than 6 days before the submission deadline and will be responded ONLY in writing and ONLY via the tender functional mailbox: [info@asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr](mailto:info@asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr). Please use the subject "**Request for clarification for the ToR for EEA Grants Programmes Evaluation**". Responses to queries will be given until 4 days before the submission deadline and the FO's answers will be published on the Fund Operators website <https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr>. It is therefore advisable to consult the website regularly.

## 7.2 Content of tenders

Proposals shall be submitted in English electronically and not hand-written. Tenders submitted in other language or hand-written will be automatically rejected. Associations and consortia shall provide all above proofs for each participating entity or person. The expected contents for the offers are presented below:

- a) Documentation relevant to the eligibility criteria of the tenderer (as described in respective section
- b) Documentation on the Selection Criteria (**Technical Capacity**) including:
  - A cover letter introducing the consultant(s)/organisation and how the skills and competencies needed for the assignment and described in Section Selection Criteria
  - 
  - **CVs in Europass format** required for all Evaluation team members included in the proposal (maximum 3 pages each)
  - List of the top 5 similar services completed during the **last 5 years** according to the template provided in Annex I: Table of similar services completed documenting the previous similar assignments, preferably on the management of external private or public funds and programmes/projects financed by donors.
  - A letter of availability should be submitted by the evaluation team members to ensure that the experts proposed in the proposal will be available to conduct the evaluation according to the time plan (Annex II).
- c) **Technical proposal:** Maximum 10-page outline with a brief overview of proposed methodologies, tools and the proposed evaluation process that demonstrate the understanding of needs and deliverables of the evaluation as well as the organization of the work and resources in order to timely complete the evaluation in a quality manner
- d) **Financial Proposal:** In total, the maximum amount of **21.047,62 euros (including VAT)** will be allocated for the programme Asylum and Migration and **8.952,38 euros (including VAT)** for the programme Local Development and Poverty Reduction. **The amount to be used for scoring is the sum of the two proposed budgets. A total amount of up to 30,000 euros including VAT.** Proposals should also include an analysis of the evaluation fee, travel and accommodation costs, daily allowance and preparation/report writing and dissemination products). Given the small available budget for the evaluation, the candidates are allowed to reshuffle the amount between the two programmes up to 20% of the smallest amount (8.952,38 euros) if needed, to ensure utilization and combination of resources (e.g. travelling, graphic design services or any other).

## 6. Eligibility Criteria

In order to be eligible to submit a proposal, tenderers (all tenderers if applying as a consortium) must:

- be legal entities or individual consultants and
- be established in one country of the EU, the European Economic Area, or any third country having concluded bilateral or multilateral agreements with the EU on public procurement procedures and
- be independent of government and governmental bodies at all levels and
- be free of any conflict of interest due to relationship or activity, i.e. having no business, family, friendships or other relations, such as owning shares at the FO or the PPs, having previously worked for the programmes, or is currently working for the programmes, having a relative who is working for the programmes, having a close personal friend in the BoD of the FO or the PP, having received gifts or hospitality, money or other benefits from the FO or the PPs, having generally a personal, family obligation, professional or legal to the FO or PPs. To that end, tenderer shall submit *a solemn declaration declaring that they have not been involved in the planning, selection or implementation of the programmes under evaluation, nor have they been involved in any way, in*

*the activities to be evaluated under this ToR, nor have they any personal interest directly or indirectly in the projects implemented and evaluation conclusions. Tenders shall also declare in the same solemn of declaration that they and their staff have no professional or legal relationships with any of the implementing actors of the projects (project promoters and fund operator) under the two programmes during the last 5 years.*

- have stable and sufficient sources of finance to maintain their activity throughout the contract duration.
- Tenderers are required to prove that they have sufficient economic and financial capacity to perform the contract.
- An association of two or more legal entities or natural persons or even a consortium is also eligible for application

## 7. Selection Criteria

Selection criteria relate to:

(a) Suitability to pursue evaluation:

- Adequate **professional and academic background** that proves the competencies of the team members and the expertise in conducting evaluations in the humanitarian and development sector (e.g. programme evaluation and policy analysis, economic, social or/and political science, humanitarian or development studies, qualitative and quantitative research methods or other relevant discipline). The above competencies will be assessed cumulatively for all team members (at least one team member).
- Experience of at **least 5 years** in evaluation of programmes in the field of asylum & migration and local development (at least one team member).
- Demonstrated competences in using innovative evaluation methods including the most relevant ones for the humanitarian sector (at least one team member).
- Previous experience in the Greek context of EEA and Norway Grants will be considered an asset.
- The language of the deliverables is **English** so capacity at proficiency level is a must. In addition, Greek language skills will be considered an asset to ensure that the national legal context can be adequately considered in the evaluation.

(b) economic and financial standing: The tenderer's accounts for the last three (3) financial years with an overall turnover of minimum 15.000 euro.

(c) professional ability: Professional ability shall be proven by the works awarded during the last three (3) years which shall be of the same or similar object but also of at least the same budget.

## 8. Evaluation Criteria

Should the Tender meets all the requirements specified in the tendering document without material deviation, reservation, or omission, the Fund Operator shall use the criteria listed on the table below to evaluate the tenders. No other evaluation criteria shall be permitted.

Fund Operator may, at its discretion, ask any Tenderer for a clarification of its Tender. Any clarification submitted by a Tenderer in respect to its Tender and that is not in response to a request by the Fund Operator shall not be considered. Fund Operator's request for clarification and the response shall be in writing. No change, including any voluntary increase or decrease, in the prices or substance of the Tender shall be sought, offered, or permitted except to confirm the correction of arithmetic errors discovered by the Fund Operator in the Evaluation of the Tenders. If a Tenderer does not provide clarifications of its Tender by the date and time set in the Fund Operator's request for clarification, its Tender may be rejected.

By applying the criteria listed below, Fund Operator shall determine the Highest Evaluated Tender. This is the Tender of the Tenderer that meets the qualification criteria and whose Tender has been determined to be substantially responsive to the tender documents and the highest evaluated.

The contract will be awarded to the **most economically advantageous tenderer** evaluating technical and price using a weight of **80% given to quality and 20% the price of each proposal**. The quality of the tender will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Selection Criteria	Description	Maximum Score	Minimum Score
Comprehension of the needs of the evaluation	Comprehension of the complexity of the evaluation context the relation between the two programmes and the context on which the programme was operated	10	5
Quality of the proposed methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehension of the evaluation questions</li> <li>Proposed methodology for setting the framework of the evaluation &amp; evaluation design is efficient to feed evaluation questions.</li> <li>The proposed data collection and analysis tools and the proposed methodology for interpretation, judgement and reporting of the evaluation findings</li> </ul>	30	15
The evaluator team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience in the programme areas</li> <li>Evaluation skillset</li> </ul>	40	20
Organization of the work and resources (value for money)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good understanding on the intensiveness of the work and capacity to achieve the demanding time plan of the evaluation.</li> <li>Allocation of the resources and roles of the proposed team for each task.</li> <li>Adequacy of the time and resources allocation to each task or deliverable</li> <li>Mix between senior and junior members.</li> <li>Fieldwork costs and working days for the evaluation team</li> </ul>	20	10
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>50</b>

For each criterion, the applicants should meet a minimum score in order to be included into the final ranking list as described in the following tables. Award (ranking of tenders)

The Fund Operator shall compare the evaluated tenders to determine the tenderer that has the highest evaluated tender. The comparison shall be on the basis of total score in accordance with the formula below.

$$\text{Total Score} = \frac{P_{\min}}{P_i} * 20 + \frac{T_i}{T_{\max}} * 80$$

Where:

$P_{\min}$ = Lowest Price

$P_i$ = Price of the Tenderer

$T_i$ = Technical score of the Tenderer

$T_{\max}$ = Highest technical score

Price weighting = 20

Quality criteria weighting = 80

The contract will be awarded to the Tenderer with the highest score. All the tenderers will be informed written for the final scoring list.

The Fund Operator shall transmit the Letter of Award to the successful Tenderer. The letter of award shall request the successful tenderer to accept the Award by signing the Letter and sending it back to the Fund Operator. Within 14 days from acceptance, Successful Tenderer will be requested to sign, date and return the Contract Agreement to the Fund Operator.

For signing the contract, the winning contractors will have to submit to FO all documents proving their legal status and their legal representation, as will be requested by the FO. The name of winning tenderer(s) will be published on the FOs dedicated [website](#).

Fund Operator reserves the right to accept or reject any Tender, and to annul the Tendering process and reject all Tenders at any time prior to notification Award, without thereby incurring any liability to Tenderers. In case of annulment, all Tenderers shall be notified with reasons and all Tenders submitted shall be promptly returned to the Tenderers.

## 8.1 Appeals

Applicants can submit an appeal against the official decision of the FO within **ten days** from the receipt of the rejection letter. The Fund Operator is obliged to assess the appeal within ten more days.

## 9. Volume of the Contract

The total estimate to be contracted, amounts to **€30.000 (€20.000 + €10.000 VAT)**

## 10. Dispute Resolution

The present TOR and the whole tender procedure will be governed by Greek Law. For any dispute that cannot be resolved amicably, the courts of Athens will be competent courts.

## 11. References

- [EEA and Norway Grants, Results Guidelines](#)
- <https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr>
- <https://eeagrants.org/about-us/organisational-structure>
- <https://eeagrants.org/sites/default/files/resources/2014-2021%20Results%20guideline.pdf>
- [https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/TargetsOutcomes\\_Bilateral-Cooperation-Initiatives.pdf](https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/TargetsOutcomes_Bilateral-Cooperation-Initiatives.pdf)
- [https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/TargetsOutcomes\\_Local-Development-and-Poverty-Reduction.pdf](https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/TargetsOutcomes_Local-Development-and-Poverty-Reduction.pdf)
- [https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/TargetsOutcomes\\_Asylum-migration.pdf](https://www.asylumandmigration-eeagrants.gr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/TargetsOutcomes_Asylum-migration.pdf)

## Annexes

Annex I: Table of similar services completed

Title of the Project				
Name of the programme	Budget (EUR)	Description	Donor	Dates (start/end)
Link of Published (evaluation) report or other document verifying the completion of evaluation (e.g certificate of successful contract completion)				



## Annex II: Template of the letter of intent for evaluation team members

### LETTER OF AVAILABILITY FOR THE EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

Terms of Reference for the selection of Evaluator for the EEA Grants programmes in Greece, 2014-2021, “Asylum & migration” and “Local development & Poverty reduction”

The undersigned:(Name, Address, email)

For the attention of the Fund Operator I, (name) the undersigned, do hereby confirm that in the event that the (name of the tenderer) application of the is successful in securing the conduction of Evaluation for the EEA Grants programmes in Greece, 2014-2021, “Asylum & migration” and “Local development & Poverty reduction” , I am available to work as member of the evaluation team with the role of (role name) for the execution of evaluation, in accordance with the TORs specifications and the tender to which the present form is annexed, and I am available to carry out the part of the tasks assigned during the period foreseen for the execution of the contract.

Date, Name/Signature