EVALUATION AND FITNESS CHECK (FC) ROADMAP			
TITLE OF THE EVALUATION	Evaluation of EU support for Security Sector Reform in enlargement and neighbourhood countries (2010-2016)		
LEAD DG – RESPONSIBLE UNIT	DG NEAR A3	DATE OF THIS ROADMAP	11/11/2016
TYPE OF EVALUATION	Evaluation External	PLANNED START DATE	Q4 / 2016
		PLANNED COMPLETION DATE	Q1 / 2018
		PLANNING CALENDAR	http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/index_en.htm
This indicative roadmap is provided for information purposes only and is subject to change.			

A. Purpose

(A.1) Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an assessment and evidence on the scope and performance of the implemented and on-going EU support for Security Sector Reform (SSR) in countries covered by the IPA[1] and ENPI/ENI[2] instruments. It aims at providing recommendations for the improvement of the programming and implementation of EU support to Security Sector Reform in line with the principles laid down in the Communication JOIN (2016) 31 final "Elements for an EU-wide strategic framework to support security sector reform" and the Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy.

The results of the evaluation will be used to:
- demonstrate whether already on-going/planned IPA (I) II, ENPI/ENI action programmes/interventions in the area of SSR have taken on board the past lessons learnt;
- feed into the reflection on the revision of policies/programmes in view of the recent adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and new policy framework for SSR;
- provide recommendations for the European Commission on the best way to approach and improve its support to SSR both in terms of the use of policy dialogue and financial assistance following the adoption of the new EU SSR policy framework[3];
- contribute to the preparation/ adjustment of action programmes, namely for IPA II and ENI assistance to the extent possible;
- contribute to the development of a monitoring and evaluation framework, including indicators for security capacity building and SSR related activities

(A.2) Justification

This evaluation is in line with the "evaluation first principle", requiring a comprehensive evaluation on the performance of policy, instruments, and programmes in the context of planning new interventions.

B. Content and subject of the evaluation

(B.1) Subject area

The EU's external action is guided by the objectives laid down, inter alia, in Article 21(2) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) which, amongst other objectives, include to "preserve peace, prevent conflicts and strengthen international security" and to "foster the sustainable economic, social and environmental development of developing countries, with the primary aim of eradicating poverty". Whilst the Treaty of Lisbon only came into force in 2009, these objectives have been at the heart of EU external action under both Community competence and the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), as reflected in key policy documents. Furthermore, the EU has long recognised the security-development nexus and the need

---

1 Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/instruments/overview/index_en.htm

2 European Neighbourhood Instrument 2014-2020, http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/how-is-it-financed/index_en.htm

3 Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council: Elements for an EU-wide strategic framework to support security sector reform (JOIN(2016) 31 final); https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/joint-communication-ssr-20160705-p1-854572_en.pdf

for supporting Security Sector Reform in partner countries in order to strengthen state structures while meeting the security needs of the population.

The EU has long been engaged in supporting Security Sector Reform in partner countries and regions around the world under a wide range of policies and instruments. These include policies and instruments, which fall under Development Cooperation, Enlargement, the Stabilisation and Association Process, the European Neighbourhood Policy, Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management (including CSDP[4]/CFSP), Democracy and Human Rights, and the External Dimension of the area of Freedom, Security and Justice.

In 2005 and 2006, two distinct SSR policies were released and framed up to 2016, the Union's support to partner countries/third states in security sector reform. The "EU Concept for ESDP Support for Security Sector Reform" (2005) focused on the principles, key elements and modalities for the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP, now CSDP[5]) support to SSR. It also stressed the need for close cooperation among all relevant actors to ensure a consistency, coherence and complementarity of EU external action. This approach was mirrored by the "Concept for European Community Support for Security Sector Reform" (2006) which also identified areas of engagement, the guiding principles, and the need for coordinated and holistic approach to SSR, complementing ESDP's action.

The Council conclusions of 6 June 2006 established that these two concepts constituted the EU policy framework on SSR. EU action on SSR should be based on principles drawing on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) definition of SSR. The EU policy framework also made clear that the EU can mobilise a broad range of civilian and military instruments able to support SSR activities and that a case-by-case analysis is needed to assess whether proposed activities should be done under EU cooperation instruments, CSDP, or a combination of both.

In December 2013, the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR) issued a Joint Communication on the "Comprehensive Approach to External Conflicts and Crises[6]" which emphasised the strategic and coherent use of the EU's tools and instruments spanning the diplomatic, security, defence, financial, trade, development cooperation and humanitarian aid fields. This was followed in April 2015 by the Joint Communication on "Capacity Building in Support of Security and Development[7]" (CBSD) which analysed how to better operationalise the Comprehensive Approach in the field of capacity building in the security sector and proposed options and steps to better combine existing EU policies and funding instruments. One of the options proposed was the establishment of an EU-wide Strategic Framework for Security Sector Reform. This was later endorsed in May 2015 by the Council and included in the Commission Work Programme 2016.

The recent Joint Communication "Elements for an EU-wide strategic framework to support security sector reform"[8] provides elements for a single EU-wide SSR support framework, as set out in the May 2015 Council conclusions[9], including also for guiding the EU's work on capacity building in support of security and development (CBSD). It reflects the 'comprehensive approach' to external conflict and crisis in bringing together common security and defence policy (CSDP) and all other relevant common foreign and security policy (CFSP) tools, external action instruments and freedom, security and justice actors, thus merging and updating the two previously separate EU policy concepts for SSR support[10]. It will contribute to the effectiveness of the Global Strategy on foreign and security policy[11] and of the European Agenda on Security[12]. It also takes account of relevant OECD-DAC decisions[13] and, where applicable, OECD-DAC directives in the field of peace and security.

Internationally, the nexus between security and development continues to rise in prominence. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development adopted in September 2015 by the United Nations General Assembly acknowledged that there can be no sustainable development without peace and vice versa. In particular, Goal 16 of this Agenda aims at promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, providing access to justice for all, building effective, accountable institutions at all levels. Furthermore, the OECD-DAC recognised in December 2014 that "peaceful and inclusive societies will be an increasingly important part of the development agenda" and agreed to "generate greater

4 Common Security and Defence Policy

5 Common Security and Defence Policy

6 JOIN(2013) 30 final, The EU's comprehensive approach to external conflict and crises

7 JOIN(2015) 17 final, Capacity building in support of security and development – Enabling partners to prevent and manage crises

8 JOIN(2016) 31 final, Elements for an EU-wide strategic framework to support security sector reform

9 Council conclusions on CSDP, Council of the European Union (document 8971/15, May 2015)

10 A concept for European Community support for security sector reform, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament (SEC(2006) 658); and EU concept for ESDP support to SSR (Council 12566/4/05), which was produced on the basis of the European Security Strategy - A Secure Europe in a Better World, adopted by the European Council on December 2003

11 Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe – A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, June 2016

12 COM(2015) 185 final, The European Agenda on Security

13 For example the agreement to 'update and modernise the ODA reporting directives on peace and security expenditures'; see high-level meeting final communiqué (OECD DAC, 19 February 2016)

14 Official Development Assistance

15 JOIN(2015) 50 final

political momentum in support of peacebuilding and state-building efforts." The OECD DAC subsequently decided on 19 February 2016 to "update and modernise the ODA[14] reporting directives on peace and security expenditures". These developments have highlighted the importance of the security-development nexus and have deep implications for EU external action in SSR.

The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) was designed in 2003 (Communication 'Wider Europe') to develop closer relations between the EU and its neighbouring countries. Under the ENP, the Union offers to its neighbours a privileged relationship, building upon a mutual commitment to, and promotion of, the values of democracy and human rights, the rule of law, good governance and the principles of a market economy and sustainable and inclusive development. The level of ambition of the relationship depends on the extent to which these values are shared.

The ENP was reviewed in 2011, following the 'Arab Spring' uprisings. However, given the significant developments in the Neighbourhood since 2011, it became essential to undertake a further review of the ENP. In this regard, the Joint Communication on the ENP review[15] adopted on 18 November 2015, which was welcomed by the 14 December 2015 Council conclusions, sets out strategic priorities for the EU's cooperation with Neighbourhood partners in the security area and proposes to address issues of common interest. The aim is to support partners, including through capacity building projects to ensure security for the population, to become more resilient to security threats and to be better prepared to prevent and respond to conflict and crises thereby stabilising EU's Neighbourhood, based on a tailor-made approach and the principle of differentiation. The ENP security dimension aims at fostering human security, which is inter-linked to the development of effective institutions (including security institutions) within the framework of democratic governance, transparency and accountability principles.

The reform of the security sector in candidate or potential candidate countries is partly covered under the political Copenhagen criteria (guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, respect and protection of minorities) for EU membership. The prospect of EU membership also carries with it a series of very specific obligations in the areas of border controls, migration, asylum and visa, police cooperation, or judicial co-operation in criminal or civil matters, which falls under the EU policy of freedom, security and justice. Fulfilling membership requirements in these areas is not only about transposing in national legislation the related EU acquis under Chapters 23 Judiciary and fundamental rights -24 Justice, freedom and security of accession negotiations. The countries must also demonstrate their capacity to successfully implement this acquis, and more generally align the rest of the related legislation and practice of their services in line with commonly accepted EU standards and best practices.

(B.2) Original objectives of the intervention

The overarching objectives are to contribute: (i) to peace, stability and security and (ii) the respect of democratic, rule of law and human rights principles in third countries, as prerequisites for development. These objectives will be achieved by promoting the legitimacy, good governance, integrity, sustainability, effectiveness and ownership of the security sector in third countries.

The security system reform processes supported by the EU should be[16]:
- **nationally/regionally owned reform processes** designed to strengthen good governance, democratic norms, the rule of law and the respect for human rights, in line with internationally agreed norms;
- **addressing the core requirements of a well-functioning security system**, including the development of a nationally owned concept of security, well defined policies and good governance of security institutions, while ensuring that any development of professional security forces leads them to be both accountable to the civil authorities and capable of carrying out the operational tasks assigned to them, in full respect of HR and Rule of Law principles;
- **seen as a framework for addressing diverse security challenges facing states and their populations**, based on a gender-sensitive multi-sector approach, and targeting reform needs in different key sectors. This includes separating tasks between different services and institutions;
- **based on** the same **principles of accountability and transparency** that apply across the public sector, in particular improved governance through greater civilian and parliamentary oversight of security processes;
- **based on political dialogue with each partner country**, addressing human rights, development and security concerns, and be carried out in synergy with other instruments.

(B.3) How the objectives were to be achieved

The EU support for SSR in IPA/ENI countries is provided through political and policy dialogue and financial assistance.

- <u>EU policy dialogue</u>

---

16 COM(2006) 253 final A concept for European Community support for security sector reform, Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament

At international level, in close cooperation with UN, the Council of Europe and the OSCE.

In its cooperation with **enlargement countries** the Commission is engaged in policy dialogue:
- at regional level, in the framework of the South East Europe Cooperation process and Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)
- at bilateral level, as part of the accession process;
- as part of the programming process of IPA assistance, setting specific objectives and priorities for support in: Multi-Annual Indicative Financial Frameworks (MIFFs) and Multi-Annual Indicative Planning documents (MIPDs) (for IPA I); Annual and/or multi-annual (action) programmes;
- Specifically for the 2014-2020 programming period – in the framework also of sector reform programmes and for budgetary support.

In its cooperation with **EU Neighbourhood countries** the Commission is engaged in policy dialogue:
- at bilateral level, through the agreement of ENP Action Plans or Association Agendas, in line with Association Agreements or other agreements between the EU and partner countries;
- at regional level in the framework of Eastern Partnership[17];
- as part of the programming process of ENPI/ENI assistance, setting specific objectives and priorities for support in Country Strategy Papers, Single Support Frameworks – SSF(Multi-annual Indicative Programmes), Annual Action programmes; and more specifically, in the case of budgetary support programmes;

- EU financial assistance

During 2007-2013, IPA assistance under the Component I (Transition Assistance and Institution Building) has provided opportunities for supporting actions aiming at strengthening of democratic institutions, as well as the rule of law, including its enforcement, at promoting and protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms and enhancing the respect for minority rights, at promoting gender equality and non-discrimination and reforming the public administration. IPA II (2014-2020) targets reforms within the framework of pre-defined sectors. These sectors cover areas closely linked to the enlargement strategy, such as democracy and governance, rule of law or growth and competitiveness. This sector approach promotes structural reform that will help transform a given sector and bring it up to EU standards. It allows a move towards a more targeted assistance, ensuring efficiency, sustainability and focus on results. The bulk of the assistance is channeled through the Country Action Programmes for IPA II Beneficiaries, which are the main vehicles for addressing country-specific needs in priority sectors as identified in the indicative Strategy Papers. Multi-Country Action Programmes aim at enhancing regional cooperation (in particular in the Western Balkans) and at adding value to the Country Action Programmes through other multi-beneficiary actions.

The vast majority of ENPI/ENI funding is used for bilateral cooperation, tailor-made to each Neighbourhood partner country. A key element in this context have been in the past the bilateral ENP Action Plans (AP), similar documents (e.g. Association Agendas) and successor documents (Partnership priorities), which are mutually agreed between the EU and each partner country. In addition to bilateral cooperation, ENI funding also supports regional, Neighbourhood-wide and Cross Border Cooperation (CBC) programmes.

EU SSR support is also funded from **other EU instruments** under projects that can be country-specific, multi-country / regional, or with a global coverage. These instruments are: the Instrument Contributing to Peace and Stability[18], the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights[19], thematic programmes of the Development Co-operation Instrument[20], the Instrument for Nuclear Safety Cooperation[21] and the Internal Security Fund (ISF)[22].

CSDP missions can also be providers of SSR support and their contributions will have to be taken into account in the context of the present evaluation.

EU SSR assistance has been implemented through a variety of modalities, i.a.:
- twinning, twinning light, TAIEX[23] and SIGMA[24];
- technical assistance and capacity building
- provision of equipment and supplies,
- grant schemes;
- budget support.

---

17 Platform 1 - "Democracy, good governance and stability"

18 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/fpi/what-we-do/instrument_contributing_to_stability_and_peace_en.htm

19 http://www.eidhr.eu/

20 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/finance/dci_en.htm_en

21 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/funding-instruments-programming/funding-instruments/instrument-nuclear-safety-cooperation_en

22 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/fundings/security-and-safeguarding-liberties/index_en.htm

23 Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument of the European Commission, http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/tenders/taiex/index_en.htm

24 Support for Improvement in Governance and Management , http://www.sigmaweb.org/

C. Scope of the evaluation/FC

(C.1) Topics covered

Based on the OECD-DAC definition[25], the security system can be defined as all state institutions and other entities with a role in ensuring the security of the state and its people.

- **Core security actors including law enforcement institutions**: armed forces; police; gendarmeries; paramilitary forces; presidential guards; intelligence services; coast guards; border guards; customs authorities; reserve or local security units.

- **Security management and oversight bodies**: parliament/legislature; government/the executive, including ministries of defence, internal affairs, foreign affairs; national security advisory bodies; financial management bodies; and civil society, including the media, academia and NGOs.

- **Justice institutions**: justice ministries; prisons; criminal investigation and prosecution services; the judiciary (courts and tribunals), implementation justice services (bailiffs and ushers); human rights commissions and ombudsmen; etc.

- **Non-statutory security forces**: liberation armies; guerrilla armies; private bodyguard units; private security companies; etc.

Security system reform means transforming the security system, which includes all these actors, their roles, responsibilities and actions, working together to manage and operate the system in a manner that is consistent with democratic norms and sound principles of good governance, and thus contributing to a well functioning security framework. For the EC, the objective is **to contribute** explicitly to **strengthening good governance, democracy, the rule of law, the protection of human rights and the efficient use of public resources**. In this respect, civilian control and Parliamentary oversight are key aspects of SSR[26].

The evaluation shall:

- Assess the performance (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact, sustainability and EU value added) of EU support (policy dialogue and financial assistance) to SSR in partner countries during 2010-2016;

- Assess the coherence, complementarity and coordination of EU interventions financed from IPAI/II and ENPI/ENI with other actions financed from other EU instruments, CFSP/CSDP actions and actions carried out by Member States, regional and international donors (state and/or international organisations) for SSR in the partner countries;

- Assess the Intervention logic of IPA II and ENI (2014-2020) programming/planning documents addressing SSR, in terms of their coherence with the new policy framework.

- Provide conclusions and recommendations both at policy and financial instrument level on how to further improve the support provided to SSR, including cross-fertilisation between IPA and ENI experiences.

Thematic coverage

The evaluation shall assess EU support to SSR in the following areas[27]:
- Democratic oversight and accountability
- Defense reform
- Intelligence and security service reform
- Integrated border management (with a focus on coast guards, border guards, customs authorities)
- Police reform
- Justice reform (in particular criminal justice reform)
- Prison reform
- Private security and military companies
- Civil society (including the media, academia and NGOs)

The evaluation will assess to what extent the EU support to SSR leads to the development of security systems that respect internationally accepted human rights, the rule of law and democratic principles; apply the good governance principles of transparency and openness, participation and inclusivity, and accountability; and fight corruption.

Geographical coverage

---

25 Security System Reform and Governance, Policy and Practice, DAC Guidelines and Reference Series (Paris: OECD 2004).

26 COM(2006) 253 final

27 Based on OECD DAC Handbook on Security System Reform (SSR), Supporting Security and Justice, 2007

The evaluation should cover:

- IPA II[28] beneficiary countries –Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo∗, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey;

- ENI partner countries – Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Republic of Moldova, Morocco, Palestine∗, Syria, Tunisia and Ukraine.

Temporal coverage

The evaluation will focus on assessing the performance of EU interventions to support SSR in ENI and IPA countries under implementation and/or decided in the period 2010-2016.

(C.2) Issues to be examined

In line with the Better Regulation guidelines on evaluations introduced by the Commission in 2015 and with DG NEAR Guidelines on linking planning/programming, monitoring and evaluation[29], the main evaluation criteria are: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, coherence and EU added value.

During the inception phase, a mapping of areas of EU interventions (policy dialogue and financial assistance) in the field of SSR in the period 2010-2016 in IPA and ENI countries will be prepared by the external evaluators as part of this assignment. The EU support for SSR provided to all above-mentioned countries shall be subject of analysis by the external evaluators during the desk phase. However, a limited number of countries and interventions (case studies) will be subject to a more in-depth analysis during the field phase. Up to 12 countries will be subject to this in depth analysis. The selection of the case study countries will be made by the Inter-service Steering Group (ISG) on the basis of a proposal to be made by the evaluators. This proposal will be based on a relevant and representative sample of interventions, to be established using criteria that the evaluators will have to define and present during the inception phase.

Indicative evaluation questions to be further developed at the inception stage are:

Relevance:
1. **To what extent has the policy and programming dialogue carried out in bilateral and regional contexts been in line with the objectives set in the EU policy framework on SSR and wider goals of EU's external cooperation?**
   - To what extent have the (original) objectives, defined in the programming/planning documents, proven to correspond to the needs and capacities of the partner countries in the area of SSR and the EU policy framework on SSR? To what extent have the EU interventions proved to be relevant to those needs?
   - To what extent has the EU engagement been based on analysis of the security sector and needs assesment in the partner countries?
   - To what extent has SSR been integrated in the Country (CSP) and Regional (RSP) strategy papers, Action plans and programming tools?

Effectiveness:
2. **To what extent have the objectives defined in the programming/planning documents been achieved?**
   - To what extent do the outputs and results of EU interventions correspond and contribute to the achievement of the objectives?
   - What have been the (quantitative and qualitative) effects of the EU interventions?
   - To what extent can these changes/effects be credited to the EU interventions?
   - To what extent has the civil society been succsesfully involved in the policy dialogue for the programming, implementation/monitoring of EU interventions in the SSR field?
   - To what extent has the EU complemented efforts of other international organisations in the SSR field?

Efficiency:
3. **To what extent has the EU ensured adequate and timely SSR expertise and support through its programmes and missions in the partner countries? To what extent has the EU support to SSR in partner countries been flexible to adapt to emerging needs?**
   - To what extent has the EU comprehensive approach[30] been applied in EU support to SSR in the partner countries?
   - What factors influenced the efficiency with which the achievements observed were attained?
   - To what extent has the choice of aid modality been the most appropriate? Could the use of other type of financing or mechanisms have provided better cost-effectiveness?

---

28 The Icelandic government has decided to put the EU accession negotiations on hold. In this context, the European Commission, in agreement with the Icelandic government, has suspended preparatory work on IPA for the period 2014-2020. As a consequence Iceland will not be covered by this evaluation.

∗ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

∗This designation shall not be construed as recognition of a State of Palestine and is without prejudice to the individual positions of the Member States on this issue.

29 http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2016/20160831-dg-near-guidelines-on-linking-planning-progrming-vol-1-v0.4.pdf

30 JOIN(2013) 30 final

- To what extent were the monitoring systems setup to function at regular intervals and be capable of collecting data and detecting problems? To what extent were the indicators appropriately designed to measure the progress in relation to the baseline situation and the effectiveness of the targets implementing the priorities? To what extent were the targets set realistic?
- To what extent are the costs involved justified, given the changes/effects which have been achieved?

Impact:

4. **To what extent the EU support (policy dialogue and financial assistance) has contributed to the development by the partner countries of security systems that respect internationally accepted human rights, the rule of law and democratic principles; apply the good governance principles of transparency and openness, participation and inclusivity, and accountability; and fight corruption?**
   - To what extent enlargement countries are converging towards EU objectives and targets, in particular in the framework of Chapters 23 and 24?
   - To what extent are partner countries converging towards relevant international standards, notably in the fields of human rights, the rule of law, fundamental freedoms?
   - To what extent are the outputs and immediate results translated into the desired/expected impacts? Are impacts sufficiently identified /quantified? Were there any unexpected impacts (both positive and negative)?
   - To what extent do the observed effects contribute to the achievement of the SSR policy framework overall objectives?
   - How fairly are the observed changes/effects distributed across the different stakeholders, genders and social groups? Are the needs of women and men appropriately addressed by these interventions? If not, why? If so, was this due to a specific element in programming or implementation?

Sustainability:

5. **To what extent the EU support to SSR is based on nationally owned processes?**
   - To what extent are the partner countries demonstrating ownership of the reform process during and after the EU intervention?
   - How much have the security sector reforms in Enlargement and Neighbourhood countries continued to be implemented after the end of the EU support? And how it could be attributed to the EU support (policy dialogue and financial assistance)?
   - To what extent are the outcomes of the EU interventions likely to continue producing effects after the end of EU funding?

Coherence, Complementarity, Coordination:

6. **To what extent is the EU engagement following a proper sequencing of political dialogue, cooperation activities/instruments and possible CSDP missions/operations?**
   - To what extent does the EU link its engagement in short-term and long term support in SSR?
   - To what extent is EU support for SSR complementary and coordinated with CSDP missions/operations and MS actions?
   - To what extent are the interventions of EU and Member States coordinated with those of international/regional organisations and donors to maximise their joint effects in the partner countries?
   - To what extent does the approach to SSR take into account inter-linkages between security development and governance, including democratic principles, rule of law, human rights and institutional capacity building?

EU added value:

7. **What is the additional value resulting from the EU support in SSR compared to what could be achieved by the Member States in the region and/or by the partner countries themselves at national and/or regional levels?**

(C.3) Other tasks
As part of this assignment, the contractor will be asked to reconstruct the intervention logic of EU support provided for SSR in partner countries and map the relevant EU interventions contracted in the 2010-2016 period. The final evaluation questions and methodology for this assignment will be completed and agreed upon during the inception phase of the evaluation.

D. Evidence base
(D.1) Evidence from monitoring
ENPI/ENI, IPA I/II actions have been subject to result oriented monitoring (ROM). The ROM reports as well as internal monitoring reports will be used by the evaluators during the Inception and Desk phases and to prepare the field missions as one among many inputs.

(D.2) Previous evaluations and other reports

Some relevant EC evaluations have taken place at national, regional and strategic level. They, together with the relevant performance audits of the European Court of Auditors, will be taken into account in the carrying out of the current evaluation. Hereunder non-comprehensive list of available evaluations/audit reports:

Thematic evaluations[31]:
- IPA II Monitoring, Reporting and Performance Framework, published in 2016
- Third interim evaluation of IPA assistance, published in 2015
- Thematic Evaluation on IPA Support to Roma Communities, published in 2015
- Thematic evaluation on IPA support to the fight against corruption, published in 2015
- Evaluation of TAIEX Instrument, published in 2015
- Synthesis of Budget Support Evaluations (2010-2014), published in 2014
- Mapping of Sector Strategies (IPA) published in 2014
- Thematic Evaluation of EU's Support to Refugees in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro and Serbia, published in 2014
- Thematic Evaluation of Rule of Law, Judicial Reform and Fight against Corruption and Organised Crime in the Western Balkans, published in 2013
- Evaluation of the European Union's Support to two European Neighbourhood Policy Regions (East and South) (2004-2010), published in 2013
- Thematic Evaluation of European Commission Support to Justice and Security System Reform, European Commission, November 2011[32]

Country evaluations[33]:
- Strategic evaluation of the EU cooperation with Georgia (2007-2013), published in 2015
- Evaluation of the European Union's Cooperation with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (2007-2013) - Country Level Evaluation, published in 2015
- Joint strategic evaluation of budget support operations in Morocco (2005-2012), published in 2014
- Strategic evaluation of the EU cooperation with the occupied Palestinian Territory and support to the Palestinian people (2008-2013), published in 2014
- Strategic evaluation of EU cooperation with Ukraine (2002-2009), published in 2010

European Parliament Studies:
- Assessing the EU's Approach to Security Sector Reform (SSR), January 2013[34]

Audit reports of the European Court of Auditors[35];
- Special report no 21/2016-EU pre-accession assistance for strengthening administrative capacity in the Western Balkans: A meta audit;
- Special report no.20/2016- Strengthening administrative capacity in Montenegro
- Special report no. 13/2016 - EU assistance for strengthening public administration in Moldova
- Special report no.11/2016 - Strengthening administrative capacity in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: limited progress in a difficult context
- Special report no 19/2014 – EU Pre-accession Assistance to Serbia
- Special report no 4/2013 – EU cooperation with Egypt in the Field of Governance
- Special reports 2009/12- The effectiveness of Commission's projects in the area of Justice and Home Affairs for Western Balkans;
- Special Reports 2009/16 The European Commission's management of pre-accession for Turkey
- Special Reports 2012/18 – European Union's assistance to Kosovo related to the rule of law

(D.3) Evidence from assessing the implementation and application of legislation (complaints, infringement procedures)
N/A
(D.4) Consultation

31 https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/80199_en; http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/news_corner/key-documents/index_en.htm

32 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/reports/2011/1295_vol1_en.pdf

33 https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/80199_en; http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/news_corner/key-documents/index_en.htm

34http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/433837/EXPOSEDE_ET%282013%29433837_EN.pdf

35 http://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/AuditReportsOpinions.aspx?ty=Special%20report&tab=tab4

Stakeholders for this evaluation include:

National/regional stakeholders include (non-exhaustive list):
- National IPA coordinators (NIPAC);
- National Coordinating Units in ENI countries (NCU)
- Operating Structures of participating beneficiary countries
- Members of the IPA and Sector monitoring committees
- TAIEX National Contact Points (NCPs)
- Law enforcement institutions
- Civil management institutions
- Criminal justice system institutions
- Armed forces, intelligence services
- Civil oversight institutions
- Non-state security actors

International stakeholders (non-exhaustive list):
- UN
- Council of Europe
- OSCE
- Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)
- Other regional/international organisations

EU stakeholders(non-exhaustive list):
- EEAS
- EU Delegations
- EU Agencies (e.g. CEPOL, EUROPOL, etc…)
- EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator

Targeted stakeholder consultation

Overall, the aims of the targeted stakeholder consultation are threefold: (i) to get stakeholders involved in the evaluation process and make them more proactive towards the aims of the evaluation; (ii) to use feedback from consultation to make the evaluation process and its outputs more relevant to stakeholders' needs; and (iii) to improve the quality, credibility and future use of the evaluation outputs through consultation and engagement of the various stakeholders.

The targeted consultation of stakeholders represents a crucial element of the evaluation methodology and will be ensured throughout all evaluation phases.

- Inception and desk phases

During the inception and desk phases, the EU and national/regional stakeholders will be consulted via phone/email/face to face discussions based on a comprehensive consultation strategy developed with the support of the contractor. Use of interviews, surveys, questionnaires and other tools will be considered and decided upon during the inception phase. Comments/views will be taken on board from these stakeholders before the finalisation of the Inception and the Desk phase reports.

- Field phase

During the field phase the evaluators will visit up to 12 countries.

- Final report

A stakeholders' workshop will be held towards the end of the field phase before the elaboration of the draft final report to discuss the findings and preliminary recommendations. The draft final report will be sent for comments to the stakeholders listed above before its finalisation.

- Dissemination

A dissemination seminar/conference will be held in Brussels once the evaluation has been completed.

(D.5) Further evidence to be gathered

In addition to the above consultation strategy (to be further defined), the contractor will gather evidence from desk research and other activities as needed.

E. Other relevant information/ remarks

Given that there will be an overarching ex-post evaluation of IPA I (2007-2013) to which this evaluation will feed in, the better regulation guidelines will not fully apply to this evaluation.

In particular:
- instead of a 12-week open public consultation, there will be targeted consultations as outlined in section D above; at the end of the process, instead of a Staff Working Document, there will be a management response to the final evaluation report through the follow up action plan that will be made public on DG NEAR internet site and a short summary of the evaluation in the Staff Working Document accompanying the Annual Report on the European Union's development and external assistance policies