

**« FICHE CONTRADICTOIRE » as of 01.12.2020**

**Mid-term Evaluation of the European Union Emergency Trust Fund (EUTF) for Stability and Addressing Root Causes of Irregular Migration and Displaced Persons in Africa (2015-2019)**

<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
<p><b>R-1: During the remaining implementation period, the EUTF should focus on generating further knowledge and understanding of its interventions and do this in a collaborative manner with other international bodies. To better capture outcomes and impacts, an ex-post evaluation should be conducted at least one year after all EUTF activities have been completed.</b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>The EUTF Africa has continuously paid strong attention and dedicated significant financial and non-financial resources to monitoring, research and learning through the Research and Evidence Facility (REF), the Monitoring &amp; Learning System (MLS) for the Horn of Africa and the Sahel/Lake Chad region and the MENOA for the North of Africa region. This allowed the EUTF for Africa to closely follow the performance of its interventions and to ensure informed decision-making. The MLS contract has been extended until the end of EUTF for Africa to ensure data collection, analysis and a contribution to drawing lessons.</p> <p>In 2019, a Third-Party Monitoring System has been established in Libya with the specific aim to monitor results and scrutinise human rights compliance of EUTF programmes.</p> <p>A lessons-learned exercise – led by Altai Consulting-started in 2019. This will provide valuable analysis and feedback of the migration, mobility and displacement</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For details on the ideas and possible actions proposed by the evaluation team to implement these recommendations, please consult section 5.2 of the evaluation report.

Recommendations <sup>1</sup>	Response of EU services	Follow-up (one year later)
	<p>programming in the EUTF Africa region to be capitalised on for the future programming exercises in targeted areas.</p> <p>The Research and Evidence Facility is planning a legacy project to further contribute to and disseminate the evidence base established under the EUTF, but it could be interesting to reflect on the possibility to establish a facility for research and lessons-learned under the new Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF).</p> <p>An <i>ex-post</i> evaluation, one year after the Trust Fund activities are completed, would be relevant <i>per se</i>. However, please note that the Final Evaluation of the EUTF for Africa will take place at the end of the implementation period that will help to better understand the impact of Trust Fund activities. If completed during the last year of the EUTF implementation period (2024), the Final Evaluation can be useful to feed into the midterm assessment of the MFF in 2024 reflecting on the work done on Migration and forced displacement to inform the period 2025-2027.</p> <p>With regards to generating learning, the EUTF is also producing a wealth of knowledge in several thematic areas including impact assessments and case studies.</p>	
<p><b>R-2: The EU should consider programming all its interventions in a country or region within <i>one</i> common (analytical) framework.</b></p>	<p><b>Partially Accepted</b></p> <p>For the next EU long-term budget (2021-2027), the Commission has proposed a new Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation</p>	

<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>Instrument (NDICI), which has been endorsed by the EP and the Council. Under this instrument, a geographic approach is introduced, by which the vast majority of the EU cooperation for a given country/region will be provided through a multi-annual country and/or a multi-country/regional programme. Programmes will be based on extensive analytical work to understand the country/region context. Joint programming documents and a Team Europe approach will also be used where possible to help ensure complementarity with Member States.</p> <p>A large part of NDICI programming will be composed of Team Europe Initiatives (TEIs), which also pursue an enhanced collaboration with EU Member States.</p> <p>However, it is possible that not all interventions could be covered under geographic programmes. For example, some actions that may be conducted without the consent of partner countries' governments (e.g. on human rights) may still need to be dealt through thematic programmes, which are complementary to the geographic programmes.</p>	
<p><b>R-3: The EU should have differentiated results framework structures depending on the development challenges in the partner country/region.</b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>The result framework structures should be built around intervention sectors and reforms in every country, taking into account specific development challenges.</p> <p>The current programming exercise is taking this principle into account. The suggestion of a “tranche</p>	

<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>programming” suggested in the Final Report is an interesting concept, as foreseen under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI). While indicative allocations for a given stream for the entire programming period can be agreed, the actual programming period for each resource stream may vary.</p> <p>In the particular case of forced displacement, flexibility and adaptation to development challenges would be needed as it would be hard to plan 7 years in advance.</p>	
<p><b>R-4: The EU should strengthen the treatment of migration in its bilateral and regional programmes, ensuring that the entire Valletta Action agenda is covered.</b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>With indicatively 10% of the NDICI budget dedicated to migration, the EU intends to enhance the inclusion of migration in country and regional programming, ensuring that it responds well to the needs of partners.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that the EU’s migration agenda is equally attuned to Europeans’ as well as to partner’s needs. It is relevant to ensure that all pillars of the Valletta Action Plan agenda, including the pillar on legal migration, are addressed and to find ways to do so through country and regional programmes.</p> <p>Experience and expertise developed under the EUTF for Africa should inform as much as possible future country and regional programmes. Similarly, the flexible approach offers a good model for future programmes, and should be maintained. In particular, regional migration support programmes will support</p>	

<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>comprehensive, balanced and tailor-made partnerships with relevant countries of origin or transit and host countries, following a flexible incitative approach, as per the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument. They will be complemented by actions under the country programmes, where appropriate.</p> <p>The effectiveness of existing instruments may be enhanced to ensure a greater strategic coherence, promote better information and experience sharing and ensure the adequate linkages to other relevant funding instruments. Relevant services such as HOME, ECHO should be involved, as should EU agencies such as EASO, FRONTEX and Europol, as per their respective mandates.</p> <p>Most African migration is intra-continental labour migration so a comprehensive migration policy should take into account inter-African issues of labour migration, with the Joint Africa-EU Strategy being a strategic basis for regional interventions. Actors such as the African Union, ECOWAS and IGAD may play important roles in promoting mutually beneficial migration and put in place policies and capacities required.</p>	
<p><b>R-5: The EU should develop differentiated contracting and implementation regulations for Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV) contexts.</b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>The recommendation is very relevant and so is the need for flexible implementation procedures, as they already exist under the EUTF for Africa.</p>	

<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>FCV contexts require indeed fast contracting while satisfying, at the same time, checks and balances in terms of sound financial management, transparency and non-discrimination. Flexible contracting procedures under the EUTF, as well as a set of derogations to the standard procedures, respond to such needs. Monitoring will have to be enhanced as well through third party monitoring and on the spot verifications and vetting. However, all interventions need to be conceived under a unique country strategy and coordination among different instruments and interventions needs to be ensured.</p> <p>This should not require differentiated regulations to avoid a mushrooming of different contracting procedures, but just specific provisions on flexibility and conflict sensitivity, which is already the case with some implementing partners. Although the EU could consider including assessment of “do no harm” procedures in the pillar assessment for delegated cooperation as well as develop its own human rights due diligence procedures, this type of procedures is of different nature as compared to the procedures currently assessed and it is possible that these could not usefully and realistically be included in pillar assessments.</p> <p>Developing a roster of potential implementing partners (IPs) is not necessarily a good idea. While the constitutive agreement (art.10) stipulates that delegated cooperation with Member States shall be the</p>	

<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>preferred option of implementation where the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness can be clearly demonstrated, the EUTF for Africa does not have a policy of preferred IPs, but decided to engage with partners with extensive and proven experience in targeted thematic areas. Moreover, the EUTF selected a large array of IPs through complete processes such as calls for proposals. It would be important to further enhancing the involvement of CSOs/NGOs, if necessary through ad hoc consortia, in the implementation of programmes. This does not require any change to the existing contracting and implementation regulations.</p>	
<p><b>R-6: The EU support to economic opportunities and employment creation should be embedded within larger market development efforts and private sector involvement.</b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>We welcome this recommendation, but we would like to highlight that private sector is largely present in the EUTF for Africa portfolio in the Sahel/Lake Chad region under one of the targeted thematic areas (promotion of economic and employment opportunities), both as an area of support and as an implementing partner. Projects aim at upgrading enterprises, giving access to finance for small and medium-sized enterprises or at reducing skills gaps and setting up training courses in entrepreneurship and mentoring. The adopted approach was meant to be innovative and preparatory to the roll-out of future programs to be funded under the future MFF as well as Team Europe Initiatives. Impact assessments and research outcomes in the area of employment generation and private sector will allow sharing</p>	

<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>lessons learned.</p> <p>In most cases, EU programmes aimed at creating economic and employment opportunities are indeed developed taking into account national development programs and country needs in relation to private sector investments and development. However, some EUTF programs are located in areas where larger market development initiatives are very limited or inexistent.</p> <p>This is to say that stronger private sector involvement and larger market development efforts accompanied by strong measures in favor of a better business environment would be essential for more successful interventions aiming at developing economic and employment opportunities.</p>	
<p><b>R-7: The EU should provide “whole of community” resilience interventions particularly when addressing situations of natural resource fragility.</b></p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>We welcome this recommendation, but would like to highlight that the majority of EUTF for Africa resilience programmes in the Sahel/Lake Chad and the Horn of Africa region are already following the “whole of community” approach. Specifically, the work done under the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and subsequently under the Global refugee Compact (GRC) in the HOA region has emphasized this approach.</p> <p>An inclusive approach is also adopted in the EU response in Libya in programs aimed at community stabilisation, livelihoods, humanitarian assistance and protection. This approach could be reinforced and not</p>	



<b>Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Response of EU services</b>	<b>Follow-up (one year later)</b>
	<p>only in situations of natural resource fragility.</p> <p>From its early stages, the EUTF for Africa has made efforts to promote the “whole of community” approach particularly in supporting forcibly displaced people and in promoting resilience. The EU has supported activities targeting vulnerable people and the communities they live in. Resilience interventions are not only focusing on households but also on community structures put in place to engage in preparedness and risk management strategies. The triple humanitarian-development-peace nexus and economic and social cohesion approaches used in several EUTF for Africa programmes are clear examples of actions reaching communities and regions. In some specific contexts, it would be positive to work more extensively with initiatives supporting the resilience of the wider community, such as infrastructure investments on water for instance.</p>	