



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

---

***Final Internal Evaluation of the project “Strengthening Surveillance and Bilateral Coordination Capacity along the Common Border between Belarus and Ukraine (SURCAP Phase II)”***

---

## **Annexes**



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

## **Annex 8.1.**

### **Terms of Reference**

#### **END OF PROJECT EVALUATION**

#### **FOR**

**EU FUNDED PROJECT “STRENGTHENING SURVEILLANCE AND BILATERAL COORDINATION CAPACITY ALONG THE COMMON BORDER BETWEEN BELARUS AND UKRAINE” - SURCAP PHASE II**

**IMPLEMENTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM)**

Commissioned by: IOM Country Offices in Belarus and Ukraine

Implemented by: IOM Regional Office in Austria

#### **Evaluation context**

The main purpose of SURCAP Phase II project was to assist Belarus and Ukraine to strengthen their surveillance and border control capacities along the common borderline. The second phase of the project envisaged direct equipment procurement by IOM, supplemented by a number of expert missions, networking visits to European Union (EU) Member States, regional trainings for border guard officials, as well as the establishment of a pilot Contact Point (CP) at the Belarus-Ukraine border. The project, apart from contributing to the increased effectiveness of the work of the Belarusian and Ukrainian services operating at the border in central and western areas of the countries' joint frontier, also strived to:

- Contribute to the enhancement of security levels on the Belarusian-Ukrainian border;
- Help improve international cooperation between the border services of the two beneficiary countries;
- Help beneficiary countries increase legal trade and, as a consequence, tax revenue.

#### **Evaluation purpose**

Bilateral Belarus-Ukraine projects, funded through the EU's Eastern Partnership Integrated Border Management Programme and addressing border management issues in Belarus and Ukraine, have

been implemented by IOM since 2012.

Generally speaking, the aim of the exercise is to evaluate the project from the perspective of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The overall objective of this evaluation is to assess whether the approaches and practical implementation modalities used to carry our SURCAP-II project enabled IOM to effectively implement the project activities and attain its objectives. It also serves to analyze if the project had the intended impact and if the results are sustainable upon the project's cessation. Finally, the evaluation aims to identify good practices and lessons learnt, as well as any gaps to be addressed in potential future interventions. A review is required to explore the limitations of project stakeholders and the environment they operate in, in order to inform the approaches to be taken in future projects.

Evaluation findings will be used to prepare the final SURCAP-II project report to the donor. The findings and results of the evaluation will also enable IOM Mission and the assigned project team to improve similar projects in the future. Finally, evaluation findings will be shared with the donor, so that the EU can assess value for money for a set of activities they funded.

### **Evaluation scope**

The evaluation shall cover project activities carried out by IOM (Belarus and Ukraine Country Offices) and, to a certain extent, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD, which acted as an implementing partner for the training component of the action). The evaluation expert shall look at the action carried out within the timeframe of the project duration (March 23, 2014 - March 22, 2017), and cover relevant geographical areas. More specifically, this includes Belarus – Ukraine border where the equipment donated in the framework of the action is used; Pinsk and Zhitomir regional Border Guard Divisions where the Contact Point operates; and Minsk and Kiev where the Border Guard Headquarters are located. The evaluation expert will also meeting with ICMPD project staff (based in Vienna) to exchange relevant information about the project implementation.

The only activity excluded from the evaluation will be information campaign for population living in the border areas.

### **Evaluation criteria**

The following criteria shall be used for the purpose of this evaluation:

- **Relevance:** relevance of the overall strategy of the project;
- **Effectiveness:** extent to which the results achieved are in line with the expected outcomes;
- **Efficiency:** how well the resources in general (funds, expertise, time, etc.) or inputs were



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

utilised to undertake activities, and are converted to results;

- **Impact:** how the activities of the project contributed to a change in a situation, intended or unintended, positive or negative, and what the project/programme was expected to bring;
- **Sustainability:** to what extent the project benefits continue after external support is no longer available.

### Evaluation questions

- **Relevance**
  1. Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objective?
  2. Do the project activities and outputs take into account relevant policies and guidelines?
  3. Does the project respond to the needs of the project beneficiaries?
  4. Is the project aligned with and supportive of national strategies?
- **Effectiveness:**
  1. Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?
  2. Are the target beneficiaries being reached as expected and satisfied with the services provided?
  3. What is the quality of the results/services/products provided?
  4. To what extent has the project adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions in order to ensure project outcomes?
- **Efficiency:**
  1. Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation?
  2. How well are the resources (funds, expertise and time) being converted into results?
  3. Are the costs proportionate to the results achieved?
  4. To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled?
- **Impact:**
  1. Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project?
  2. Does the impact come from the project activities, from external factors or from both?
- **Sustainability:**
  1. Will the benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?
  2. Is the technology used appropriate to local conditions?

3. To what extent have beneficiaries and been involved in the planning/implementation process and in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation?
4. Are project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services?

### **Evaluation methodology**

- Desk review: project documents, including reports to the donor, meeting minutes, trainings reports, assessments reports, legal framework relevant to bilateral cooperation between Ukraine and Belarus border guards etc.
- Field visits to Belarus and Ukraine: interviews with the beneficiaries (State Border Guard Service of Ukraine) and the State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus) at the central, regional and local level; interviews with IOM project staff in Ukraine and Belarus;
- Follow up interview: with the project implementing partner (ICMPD)

There is no need for additional surveys to collect data and to measure the achievements and impact.

The evaluation will follow the IOM Data Protection Principles, United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards for evaluations, and relevant ethical guidelines.

### **Evaluation deliverables**

Expert shall present initial evaluation findings to the project management team at IOM Minsk during the last day of the field mission. Draft report is to be provided by the evaluation expert by July 31, 2017. Based on feedback received, the final report shall be provided by September 15, 2017.

### **Evaluation workplan**

IOM offices in Minsk and Kiev will assist with logistical arrangements for meetings and site visits.

Local project beneficiaries will assist in arranging meetings / site visits during the expert's field mission to ensure they take place at relevant project locations and that the staff assigned is able to address all experts' enquiries.

Suggested evaluation itinerary (see Annex 1 attached to the ToR):

- June 19-30, 2017: Desk research and review (Vienna-based)
- July 3-7, 2017: Field visits to Ukraine and Belarus (preliminary detailed itinerary attached)
- By July 31, 2017: Drafting and submission of the first draft of the evaluation report (Vienna-based)
- By September 15, 2017: Drafting and submission of the final report (Vienna-based)



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

## **Evaluation budget**

The evaluation cost will be covered from the project budget. Maximum available budget for Evaluation is € 4,000 that should include evaluator's as well as participating staff travel costs, per diem, local transportation and any associated costs as required.

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
 SURCAP II Evaluation  
 July 3-7, 2017

| Evaluation questions   | Sub-questions  | Indicators / Data  | Document review   | Interview      |               |       |       |
|--|--|--|---|----------------|---------------|-------|-------|
|  |  |  |   | National gov't | Project staff | ICMPD | Other |
| <b>RELEVANCE</b>   |  |  |   |                |               |       |       |
| 1. Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objective? | Have the activities lead to the intended outcomes and objective – contribute to the overall enhancement of security levels at the Belarusian-Ukrainian border?                                       | Logic of the project   | Project document, reports                                 | X              | X             | X     |       |
| 2. Do the project activities and outputs take into account relevant policies and guidelines?   | Which relevant policies and strategies were consulted prior to designing the project?  | Supporting national strategic frameworks and bilateral agreements in place | Project document, reports                                 |                | X             |       |       |
|  | Is the project aligned with these policies and guidelines and does the project contribute to their fulfilment?   | Ibid   | Project document, reports                                 | X              | X             |       |       |
|  | Have there been any adjustments to the project in light of a new policy/guideline? Is the project design flexible enough to take into account new developments at policy level, including in the EU? | Adaptability of the project design to changing conditions                  | Steering Committee Minutes, project documents and reports | X              | X             |       |       |
| 3. Does the project respond to the needs of the project beneficiaries?                         | Were the beneficiaries consulted on their needs prior to the project commencement, involved in the design, and how?  | Involvement of stakeholders  | Project documents, Steering Committee meeting minutes     | X              | X             | X     |       |

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
SURCAP II Evaluation  
July 3-7, 2017

|   |   |  |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
|   | Have there been changes in beneficiaries' needs and were they addressed by the project? If not, why not?  | Adaptability of the project to changing needs                                    |   | X | X | X |  |
|   | Are there any gaps still pending after the project? What would be the logical continuation of the activities, e.g. networking with EU Member States, regional trainings, equipment? Any legal / policy level support? | Any pending needs and gaps   |   | X | X | X |  |
| 4. Is the project aligned with and supportive of national strategies?                               | See question 2 above  | See question 2 above   |   |   |   |   |  |
| <b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>  |   |  |   |   |   |   |  |
| 5. Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?         | Have there been variations between the project document (including results matrix and workplan) and actual implementation? If yes, why? Was the project objective still achieved?                                     | Variations between project plan and actual implementation and the reasons for it | Project reports                                 | X | X |   |  |
|   | Were all concerned stakeholders consulted on and agreed to the change of implementation plans?  | Involvement of national stakeholders in change in project design                 | Project reports and Steering Committee meetings | X | X |   |  |
| 6. Are the target beneficiaries being reached as expected and satisfied with the services provided? | Do the beneficiaries feel that the project is responding directly to their needs, in the quality and quantity   | Satisfaction with the quality and quantity of deliverables                       | Project reports and Steering Committee meetings | X | X | X |  |

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
 SURCAP II Evaluation  
 July 3-7, 2017

|   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
|   | desired and expected? Regarding quality of expertise – e.g. technical equipment assessment and the Contact Point assessment?   |   |  |   |   |   |  |
|   | Have the project activities – e.g. regional trainings and networking visits – led to practical implementation of other project activities or governmental initiatives?                       | Follow up, if any, to project activities                                      |  | X | X | X |  |
|   | Is there anything in the activities – networking visits, trainings, equipment – that they would have liked to change (different kind of expertise, different kind of equipment etc) and why? | Irrelevance or inappropriateness, if any, of any of the activities / products |  | X | X |   |  |
|   | Do the beneficiaries feel that other entities should have been involved in the project implementation (Belarus/Ukraine, EU institutions)?  | Any stakeholders missing from project implementation                          |  | X | X | X |  |
|   | Are the beneficiaries directly and actively involved in the implementation of the activities? If yes, how? What is their contribution?   | Active contribution of the beneficiaries                                      | Project reports and Steering Committee meeting minutes | X | X | X |  |
| 7. What is the quality of the results/services/products provided? | Was the communication and cooperation between all stakeholders involved (government, IOs) effective? Any suggestions in this regard?   | Cooperation during implementation   |  | X | X | X |  |

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
 SURCAP II Evaluation  
 July 3-7, 2017

|  |  |  |  |   |   |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
|  | Are there any aspects that the beneficiaries would like to change in the future – different expertise, different subject matter to be addressed by technical assistance?         | Possible changes in thematic orientation of the project in the future    |  | X | X | X |  |
|  | A number of the products (e.g. trainings, assessments and study visits) resulted in recommendations. How were these followed up and/or incorporated into the project activities? | Use of recommendations   |  | X | X | X |  |
|  | Are cross-cutting issues, such as fundamental rights and gender, sufficiently mainstreamed throughout project activities?  | Cross-cutting issues incorporated into project design and implementation |  | X | X | X |  |
|  | Are the products being used in practice, have they led to practical implementation of other project activities and governmental initiatives?                                     | Use of products / deliverables   |  | X | X | X |  |
| 8. To what extent has the project adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions in order to ensure project outcomes? | Were there any significant external factors that have led to change in implementation plans and/or capacity of the beneficiary to participate in the project activities?         | External factors affecting project implementation                        |  | X | X | X |  |
|  | Was the project design flexible enough to adapt to changing conditions? What was the process?  | Adaptation, if any, of the project design                                |  | X | X | X |  |

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
 SURCAP II Evaluation  
 July 3-7, 2017

|   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
|   | (also see question 2 under RELEVANCE)  |   |  |   |   |   |  |
| <b>EFFICIENCY</b>   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |
| 9. Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation? | What concrete steps did the project implementation team and/or the beneficiary take to ensure the most efficient means of project implementation? (sharing of resources, timing of activities etc)         | Efficiency of project implementation (resources)                                    |  | X | X | X |  |
|   | What worked and what did not work?   | Lessons learned in project implementation methodology                               |  | X | X | X |  |
|   | Were any alternative means of implementation explored, e.g. e-learning as opposed to residential learning? Long term international expert support rather than study tours for a limited number of persons? | Use of, if any, of alternative means of implementation (potentially more efficient) |  | X | X | X |  |
|   | Have all relevant project activities (trainings, networking visits) been rolled out – i.e. other staff were trained / briefed on the outcomes of the events?   | Roll-out of implemented activities  |  | X | X | X |  |
| 10. How well are the resources (funds, expertise and time) being converted into results?                  | See question below   |   |  |   |   |   |  |

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
SURCAP II Evaluation  
July 3-7, 2017

|  |  |  |                               |   |   |   |  |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 11. Are the costs proportionate to the results achieved?                                       | Does it appear that the resources spent are appropriate to the results achieved? E.g. could it have taken less time to do assessments, less time to procure equipment (tendering and delivery) Does the project appear to be good value for money? | Value for money  | Project documents and reports | X | X | X |  |
| 12. To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled?                                    | How does the workplan compare to the actual delivery of products / implementation of activities?   | Project documents and reports, handover documents                            | X                             | X | X | X |  |
| <b>IMPACT</b>  |  |  |                               |   |   |   |  |
| 13. Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project? | Can the interlocutors highlight any positive by-products of the project? For example, increased contacts abroad, replication of project activities elsewhere etc? Intended or unintended?  | Positive by products / impact  |                               | X | X | X |  |
|  | Can the interlocutors highlight any negative by-products of the project? E.g. increased bureaucracy, increased legal obstacles etc? Intended or unintended?  | Negative by product / impact   |                               | X | X | X |  |
| 14. Does the impact come from the project activities, from external factors or from both?      | Which external factors, if any, have contributed to these positive or negative by products? Which external factors have posed challenges to  | External factors that have affected the impact the project has on the ground |                               | X | X | X |  |

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
 SURCAP II Evaluation  
 July 3-7, 2017

|  |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|  | project implementation and/or to the full rollout of the activities in the field?  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| <b>SUSTANINABILITY</b>   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| 15. Will the benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?  | What steps have been taken to ensure that the equipment can be used and maintained after the project ceases? That the contacts found during the networking visits can be further used? That the trainings can be instituted, e.g. at the national training academy?  | Further use of the equipment procured / skills gained | Project reports   | X | X | X |  |
| 16. Is the technology used appropriate to local conditions?  | Is the equipment that has been chosen for this project appropriate to the local absorption capacities, including the type of environment that the equipment is supposed to serve?  | Appropriateness of the equipment                      |   | X | X |   |  |
| 17. To what extent have beneficiaries and been involved in the planning/implementation process and in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation? | Have the beneficiaries contributed to the project design, project implementation and decisions regarding actual project implementation? E.g. changes in project activities (type, thematic focus, timing etc) Can you provide specific examples? (See also questions | Contribution of the beneficiaries                     | Project documents and reports, Steering Committee meeting minutes | X | X | X |  |

Annex 8.2.

Evaluation Matrix  
 SURCAP II Evaluation  
 July 3-7, 2017

|  | about RELEVANCE and EFFECTIVENESS)  |  |                 |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|--|-----------------|---|---|---|---|
| 18. Are project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services? | What steps have been taken to ensure that the project stakeholders can continue using the project deliveries (Contact Point, training curricula, networking contacts, donated equipment) in their daily work?                           | Further use of equipment and other project deliverables (also see question 15 above) | Project reports | X | X | X |   |
|  | Is this sufficient foundation for the stakeholders to build up on the project? If yes, how specifically? What other follow up activities can they do themselves, any specific plans? Would they need external / IOM support to do this? | Existence of any plans / actual initiatives building on the project                  |                 |   | X | X | X |

### Annex 8.3.

#### Interview with governmental counterparts

- 1) Overall, do you believe that the **project achieved its intended objective and outcomes?** (Relevance)
  - a. *Objective: Contribute to the overall enhance of security levels at the Belarusian-Ukrainian border;*
  - b. *Outcome 1: Services demonstrate greater efficiency and effectiveness in border control;*
- 2) Does the project contribute to the **fulfillment of national strategies?** (Relevance)
- 3) Were the beneficiaries **involved in project design, implementation and decision making?** Please explain how and in which components: Steering Committee, Working Group Meetings, Regional Bilateral Meetings, Equipment procurement and delivery, trainings, networking visits, set-up of the Contact Point (Relevance, Effectiveness, Sustainability)
- 4) Do the beneficiaries feel that the project is **responding directly to their needs**, in the **quality and quantity** desired and expected? (Effectiveness)
- 5) Are the products **being used in practice**, have they led to **practical implementation of other project activities** and governmental initiatives? (Effectiveness)
- 6) Was the **communication and cooperation** between all stakeholders involved (government, IOM, ICMPD) effective and efficient? Anything to change in the future? (effectiveness)
- 7) What concrete steps did the project implementation team and/or the beneficiary take to ensure the most **efficient means of project implementation?** What worked and what did not work? Were any alternative means of implementation explored, e.g. e-learning as opposed to residential learning? Long term international expert support rather than study tours for a limited number of persons? (Effectiveness)
- 8) Have all relevant project activities (trainings, networking visits) been **rolled out** – i.e. other staff were trained / briefed on the outcomes of the events? (Effectiveness)
- 9) Does it appear that the resources spent are appropriate to the results achieved? E.g. could it have taken less time to do assessments, less time to procure equipment (tendering and delivery) Does the project appear to be **good value for money?** (Efficiency)
- 10) Is the equipment that has been chosen for this project **appropriate to the local absorption capacities**, including the type of environment that the equipment is supposed to serve? (Sustainability)
- 11) What steps have been taken to ensure that the **equipment can be used and maintained after the project ceases?** That the contacts found during the networking visits can be further used? That the trainings can be instituted, e.g. at the national training academy? (Sustainability)

- 12) What steps have been taken to ensure that the project stakeholders **can continue using the project deliveries** (Contact Point, training curricula, networking contacts, donated equipment) in their daily work? (Sustainability)
  - 13) Have all relevant project activities (trainings, networking visits) **been rolled out** – i.e. other staff were trained / briefed on the outcomes of the events? (efficiency)
  - 14) A number of the products (e.g. trainings, assessments and study visits) resulted in recommendations. How **were these recommendations followed up** and/or incorporated into the project activities? (Effectiveness)
- 

- 15) Have there been **any adjustments of the project** in light of policy / legislative developments at the national level? Any delays in project implementation because of delays in policy / legislative framework? Any variations between the stated workplan and actual implementation? (Relevance, Efficiency)
- 16) Is there anything in the activities – networking visits, trainings, equipment – **that they would have liked to change** (different kind of expertise, different kind of equipment etc) and why? (Effectiveness) Are there **any aspects that the beneficiaries would like to change in the future** – different expertise, different subject matter to be addressed by technical assistance? (Effectiveness)
- 17) Were there any activities that **were not implemented or not to the extent as planned**? If yes, why? Were the beneficiaries consulted on the change of plans? (Relevance)
- 18) Have there been any **emerging needs** that were flexibly addressed by the project (or not)? Which ones? (Relevance) Are there **any gaps still pending after the project**? What would be the logical continuation of the activities, e.g. networking with EU Member States, regional trainings, equipment? Any legal / policy level support? (Relevance)
- 19) Were **cross-cutting issues** sufficiently mainstreamed throughout the project implementation? (Relevance) Please give concrete examples and/or suggestions how to improve.
- 20) Do the beneficiaries feel that **other entities should have been involved in the project** implementation (Belarus/Ukraine, EU institutions)? (Effectiveness)
- 21) Can the interlocutors highlight **any positive by-products of the project**? For example, increased contacts abroad, replication of project activities elsewhere etc? Intended or unintended? (Impact)
- 22) Can the interlocutors highlight any **negative by-products of the project**? E.g. increased bureaucracy, increased legal obstacles etc? Intended or unintended? (Impact)
- 23) Were there any **significant external factors that have led to change** in implementation plans and/or capacity of the beneficiary to participate in the project activities? Did the project adapt – if yes, how? (Effectiveness) Which **external factors**, if any, have contributed to these positive or negative by products? Which external factors have posed challenges to project implementation and/or to the full rollout of the activities in the field? (Impact)



International Organization for Migration (IOM)  
The UN Migration Agency

#### **Annex 8.4. List of Documents Reviewed**

- Project Proposal/Description of Action
- Logical framework
- Detailed Budget of the Action
- Modification of the Description of Action
- Proposal of IOM Development Fund (co-funding)
- Interim Narrative Report 23 March 2014 – 30 September 2016 and its Annexes
  - Annex 1: Bilateral coordination meetings for BY/UA border guards and Steering committee meetings
  - Annex 2: Study visits on the IBM topics
  - Annex 3: Regional trainings
  - Annex 4: Visit of a delegation of the Belarusian and Ukrainian border guards to the Common Contact Point between Ukraine and Belarus
  - Annex 5: Organization of a pilot Contact Point at the common Belarus-Ukraine border
  - Annex 6: Specialized equipment procurement for the Belarusian/Ukrainian border agencies
  - Annex 7: EU visibility
  - Annex 8: Interim financial report
- Request letter for a project extension and modification of the Budget and the Description of Action
- ROM Report

#### Legal framework

- Concept of Migration Code of Ukraine
- Protocol between the State Border Committee of Belarus and the Administration of the State Border Service of Ukraine on pilot contact point “Pinsk – Zhytomyr”
- Strategy for the Development of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine
- Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Belarus and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on interregional and cross-border cooperation between the Republic of Belarus and Ukraine

#### Other

- Statistical reference on main results of operational activity of the Northern Regional Directorate for January-May 2017
- Summary document of the International Conference Meeting on Integrated Border Management of Common Borders of the EU Member-States and Eastern Partnership Countries

## Annex 8.5.

### AGENDA

**EU FUNDED PROJECT**  
**“STRENGTHENING SURVEILLANCE AND BILATERAL COORDINATION CAPACITY**  
**ALONG THE COMMON BORDER BETWEEN BELARUS AND UKRAINE”**  
**SURCAP PHASE II**  
**IMPLEMENTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION**

July 3, 2017

**Travel itinerary:**

VIENNA – KIEV – ZHYTOMYR – Ukraine(UA)/Belarus(RB) border crossing – PINSK – GOMEL – MINSK – VIENNA

**Timeframe of the assignment:** TBC with IOM Regional office (RO) Vienna, State Border Guard Service of Ukraine (SBGSU), State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus (SBCRB), European Union Delegation (EUD) UA, EUD RB, IOM Kiev, IOM Minsk

**Participants of the evaluation exercise:**

**In Ukraine:** Evaluation Expert (RO Vienna), IOM Kiev project implementation team representative(s), EUD UA representative(s), SBGSU representative(s).

**In Belarus:** Evaluation Expert (RO Vienna), IOM Minsk project implementation team representative(s), EUD RB representative(s), SBCRB representative(s).

**Draft itinerary for site visits and meetings:**

**Day 0 (July 2 2017) – Vienna, Kiev**

| <u>Time</u>        | <u>Organization</u>       | <u>Location/ comments</u>              |
|--------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Flight from Vienna | Transfer to hotel`        | Either Taxi or IOM Kiev arranged (TBC) |
| 14:00 – 14:30      | Transfer: Airport - Hotel | Either Taxi or IOM Kiev arranged (TBC) |

**Day 1 (July 3 2017) – Vienna, Kiev**

| <u>Time</u> | <u>Organization</u>  | <u>Location/ comments</u>              |
|-------------|----------------------|--|
| 8:30 – 9:00 | Transfer to IOM Kiev | Either Taxi or IOM Kiev arranged (TBC) |

|               |  |                                       |
|---------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 9:00 – 10:30  | <b>Meeting at IOM Kiev office</b><br>(participants: CoM, Project coordinator, Project Assistant) | Location: IOM Kiev                    |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Transfer: IOM Kiev – SBGSU HQ  | Arranged by IOM Kiev                  |
| 11:00 – 13:00 | <b>Meeting at SBGSU HQ</b><br><b>(participants: TBC)</b>   | Location: SBGSU HQ, Kiev              |
| 12:30 – 14:00 | Lunch  |                                       |
| 16:00 – 18:00 | Transfer: IOM Kiev – Zhytomyr SBGSU regional HQ  | Arranged by Either IOM or SBGSU (TBC) |

**Day 2 (July 4 2017) – Kiev, Zhytomyr, crossing UA/RB border, Pinsk**

| <b><u>Time</u></b> | <b><u>Itinerary/Counterparts</u></b>   | <b><u>Location/comments</u></b>           |
|--------------------|--|---|
| 8:30 – 9:00        | Transfer: Hotel – Zhytomyr SBGSU regional HQ   | Arranged by Either IOM or SBGSU (TBC)     |
| 9:00 – 10:00       | <b>Meeting at Zhytomyr SBGSU regional HQ. Demonstration of Zhytomyr Contact Point operation and equipment</b> (participants TBC)   | Location: Zhytomyr SBGSU regional HQ      |
| 10:00 – 13:00      | Transfer: Zhytomyr SBGSU regional HQ – frontier Border detachment at UA/RB Border. (location: TBC) (participants: TBC)   | Arranged by Either IOM or SBGSU (TBC)     |
| 14:00 – 15:00      | Lunch  |   |
| 15:00 – 16:00      | <b>Meeting at frontier border detachment. Demonstration of equipment</b> ( <i>please, add types of equipment</i> ). (participants: TBC).<br>Demonstration of equipment.                                      | Location frontier border detachment (TBC) |
| 16:00 – 16:30      | Transfer 1 (Evaluation expert): frontier border detachment (TBC) – UA/RB border crossing point (BCP) <b>Gorodishe – Verkhniy Terebezhov UA-RB border</b>   | Arranged by SBGSU (TBC)                   |
|                    | UA and RB delegation meet at the border -<br><a href="https://goo.gl/maps/7LotVA6c4iE2">https://goo.gl/maps/7LotVA6c4iE2</a><br>. Expert crosses the border (Belarusian visa and medical insurance required) |   |
| 16:30 – 21:00      | Transfer 1 continued (Evaluation Expert): UA/RB BCP – Hotel in Pinsk   | Arranged by Either IOM or SBGSU (TBC)     |
| 16:00 – 21:00      | Transfer 2: frontier border detachment (TBC) – IOM Kiev office   | Arranged by Either IOM or SBGSU (TBC)     |

### Day 3 (July 5 2017) – Pinsk, Gomel

| <u>Time</u>   | <u>Itinerary/Counterparts</u>  | <u>Location/comments</u>                  |
|---------------|--|---|
| 8:45 – 9:00   | Transfer: Hotel – Pinsk SBCRB regional HQ  | Arranged by Either IOM or SBCRB (TBC)     |
| 9:00 – 10:30  | <b>Meeting at Pinsk SBCRB regional HQ. Demonstration of Pinsk Contact Point operation and equipment</b> (communication, IT, office equipment, etc.).   | Location: Pinsk SBCRB regional HQ         |
| 10:30 – 12:30 | Transfer: Pinsk SBCRB regional HQ – frontier Border detachment at RB/UA Border (location: TBC)   | Arranged by Either IOM or SBCRB (TBC)     |
| 12:30 – 14:00 | <b>Meeting at SBCRB frontier border detachment Rechitsa at RB/UA border. Demonstration of equipment</b> (Swamp vehicle, all-terrain vehicles, antenna mast, communication equipment and portable radios, autonomous sensor systems, etc.). | Location frontier border detachment (TBC) |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Lunch  |   |
| 15:00 – 18:00 | Transfer: SBCRB frontier border detachment at RB/UA border – Hotel in Gomel  | Arranged by Either IOM or SBGSU (TBC)     |

### Day 4 (July 6 2017) – Gomel, Minsk

| <u>Time</u>   | <u>Itinerary/Counterparts</u>  | <u>Location/comments</u>                  |
|---------------|--|---|
| 8:00 – 9:30   | Transfer: Hotel – SBCRB frontier border detachment at RB/UA green border (TBC).  | Arranged by Either IOM or SBCRB (TBC)     |
| 9:30 – 11:00  | <b>Meetings at SBCRB temporary and stationary frontier border detachments Kravtsovka at RB/UA green border. Demonstration of equipment</b> (Quadrocycles, motorcycles, flashlights, communication equipment, etc.) | Location frontier border detachment (TBC) |
| 11:00 – 13:00 | Transfer: SBCRB frontier border detachment at RB/UA green border - Frontier border detachment at RB/UA blue border.  | Arranged by Either IOM or SBCRB (TBC)     |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch  |   |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | <b>Meeting at SBCRB frontier border detachment Loyev at RB/UA blue border. Demonstration of equipment</b> (Patrol boats, rigid   | Location frontier border detachment (TBC) |

|               |   |                                       |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------------|
|               | inflatable boats, etc.). (participants: TBC)                                |                                       |
| 15:30 – 19:30 | Transfer: SBCRB frontier border detachment at RB/UA blue border – IOM Minsk | Arranged by Either IOM or SBCRB (TBC) |

**Day 5 (July 7 2017) – Minsk, Vienna**

| <b><u>Time</u></b>    | <b><u>Itinerary/Counterparts</u></b>  | <b><u>Location/comments</u></b> |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 8:45 – 9:00           | Transfer: Hotel – SBCRB HQ.   | Arranged by IOM                 |
| 9:00 – 10:00          | <b>Meeting at SBCRB HQ</b> (participants: TBC)                              | Location: SBCRB, Minsk          |
| 10:00 – 10:15         | Transfer: SBCRB HQ - IOM Minsk  | Arranged by IOM                 |
| 10:15 – 12:00         | <b>Meeting at IOM Minsk office</b> (participants: CoM, Project coordinator) | Location IOM Minsk              |
| 12:00 – 13:00         | Lunch   |                                 |
| 14:00 – 15:00         | Transfer: IOM Minsk office - Airport  | Arranged by IOM                 |
| Noon flight to Vienna |   |                                 |



International Organization for Migration (IOM)  
The UN Migration Agency

## **Annex 8.6: List of Persons Interviewed**

### **Ukraine:**

Mr. Vadim Ivko – Senior Officer of International Cooperation Department at the Administration of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine

Mr. Sergey Morozov – Senior Officer of International Cooperation Department at the Administration of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine

Mr. Valeriy Kurnikov – Major General, Head of Northern Regional Directorate of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine

### **Belarus:**

Mr. Maksim Butranets – colonel, Head of Pinsk Border Detachment, the State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus

Mr. Andrei Volkov – colonel, First Deputy Head of Pinsk Border Detachment, Head of Pinsk CCP, the State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus

Mr. Andrei Vinogradov – officer, Kravtsovka Frontline Border Unit, the State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus

Mr. Andrei Hirs – Lieutenant Colonel, Head of the Department for Use of Forces and Resources, the State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus

Mr. Aleksander Sviderskiy – Colonel, Head of Unit of the Department for International Cooperation, the State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus

Mr. Taras Seredyuk – Senior Officer, Department for International Cooperation, the State Border Committee of the Republic of Belarus