

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of UK Home Office Alternatives to Detention Community Engagement Pilot Series

Key Information at a glance about the evaluation	
Title of the evaluation:	Evaluation of UK Home Office Alternatives to Detention Community Engagement Pilot Series
Timeframe of evaluation:	March 2019 – December 2020
Type of exercise:	Decentralised Longitudinal Evaluation
Evaluation commissioned by:	UNHCR, United Kingdom
Evaluation manager's contact:	GBRLO@UNHCR.ORG
Date	11 October 2019

1. Introduction

This Longitudinal Evaluation is being commissioned by the UNHCR United Kingdom country office with the support of the UNHCR Evaluation Service. The evaluation is intended to evaluate the effectiveness of the models piloted against stated objectives and to generate evidence that helps to guide and enhance opportunities for the use of Alternatives to Detention (ATD) in the UK, linked to the Home Office ATD Community Engagement Pilot Series. The Terms of Reference (ToR) summarises the envisaged approach, scope and Key Evaluation Questions.

2. Subject of the evaluation and its context

UNHCR's work on ATD

1. In UNHCR's Global Strategy - Beyond Detention 2014-2019 ('Global Strategy') one of the key objectives is the promotion of ATD to ensure that they are available in law and implemented in practice.¹ Given the rate of detention and limited availability of community engagement focused ATD, promoting the latter has been a priority objective for UNHCR's work in the UK.

ATD advocacy and position in the UK

2. ATD are a safeguard against arbitrary detention. While there is no internationally agreed definition of the term ATD and it is not a legal term in itself, UNHCR defines "*alternatives to detention as any legislation, policy or practice that allows asylum-seekers to reside in the community subject to a number of conditions or restrictions on their freedom of movement. As some alternatives to detention also involve various restrictions on movement or liberty (and some can be classified as forms of detention), they are also subject to human rights standards.*"²
3. Problems that arise as a result of immigration detention are well known: it is expensive,³ often ineffective and harmful to health.⁴ Detention itself can also result in significant interference with

¹ There are three specific goals which include the ending of children's detention, the introduction and implementation of alternatives to detention and, when detention is inevitable, the establishment of detention conditions that meet international criteria. See: UNHCR, *Beyond Detention: A Global Strategy to support governments to end the detention of asylum-seeker and refugees, 2014-2019*, 2014, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/536b564d4.html>

² UNHCR, *The 10 Point Plan in Action*, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/10pointplaninaction2016update.html>

³ See Liberty's 2019 report "Economic impacts of immigration detention reform" available at: <https://www.libertyhumanrights.org.uk/our-campaigns/end-indefinite-detention/economic-impacts-immigration-detention-reform>, in which Liberty confirm that the government's detention expenditure in 2017/18 was £108m.

⁴ In their 2018 systemic study, "*The impact of immigration detention on mental health*", the Royal College of Psychiatry state that "*The practice of detaining asylum seekers, a group with a pre-existing vulnerability to mental health problems due to higher exposure to trauma pre- and peri-migration, risks further exacerbating their mental health difficulties. The experience of detention may act as a new stressor, which adds to the cumulative effect of exposure to trauma, leading to an increased likelihood of*

an individual's ability to navigate immigration and asylum processes.⁵ ATD can be considered a strategy for reducing reliance on immigration detention and delivering compliance and more effective case resolution for people at reduced cost to the public purse.

The UK's reliance on immigration detention and recent statistics

4. Despite a reduction in recent years, the UK Home Office continues to rely on immigration detention as a means of migration control and the UK is the only EU country that does not have an immigration detention time limit. The sole operational government ATD in the UK at present is "bail" (which does not specifically include case management) as per Schedule 10 of the Immigration Act 2016, which has been in force since 15 January 2018.
5. In the year ending June 2019 there were 41,535 applications (including dependents) which is up 17% from the previous year.⁶ During the same period 24,052 individuals entered the detention estate.⁷ Of the 24,467 people leaving detention, 41% (9,945) were returned from the UK to another country and 46% (11,355) were granted Bail by the Secretary of State. The remaining 13% were either released following a grant of Bail by an Immigration Judge, released following a grant of leave to remain or released for other reasons;⁸ though the release figures are not disaggregated to specify the number of adult asylum detainees released onto bail.
6. At the end of June 2019, there were 1,727 people held in the detention estate (including 294 people detained under Immigration Act powers within the Prison estate). Out of the 1,727 people detained, 1,124 (65%) had also claimed asylum at some point during their time in the UK.⁹

UNHCR Global Strategy

7. In recent years UNHCR's ongoing work to promote ATD has been carried out under its Global Strategy.
8. Under the Global Strategy, UNHCR is working with governments, international and national non-governmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders to address some of the main challenges and concerns around governmental detention policies and practices. A main goal of the Global Strategy is to ensure that ATD are available in law and implemented in practice.¹⁰
9. There were initially 12 focus countries involved in the Global Strategy. They are Canada, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States and Zambia. In December 2016, they were joined by a further eight countries, bringing the total number of participants to 20. Those further eight countries are Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Northern Macedonia, Japan, South Africa and Zimbabwe.
10. Given the rate of immigration detention in the UK and the limited availability of ATD, (and in particular, community-based alternatives), UNHCR has prioritized advocacy with and support to the Government on ATD under the Global Strategy. At the same time UNHCR has worked with

developing mental health difficulties such as PTSD as a result of the 'building block effect'. The study is available at: <https://bmcp.psychiatry.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12888-018-1945-y>

⁵ Note that in *R (on the application of Detention Action) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2014] EWCA Civ 1634 (available at: https://www.refworld.org/cases/GBR_CA_CIV_54a1218a4.html) the Court of Appeal of England and Wales found that the practice of detaining asylum seekers pending appeal was purely based on the criteria of speed and convenience without considering whether they were at risk of absconding if released. This was determined to be unlawful. For an overview of asylum decision making in detention, please note the previous UNHCR audits of the Detained Fast Track process in 2008 and 2010: Quality Initiative Project, Fifth Report to the Minister, March 2008, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/uk/576013837>; and Quality Integration Project, First Report to the Minister, August 2010, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/uk/576010337>.

⁶ Home Office transparency data, August 2019, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-year-ending-june-2019/how-many-people-are-detained-or-returned>.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ The two other main goals of the Global Strategy are: ending the detention of children; and ensuring that conditions of detention, where detention is necessary and unavoidable, meet international standards by, inter alia, securing access to places of immigration detention for UNHCR and/or its partners and carrying out regular monitoring. See: UNHCR, *Beyond Detention: A Global Strategy to support governments to end the detention of asylum-seeker and refugees, 2014-2019*, 2014, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/536b564d4.html>

partners to address issues relating to conditions of detention and, in particular, the introduction of a time limit on immigration detention.

Development of the ATD Pilot

11. UNHCR's work on ATD has sought to both support the Government in its efforts to explore the potential expansion of the use of ATD and to complement advocacy efforts being undertaken by civil society in the UK. There are a range of actors involved in promoting ATDs in the UK, and the "detention landscape" has benefited from a number of small-scale ATD pilots, including Detention Action's Community Support Project.
12. 2017 and 2018 saw significant progress in UNHCR's work on the use of ATD in the UK. A wide range of interventions with the Government were undertaken, including high level discussions on the use of detention/expansion of ATD involving UNHCR's High Commissioner and the Assistant High Commissioner for Protection. This resulted in the establishment of a UNHCR/Home Office working group on ATD, which first met on 20 October 2017.
13. A senior level ATD meeting between the Home Office, UNHCR and government representatives from Canada and Sweden took place in November 2017. At that meeting the UK committed to working with the support of UNHCR to introduce a pilot ATD.
14. In July 2018, the Shaw Progress Report was published. Stephen Shaw had been commissioned to report on progress following publication of a review in 2016, which had, among other findings, revealed the impact of detention on mental health and called on the government to strengthen legal safeguards against lengthy detention periods. The progress report provided other important recommendations including, *inter alia*, the reaffirmed position that ATD needed to be fully explored by the Home Office. In his Ministerial statement in response to the Shaw Progress Report, the Home Secretary announced that the first ATD pilot, focusing on vulnerable women detained in Yarl's Wood Immigration Removal Centre, would be introduced with UNHCR's support.
15. Since the Home Secretary's announcement UNHCR has worked with the Home Office, Action Foundation and a number of detention-based specialist NGOs to support the development of the first ATD pilot known as *Action Access*.
16. As at August 2019, 11 women have entered the pilot since commencement. It is envisaged that up to 50 women will benefit from Action Access over the two year period of the pilot.

Action Access and the Community Engagement Pilot series

17. The aim of the Action Access pilot is to test whether support in the community leads to better outcomes for migrants and asylum-seekers when compared with detention. By better outcomes, we mean more efficient case resolution, whether this is integration in the UK or return (preferably voluntary) to the country of origin or habitual residence. It seeks to provide participants who volunteer for the pilot with support in the community whilst resolving their immigration cases, and thereby delivering humane and cost-effective immigration case management. All Action Access participants are asked to give their informed consent to participate in user research and the independent evaluation – if they refuse to give consent, this decision has no negative consequence.
18. Action Access is currently available to single women over the age of 18 years without dependents in the UK, who have no offending history, no imminent removal directions and who have at some point in their immigration history claimed asylum in the UK.
19. Action Access, through Action Foundation, is employing the principles of community-based ATD by: placing individuals in locally managed accommodation; assisting them to maintain contact with the Home Office (Immigration Enforcement); providing access to legal, health and other core services; and ensuring that sufficient trust is built to generate outcomes which satisfy all the stakeholders.
20. Action Access is the first of four planned ATD pilots being designed and managed by the Home Office, with the support of UNHCR and in partnership with civil society organisations in the UK,

under the Community Engagement Pilot (CEP) series. The overall principle of the CEP series is to test approaches to supporting people to resolve their immigration case in the community.

21. The pilot series has been framed around five pillars of support:
 - i. Personal Stability: achieving a fundamental position of stability from which to make difficult, life-changing decisions (relevant to housing, subsistence, safety, and healthcare);
 - ii. Reliable information: providing and ensuring access to accurate, comprehensive, personally relevant information on UK immigration and asylum law;
 - iii. Community Support: providing and ensuring access to consistent pastoral support, and community support;
 - iv. Active Engagement: giving people an opportunity to engage with immigration services and ensuring that people feel able to connect and engage at the right level; and
 - v. Prepared Futures: being able to plan for the future, finding positive ways forward for individuals – such as skills development in line with their original immigration objective.
22. The objectives of the pilots under the CEP series include: increasing compliance and engagement with the Home Office; reducing the use of detention; and demonstrating qualitative improvements to individual's experiences in the immigration system.
23. The plan for the other pilots are as follows:
 - Pilot 2 is for people where personal stability already exists and will focus on providing other support, similar to that in Pilot 1, especially reliable information, community support, engagement with the Home Office and preparing for next steps. The ambition will be to support 50 people at any one time over a two year period. The Home Office have recently commenced the commercial process for this pilot.
 - Pilot 3 will be aimed at people with no or few ties to the UK who may be here working illegally or seeking life experience through informal channels.
 - Pilot 4 is aimed at focussing on individuals with strong ties to the UK who believe they are British or see the UK as home and exploring routes to their case resolution and potentially regularisation.
24. UNHCR's interest and involvement in the further CEP pilots remains to be confirmed. It is possible, however, that UNHCR may be requested to undertake evaluations of the additional pilots. Where this is considered by UNHCR to be feasible and consistent with its mandate, UNHCR will consider expanding the scope of the current TOR to include an evaluation of the further pilot(s). This will, however, only take place with the agreement of the contracted consultant(s).

Current Monitoring and Data collection

25. The Home Office and Action Foundation are collecting data for their own purposes. Where it is considered necessary to capture further data, any such data must be gathered in light of what is already available and the ethical position of using any available Home Office or Action Foundation data. It will be important to ensure the participants in the pilot do not experience research fatigue, while maintaining the integrity and independence of the evaluation.
26. The Home Office "user researchers" are using a number of methods to collect data on the experience of pilot participants, including individual interviews and diary entries. The purpose of this work is to support service design rather than evaluation. The methodology for the user research is evolving and will continue to be developed over the duration of the pilot. There is no specific requirement that participants engage and there are no negative consequences for participants where they refuse to engage with the user researchers.
27. Action Foundation utilises the "in form" database for case management data keeping. Specifically, "in form" records: information about the participant (relevant to their background – e.g. age, ethnic origin and ability to speak English); any goals (related, for example, to their integration into the community); risk assessments; needs assessments; and alerts (records relating to safeguarding issues).

3. Purpose and objectives

28. The evaluation is being undertaken for learning and accountability purposes. Community-based, engagement-focused ATD have not been extensively used in the UK and there is an interest in expanding their application. In this context, it is important that evidence is gathered and analysed with respect to the effectiveness of the piloted ATD as immigration management tools. The results of the evaluation are expected to help inform the further development and expansion of ATD in the UK. At the same time, the evaluation is intended to build evidence that contributes to work being undertaken globally on the use of ATD and supports the growing community of practice in this area.
29. The aim of the evaluation is to provide the UK Home Office with an evidence based assessment of the effectiveness and relevance of the approaches being used within the Action Access pilot. The evaluation will provide a descriptive analysis and mapping of the type of support being offered, efforts and approaches being used by both Action Foundation and the Home Office in delivering the pilot. It is likely that the design of the pilot will change as response to the iterative process of the service design research. Evaluation consultants will need to be able to respond to this effectively. The evaluation will then assess the extent to which the ATD pilot is contributing to its intended outcomes, the extent to which it is delivering basic needs, case management and legal support, whether or not it represents value for money, and identify lessons learned and examples of good practice that could be applied across the asylum and immigration system (for more on the approach see below).
30. The evaluation is expected to inform future UK Home Office decision-making around the use of ATD in the UK, including if and how they can be operationalized best.
31. The primary audience for this evaluation is thus UNHCR UK, the Home Office, Action Foundation with anticipated secondary users being the civil society in the UK and UNHCR as a whole. The evaluation will also be of interest to Governments working on ATD and the global ATD community of practice.

4. Evaluation Approach

4.1 Scope

32. The evaluation scope – relating to population, timeframe and locations for participants in the pilot – is as follows:
 - Timeframe to be covered in the evaluation: March 2019 – December 2020
 - Population location and details: (1) Newcastle (North East of England) and surrounding area; and (2) Female asylum claimants living in managed accommodation.
 - Data is defined for the scope of this evaluation to include all operational data, including data from population management activities, needs assessments, vulnerability and protection risk assessments, programme implementation, case management, monitoring and evaluation, collected and/or collated by UNHCR and the implementing partners (as referenced concern exists in relation to a conscious approach to collecting data and avoiding participant research fatigue).
 - This evaluation examines the UK Home Office approach to ATD. This is specifically in relation to the first pilot programme Action Access being managed in partnership with Action Foundation.
 - To be confirmed: A comparator group.

4.2 Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs)

33. The evaluation will address the key evaluation questions (KEQ) and sub-questions listed below. The analysis needed to answer them is likely to touch on other possible sub-questions and may be further refined during the evaluation inception phase.

KEQ 1: To what extent does the ATD pilot contribute to the outcomes of the Community Engagement Pilot across each pillar (as outlined in paragraph 21 above)?

This KEQ will also seek to answer the following sub-questions:

- To what extent does the ATD pilot deliver better outcomes, in terms of personal stability, reliable information, community support, active engagement and prepared futures, for the pilot participants than individuals held in detention?
- Has the pilot contributed to the integrity of the asylum system by supporting compliance and engagement with Home Office immigration and asylum procedures?
- To what extent does the ATD pilot contribute toward the application of a fair and humane asylum system in line with international standards?

KEQ 2: How effectively does the ATD pilot deliver basic needs, case management and legal support?

This KEQ will also seek to answer the following sub-questions:

- How client-focused is the delivery of basic needs, case management and legal support?
- How responsive is the Action Access pilot programme to the specific needs of the participants?
- What factors contribute and constrain the effective delivery of basic needs, case management and legal support?

KEQ 3: Considering the long-term aims of the pilot programme, to what extent does the ATD pilot represent value for money?

This KEQ will also seek to answer the following sub-questions:

- How are the costs of the delivering the pilot shared between the different actors contributing to the pilot?
- How do the costs of delivering ATD compare to the costs of detention?
- How do the costs of delivering ATD change over time and what factors contribute or constrain the efficient delivery of quality, client-focused ATD approaches?
- What is the added value of the ATD models?

KEQ 4: What lessons learnt and examples of promising practice are emerging from the ATD pilot that could be applied across the UK government's approach to asylum and migration management?

This KEQ will also seek to answer the following sub-questions:

- What examples of innovative and promising ATD practice are emerging?
- To what extent is the ATD pilot, or elements of the ATD pilot, scalable?
- How sustainable is the ATD approach?
- What elements from the pilots can be mainstreamed into future programme designs?
- To what extent does the organisation running the pilot programme feel supported and equipped to deliver ATD pilot programmes?

4.3 Approach and Evaluation Methodology

34. This is an evidence-based, longitudinal evaluation to understand the extent to which the ATD pilot is contributing to its intended outcomes and delivering basic needs, case management and legal support. It will also consider whether or not it represents value for money and identify lessons learned and examples of good practice that could be applied across the UK's asylum and immigration system.
35. The methodology should be two-pronged: 1) utilise a case-based evaluation approach to yield rich detail from the individual cases admitted to the Action Access pilot; and 2) situational analysis of the various factors in the UK impacting on the ATD pilot's delivery of its stated objectives.
36. The evaluation methodology should use both qualitative and quantitative methods to answer the five Key Evaluation Questions and Sub-questions. Methods appropriate for this evaluation include (but are not limited to) the following: 1) document review and content analysis; 2) in-depth interviews with ATD pilot participants, UNHCR staff, Home Office staff, Action Foundation staff,

- service provider staff engaged with the ATD; 3) key informant interviews with civil society and other actors working on issues relating to asylum and immigration management; 4) field data collection and 5) systematic review of the Action Access pilot, including analysis of existing data, to understand its operation, how it may have evolved since inception and inform scalability.
37. In addition, the evaluation should undertake a desk-based review to consider ATD practice in other, comparable jurisdictions, to put the Action Access pilot in context and to help support the identification and assessment of lessons learned and examples of promising emerging practice.
 38. UNHCR welcomes the use of diverse, participatory, and innovative evaluation methods. The methodology – including details on the data collection and analytical approach(es) used to answer the evaluation questions – will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase, and presented in an evaluation matrix.
 39. The evaluation methodology is expected to:
 - i. Reflect an Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) perspective in all primary data collection activities carried out as part of the evaluation – particularly with refugees.
 - ii. Employ a mixed-method approach incorporating qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis tools including the analysis of monitoring data – as available.
 - iii. Refer to and make use of relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria such as those proposed by OECD-DAC and adapted by ALNAP for use in humanitarian evaluations.¹¹
 - iv. Refer to and make use of relevant standards analytical frameworks.
 - v. Gather and make use of a wide range of data sources (e.g. key informant interviews, direct observations, organisational documents, monitoring data, mission reports, coordination groups meetings, strategy narratives, and indicator reports) in order to demonstrate impartiality of the analysis, minimise bias, and ensure the credibility of evaluation findings and conclusions.
 - vi. Be explicitly designed to address the key evaluation questions – taking into account evaluability, budget and timing constraints.
 40. The evaluation team is responsible for gathering, analysing and triangulating data (e.g. across types, sources and analysis modality) to demonstrate impartiality of the analysis, minimise bias, and ensure the credibility of evaluation findings and conclusions.

4.4 Evaluation Quality Assurance

41. The evaluation consultants are required to sign the UNHCR Code of Conduct, complete UNHCR's introductory protection training module, and respect UNHCR's confidentiality requirements. UNHCR operates a zero tolerance policy towards sexual exploitation and abuse.
42. In line with established standards for evaluation in the UN system, and the UN Ethical Guidelines for evaluations, evaluation in UNHCR is founded on the inter-connected principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility, which in practice, call for: protecting sources and data; systematically seeking informed consent; respecting dignity and diversity; minimising risk, harm and burden upon those who are the subject of, or participating in the evaluation, while at the same time not compromising the integrity of the exercise.
43. The evaluation is also expected to adhere with the UNHCR 'Evaluation Quality Assurance' (EQA) guidance, which clarifies the quality requirements expected for UNHCR evaluation processes and products.
44. The Evaluation Manager will share and provide an orientation to the EQA at the start of the evaluation. Adherence to the EQA will be overseen by the Evaluation Manager with support from the UNHCR Evaluation Service as needed.

4.5 Data and information sources

45. The following data and information sources will be of relevance to the evaluation and should be considered:

¹¹ See for example: Cosgrave and Buchanan-Smith (2017) [Guide de l'Évaluation de l'Action Humanitaire](#) (London: ALNAP) and Beck, T. (2006) [Evaluating Humanitarian Action using the OECD-DAC Criteria](#) (London: ALNAP)

- Home Office individual case files of participants taking part in the pilot.
- Action Access data sources (subject to data protection/confidentiality/security clearance).
- Data gathered through the Home Office user research methodologies (including questionnaires, transcripts of interviews and participant diaries) completed by pilot participants.
- Data on pilot participants gathered by Action Foundation through the “in form” database
- Tools and resources as described below.
- Existing Home Office data sources to allow comparisons.

Tools

- UNHCR ‘Beyond Detention: Guiding Questions for the assessment of Alternatives to Detention’, May 2018, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/5b1e662d4.html>.
- EPIM ‘ATD network client summary sheet’ (See pages 34-37), July 2018, available at: https://www.epim.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ATD-Evaluation-Report_FINAL.pdf.

Evaluations

- EPIM, ‘Alternatives to detention from theory to practice Evaluation of three engagement-based alternative to immigration detention pilot projects in Bulgaria, Cyprus and Poland’, July 2018, available at: https://www.epim.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ATD-Evaluation-Report_FINAL.pdf.
- Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, ‘Report of the 2017/2018 External Audit (Detention Review)’, available at: <https://irb-cisr.gc.ca/en/transparency/reviews-audit-evaluations/Pages/ID-external-audit-1718.aspx>.
- Detention Action ‘Alternatives to Detention Community Support Project, April 2014 – June 2017’ (covering first year of the project from June 2014 – May 2015), 2015, available at: <https://www.iars.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/FINAL%20IARS%20DA%20evaluation%20report%20July%202015.pdf>.
- Migrationsverket and European Migration Network, ‘The use of detention and alternatives to detention in the context of immigration policies in Sweden’, 2014, available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/27a-sweden_detention_study_august2014_en.pdf.
- UNHCR, ‘Legal and Protection Policy Research Series’, ‘Building Empirical Research into Alternatives to Detention: Perceptions of Asylum-Seekers and Refugees in Toronto and Geneva’, Costello and Kaytaz, June 2013, available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/uk/protection/globalconsult/51c1c5cf9/31-building-empirical-research-alternatives-detention-perceptions-asylum.html>.
- Equal Rights Trust, ‘Measures of First Resort: Alternatives to Immigration Detention in Comparative Perspective’, 2011, available at: http://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/ERR7_alice.pdf
- Brown, C, ‘Toronto Bail Program’ 2011, available at: http://biblioteca.cejamericas.org/bitstream/handle/2015/5458/Toronto_BailProgram.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- Children’s Society and BID, ‘An evaluative report on the Millbank Alternative to Detention Pilot’, May 2009, available at: https://hubble-live-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/biduk/redactor2_assets/files/175/An_evaluative_report_on_the_Millbank_Alternative_to_Detention_Pilot.pdf.
- Tribal, ‘Review of the Alternative to Detention (A2D) Project’, (Millbank), May 2009, available at: <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090804165245/http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/aboutus/reports/alternative-to-detention/alternative-to-detention.pdf?view=Binary>.

Commentary

- Council of Europe, ‘Analysis of the legal and practical aspects of effective alternatives to detention in the context of migration’, January 2018, available at: <https://rm.coe.int/steering-committee-for-human-rights-cddh-analysis-of-the-legal-and-pra/1680780997>.

- Odysseus Network 'Alternatives to Immigration and Asylum Detention in the EU', 2015, available at: <https://odysseus-network.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/FINAL-REPORT-Alternatives-to-detention-in-the-EU.pdf>.
- EU Commission 'The use of detention and alternatives to detention in the context of immigration policies', 2014, available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/emn_study_detention_alternatives_to_detention_synthesis_report_en.pdf.

5. Organisation, management and conduct of the evaluation

46. UNHCR UK will serve as the **Evaluation Manager**. They will be responsible for: **(i)** managing the day to day aspects of the evaluation process; **(ii)** acting as the main interlocutor with the evaluation team; **(iii)** providing the evaluators with required data and facilitating communication with relevant stakeholders; and **(iv)** reviewing the interim deliverables and final reports to ensure quality – with the support of UNHCR Evaluation Service at HQ and a Reference Group comprising (TBD).
47. The **Evaluation Team** will comprise a senior team leader and team member. The team is expected to produce written products of high standards, informed by evidence and triangulated data and analysis, copy-edited, and free from errors.
48. The language of work of this evaluation and its deliverables is English.

5.1 Expected deliverables and evaluation timeline

49. The evaluation should be conducted from October 2019 to December 2020 and will be managed according to the timeline detailed below.
50. The key evaluation deliverables are:
 - Inception report;
 - Data collection toolkit (including questionnaires, interview guides, focus group discussion guides) and details on the analytical framework developed for / used in the evaluation;
 - Progress report, for the first year of the pilot, including an Executive Summary; and
 - Final evaluation report including recommendations and an Executive Summary.

Activity	Deliverables and payment schedule	Indicative timeline	Minimum # of estimated days
Evaluation ToR finalised and call for proposals issued	ToR and call for proposals	October 2019	N/A
Contract Awarded	Contract signed	October/November 2019	N/A
Inception phase including: - Initial desk review and key informant interviews. - Circulation for comments and finalisation - Potential Workshop and ATD results framework/theory of change	Final inception report – including methodology, refined evaluation questions (as needed) and evaluation matrix.	October/November 2019	10 days
PROGRESS REPORT: Data collection – Document review and in-person/virtual interviews (subject to necessity), including visits to partners	Data collection completed in line with inception report	October/November – December 2019	10 days

<p>PROGRESS REPORT Data analysis and drafting phase including: Stakeholder feedback and validation of evaluation findings, conclusions and proposed recommendations.</p>	<p>Draft report and recommendations (for circulation and comments) with the potential of a validation workshop</p>	<p>December 2019 – January 2020</p>	<p>15 days</p>
<p>PROGRESS REPORT: Finalisation</p>	<p>-Updated draft in line with stakeholder comments and the EQA - PPT presentation summarising findings and evaluation learnings</p>	<p>January 2020</p>	<p>5 days</p>
<p>Mid Term Data Collection: In person/virtual interviews, focusing on partners delivering ATD pilot and ATD participants (subject to necessity)</p>	<p>Written internal update and analysis presented to UNHCR (maximum 5 pages)</p>	<p>June 2020</p>	<p>10 days</p>
<p>FINAL REPORT: Data collection – Document review and in-person/virtual interviews (subject to necessity), including visits to partners</p>	<p>Presentation of preliminary findings with UNHCR at a stakeholders workshop</p>	<p>November 2020 - January 2021</p>	<p>10 days</p>
<p>FINAL REPORT: Data analysis and drafting including: Stakeholder feedback and validation of evaluation findings, conclusions and proposed recommendations</p>	<p>-Draft report and recommendations (for circulation and comments) with the potential of a validation workshop - PPT presentation summarising findings and evaluation learnings</p>	<p>January 2021</p>	<p>15 days</p>
<p>FINAL REPORT: Finalisation</p>	<p>Updated draft in line with stakeholder comments and the EQA</p>	<p>January 2021</p>	<p>5 days</p>

6. Evaluation team qualifications

Functional requirements for an evaluation firm comprising multiple team members. The firm/group of experts should be able and willing to travel between London and Newcastle and meet the following qualifications and experience expectations:

Evaluation Team Leader

- A post-graduate degree in Organisational Effectiveness, Business Administration or a related area.

- Minimum of 10 years of evaluation experience in qualitative analysis and synthesis of data in a relevant setting.
- Proven experience in successfully leading an evaluation team and managing data collection in complex environments.
- Technical expertise in evaluating data utilisation, organisational information management involving population level data and program operation data, results frameworks and performance measurement at the organisational level.
- Proven track record of leading (preferable) or participating as senior team member in an evaluation commissioned.
- In depth knowledge of and proven experience with various data collection and analytical methods and techniques used in evaluation and operational research.
- Experience in generating useful and action-oriented recommendations to management and programming staff.
- In-depth experience or knowledge of UK asylum procedures and/or immigration law.

Evaluation Team Member

- University degree (in the areas of social science) plus a minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience, or a post-graduate degree with at least 4 years of relevant experience in strategic information, data analysis, collection and/or information management.
- Proven experience (minimum 5 years) in supporting qualitative data collection and analysis for evaluation purposes (preferable) or studies and operational research around data utilisation and information management, advocacy and/or inter-agency coordination.
- In depth knowledge with various data collection and analytical methods and techniques used in evaluation and operational research.
- Proven expertise in facilitating participatory workshops involving different groups and participants.
- Technical expertise in the use of strategic information, data management, data analysis, information management involving population level data and program operation data, results frameworks and performance measurement at the organisational level.
- Knowledge of UK asylum procedures or experience working with asylum seekers and claimants.

7. Evaluation team selection criteria and bid requirements

Technical criteria used to evaluate proposals will comprise 70% of the total score while the remaining 30% is based on the financial offer. The technical offer will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- Proposed services: Approach and methodology to the evaluation (max 35 points).
- Team Composition and Strength: Number of people, qualifications and relevant experience (max 15 points).

The bid should include the following components:

- Proposed services: A statement detailing the methodology and tools you propose for this evaluation, important constraints/risks to the evaluation study that should be taken into consideration and mitigation strategies, expected level of effort (# of days and team size) and what quality assurance measures would be taken. (max. 6 pages).
- Team Composition and Strength: Bidders should indicate the composition and qualifications of each proposed team member; their role and past experience working together in carrying out this type of evaluation. Please submit the names and CVs of all proposed members (max 4 pages).