Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Federal Department of Foreign Affairs FDFA
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC

Thematic Cooperation / Section Water

Blue Peace Middle East

Terms of Reference for an independent assessment of legal, institutional and financial sustainability options

A targeted comparative assessment of registration options to support the Managing Committee's Decision

November 2026

Contracting authority	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
Technical steering	Blue Peace Middle East Institutional Working Group of the Managing Committee
Assignment type	A senior lead consultant, who may be supported by one specialist, with local legal input
Level of effort	Not exceeding 25 working days
Expected start date	March 1, 2027

Table of Contents

1. Background 3
2. Purpose and overarching conditions 3
3. Assessment criteria 5
4. Key questions the assignment must answer 6
5. Approach and consultation 6
6. Phases and deliverables 7
7. Final report and recommendation 7
8. Consultant profile and independence 8
9. Tender process 9
10. Management of the assignment 10
11. Conflict of interest, confidentiality and ownership 11
12. Level of effort and logistics 11
13. Expected outcome 12
14. Reference documents 12
15. Annexes 12

1. Background

Blue Peace Middle East is a regional Track 1.5[1] water cooperation and dialogue initiative that promotes regional cooperation, knowledge exchange, capacity development and collaboration on transboundary water and on Water–Energy–Food–Ecosystems (WEFE) challenges. It brings together five member countries; Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Türkiye, with Iran engaging in the initiative's activities. Together, these are the six countries participating in the initiative. It operates through a Regional Mechanism comprising the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), the Managing Committee (MC) and the Coordination Office (CO).

The initiative has established a regional convening role over more than a decade, with sustained participation by its member countries. Its legal, institutional, managerial and financial arrangements have not, however, developed at the same pace. The initiative holds no legal personality of its own. It operates through a host institution, is sustained by a single donor partner, and carries out its functions through project-based arrangements. This creates exposure in relation to institutional continuity, legal capacity, accountability, the ownership of assets, contracts, records, data and intellectual property, staff employment, financial management, institutional independence, long-term regional ownership, and dependence on a single source of funding.

The Managing Committee has been examining this question since its 17th Meeting in February 2026, which established the Institutional Working Group (IWG). The Working Group requested the Coordination Office to prepare a preliminary research baseline as an internal mapping exercise; it identified the legal forms available, the jurisdictions where registration could in principle take place, and the financing models through which the initiative could be sustained. It makes no recommendation and does not constitute legal or financial advice.

The external evaluation of the current phase reached converging conclusions independently. It supports further exploration of the legal structure options rather than the endorsement of a single model, identifies continued dependence on a single donor as a sustainability risk, and recommends that the Managing Committee and the Policy Advisory Committee finalise the decisions on the initiative's future legal status before the start of the next phase.

At its 18th Meeting in June 2026 the Managing Committee agreed that the Institutional Working Group would narrow the options and develop draft Terms of Reference for an external consultant. At its Second Meeting on 4 August 2026, the Working Group selected the strategic directions to be assessed. At its extraordinary Meeting on 29 September 2026, the Managing Committee approved these Terms of Reference, this assignment gives effect to that mandate.

2. Purpose and overarching conditions

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the assignment is to provide Blue Peace Middle East and its governing bodies (MC and PAC) with an independent, evidence-based and operationally realistic basis on which to decide the future institutional arrangement of the initiative and the financing model required to sustain it.

These Terms of Reference define the questions to be answered and the criteria against which the options are to be compared. They do not select an option, do not prescribe the method of analysis, and do not assume any particular outcome. The consultant is expected to identify and assess the options on the evidence and may propose variants or additional arrangements where the analysis supports them. The Managing Committee will take the decision, in consultation with the Policy Advisory Committee.

[1] Track 1.5 refers to a format in which government officials participate alongside experts and non-governmental actors in a personal or professional capacity rather than as formal state negotiators, allowing dialogue to proceed without binding the participating states.

2.2 Overarching conditions

The following conditions govern the assignment as a whole and apply to every option assessed.

Decision-making authority: The direction and decisions of Blue Peace Middle East rest with the Managing Committee under the initiative's governance arrangements, in consultation with the Policy Advisory Committee. Nothing in this assignment alters that.

National approvals: Depending on the jurisdiction and the arrangement selected, approvals or consents may be required from national authorities. These are legal requirements attaching to registration in a given jurisdiction. They are not decision rights over the initiative's direction, and the consultant shall identify and treat them as such.

Host and registration jurisdictions: Neither registration in a given jurisdiction nor a hosting arrangement shall confer governance authority, preferential influence or decision-making rights on the country of registration or on the host institution. Any entity will nonetheless remain subject to the applicable laws and regulatory requirements of the jurisdiction concerned. The consultant shall identify those requirements and the governance safeguards that limit their effect on the initiative's autonomy.

No preferred option: No option shall be treated as preferred by reason of the jurisdiction in which it would be established or the institution with which it would be associated, and the preference of any single country, donor or host institution shall not be treated as determinative.

Registration and hosting are distinct questions: The jurisdiction in which the initiative is registered and the location at which the Coordination Office (executive body) is hosted are separate matters and need not coincide. The consultant shall address them separately under each option and shall state, for each option, where the initiative would be registered, where the Coordination Office would be located, and the implications of each.

2.3 Focus of the assessment

The assessment shall be specific and targeted, so that it is useful to the Managing Committee in taking its decision. It shall focus on the following options, setting out the advantages and disadvantages of each. They are listed in no order of preference, and the assignment does not proceed from an assumption that any one option is the preferred outcome. Options may be combined, and the consultant may propose combinations, or variants of a single option, where the analysis supports them.

(a) **Registration within or outside the participating countries:** Registration of the initiative as a non-governmental, non-profit entity, either within or outside the six participating countries, in the legal form available in the jurisdiction concerned. Outside the six participating countries, the jurisdictions to be examined shall be determined as follows. At the inception stage the consultant shall propose a shortlist of up to four jurisdictions, with a clear justification for each against the assessment criteria in section 3. The Managing Committee shall confirm one or two of them before the in-depth analysis begins, and only the jurisdictions so confirmed shall be examined in depth.

(b) **Registration during a transition while hosted:** Registration of the initiative during a transition period while it is hosted, with clear independence, through one existing organisation. The consultant shall propose a transition plan of defined and justified duration, shall establish what safeguards clear independence would require in practice, and shall identify which functional requirements would remain unmet while the initiative has no separate legal personality.

(c) **Continuation of the rotational hosting model:** The continuation of rotational hosting of the Coordination Office. The consultant shall examine its advantages and disadvantages against the criteria in section 3, on the same basis as the other options. Its inclusion in the assessment does not imply that the Managing Committee has adopted, or will adopt, rotational hosting as its future model.

2.4 Outside the scope

The following are expressly outside the scope of the assignment:

- A treaty-, charter- or declaration-based intergovernmental organisation.
- A federation of national entities.
- Any review or redesign of the roles or working principles of the Policy Advisory Committee and the Managing Committee. The assignment addresses the requirements of a future institutional arrangement and takes the existing governance structure as its starting point.

- The drafting of constitutive or institutional instruments. The consultant identifies which instruments each option would require and what each must address.

3. Assessment criteria

The criteria below define the dimensions on which the options, and jurisdictions examined, are to be compared. The consultant shall apply each criterion consistently across the options, state the evidence on which each judgement rests, and report where the evidence is insufficient to reach a conclusion. The sub-elements are indicative of what is to be examined and are not exhaustive.

Criterion	What is to be assessed
1. Legal feasibility and capacity requirements (primary)	What each arrangement requires to establish, and what it enables the initiative to do: statutory basis; eligibility of founders and members; establishment procedure and time; any national approvals required; the supervisory authority and its powers; reporting, audit and compliance obligations; and the capacity to contract, hold property and assets, employ staff, receive funds, grants and contributions, operate bank accounts and defend its interests.
2. Political and regional acceptability, ownership and neutrality (primary)	Acceptability to each member country and any national-level approvals required; whether the arrangement is, and is seen to be, collectively owned by all member countries on an equal basis; the risk of its being perceived as dominated by one member country or by a host institution; the influence and incentives attaching to a country of registration or a host; the safeguards that prevent undue influence; sensitivity to regional political developments; whether the regional purpose can be secured in the entity's constitutive documents; and flexibility concerning future membership.
3. Governance fit and Track 1.5 character (primary)	Whether the arrangement preserves the initiative's character as a Track 1.5 platform and honest broker, its decision-making independence, and the existing Policy Advisory Committee and Managing Committee structure.
4. Financial feasibility and access to financing	Whether the arrangement can support funding diversification, member-country contributions and sustainable core financing; which sources of funding it opens or closes; eligibility for international grants and accreditation; fiduciary acceptability; annual compliance costs; and banking, foreign-exchange and movement-of-funds implications.
5. Time, cost, transition and continuity	How long establishment or adaptation takes and what it costs, both to establish and to maintain annually; the duration and cost of the transition; the transfer of staff, contracts, records, assets and intellectual property; preservation of institutional memory; continuity during regional disruption or changes of donor or host; and the reversibility of the choice.
6. Adaptability and future development	Ability to establish country focal points, manage regional programmes, administer a multi-donor arrangement, enter framework agreements, secure recognition in international processes, and expand membership without undermining existing ownership; and the longer-term institutional options each arrangement leaves open.

Three criteria are identified as primary, because they are most likely to determine whether an arrangement is workable in the present regional context. The consultant shall address all six and give particular weight to the three in the comparative assessment. This does not introduce numerical weighting.

No numerical scoring or weighted ranking shall be applied to the comparison of options or jurisdictions. The consultant shall provide a structured qualitative comparison supported by documented evidence, distinguishing verified legal fact from stakeholder preference, stated political constraint and professional judgement. This restriction concerns the comparison of options; it does not apply to the evaluation of consultants' proposals, which is addressed in section 9.

4. Key questions the assignment must answer

The questions below set out what the Managing Committee will need to know in order to decide. The consultant shall answer each of them explicitly in the final report and shall determine the method by which they are answered:

1. What are the current legal, institutional, administrative and financial arrangements of the initiative, drawing on the existing documentation listed in section 14, and which functions must any future arrangement be able to perform?
2. Under each option, what would be required to establish or adapt the arrangement in practice, including any national approvals, and what would it imply legally, politically, financially and operationally?
3. For registration within the six participating countries, which jurisdictions are realistically available and what does each require; and what does registration require in each of the jurisdictions outside the six participating countries confirmed by the Managing Committee under section 2.3(a)?
4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of continuing the rotational hosting model, and what would it imply for the initiative's legal capacity, continuity, cost and regional ownership?
5. For registration during a transition while hosted, what period is proposed and on what justification, what governance, financial and operational safeguards would be required to secure clear independence, and which functional requirements would remain unmet in the absence of separate legal personality?
6. What influence would a country of registration or a host institution acquire under each option, and what safeguards would prevent influence over the initiative's decisions?
7. What costs does each option imply to establish and to run each year, including the executive and administrative arrangements it would require, and at least a comparison between a hosted arrangement and an independently registered entity?
8. Which sources of financing does each option open or close; can each support funding diversification and what transition financing is required?
9. What standing does each option confer for participation and accreditation in international processes, and does any option foreclose the initiative's future institutional development?
10. What is the realistic duration, cost and sequence of any transition, which instruments would need to be adopted, and what decisions are required, from whom and when?
11. On the evidence assembled, and following the comparative assessment and the consultations, what is the consultant's professional recommendation, what fallback would the consultant propose, and on what conditions does each depend?

5. Approach and consultation

The consultant is responsible for the design of the analysis. The assignment shall be guided by independence, neutrality, balanced and inclusive representation of the member countries, evidence-based analysis, transparency, conflict sensitivity, political realism, legal accuracy, financial realism, practical implementability, confidentiality and accountability. The consultant shall distinguish clearly between verified legal fact, stakeholder preference, stated political constraint, financial estimate, professional judgement, and matters requiring further governmental or legal confirmation.

Jurisdictional analysis shall rest on verification by locally qualified legal practitioners in the jurisdictions examined. The assessment shall not presume that the current host location is the preferred future jurisdiction.

The consultant shall consult, at a minimum: the Chair and members of the Managing Committee; members of the Policy Advisory Committee; the Coordination Office; the relevant national authorities in the member countries; the current donor partner; and the present and previous host institutions. Consultations with national authorities may be conducted by remote interview or written questionnaire. The consultant shall also review, as a desk exercise, the experience of comparable regional or international organisations that have undergone similar transitions.

Consultations shall give each member country a meaningful opportunity to present its views, concerns and national legal requirements, without any country, donor or host institution receiving preferential influence over the assessment. Interview findings shall be reported in aggregated form unless express consent is given for attribution. The documents to be made available to the consultant are listed in section 14.

6. Phases and deliverables

Phase	Content	Deliverable	Indicative timing
1. Inception	Clarification of the decision needs; proposed methodology and consultation plan; document request; identification of candidate jurisdictions within the six participating countries; and a shortlist of up to four jurisdictions outside them, each with a justification against the criteria in section 3, for confirmation by the Managing Committee.	Inception report and work plan, including the proposed shortlist of jurisdictions outside the six participating countries, online presentation of the inception findings to the Managing Committee.	End of week 2
2. Analysis and consultation	Current-state and functional analysis; legal and jurisdictional research with local verification; consultations with member countries, governing bodies, the donor and host institutions; financing analysis.	Options paper setting out each option, its requirements and implications	End of week 10
3. Comparative assessment and validation	Structured qualitative comparison of the options against the criteria in section 3; costed and sequenced indicative transition pathways; regional validation workshop to test factual accuracy and clarify feasibility conditions. The workshop shall not replace the consultant's independent judgement.	Comparative assessment, draft indicative pathways and workshop report	End of week 14
4. Finalisation and presentation	Final report, recommendation and decision package; online presentation of the findings and recommendation to the Managing Committee, with materials suitable for the consultation of the Policy Advisory Committee.	Final report, decision package and presentation	End of week 17

The Managing Committee shall confirm the jurisdictions under section 2.3(a). The in-depth analysis of jurisdictions outside the six participating countries shall not begin before that confirmation.

All deliverables shall be submitted in English. The consultant shall additionally provide, upon request, the executive summary and the decision package in Arabic, Turkish and/or Persian as required for consultation at national level.

7. Final report and recommendation

The final report shall be concise, in the order of 15 to 20 pages excluding annexes and shall answer each of the key questions in section 4. It shall include at least: the methodology and its limitations; the current institutional and legal baseline and the functions any future arrangement must perform; the comparisons under section 2.3, including, for each option, the place of registration and the location of the Coordination Office, setting out the advantages and disadvantages of each option, its requirements and, where applicable, the comparison of jurisdictions; the comparative qualitative assessment against the criteria in section 3; the costs of each option, including the comparison between a hosted arrangement and an independently registered entity; an indicative transition pathway for each option, with its sequence, duration

and cost; the instruments each option would require; the decisions required, from whom and when; and the consultant's recommendation under section 7.1.

The decision package is a short document for the Managing Committee, separate from the final report, that summarises the options compared, the main findings against the criteria in section 3, the decisions required from the Committee, and the consultant's recommendation.

On completion, the consultant shall present the findings and the recommendation to the Managing Committee in an online session and shall respond to members' questions. The consultant shall also provide materials suitable for the consultation of the Policy Advisory Committee.

7.1 The consultant's recommendation

Following the comparative assessment and the stakeholder consultations, the consultant shall state a professional recommendation as to the preferred option, together with a fallback and, where appropriate, a phased alternative, setting out the conditions on which each depends.

The recommendation shall follow the comparative assessment and the consultation process and shall not precede either. It shall be presented as the consultant's independent professional judgement and expressly without prejudice to the decision of the Managing Committee, which retains sole authority to decide. It shall not be presented in the executive summary in a manner that displaces the comparative assessment.

8. Consultant profile and independence

Given the focused scope and the level of effort, the assignment shall be led by a single senior consultant. The lead consultant may be supported by one specialist, in legal or financial matters as the proposal justifies, within the 25 working days, and shall be supported by locally qualified legal practitioners in the jurisdictions examined, budgeted separately.

Lead consultant

An advanced degree in international law, institutional governance, public administration, international relations, development finance or a related field; at least fifteen years of relevant experience; demonstrated experience establishing, restructuring or assessing regional or international institutions, evidenced by comparable completed assignments; experience of legal-personality and jurisdictional assessments and of institutional transitions from donor-funded programmes to independent entities; experience in institutional cost and financing analysis; experience in multi-country and politically sensitive environments; and excellent written and spoken English.

Specialist (optional)

Where proposed, a specialist with expertise either in comparative non-profit and institutional law, including host-institution agreements, employment, taxation, foreign funding and banking compliance; or in institutional cost analysis, financing strategy and donor diversification.

Local legal input

Short, targeted verification from qualified local legal practitioners in the jurisdictions examined, procured and budgeted separately from the lead consultant's time.

Desirable

Experience of regional cooperation in the Middle East; water diplomacy; Track 1.5 processes; and knowledge of Arabic, Turkish or another language of the member countries.

8.1 Independence

The independence of the assessment, and the perception of that independence in every member country, is a condition of the assignment.

The following apply to the lead consultant and to every member of the core team, except where a requirement refers to the lead consultant alone, and shall be certified in the proposal:

- The lead consultant shall not be a national of any of the six countries participating in Blue Peace Middle East.
- No current employment, board or comparable engagement with a government, ministry or public institution of any of the six participating countries, with the donor, or with the present host institution (INWRDAM); and no such engagement within the three years preceding the proposal.

- No personal, professional or financial interest in any of the options or institutions under assessment.
- No prior engagement with the initiative that would place the consultant in the position of assessing work in which the consultant participated.
- Disclosure of the nationality and country of residence of each team member. Where a team member is a national or resident of the donor country, or resident in a participating country, that member shall not lead the assessment of the jurisdiction concerned, and the arrangement shall be recorded in the final report.

9. Tender process

9.1 Eligibility criteria

Criterion	Verification
Experience : The lead consultant has sufficient experience to fulfil the assignment	One reference of comparable completed mandate from the past five (5) years
Language : The lead consultant can well communicate in English both orally and in writing,	Confirmed language skills
Availability : The lead consultant must confirm availability to execute the tasks listed in section 6 over a period of approximately four months, tentatively planned from early March to the end of June 2027, including attendance at one mission for the validation workshop.	Written confirmation
Conflict of interest / independence: The consultancy team declares to be free of any conflict of interest and respecting the independence of this assessment as per section 8.1.	Written confirmation

Proposals not meeting one or more of the eligibility criteria will not be further considered in the awarding process.

9.2 Award criteria

Criterion	Weighting
Qualifications of the consultancy team, and relevant references	40%
Understanding of the assignment and quality of the proposed approach and methodology	40%
Financial offer	20%

9.3 Application procedure and timetable

Date / deadline	Activity
6.11.2026	Invitation to tender
17.11.2026	Deadline for submitting questions and expressing interest to submit an offer by e-mail to nathalie.semoroz@eda.admin.ch, with copy to benjamin.guelpa@eda.admin.ch
27.11.2026	Sharing of the questions and answers with all interested tenderers
11.12.2026	Deadline for submission of technical and financial offer by e-mail to nathalie.semoroz@eda.admin.ch, with copy to benjamin.guelpa@eda.admin.ch
31.01.2027	Information of the awarding or non-awarding of the contract to all bidders
23.02.2027	Signing of contract
01.03.2027	Contract start date

In all correspondence, please use the email subject *Proposal Assessment Blue Peace Middle East.*

9.4 Structure and content of the proposals

The technical proposal must not exceed 8 pages (annexes excluded), and should outline the consultancy team's:

- understanding of the assignment;
- approach to and methodology for the assignment, and work plan (max. 3 pages);
- presentation of the team, in line with section 8 (including CVs in the annex; CVs max. 3 pages each);
- experience with similar assignments;
- potential challenges, risks and mitigation measures;
- financial proposal (in the annex).

The financial proposal should be filled out according to the template form Type B in Annex 1. It must include all costs related to the assignment and clearly outline the number of days and the daily rates for each proposed consultant in Swiss Francs (CHF), excluding VAT for consultants based in the European Union. The work of locally qualified legal counsel shall be itemised separately. All necessary expenses, including anticipated travel costs (accommodation, flights, local transportation), need to be listed separately and offered as reimbursables. For food, payment will be lump sum based.

9.5 Contracting

The contract will be awarded by SDC following an analysis of the technical and financial proposals received in response to these Terms of Reference. It is not possible to appeal the award.

10. Management of the assignment

Party	Role
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Contracting authority. Contracts the consultant and manages the financial and administrative aspects of the contract.
Institutional Working Group	Technical steering body. Participates in the technical evaluation; reviews and clears deliverables; acts as country interlocutors and facilitates access to national authorities; tests findings against member-country

	realities; and formulates the recommendation to the Managing Committee.
Chair of the Managing Committee	Principal focal point for the consultant.
Coordination Office	At the request of the Chair and the Working Group: administrative support; circulation of documents; facilitation of the consultant's access to institutional records; and the record of the Working Group's decisions.
Managing Committee	Confirms the jurisdictions to be examined outside the six participating countries, on the shortlist proposed at inception. Receives the deliverables and the Working Group's recommendation and takes the decision on the future legal form.
Policy Advisory Committee	Consulted on the strategic implications before any final decision.

Deliverables shall be circulated by the Chair through the Coordination Office and reviewed collectively by the Working Group. Comments shall be consolidated into a single response within an agreed review period, distinguishing factual corrections from institutional preferences.

The consultant shall maintain a comments-and-response matrix recording each comment, the response, the change made, and the reason where a change was not accepted. The independence of the consultant's professional judgement shall be protected throughout.

11. Conflict of interest, confidentiality and ownership

The consultant shall disclose all actual, potential and perceived conflicts of interest; shall remain independent of the candidate jurisdictions, of the present host institution, and of any potential service provider; shall not act on behalf of any donor; and shall not accept instruction from any party other than as provided in section 10. The independence requirements in section 8.1 apply throughout the assignment and not only at selection.

Some options under assessment relate to existing arrangements. The following safeguards shall accordingly apply where a member of the Policy Advisory Committee, the Managing Committee, the Institutional Working Group, their institution or their country, the Coordination Office or its host institution, or the current donor partner, is connected to an option under assessment:

- Disclosure of any such connection at the outset of the assignment, recorded in writing.
- Separation of the disclosing party from the assessment of, and from any decision or recommendation concerning, the option to which the connection relates.
- Direct access by the consultant to the Chair as principal focal point, so that no assessment is mediated solely through a party connected to an option under assessment.
- Recording in the final report of any such connection and of the measures applied.

The consultant shall sign a confidentiality undertaking; protect confidential documents; obtain informed consent for interviews and store records securely; report interview findings in aggregated form unless consent is given for attribution; and publish or circulate no output without written authorisation.

All reports, models, legal analyses, financial estimates, interview instruments, matrices and databases produced under the assignment shall become the property of Blue Peace Middle East, subject to the contractual arrangements agreed with SDC. The consultant may not distribute or use the outputs for any other purpose without prior written authorisation from the Initiative Managing Committee.

12. Level of effort and logistics

The level of effort is 25 working days, exclusive of travel time (maximum 2 working days per international team member). The work of locally qualified legal counsel engaged for jurisdiction-specific verification is not included in the 25 working days and shall be itemised separately in the financial proposal.

The assignment includes one mission, combining the regional validation workshop with meetings and engagement with the governing bodies and other stakeholders. The workshop shall be held in conjunction with a meeting of the governing bodies where the timing permits; the arrangements and location will be confirmed at the inception stage. The proposal shall set out the days allocated to it. Other consultations, including with national authorities, may be conducted by remote interview or written questionnaire. The final presentation of the findings and recommendation shall be delivered online.

13. Expected outcome

A short, evidence-based comparison that allows the Managing Committee to decide, in consultation with the Policy Advisory Committee, where the initiative should register and on what timeline, while preserving the initiative's regional ownership, its Track 1.5 character and the honest-broker role on which its value rests. This assessment is the basis for a further, separate assignment on the detailed registration process and the financing model, once the Committee has decided.

14. Reference documents

The following references are available to interested tenderers:

- Blue Peace Middle East website: https://bluepeaceme.org/en
- Blue Peace Middle East YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/@BluePeaceMiddleEast

After the signing of the contract, the following documents will be made available to the consultant: the Rules of Governance; the current phase project document; the preliminary research baseline; the reports of the 17th and 18th Managing Committee Meetings and of the Institutional Working Group; hosting and contractual arrangements; financial reports, budgets and audit reports, and the external evaluation report.

15. Annexes

No.	Annex
1	Budget form Type B - for legal entities, organisations and self-employed persons
2	General Terms and Conditions (GTC) of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) for mandates (type A and B), and fact sheet on compensation for fees and expenses
3	Code of conduct for contractual partners of the FDFA