1. **Evaluation Facts**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title**: **Building Opportunities for Resilience in the Horn of Africa (BORESHA)**  **Background and Introduction**  Funded by the European Union Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF), Building Opportunities for Resilience in the Horn of Africa **(BORESHA)** project is a 3-year cross-border project (December 2017- November 2020) whose overall objective is to promote economic development and greater resilience, particularly among vulnerable groups in the Mandera Triangle (area between Kenya, Somalia and Ethiopia). The project adopts a community-driven approach to address the shared nature of the risks and opportunities on in this border area. It is part of the EU's programme for Collaboration in the Cross-Border areas of the Horn of Africa, providing over 60 million euros of investment to prevent and mitigate the impact of local conflict and to promote economic development and greater resilience in four different cross-border regions. The consortium is led by DRC in partnership with WYG, World Vision and CARE International.  **Expected results of the project**: 1. Communities in Mandera Triangle are more resilient and better prepared for shocks, and response is more effective; 2. Individuals and communities are more self-reliant through increased skills and opportunities for cross-border employment, diversified enterprise and livelihoods; 3. Cross-border rangeland and other shared natural resources are more equitably and sustainably managed.  **Overall objective of the project**  The overall goal of the project is to promote economic development and greater resilience, particularly among vulnerable groups, including youth, women, displaced persons and persons living with disabilities  **Target Beneficiaries**  Overall project targeted 350, 000 individual beneﬁciaries. The programme sought to work with local and national government authorities, community leaders, young people, women, youth groups, women’s associations, local communities, private sector and local business leadership in Mandera, Gedo and Dolo Ado. Specifically, the project targeted vulnerable communities and individuals or those at risk of migration or displacement  The project has been implemented in the target areas (Mandera county in Kenya, Dollow and Beled Hawa district in Somalia and Dolo Ado and Dolo Bay in Ethiopia) since November 2017 and is planning an end of project evaluation between October and November 2020. The evaluation will help document key achievements, gaps, challenges, lessons, and recommendations for future programming in resilience in volatile context.  Read more on BORESHA here <https://boreshahoa.org/about-boresha/>  **Timing of Evaluation:** 1st October 2020 to 30th November 2020. Detailed timelines in table below   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Activity** | **Key dates** | **Responsible** | | Consultants bidding and procurement process | 1st August to 31st August 2020 | Procurement office | | Contracting and start up processes | September 2020 | Procurement and Nicoletta | | Data collection | November 2020 | Consultants and BORESHA staff | | Data analysis and report writing | December 2020 | Consultants | | Validation workshop and final report submission | December 2020 /January 2021 | Consultants and PMU |   **Evaluation Owner:** Nicoletta Buono; Evaluation **Manager:** Peterson Mucheke  **Evaluation Team:** Nicoletta Buono, Peterson Mucheke, George Ebulu, PMU, Partner leads (CARE, WYG, WV, DRC) and HQ and region evaluation team of advisors.  **Type of evaluation:** End of Project Evaluation  **Evaluation Trigger:** This evaluation is triggered by: 1) requirement of the donor and project commitment as set out in the project contract document and 2) DRC evaluation policy (MELMOP) on projects with budget threshold > 2 million dollars |

1. **Objectives of the Evaluation**

|  |
| --- |
| * The objective of this evaluation is to document the overall performance of the project against set goals/impacts, objectives/outcomes, and outputs from project interventions as defined in the project theory of change and results framework. The evaluation will also seek to document any lessons learned, expected as well as unexpected results or changes within and outside the project that impacted project delivery and impact. * Main focus: The main focus of the evaluation will be to evaluate the results, context, changes and processes and their impact on results delivery and sustainability of benefits from the project. The evaluation will assess the documented project results/reports, the roles of the four implementing partners (DRC, WYG, World Vision International and CARE International), beneficiaries in the 3 countries (Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia). |

1. **Intended use of the Evaluation findings and recommendations**

|  |
| --- |
| The evaluation intended users include EUTF (in full first time), DRC programmes, BORESHA partners and other partners interested in resilience work in the cross-border areas.   * The findings will inform future programming in resilience in cross-border settings specifically in the Horn of Africa. * The evaluation findings will be presented in a meeting bringing together donors and other stakeholders at the end of the project. The findings will also be shared in other post project partner events as appropriate (e.g. with Altai). Findings from the evaluation will also be widely disseminated. DRC Lessons Learned Note will be used and sent to [MEL@drc.dk](mailto:MEL@drc.dk) for input to the annual meta-evaluation process in DRC. |

1. **Context and background to the project**

|  |
| --- |
| **Description of the programme or project being evaluated:**  **BORESHA (**Building Opportunities for Resilience in the Horn of Africa) is 3 year, 14 million Euros project funded by the **European Union Trust Fund for Africa**. The project's overall objective is to promote economic development and greater resilience, particularly among vulnerable groups in the Cross-Border area between Kenya, Somalia and Ethiopia and is planned to run from December 2017- November 2020. The project adopts a community-driven approach to address the shared nature of the risks and opportunities in this border area. The consortium is led by Danish Refugee Council in partnership with WYG, World Vision International and CARE International.  The project is being implemented in line with the project theory of change outlined below:  **Project Theory of Change**  “If we strengthen cross-border communities’ capacities to identify their own priorities, plan and advocate for measures to help them withstand shocks; Promote the development of inclusive cross-border environment for livestock and non-livestock trade and business; foster private sector opportunities for women and young people; If we support the equitable and conﬂict sensitive management of natural resources in the cross-border area; then communities will become more resilient and self-reliant; individuals, including women and young men, will have the skills and opportunity take up a more diverse range of employment and livelihoods options; natural resources will be used more rationally, and with less conﬂict; local governments will be more accountable to their constituencies; and fewer people will be displaced within, or migrate out from, the cross-border region”.  **Project Expected Results**  350,000 individual beneﬁciaries across three countries. Specially project expected results included: 1. Communities in the Cross-Border Area between Kenya, Somalia and Ethiopia are more resilient and better prepared for shocks, and response is more eﬀective.2. Individuals and communities are collectively more self-reliant through increased skills and opportunities for cross-border employment, diversiﬁed enterprise and livelihoods. 3. Cross-border rangeland and other shared natural resources are more equitably and sustainably managed.  **Target Beneficiaries**  The programme has been working with local and national government authorities, community leaders, young people, women, youth groups, women’s associations, local communities, the private sector and local business leadership in Mandera, Gedo and Dolo Ado/Dolo Bay. The programme targets communities and individuals identiﬁed as vulnerable or at risk of migration or displacement  **Overall objective of the project**  The overall goal of the project is to promote economic development and greater resilience, particularly among vulnerable groups, including youth, women, displaced persons and persons living with disabilities  **Specific project targets:**  **Outcome 1: Building resilience within the communities.**   * **Early** Warning and Recovery Systems and community-based Disaster Risk Reduction plans for 37 communities. * Index-based Livestock Insurance awareness for 5000 livestock owners in the three countries.   The outcome indicators to be assessed under this outcome are:  1.1: # of community associations (especially farmers and pastoralists) who know early warning signs and knows what to do in case of an emergency or disaster.  1.2: # of DRRM plans funded or integrated in local development plans (LED, CIDP) by targeting, costing/budgeting and implementation.  1.3: Proportion of shocks “well managed” by the target communities during the project  1.4: Number of livestock-dependent households protected by insurance Outcome 2; Livelihoods & Economic Improvement.  * **19 Livestock Common Interest Groups (LCIGs)**established and supported. * Milking herds belonging to **250 women-headed households**supported during the dry season * Animal health initiatives including: **90 community animal health workers and animal health professionals trained**and **560,000 animals**vaccinated and de-wormed * **193 Village Savings and Loans**associations (VSLAs) established and supported * A [**Grant Fund Facility**](https://boreshahoa.org/opportunities/)established to provide financial support to small businesses * **3 Business Development Centres**set-up to provide advisory services and technical assistance to emerging businesses * **Cash for Work**for the most vulnerable, including displaced and returnees and rehabilitation of community infrastructure * Strengthening cross-border markets, connectivity and trade through a **Tri-Border Trade and Economic Development Committee**  Outcome indicators to be assessed under outcome 2 are: 2.1: % Increase in number of livelihood resources being used by households compared to baseline  2.2: % increase in revenues of the target HHs compared to baseline  2.3: % of individuals describing better health and lower rates of attrition amongst their herds compared to baseline  2.4: % of HHs in targeted communities getting better results from their SMEs  2.5: % of VSLA members self-reporting an increase in household income  2.6: Number of women and youth who are able to access jobs and/or business opportunities within 12 months of graduating  2.7: % Community members reporting improvements from the community infrastructure established / rehabilitated, supporting cross border employment / diversified enterprise and livelihoods  2.8: % community members reporting increase in cross-border employment opportunities (as reported by individuals against baseline). Outcome 3: Natural Resource Management – Participatory Range Land Management.  * Strengthening the planning and management of **cross-border natural resources.** * Community-led protection and **rehabilitation of rangelands**and management of invasive species. * **30 schools**supported to harvest rain-water and build capacity on environmental management. * **12 water points**rehabilitated or constructed. * 3223 HH supported with hygiene kits COVID-19 prevention and response enhanced   **Outcome indicators to be assessed under this outcome are:**  3.1: % change in land area rehabilitated and managed for communal use  3.2: # of natural resource management committees reporting increased productivity due to land management practices  3.2b: # of households generating income through alternative uses of invasive species  3.3: New efforts in cross-border collaboration in managing natural resources (e.g. agreements, MoUs, shared use of maps, cross-border committees, etc.)  3.4: # of households accessing water for domestic and livelihood activities from rehabilitated / developed water sources.  3.4b: Number of schools making use of water collected from water harvesting schemes.  **Key assumptions during project inception (and implementation) were:**   * Local and national level authorities actively support and engage with project activities. * Climate and early warning information is accurate enough to plan for dry spells, droughts and floods. * There will be stable political leadership and governance. * Political environment allows stakeholders in the three countries to support cross-border collaboration. Borders between Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya are open for legal cross-border movement and trade. * There is political will from the respective authorities and communities at large for sustainable utilization of natural resources for livelihoods activities (land, water, pasture). * Natural calamity such as droughts, floods, wild fires and locust invasion does not negatively impact rehabilitated communal lands. * Communities remain relatively stable (no extraordinary in or out migration) * There will be adequate uptake of insurance models for the schemes to be viable. All factors of uptake are favourable. * The insurance service providers provide timely, effective and efficient services * Existing local government traditional policies, investments, and initiatives in operational areas are open to change. * Sustained willingness of the local authorities, and local groups to support programme initiatives. * Skills providers are available for the vocational skills identified through the assessment. * No disruptions in infrastructure project delivery due to disasters or conflict(floods largely impacted CfW start up) * Stakeholders see the merit of the Committee and are willing to commit to its effective operations. * Stakeholders - including business associations and TVET providers - support establishment of BDSC. * Research findings will inform necessary policy adjustments & increase community knowledge. * Stable economic and political environment between the three countries to allow for cross-border collaboration. * Minimal potential for NRM related conflicts. * School attendance is not disrupted by migration as a result of severe conflict and other natural calamities, such as drought, floods, disease outbreak e.t.c. |

1. **Scope of the evaluation**

|  |
| --- |
| What will and what will not be covered by the evaluation?   * Time frame: The evaluation is expected to be conducted from 1st November 2020-31st January 2021. The evaluation will focus on interventions implemented within the project life time from 2017 to 2020. The study may also refer to other interventions implemented within the project location for comparison. * Thematic areas: Resilience, Disaster risk reduction (DRR), Index Based Livestock Insurance (IBLI), Livelihoods, Natural resources management. Impacts, challenges lessons learnt, sustainability, replication opportunities, scaling up, (expand each of them to give a sense of what was done under each thematic area (egg technical approaches used, expected results, to what extent did the approaches work?) * Geographical areas: Dollow Somalia, Mandera Kenya and Dolo Ado and Dolo Bay in Ethiopia, Nairobi for coordination activities.. |

1. **Key evaluation questions**

The questions that the evaluation will seek to answer are highlighted under the different OECD criteria below.

1. **Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation will use the OECD DAC evaluation criteria adapted to humanitarian action by ALNAP.

|  |
| --- |
| **The relevant OECD DAC evaluation criteria for the project are:**  The evaluation questions to be answered under each evaluation criteria are listed below.   * Relevance/Appropriateness   + To what extent were the BORESHA responses relevant to the context and able to address the community, households and individual beneficiaries needs identified?   + Are the BORESHA project response strategies (and intervention) appropriateto the current needs and the consortium partners mandate? Looks at appropriateness of conceptualisation (there is a need?) and the appropriateness of design.   + To what extent does the project respond to priority issues?   + did anything about the BORESHA programme contradict or conflict with other existing programmes (especially longer-term plans) both of the country and of other donor programmes?   + were the right people, living in the right area targeted at the right time? * Effectiveness and Efficiency   + What internal and external factors affected (both positively and negatively) the effectiveness and coverage of the project? How well did the project partners connect and coordinate with beneficiaries, local / national / international frameworks and other actors? What were the strengths and weaknesses of coordination and collaboration?   + How has implementation and accomplishment of program activities been carried out at the technical/programmatic, organizational and contractual levels?   + **Cross – border programming. -** How well did the project promote cross-border cooperation between communities specifically in     - Response to disasters (drought, floods, livestock diseases and conflicts)?     - Trade and economic activities.     - Cross-border natural resource management     - The role of media/ technology in cross border programming?     - What was learnt from the limitations of the cross-border programming?   + Did the project design reflect cross-border programing to a sufficient degree? Are there lessons-learned on cross-border programming?   + **Integration of sectors –**      - Did integration of different sectors and linkages improve quality programming and sustainability?     - Are there areas of conflict or tension between partners or lost opportunities for partnership that were not explored?     - How did project structure encourage synergy among partners?   + **Engagement of the private sector:**      - What role has the private sector played in improving resilience and reducing vulnerability (if any)?     - DRR committees, VSLA groups, LCIGs, prosopis alternative utilization. The evaluation seeks to understand the role private sector played in these groups and how the groups affected operations of the private sector in project areas.     - Has the project built the private sector actors capacity to become more effective in contributing to resilience, if so how?     - Have the methods of interventions used in the private sector helped in reducing vulnerability among the targeted communities / households?   + To what extent the project is cost effective in terms of times, resource (human and capital, and material resource and energy)?   + What is the level of satisfaction of the direct beneficiaries or participants?   + If the program has not achieved some results, investigate why not and the barriers to success? * Coherence   + **Linkages between resilience and conflict management-** In what ways did resilience approaches adopted enhance conflict management? How has BORESHA interventions contributed to reduction of conflict?   + Alignment with existing public sector strategies and plans? * Coordination   + **Consortium** Management - How did project ensure effective feedback mechanisms between stakeholder institutions and implementing partners in the cross – border consortium environment? –   + Level of communications and plans at an appropriate level? Timing? Process?   + Linkages with other projects in the area? Synergies with these?     - Complexities, successes and efficiency of consortium cross-border programming     - What methods worked/did not work for the consortium management in programming?   + How well did the project collaborate with national and local authorities as well as other partners? * Impact   + What has changed that can be associated with to the BORESHA project contribution? (In different areas and target populations)?   + To what extent have changes occurred as postulated by the project theory of change been achieved? What factors facilitated or hindered the same? Changes at outcome and impact level.   + Did impact vary for different targeted areas, households, or individuals (refugee, Host, men and women)? If so, how and why?   + Are there any unintended consequences, (positive or negative)?   + **Economic Empowerment -** 1. What new emerging areas or opportunities have come up that can be best supported through the private sector?   + **Nexus between resilience and early response:** - To what extent has BORESHA demonstrated this? Are there lessons-learned on how to improve the nexus? * Sustainability (at the design phase, what pillars of sustainability were identified? What is their status now?)   + To what extent have systems that were put in place for sustainable management and utilization of shared natural resources functional? What is the extent of their continuity in absence of the project?   + Are the project benefits and impacts sustainable? Which ones and in what ways?   + **Engagement of the private sector:** Sustainability Issues and Impacts on Resilience     - What role has the private sector played in improving resilience and reducing vulnerability?     - What was done to enhance sustainability of the impacts and benefits of the project?     - What is the sustainability of different BORESHA approaches e.g NRM committees, DRR committees, VSLA groups, LCIGs, prosopis alternative utilization, the Business Development Services Centres and the Grant Fund Facility?     - How did project build capacity of beneficiaries to become more effective private sector players? Can this be maintained following the end of the project?     - What methods or interventions used in the private sector helped in reducing beneficiaries’ vulnerability?   + To what extent has the project built the resilience of cross-border households * What lessons can we pick from the project (design, implementation, assumptions…)? |

1. **Evaluation deliverables**

For all evaluations a DRC Lessons Learned Note should be used and sent to [MEL@drc.dk](mailto:MEL@drc.dk) for input to the annual meta-evaluation process in DRC. You will find the template for lessons learned notes on melmop.drc.dk under the Learning Library.

|  |
| --- |
| * Inception Report / Response to ToR * An inception report presenting the consultant’s understanding of the TOR, detailing methodologies to be used and representative sample size calculations, a detailed execution plan, data-collection tools, clearly defined research/assessment questions and corresponding or feeding sub-questions (incorporating the summary of the introductory meetings). * Draft Report: Draft summary of findings and recommendations by partners * Evaluation datasets * A presentation of the key findings in a validation workshop * Output of statistical analysis of quantitative results in MS Word * Content analysis or other analytical output of the qualitative data, including key themes identified and frequencies of those themes Final Report: A comprehensive evaluation report that highlights the findings, lessons learnt, best practices and practical recommendations. * DRC Lessons Learned Note * A presentation of the draft report made at the validation workshop   All will be deliverables plus a 2 pager stand-alone summary brief on the evaluation that is sharable on the project for dissemination. The final report will be due on or before 15th December 2020. The findings, recommendations and conclusions should go beyond the project level and provide higher level learning for DRC and partners beyond the project. |

1. **Methodology**

The evaluation methodology will be further developed by the consultant / evaluator(s) and be well articulated in the response to the ToR. The methodology should demonstrate robustness and rigour in addressing the evaluation objectives and questions. Interested consultants will be expected to propose the design and methodology to be used in this evaluation as part of their proposals. The methodology proposed by the successful consultant shall be discussed, finalized and approved by DRC evaluation committee before commencing data collection as part of the quality assurance process. It is however expected that the methodology will use a mixed-methods approach including both qualitative and quantitative components. The data collection methodologies should use a participatory approach engaging all relevant stakeholders, including community leaders, government counterparts and partners. The consultant should demonstrate how they will conduct document and system review, household surveys, FGDs, KIIs and Field visits/observations as appropriate. The consultant will aim to provide an expanded analytical framework as part of the desk review.

More over the Evaluation team will assess the accountability implementing partners to target beneficiary targeting, Donors and partners. Additionally, they will assess integration of crosscutting issues in particular gender.

1. **Recommended documentation**

|  |
| --- |
| As a minimum the evaluator will be made aware of and have access to the following documentation;   * Project proposal, project document, logical framework and/or theory of change, publications and relevant monitoring and donor reports and data * Reports from evaluations conducted on similar or related projects * Evaluation report template – attached |

1. **Follow Up**

|  |
| --- |
| * A signed management response will be shared with the evaluator and Head of Desk and GSL on Monitoring and Evaluation in OPSU * An Evaluation Lessons Learned Note, which is sent to HQ [mel@drc.dk](mailto:mel@drc.dk) will be done by the evaluator |

1. **Practical Implementation of the Evaluation**

|  |
| --- |
| Bid by the evaluator(s) should include the following information:   * The evaluation plan - days covered by the evaluation * Language * Budget * Skills and experience of the evaluator(s) * Timing and timelines /workplan of Evaluation Process – see earlier section   + Preparation of draft ToR   + Selection of evaluator   + Agreement on ToR   + Desk review   + Start-up meeting   + Field visit   + Consultation with beneficiaries   + Draft evaluation report   + Debrief meeting – reflect on findings and recommendations   + Acceptance of Final Evaluation Report   + Follow up on findings and recommendations   Contact information for manager commissioning the evaluation [nicoletta.buono@drc.ngo](mailto:nicoletta.buono@drc.ngo) |

1. **Managing the evaluation- Roles and responsibilities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The key stakeholders and their specific roles in the evaluation process are:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **No** | **Stakeholder** | **Role in the evaluation** | | 1 | Project PMU lead: Nicoletta Buono | Commission the evaluation | | 2 | Evaluation Manager: Peterson Mucheke M | Evaluation planning and coordination | | 3 | Evaluation Team of Advisors / Committee  Nicoletta Buono, Peterson Mucheke M, George Ebulu, PMU, Partner leads | Provide technical support and guidance to the Evaluation Manager and team. Review key evaluation documents to shape the quality of the evaluation processes and products | | 4 | Evaluation team: Nicoletta Buono, Peterson Mucheke M, PMU, Partner leads, consultants | Implementation of the evaluation plan | | 5 | Consultant TBD | Implement evaluation and deliver agreed deliverables within schedule | | 6 | Other key stakeholders: Partners, Local government officials and beneficiaries’ communities. Project staff | Provide feedback and experiences on the project. Validation of findings. | |

1. **Expected profile of Evaluation consultant**

The evaluation team shall include one local consultant from each of the 3 project countries. The desired specification and qualities of the consultants are:

* At least 8 years of experience in conducting evaluation
* Advanced degree in development, agriculture, natural resources management, disaster management, rural development or related fields.
* Familiarity with issues in the cross-border areas in the Horn of Africa and ASALs
* Advanced experience in resilience, climate change, disaster management, livelihoods, grants, training and rural development or relate field as well as project implementation, monitoring.
* Working experience and knowledge in livestock production, marketing, processing, animal health service delivery, training institutions or formation of national laws, policies and strategies.
* Proven experience of using participatory methods for data collection and analysis in cross-border multi-partner and multi-country programme/project evaluation.
* Experience of effective interaction with local, national and regional government institutions and marginalized communities.
* Good spoken and written communication skills in English. Knowledge of Somali language of the local communities is an asset;
* Excellent skills and ability to articulate ideas in a clear and accurate manner including the ability to prepare reports.
* Strong interpersonal skills, analytical skills and ability to establish and maintain effective working relations.

1. **Data Protection and Confidentiality**

While executing this assignment, the consultant and all the parties involved shall ensure effective protection of confidential and sensitive data and information in conformity with the humanitarian and protection principles and to applicable legal data protection standards[[1]](#footnote-2). All data collection and processing activities shall be executed in accordance with the following principles that is;

* Safeguarding individuals’ Personal Data is a crucial part of humanitarian mission to protect the lives, integrity and dignity of beneficiaries and participants and is fundamental in the provision of protection response and humanitarian aid.
* People-centered and inclusive. Evaluation activities will respect the interests and well-being

of the population, in all relevant phases of the evaluation and which activities must be sensitive to age, gender, and other issues of diversity.

* Do No Harm - evaluation activities must include a risk assessment and take steps, if necessary, to mitigate identified risks. The risk assessment must look at negative consequences that may result from data collection and subsequent actions or service delivery.
* Defined purpose and proportionality. The purpose must be clearly defined and explained to the participants in the data collection process
* Informed consent and confidentiality. Personal information may be collected only after

informed consent has been provided by the individual in question and that individual must

be aware of the purpose of the collection. Further, confidentiality must be clearly explained

to the individual before the information may be collected. Consent must be genuine, based on the data subject’s free and informed decision.

* Data protection and security. The evaluation process must adhere to international standards of data protection and data security.
* Competency and capacity. Actors engaging in this evaluation activities are accountable for ensuring that evaluation activities are carried out by competent team who have been trained appropriately.
* Impartiality – all steps of the evaluation cycle must be undertaken in an objective, impartial, and transparent manner while identifying and minimizing bias.

1. **Contact information for manager commissioning the evaluation** [nicoletta.buono@drc.ngo](mailto:nicoletta.buono@drc.ngo)

1. ICRC Handbook for Data Protection in Humanitarian Action, UNHCR’s Policy on the Protection of

   Personal Data of Persons of Concern, DRC’s Operational Handbook regarding data security and

   management of hardware and the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)