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Executive Summary

Background

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is the leading international organisation addressing issues of migration. It acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration management, advance understanding of migration issues, encourage social and economic development through migration, and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

IOM has been working with government and partners in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Puntland and Somaliland to promote the humane management of these mixed migration flows through the project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa” (funded by the Swiss government through the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, SDC and the Federal Office for Migration (FOM, now State Secretariat for Migration, or SEM), adapting the project’s activities to the particular needs of each country. Thus, in Ethiopia, the project has primarily focused on awareness-raising within migrants’ communities of origin regarding the difficulties and hardships involved in the journey, and on the other the rights that migrants hold. In addition, the project has sought to address in part at least, some of the push factors associated with scant socio-economic opportunities, by promoting community-based livelihoods opportunities. Finally, it has sought to enhance cooperation, coordination and capacity among various key stakeholders, including national and regional governments, other international non-governmental organisations (INGOs). In Djibouti, Puntland and Somaliland, the project focuses primarily on direct emergency assistance to migrants, raising their awareness regarding their options for safe voluntary returns, and enhancing national capacities on coordination, cooperation, migrants’ rights and emergency assistance.

The project is managed by IOM Kenya, and also includes measures aiming to improve regional coordination and cooperation with regards to migration in general, and mixed migration in particular.

This project commenced implementation in 2010 and is currently approaching the end of its third phase of funding. Its aims are:

- Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options
- Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanism; and
- Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders.

In order to achieve these objectives, the project has had a total budget of 1,850,000 CHF distributed over four phases between 2010 and 2015.

Evaluation purpose and scope

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the effectiveness and impact of the Swiss funded project, assess prospects for sustainability, identify links/synergies between this action and other existing initiatives that deal with mixed migration, identify and document lessons learned and best practices (M&E processes of the project design and implementation), and inform the development of [potential] follow up projects and programmes.

This evaluation focuses on the project entitled “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa”, funded by the Swiss Confederation SDC. Chronologically, the evaluation will focus on activities undertaken and results achieved from March 2010 to March 2015. The geographic scope of the evaluation includes Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia (Somaliland and Puntland only).

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Assess the relevance of the project’s intended outcomes and impact within the regional context. This will include an assessment of the appropriateness of the project design.
2. Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation. This will include an assessment of management arrangements, including monitoring and evaluation, for achieving its stated objectives.

3. Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching its stated objectives and, to the extent possible in light of the period of implementation, its desired impact, at the regional level.

4. Assess prospects for sustainability, including an assessment of proposed follow-up programming.

5. Identify lessons learned and identify good practices.

6. Develop recommendations for improvements.

**Methodology**

The assignment was carried out in conformity with international evaluation standards including OECD-DAC and UNEG principles and guidelines. Within the resources available, the evaluation was evidence-based and utilization focused. Stakeholder participation was sought and incorporated into the evaluator’s understanding of the information collected, analysis performed, findings presented, recommendations made, and results disseminated. This evaluation framework was structured around the key evaluation issues of relevance, effectiveness, process and efficiency, and sustainability.

The overall approach for the evaluation was a focus on contribution analysis, aiming to assess whether or not the project can be understood to be one of the causes of observed change. This approach consists of collecting stakeholders’ views about causes and effects, and triangulating these across different respondent categories, to develop an interpretation. This includes document review, interviews, focus groups and/or questionnaires.

The consultant obtained data from a desk review of documents, as well as semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders. All methods of data collection were undertaken with a utilization-focused approach emphasising lessons learned and good practices with an aim to better inform future programming.

The relatively constrained timelines and resources for this evaluation have meant that some key actors could not be reached during this exercise. In order to mitigate this risk, the active cooperation of the project staff was requested to arrange meetings with relevant stakeholders. These same constraints made it impossible for the evaluator to conduct extensive field visits and so telephone interviews were conducted with some respondents.

**Findings**

**Relevance**

Overall, the evaluation finds that the project is relevant. Indeed the project’s intervention logic is validated and responds to the needs arising in the regional context through a series of actions that support and complement interventions undertaken by other actors. Furthermore, the project’s activities and objectives are clearly aligned with the implementing agency’s strategic priorities and core competencies. They are also mostly in line with the donor’s priorities for the period under review. The project’s regional approach is also especially well-suited to the transnational dynamics driving mixed migration flows.

**Finding 1:** The project is clearly relevant to the regional context wherein mixed migration remains a major phenomenon, which is likely to continue growing in the near future

**Finding 2:** The project complements and/or supports the interventions of other actors involved in mixed migration activities in the region

**Finding 3:** The project addresses themes that constitute IOM’s core competencies and is clearly aligned with the organisation’s strategic priorities globally and regionally. Further, it supports and complements other key projects in the region

**Finding 4:** The project is mostly in line with the donor’s priorities with regards to addressing the challenges of mixed migration in the region in the short and long term
Finding 5: The project’s Theory of Change is generally sound, and its assumptions are largely validated, with the exception of lack of awareness of the risks as a main driver of irregular migration.

Finding 6: A regional approach seems to be better able to create the coordinated and harmonised actions needed to address a transnational phenomenon such as mixed migration, than a series of country-specific projects.

Effectiveness

Overall, the project has delivered on the majority of planned activities and outputs, with is contributing to the achievement of outcomes, in particular with encouraging sending communities to reflect on alternatives to irregular migration, as well as in its core activities of providing services and emergency assistance to migrants. Similarly, although with some delays, the project has made progress in terms of strengthening government capacity to provide services to migrants. Finally, the project has had some success in promoting coordination and cooperation mechanisms within and across the project countries. It has done so in large part because of the dedication of project staff.

Finding 7: The project has produced and distributed migration related information with some indication of changing attitudes among sending communities, although hard evidence of effectiveness for the awareness-raising campaigns is not available.

Finding 8: The project has collaborated with government entities to enhance their understanding of mixed migration as well as to provide relevant information and advice to migrants, with some indication of improved capacities.

Finding 9: The project has successfully provided emergency services and continues to support and enhance the capacity of local authorities to offer reliable protection mechanisms especially to migrants.

Finding 10: IOM has contributed to strengthening existing coordination mechanisms, although these have a mixed record of effectiveness.

Finding 11: The project has benefited from generally knowledgeable and overall highly dedicated staff, but has faced challenges primarily related to monitoring and evaluation processes, as well as coordination.

Efficiency and Process

The project has, overall, delivered its planned activities within budget. It must be noted that there have been important delays in particular regarding the training components of the project. There have also been some coordination issues resulting from a rather complex and cumbersome management structure. An important challenge in the management of the project and in the conduct of the evaluation was presented by insufficient M&E capacity across the organisation and in a few project staff. Resources allocated appear to have been generally appropriate for the planned activities, with transparent administrative procedures.

Finding 12: The project’s costs are appropriate and procurement procedures are in place to ensure cost-effectiveness.

Finding 13: The project has experienced a number of delays in implementation, particularly of training activities, which have resulted in a slow disbursement rate.

Finding 14: The project is appropriately managed, with transparent administrative procedures, within the constraints imposed by the institutional set-up of IOM.

Finding 15: Monitoring and evaluation practices are generally weak, which undermines the achievement of project results, or at least and their verification.

Sustainability

In general terms, the project reflects good practices for promoting national ownership and building national capacities, which are needed to ensure the sustainability of project results, although there have been some important
procédural weaknesses related to the training-based capacity building activities. The sustainability of project results is also rooted in the fact that it is part of a broader set of projects in mixed migration, which constitute a strategic programme in the thematic area and region. This presents good prospects for the continuation of project achievements.

**Finding 16:** The project outcomes are largely sustainable, since most activities are embedded within government structures, although there is some uncertainty as to the sustainability of training-based capacity building. Further, external factors could undermine some of the project’s achievements regarding migrant protection.

**Finding 17:** The project has operated, from the beginning, in tandem with other interventions, which promotes the continuation of its efforts.

### Recommendations

#### Recommendations for IOM

**Recommendation 1:** IOM should continue to strengthen M&E and Knowledge Management capacity among project staff to reflect MiDR

**Recommendation 2:** IOM should ensure that training-based capacity building activities are, whenever possible, complemented by institutional capacity building strategies

#### Relevance

**Recommendation 3:** IOM should consider incorporating the development of a detailed Theory of Change for all its projects

#### Effectiveness

**Recommendation 4:** IOM should more explicitly acknowledge its coordinating and advising role with regards to regional coordination mechanisms and adjust its expectations accordingly

#### Efficiency and process

**Recommendation 5:** IOM should develop, monitor and seek to enforce detailed project work plans to ensure the timely execution of planned activities

**Recommendation 6:** With regards to strengthening the monitoring and evaluation function, IOM should consider developing country-specific planning and monitoring plans and frameworks for multi-country and regional projects

#### Recommendations for the Donor

**Recommendation 7:** The Swiss Government should support IOM in ensuring that M&E plans of future collaborations meet SDC’s standards and needs

**Recommendation 8:** The donor should consider providing longer-term funding for interventions aimed at addressing behaviour change
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<td>MfDR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMTF</td>
<td>Mixed Migration Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>Migration Response Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD-DAC</td>
<td>Development Co-operation Directorate of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Office National d’Assistance aux réfugiés et aux sinistrés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>State Secretariat for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Trafficking in Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCHR</td>
<td>United National High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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1. Introduction

This second draft evaluation report presents the findings of the Evaluation of the IOM Project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa, 2013-2015, and Previous Phases”. It incorporated comments received on the first draft, and is submitted for further review and comments from the project manager. Any remaining errors and omissions will be amended in the final version of the report. However, the consultant’s findings are independent; hence the analysis will remain unchanged unless evidence is provided that justifies changes.

The report is organised into five sections, as follows:

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: Context and Purpose of the Evaluation
- Section 3: Evaluation Approach and Methodology
- Section 4: Findings
- Section 5: Conclusions/Lessons Learned
- Section 6: Recommendations

It also contains the following appendices:

- Appendix I: Evaluation Matrix
- Appendix II: Detailed Methodology
- Appendix III: Country profiles
- Appendix IV: List of Respondents
- Appendix V: List of documents consulted
- Appendix VI: Interview Protocol
- Appendix VII: Terms of Reference

2. Context and Purpose of the Assignment

2.1 Context

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is the leading international organisation addressing issues of migration. It acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration management, advance understanding of migration issues, encourage social and economic development through migration, and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

One of the key regions in which IOM works is the Horn of Africa, an area where volatile, insecure conditions continue to motivate large numbers of people to move within and across borders. These migrants include internally displaced persons (IDPs), refugees, asylum seekers, smuggled and trafficked persons, and economic migrants. The push and pull factors mobilizing these population movements are varied, with some migrants fleeing from the Horn of Africa due to political unrest, persecution, and conflict, while others are leaving situations of extreme resource scarcity, drought, crop failure, food insecurity, and severe poverty. Thus, a large number of migrants, most of whom come from Ethiopia and Somalia, head to Somaliland, Puntland and Djibouti with the goal of crossing the Gulf of Aden to reach Yemen and beyond. They face extreme hardship in making this trip: exposure to often harsh climatic conditions, physical and sexual abuse from smugglers, traffickers and authorities, as well as regular incidents at sea that cause loss of life. They are especially vulnerable because they have limited financial resources and often lack legal documentation (such as visas or travel permits), in a context where there is a general absence of legal protection for migrants and dangerous security conditions in many of these countries.

---

1 This section draws upon the Terms of Reference for the assignment, as well as on the project-related documents provided to the consultant.
IOM has been working with government and partners in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Puntland and Somaliland to promote the humane management of these mixed migration flows through the project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa” (funded by the Swiss government through the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, SDC and the Federal Office for Migration (FOM, now State Secretariat for Migration, or SEM), adapting the project’s activities to the particular needs of each country. Thus, in Ethiopia, the project has primarily focused on awareness-raising within migrants’ communities of origin regarding on the one hand the difficulties and hardships involved in the journey, and on the other the rights that migrants hold. In addition, the project has sought to address in part at least, some of the push factors associated with scant socio-economic opportunities, by promoting community-based livelihoods opportunities. Finally, it has sought to enhance cooperation, coordination and capacity among various key stakeholders, including national and regional governments, other international non-governmental organisations (INGOs). In Djibouti, Puntland and Somaliland, the project focuses primarily on direct emergency assistance to migrants, raising their awareness regarding their options for safe voluntary returns, and enhancing national capacities on coordination, cooperation, migrants’ rights and emergency assistance.

The project is managed by IOM Kenya, and also includes measures aiming to improve regional coordination and cooperation with regards to migration in general, and mixed migration in particular.

This project commenced implementation in 2010 and is currently approaching the end of its third phase of funding. Its aims are:

- Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options
- Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanism; and
- Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders.

In order to achieve these objectives, the project has had a total budget of 1,850,000 CHF, distributed as presented below in Table 2.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>450,000 CHF</td>
<td>Awareness raising, emergency response, regional dialogue, MRCs established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>550,000 CHF</td>
<td>Program implementation, AVR cases, building MRCs, expanding the MMTF network, Regional Committee on Mixed Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2015</td>
<td>850,000 CHF</td>
<td>Continuation of program development, strategic adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Program review in process, continuation under consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the period of funding, the project has maintained similar objectives and expected outcomes. The primary changes that occurred over time are as follows. The 2010-2011 phase of the project focused on Somaliland, Puntland and Djibouti (Obock Region), and included a partnership in the latter region with a non-governmental organisation to run the MRC in Obock. This,  

---

2 While there was a previous phase (2008-2009) with a budget of 150,000 CHF, it is not contemplated in the scope of this evaluation and hence it is omitted from this table. The current phase of SDC funding, as detailed in the agreement signed between SDC and IOM, corresponds to 850,000 CHF (inclusive of amendment to include the cost of the evaluation).

3 This phase is planned by IOM, though it is acknowledged that there is no current commitment for funding.
however, was eventually abandoned in light of the significant lack of capacity of local NGOs. The 2011-2012 phase of the project included Ethiopia for the first time, in recognition of large number of migrants from that country.

2.2 Evaluation Purpose

As stated in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation:

“IOM and Switzerland conduct project and programme evaluations as part of their commitment to improved results based management. Evaluation results are used to improve decision-making and evaluate performance of the project partner, and to improve project and programme design and implementation. The purpose of this evaluation is to review the effectiveness and impact of the Swiss funded project, assess prospects for sustainability, identify links/synergies between this action and other existing initiatives that deal with mixed migration, identify and document lessons learned and best practices (M&E processes of the project design and implementation), and inform the development of [potential] follow up projects and programmes.”

2.2.1 Evaluation scope

This evaluation focuses on the project entitled “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa”, funded by the Swiss Confederation SDC. Chronologically, the evaluation will focus on activities undertaken and results achieved from March 2010 to March 2015. The geographic scope of the evaluation includes Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia (Somaliland and Puntland only).

2.2.2 Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Assess the relevance of the project’s intended outcomes and impact within the regional context. This will include an assessment of the appropriateness of the project design.
2. Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation. This will include an assessment of management arrangements, including monitoring and evaluation, for achieving its stated objectives.
3. Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching its stated objectives and, to the extent possible in light of the period of implementation, its desired impact, at the regional level.
4. Assess prospects for sustainability, including an assessment of proposed follow-up programming.
5. Identify lessons learned and identify good practices.
6. Develop recommendations for improvements.

2.2.3 Evaluation questions

The specific evaluation questions and sub-questions were finalised in consultation with the client and are contained in Appendix I of this report (Evaluation Matrix).

3. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The assignment has been carried out in conformity with international evaluation standards including OECD-DAC and UNEG principles and guidelines. Within the resources and timelines available, the evaluation is evidence-based and utilization-focused. Stakeholder participation has been sought and incorporated into the evaluators’ understanding of the information collected, analysis performed, findings presented, recommendations made, and results disseminated. The consultant is independent, thus while factual errors will be corrected, the conclusions reached are those of the evaluator, based on the context and evidence presented.

The data collection methods included document review, key informant semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and field observations. A detailed discussion of the methodology and approach is presented in Appendix II of this report.

4 Terms of Reference, p. 2
4. Findings

This section presents the findings emerging from the data collection and analysis process. It is organised according to the main evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability based on the definitions of these terms by the OECD/DAC, and follows the lines of inquiry summarised in the evaluation matrix.

4.1 Relevance

The concept of relevance is defined in the OECD-DAC as: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies. Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.

This section analyses the following questions of the evaluation matrix:

- To what extent are the project’s intended results relevant for the context within which it operates?
  - To what extent does the project design support or complement the needs of stakeholders and the priorities of regional governments?
  - To what extent does the project complement or support other initiatives in the same thematic and geographic areas implemented by other actors?

- To what extent does the project support or complement the priorities of IOM focused on migration (regional and country office activities)?
  - What are IOM’s priorities in each country? In the region?
  - What other programs/projects are being implemented by IOM in each country? In the region? How does this project support or complement them?

- To what extent does the project support or complement the priorities of the donor (Switzerland) in the region?
  - What are Switzerland’s migration related priorities in the region?
  - What other migration related programs/projects are being funded by Switzerland in the region?

- What is the project’s Theory of Change, and has it been validated by the project’s implementation? How appropriate is project design to achieve its objectives in the context in which it operates?
  - What are the assumptions underlying the project design? Are they appropriate for the context(s) where the project is implemented?
  - What, if any, is the added value of creating a regional project as opposed to developing country-specific projects for the same purpose?

4.1.1 Relevance to context

Finding 1: The project is clearly relevant to the regional context wherein mixed migration remains a major phenomenon, which is likely to continue growing in the near future

The Horn of Africa is experiencing a complex migration and asylum situation. As noted by the Migration Policy Centre:

The migration and asylum reality in this region deserves more attention as it is complex and dynamic, with countries simultaneously hosting and assisting internally displaced persons, refugees, returnees, victims of trafficking and labour migrants. Ongoing conflicts are compounding this drama, (...) But most of these flows are mixed, with a significant economic dimension as well, and they require a corresponding multi-tiered approach.⁵

In that respect, the approach at the heart of this project, which seeks to address the needs of different types of migrants though direct service provision as well as through supporting and building the capacities of relevant national and regional actors, seems best suited to address the challenges posed by the mixed migration flows prevalent in the Horn of Africa.

According to the Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat:

“...the number of Eritreans leaving Eritrea into Sudan and in particular into Ethiopia appeared to rise through the year culminating in unprecedented numbers (particularly of child migrants and unaccompanied minors) in the final months of the year [2014] (e.g. as many as 5,000 per month in November). Meanwhile, the number of predominantly economic migrants from Ethiopia to Yemen (and onto Saudi Arabia) rose from a trickle in the first two or three months of 2014 to the high monthly averages previous seen in earlier recent years despite the threat of expulsion from Saudi Arabia that caused the virtual halt of Ethiopians entering Yemen in late 2013 and early 2014.”

An understanding of the key drivers for these migration flows also supports the project’s rationale and approach:

“(…) the key drivers compelling movement in 2014 were often a combination of drivers, frequently augmented by combined humanitarian and protracted crises. Humanitarian crises included displacement due to natural disasters with environmental stress as well as continued conflict in (…) Somalia, (…) and Yemen. Protracted crises include the endemic poverty affecting parts of the region, climate change, authoritarian regimes leading to political crisis (reportedly (…) for some Ethiopia) and the securitization in the region (Yemen and Somalia primarily) due to armed militias, terrorism and unresolved conflict (…Somalia). Interestingly the number of maritime migrants crossing irregularly the Mediterranean in 2014 were three times the number in 2012 (…). (…) the importance of pull factors should not be under-estimated: such as ‘chain migration’ (facilitated by a critical mass of diaspora), ‘aspirational migration’ (youth primarily hoping to attain what they see increasingly on globalized media and through social media) and the deepening of what can be called a ‘culture of migration’ affecting some countries more than others.”

The complexity of the situation is further illustrated by the active presence of a number of actors involved in mixed migration, notably the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), the Norwegian Refugee Council, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, and the involvement of agencies such as the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and Unicef, among others. The majority of these organisations focus on providing emergency assistance, particularly to Internally Displaced Persons and Refugees, although for instance the DRC has focused much of its work on supporting livelihoods enhancing activities in both sending communities and in long-term displaced persons’ communities.

Finding 2: The project complements and/or supports the interventions of other actors involved in mixed migration activities in the region

A good example of this situation can be provided through a closer look at the activities of the DRC. As we will see, there is complementarity rather than duplication, in part because the DRC focuses on displaced populations, while IOM provides emergency assistance to all types of migrants, but also through active coordination among relevant actors:

In Somaliland, DRC supports drought-affected and other vulnerable populations both urban and rural areas, working with emergency responses and longer term recovery and development projects. In addition, it has more recently begun to emphasise education and business development projects for youth, improved livelihoods and capacity building. In Puntland, the majority of DRC activities target humanitarian assistance in support of displaced populations. Like IOM, DRC in Puntland adopts an integrated approach by providing life-saving assistance, supporting protection and livelihoods activities, and constructing and rehabilitating infrastructure for internally displaced persons (IDPs), conflict-and drought affected populations and the urban poor. In Puntland, DRC’s assistance include the provision of cash relief and shelter kits, as well as the construction and rehabilitation of water infrastructure, schools, and other community assets.

---

6 End of Year: regional mixed migration thematic summary (2014)
7 Ibid.
8 Personal communication, DRC respondent to the evaluation
9 http://drc.dk/relief-work/where-we-work/horn-of-africa-and-yemen/somalia/
At first glance, this seems to indicate duplication or overlap rather than complementarity. However, the design of the project under evaluation was explicitly developed bearing in mind IOM’s role and participation in the Mixed Migration Task Force in Somalia (which later was divided into separate groups for Bosasso and Hargeisa, and in 2012 was complemented by a Kenya MMTF). The fundamental element of the MMTF mechanism is to ensure that different actors operating in similar thematic and geographic areas cooperate and coordinate their action precisely for the purpose of avoiding duplication and overlap (see section 4.2.3 for additional details). IOM collaborates and coordinates with other actors regularly through these bodies to avoid duplication of efforts.

At the policy level, IOM also works in concert with the Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat (RMMS) and with the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) to promote dialogue on the issue of mixed migration. In this area, the organisations collaborate to increase awareness and capacity among relevant actors in the region (governmental and non-governmental), by organising and participating in workshops and meetings. In these fora, IOM’s role is primarily to provide lessons learned from their operational experience to feed into the political dialogues where these other organisations focus their efforts.

### 4.1.2 Alignment with IOM’s priorities

**Finding 3:** The project addresses themes that constitute IOM’s core competencies and is clearly aligned with the organisation’s strategic priorities globally and regionally. Further, it supports and complements other key projects in the region

The International Organization for Migration is mandated by its constitution to provide both migration services and capacity building support to member states. Its core activities are centred in the four broad areas of migration management: “migration and development, facilitating migration, regulating migration, and addressing forced migration. Cross-cutting activities include the promotion of international migration law, policy debate and guidance, protection of migrants’ rights, migration health and the gender dimension of migration”.

Furthermore, the organisation’s strategic focus specifically lists the following priorities (among others):

2. To enhance the humane and orderly management of migration and the effective respect for the human rights of migrants in accordance with international law.

3. To offer expert advice, research, technical cooperation and operational assistance to States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders, in order to build national capacities and facilitate international, regional and bilateral cooperation on migration matters. …

5. To support States, migrants and communities in addressing the challenges of irregular migration, including through research and analysis into root causes, sharing information and spreading best practices, as well as facilitating development-focused solutions. …

10. To undertake programmes which facilitate the voluntary return and reintegration of refugees, displaced persons, migrants and other individuals in need of international migration services, in cooperation with other relevant international organizations as appropriate, and taking into account the needs and concerns of local communities. …

As such, it is clear that the project’s focus on providing information to actual and potential migrants, ensuring the availability of protection institutions and mechanisms for actual migrants and host communities, and enhancing the capacity of national governments to manage mixed migration in a humane manner responds directly to the organisation’s primary strategic goals.

More concretely, in terms of supporting and complementing existing interventions implemented by IOM in the region and in the specific countries, the project was designed to make use of existing Migration Response Centres (MRCs) such as the one in Obock (Djibouti) which was established with funding from the Government of Japan in the context of a different project. It also complements and/or follows up on the activities of the following projects, among others:

---
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- Enhancing National Capacities and Cooperation for the Prevention of Trafficking in Persons (TIP); and Protection of Victims and Prosecution of Traffickers in Ethiopia (funded by JTIP): 2012 to 2014
- Supporting governmental and non-governmental partners to protect migrants’ human rights along the East African Route: (funded by the European Commission, Switzerland and Norway): 2012-2014
- Capacity Building for Migration Management in Djibouti (funded by IOM Development Fund): 2012-2013
- Addressing Anti-Piracy and Migration Management Needs in Djibouti while Improving Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling to and through Djibouti (funded by Japan Supplementary Budget): 2012-2013
- Durable Solutions for Protracted Refugees in Djibouti (funded by PRM): 2012-2013

These projects and others that are part of the Mixed Migration portfolio for IOM in the Horn of Africa share a set of overarching objectives: to improve the protection of vulnerable migrants in this region, to strengthen governmental capacity to manage mixed migration, and to improve the legal and political frameworks regulating migration through enhanced respect for the human rights of migrants. While many of these projects perform similar activities, they are characterised here as complementary because, as described in section 4.1.1 above, the sheer numbers of migrants create massive need, which none of these projects can address alone. Furthermore, the capacity building needs are profound and varied, so that each project can only contribute to one or two components. As an example, the project “Addressing Anti-Piracy and Migration Management Needs in Djibouti” focused its capacity building components on providing training for border officers to identify authentic and forged documents, but did not provide training on identifying different types of migrants (such as asylum seekers or trafficked persons).

Particular mention should be made of the project “Horn/Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants (funded by PRM)”. Currently in its 5th phase (Oct 2010 – Sept 2015), this project focuses on providing assistance and support to migrants in this area, as well as strengthening regional coordination and capacity in mixed migration management and improving frameworks for regularised labour migration. While this project includes many similar activities to the project under review in this report, it has a stronger emphasis on technical capacity building for migration management across the board, beyond identifying different types of migrants and emergency protection and rescue. It also has a wider geographical reach. The two are complementary to the extent that some resource intensive activities, in particular the organisation of RCMM meetings, are financed through a pooling of funds from the two projects.

In addition, the project’s activities in Somalia contribute to achieving objectives of the humanitarian response under the Mixed Migration Task Force. IOM’s mixed migration programme specifically falls within the organisation’s responsibilities within the MMTF strategic framework for humanitarian interventions and access to essential services, as well as the MMTF advocacy and capacity building strategy focusing on enhancing local awareness and local capacity to mitigate the consequences of mixed migration.11

As such, this project is clearly inscribed within an overarching intervention strategy, the IOM Mixed Migration Response Program, which covers Somalia (Puntland and Somaliland), Ethiopia, Djibouti and Yemen, which has been built since 2008 with financial support from the European Commission, the US State Department’s Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM), and the governments of Switzerland, Japan, the Netherlands and Finland.

---

11 Project Document
4.1.3  Alignment with donor’s priorities

Finding 4: The project is mostly in line with the donor’s priorities with regards to addressing the challenges of mixed migration in the region in the short and long term.

The Swiss government’s Cooperation Strategy for the Horn of Africa (2013-2016) focuses geographically on Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, North/North-Eastern Kenya, Somalia, and thematically on four sectors: food security/rural development; health; good governance, state and peace building/conflict transformation, and migration. The Government of Switzerland’s priorities in the area of migration are outlined as follows:

“The Swiss Goal is to improve protection and living standards for refugees, IDPs and migrants in the region, and to improve migration management to reduce vulnerability caused by irregular migration patterns, through 3 Outcomes:

1. Targeted refugees, IDPs and migrants are better protected and their living conditions are improved, while targeted host communities are served with specific programmes in order to reduce their burden (…)

2. National and regional migration management is strengthened and improved i.a. through a dialog with IGAD, bilateral dialogues and capacity building of national authorities, contributing to a better respect of mixed migrants’ rights. (…)

3. Synergies between Diaspora activities and regional, national and local development and humanitarian programmes are identified and pilot projects of Diaspora organizations are launched (…).” (emphasis in the original text)\textsuperscript{12}

The implementation of this cooperation strategy consists of a combined regional approach, including regional interventions and multi-country interventions, through multilateral partnerships, core/earmarked contributions, bilateral instruments, locally managed development funds, and SDC HA direct implementation\textsuperscript{13}.

According to a donor representative, the strategy is financed both by SDC humanitarian aid and development credit lines, in addition to some funds stemming from the State Secretariat for Migration (SEM) and the Human Security Political Division. Further, while supporting interventions that provide assistance and increased protection to migrants, Switzerland also supports initiatives that aim at improving national and regional authorities (including IGAD) but also international organizations to better respond to the needs of the migrants (technical expertise provided to UNHCR for example).

In the region of the Horn of Africa, Switzerland currently supports the Danish Refugee Council in the provision of enhanced protection for migrants in Bosaso, as well as being a key supporter of the Regional Mixed Migration Secretariat. The project in Bosaso is comparable with the project under review in this evaluation, although it lacks the higher level political engagement component that the latter espouses. In addition, Switzerland contributes to the Refugee Consortium of Kenya for providing counselling and supporting urban migrant livelihoods. It also provides strategic core contributions to UNHCR in Kenya and Somalia, as well as technical expertise through secondees to UNHCR. Switzerland also supports an innovative project in Kakuma refugee camp in the field of skills development.

In this regard, the IOM project complements Switzerland’s migration related portfolio of projects. According to one respondent, this project is considered by SDC to be contributing to the desired outcomes of providing assistance to migrants in emergencies and, in the longer term, of advocating for finding legal solutions at the policy level. Further, the same respondent indicated that the project’s combination of service delivery and advocacy is in principle a positive element, but concern was expressed that the project may be trying to tackle too many important and complex issues at the same time.

The project under evaluation is clearly in line with two of Switzerland’s three strategic outcomes in this area for the 2013-2016 period, in so far as it also aims to reduce the vulnerability of migrants, to strengthen national and regional migration management capacity. It also works in the same direction as other projects funded by Switzerland in the area, with a multi-country focus. A review of a sample of other projects funded by the Government of Switzerland shows that the portfolio of projects focuses geographically in Kenya, Ethiopia, Somalia and Puntland. The support provided to the IOM project appears to be the only one of these projects that has a multi-country reach.

\textsuperscript{12} Cooperation Strategy Horn of Africa 2013-2016, p. 18

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid. p. 19
It should be noted, however, that Switzerland’s regional strategy is currently under review, with focus on protection and on supporting initiatives that bring a more developmental approach to protracted displacement (hence, focusing also on durable solutions and innovations).

### 4.1.4 Validity of the Theory of Change

The practice of developing an explicit theory of change (TOC) for a development intervention is becoming increasingly common, as it has proved to be a useful project planning and management tool. A TOC provides a narrative basis for developing a logical framework, and it allows the planners to conceptualise the intervention in its totality, while making clear the intervention’s expectations and visualising the potential challenges that its implementation may encounter.

Carol Weiss (1995) defines a theory of change quite simply and elegantly as a theory of how and why an initiative works. Theories of change map the causal chain of a development intervention, from inputs to outcomes to impacts. It tests the underlying assumptions to answer the crucial question of ‘why’ a development programme should have an impact. Exhibit 4.1 below presents a simple Causal Chain model.

**Exhibit 4.1: Generic Theory of Change**

![Generic Theory of Change Diagram](https://www.theoryofchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/TOC_1-at-2x.png)

The project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa” does not have an explicit TOC, in so far as the project documents do not detail all the elements of the intervention logic (see sidebar). However, it can be reconstructed based on the evaluator’s understanding of the program, as explained in its planning documents and by the program manager. The project has undergone three different phases in its current form (with an additional, prior phase not involving Ethiopia), but has maintained a stable results framework, with minor variations over time.

It begins from the premise that the drivers of mixed migration (MM) need to be addressed in a holistic manner, in terms of the factors that cause MM and render it dangerous, and also in terms of acknowledging that this is a transnational phenomenon that cannot be tackled by each individual country on its own.

The project’s overarching objective is to enhance the protection of vulnerable migrants through the realization of their human rights, improving access to emergency services and support and to enhance national and local initiatives to implement measures to prevent irregular and harmful forms of migration. More specifically, it seeks to “strengthen protection of irregular
migrants and potential migrants travelling to, through and from the Horn of Africa.”\(^{14}\) In order to achieve this, it pursues three different but—reflecting its holistic approach—complementary outcomes\(^{15}\):

- **Outcome 1:** Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options
- **Outcome 2:** Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanism
- **Outcome 3:** Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders.

### Finding 5:
The project’s Theory of Change is generally sound, and its assumptions are largely validated, with the exception of lack of awareness of the risks as a main driver of irregular migration.

Simply put, the project’s TOC understands the protection needs of migrants in the Horn of Africa as stemming from three interrelated factors: (1) lack of awareness among potential and actual migrants regarding the risks of mixed migration, coupled with an absence of safer migration options; (2) the absence of sufficient protection mechanisms to address the needs of both migrant and host populations, and (3) insufficient capacity of the national governments regarding their role (rights and obligations) in mixed migration and the related lack of sufficient coordination mechanisms.

At the same time, the project sees mixed migration as stemming, at least in part, from a lack of awareness on the part of potential and actual migrants of, on the one hand, existing legal channels of labour migration, and on the other of the dangers of irregular migration. The project’s response to this assumption is to attempt to discourage irregular migration by providing potential migrants with the relevant information. In point of fact, a small but still substantial group of migrants interviewed in the course of the evaluation reported having been completely unprepared for the rigours of the journey, and claimed to have made the decision to migrate because of the stories of success that previous migrants would tell.

However, the vast majority of migrants interviewed during the evaluation reported being well aware of the dangers involved (some of them having made the journey more than once), but they were willing to face them anyway. One respondent put it quite eloquently: “the chance of a dream is better than the certainty of misery”. In this respect, the group interviews confirm the view expressed by a majority of project field staff that lack of knowledge does not seem to be a primary driver for irregular migration. As such, Outcome 1 appears to be based on a partially valid assumption. It does not follow, however, that all outputs and activities corresponding to this Outcome are invalidated. As will be discussed in section 4.2 (Effectiveness), the awareness-raising activities of the project do appear to have a positive effect with regards to changing attitudes toward irregular migration in some source communities, as well as contributing to the development of livelihoods supporting activities for youth in the same communities, thus directly addressing one of the primary drivers of labour migration (both regular and irregular).

An important underlying assumption for the project is that mixed migration will continue to occur as long as the socio-economic context in the region remains unchanged, with scarce employment and livelihoods opportunities in the source countries (primarily Ethiopia and Somalia, as well as neighbouring Eritrea) and high demand for labour in destination countries (mostly in the Arabian Peninsula, but also in Europe). Further, the continued socio-political instability in the region that drives some migration (out of Eritrea in particular) appears unabated, and is in fact being exacerbated by increasing insecurity in the Arabian Peninsula and the Middle East, which creates new migration flows in the region. In light of that reality, the assumption that migrants will continue to need protection is clearly validated (Outcome 2).

Exhibit 4.2 below juxtaposes migration flows from June 2012 (on the left) and April 2015 (on the right). It clearly shows that little has changed in terms of mixed migration over this period—the only major change resulting from the outbreak of violence in Yemen, which is reversing the direction of some migration flows.

---

\(^{14}\) IOM project proposal: “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Traveling through Horn of Africa: 2013-2015”

\(^{15}\) The language presented in this section is that used in the project document for the 2013-2015 phase, which is the main focus of this evaluation. While it is slightly different from the logical frameworks (logframes) of the previous phases, they are substantively the same.
Further, as RMMS also observes, trafficking, mistreatment by smugglers and unsafe transportation options remain a significant threat to vulnerable migrants, thus underscoring the need for enhanced protection and emergency assistance. What is more, the treatment of migrants by government officials often disregards their rights and leads to deportations, arrests, and treatment of trafficking victims as criminals. This then derives from a common lack of awareness of migrant rights, overlaid with legitimate security concerns, and causes the response to migration to frequently entail additional suffering and abuse, thus increasing the vulnerability of such migrants in the region.

This situation also validates the logic of Outcome 3, in so far as there is a clear need to enhance governments' understanding of their role in mixed migration, not only as gatekeepers and regulators, but also as duty-bearers for the protection of migrants (providing emergency assistance at sea, for instance) and the respect of their human rights.

In addition, the intrinsically transnational nature of migration makes for a strong prima facie argument in favour of enhanced coordination among the countries affected by mixed migration, particularly among governments but not excluding a role for civil society organisations (CSOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and international organisations, both governmental and non-governmental.

The assumptions and intervention logic of the project have been overall validated by the evaluation. Indeed, key informants in all countries confirm that the existing pattern of migration favours irregular migration in the absence of a clearly established regulatory framework. The project’s emphasis on capacity building in the form of promoting the creation and functioning of cross-border migration committees thus appears to be an appropriate response to the regional context. The project also recognises that vulnerable migrants are exposed to dangers emanating from the harsh conditions along migration routes, precarious conditions in boats, abuses from human smugglers and the risk of trafficking. The project’s objective of providing protection services to migrants, and enhancing the national governments’ capacity to provide such services, is also appropriate to its context.

Finding 6: A regional approach seems to be better able to create the coordinated and harmonised actions needed to address a transnational phenomenon such as mixed migration, than a series of country-specific projects.

---

IOM has played a lead role in defining best practices in humane management of mixed migration flows, as have the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). While there is some variation in the particularities of the approaches each of these organisations has taken, the broad outline of best practices is clear: A focus on what IOM calls “...the whole ‘migration lifecycle’...by addressing mixed migration flows before or as they develop, while in motion and in emergency situations, post-arrival and in the longer term.” Such a focus implies working both in the short-term by offering services to migrants and trying to improve their situation, as well as in the long-term by trying to improve the circumstances of mixed migration. This latter component logically would include legal measures, greater cooperation between responsible authorities, and sensitization/awareness as well as capacity building for key actors.

Because, as has already been mentioned, migration is intrinsically a transnational phenomenon, no single country can unilaterally manage it or address the problems and concerns arising from mixed migration. As such, and as informed by the intervention logic, a coordinated, cooperative approach is necessary, and it makes sense to ensure that similar and complementary actions are taken in all relevant countries in the region, with a mutually supportive and responsible mechanism that can be provided by a regional project, as opposed to a series of country-specific projects.

Indeed, a single planning process with overarching results provides the “bigger picture” perspective that can be more difficult to maintain from the perspective of a single country project. The single funding source and reporting schedule involved in a regional project also provides a common lens to assess the various components of the project in each of the countries, thus promoting shared responsibility and cooperation among the implementing offices, which would not necessarily be the case otherwise.

4.2 Effectiveness

Effectiveness can be defined as “the extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance” (OECD DAC). It can also be construed as the answer to the question “is the activity achieving satisfactory results in relation to stated objectives?” In other words, effectiveness is seen as a measure which assesses the extent to which the objectives of a project were met, from the output to the outcome level, and the extent to which these results contribute to achieving the longer-term, broader objectives of the project.

For this project, the evaluation explores the extent to which the project has clearly defined and subsequently achieved its expected outputs and outcomes. It should be noted, however, that some of the project’s expected outcomes focus on significant behaviour change and on government capacity building, both of which are known to be slow processes that will only be noticeable in the long term. As such, some components will assess progress towards the achievement of outcomes.

This section explores the effectiveness questions of the evaluation matrix (see also Appendix I)17:

- To what extent has the project met its stated objectives in terms of outputs and outcomes?
- What has been the quality of the project outputs?

4.2.1 Outcome 1: Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options

This outcome area focuses on the following outputs:

- Output 1.1: Migrants have the necessary information to opt for a safer migration option.
- Output 1.2: Governments’ officials have the necessary knowledge and tools to advise migrants and potential migrants on alternative options to irregular migration.

Finding 7: The project has produced and distributed migration related information with some indication of changing attitudes among sending communities, although hard evidence of effectiveness for the awareness-raising campaigns is not available.

17 For the sake of clarity and brevity, this section is organised according to the project’s planned outcomes rather than the specific project activities as is the case in the evaluation matrix.
What Output 1.1 meant in practice was the production and dissemination of a variety of knowledge products and information aimed primarily at communities of origin of potential and actual migrants, as well as the provision of information for actual migrants. These knowledge and dissemination products were printed pamphlets, T-shirt and other promotional materials (bags, posters…) in the different languages commonly spoken by migrants. However, taking into consideration the relatively high levels of illiteracy prevalent in the region, information sessions were also held, and culturally appropriate live dramas, artistic showcases and radio programmes were supported and/or produced specifically focusing on the dangers of irregular migration and the risk of trafficking in Ethiopia, Djibouti, Somaliland and Puntland.

Furthermore, in the context of Ethiopia as a primary sending country, a series of community conversation facilitator (CCF) trainings were organised in particular in Oromo nationality Zone of Amhara Region, Jimma Zone of Oromia Region, and Debubawi Zone of Tigray region. The purpose of these trainings is to provide CCFs with information about irregular migration and ways to counter the problem. It is especially noteworthy that, during the evaluation mission, officials from the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs Offices of Oromia Region highlighted particularly the fact that, directly on the basis of community conversations, certain communities had decided to take action to prevent youth from engaging in irregular migration. It was noted that some communities decided to withhold identity papers from youth deemed to be at risk of migrating, while others decided to invest in creating livelihoods opportunities for these youth.

While it can be argued that withholding identity documents is not the most desirable approach to controlling the problem, it is an important initiative in so far as it demonstrates that the communities are taking the situation seriously and understand that irregular migration of youth has detrimental effects not only for the migrants themselves but for the community as a whole. The decision to invest in livelihoods opportunities represents a similar -if perhaps more positive- recognition of the drivers for outmigration. According to project staff as well as to a number of interviewees in Ethiopia, historically youth have been driven to migrate in search of work at least partly at the urging of family members, and hence any initiatives that seek to keep them from leaving the community represents a significant attitude –if not quite behavioral- change.

More broadly speaking, the project’s awareness-raising activities among both potential and actual migrants have mostly been documented in terms of the number of items produced and distributed, and of the estimated numbers of audience members for dramas and radio programmes. It is therefore not possible to determine to what extent exposure to this information has had an effect on people’s attitudes and, more importantly, decision-making processes regarding migration. Using general migration data would also not be a suitable indicator, given that irregular migration is not solely driven by lack of knowledge or awareness regarding the dangers of this type of migration.

On this point, there is evidence emanating from the group interviews conducted with migrants in Ethiopia, Djibouti and Somaliland, that while most respondents indicated having been insufficiently prepared for the rigours of the trek, they did expect it to be difficult and they knew that this particular avenue for migration violated existing laws. As has already been noted in section 4.1.4 above, awareness of the risks involved does not appear to be a deterrent for undertaking irregular migration.

**Finding 8: The project has collaborated with government entities to enhance their understanding of mixed migration as well as to provide relevant information and advice to migrants, with some indication of improved capacities.**

One of the characteristics of the project has been the constant collaboration with government institutions (national, regional and local) in the development and delivery of awareness raising activities for actual and potential migrants, in all countries. However, the project also recognises that the authorities do not always have a strong understanding of the frameworks regulating migration, as well as the fact that the legal and policy frameworks at the national level may be non-existent in particular with regards to the protection of migrants. Therefore, an important component of the project has been the training of government officials in migration related issues.

In particular, the information provided through MRCs directly involves government officials, in so far as, with the exception of the MRC in Obock, these are staffed by government employees and are incorporated into the national and local government structures to a greater or lesser extent. Hence, through their exposure to IOM led activities, these officials have become more familiar with the relevant information.
More importantly, government officials\(^\text{18}\) have received training on migrant rights and migration issues more broadly, to enhance their ability to advice migrants but also more broadly to enhance their understanding of their roles in migration management. During the course of the evaluation, all respondents indicated that such training and collaboration had been a valuable tool in the conduct of their work.

One example of this training is provided by the Media Workshop conducted in Ethiopia in collaboration with the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the Government Communication Affairs Office (GCAO), intended to provide training on responsible reporting on migration issues to major media agencies as well as government agency communication bureaus. The content of the workshop was deemed to be very useful in particular in order to clarify key concepts and distinctions (such as between trafficking and smuggling). A respondent from the GCAO described it as “a real eye opener” which would prevent media practitioners from inadvertently misinforming people about migration issues. As a direct result of this training, GCAO has begun to produce weekly editorials discussing the risks of illegal migration through accounts of people’s real experiences. Hence, they consider that they are better able to provide reliable and clear information to potential and actual migrants.

Similarly, in Somaliland, a respondent from the Department of Immigration of the Ministry of the Interior indicated that training received by his team on mixed migration has proven especially useful, in so far as it has improved the border security officers’ ability to identify and appropriately deal with refugees and asylum seekers. The same was indicated by the Director of the Immigration Police in Djibouti.

It must be noted, however, that respondents had a difficult time in discerning the specific contributions of this project, given that, as mentioned in section 4.1.2 above, this is one of a series of related projects implemented in the region by IOM. This is only problematic because, as a rule, there has been insufficient follow up to training and information events, such that it is not possible to determine exactly the extent to which the information/knowledge gained through these events is retained and/or put into practice in their aftermath.

### 4.2.2 Outcome 2: Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanisms

This outcome area focuses on the following outputs:

- Output 2.1 Health, transport, AVR, and NFI services are available to assist irregular migrants.
- Output 2.2 Health and NFI services are available to assist migrant-hosting populations.
- Output 2.3 Infrastructure and capacity to deal with emergency and life-saving needs enhanced.

**Finding 9:** The project has successfully provided emergency services and continues to support and enhance the capacity of local authorities to offer reliable protection mechanisms especially to migrants

IOM has extensive experience and expertise in providing protection services, including health, transport, Assisted Voluntary Returns (AVR) and non-food items (NFIs) to both migrant and host communities. As such, it is unsurprising that this is being done effectively in the context of this project.

The MRCs are the primary providers of such assistance, beginning from registration of migrants and providing other services/assistance as needed. As part of this project, an Emergency MRC was established in Mille (Ethiopia) in order to reach migrants along their route through the Afar region towards Djibouti. From September 2013 to August 2014, it had assisted 2,769 vulnerable migrants.

Similarly, the Obock MRC has been able to expand the area covered by the outreach teams, since the migrant routes have moved further from the MRC’s original location. As such, the number of registered migrants in Obock has increased from

\(^{18}\) Unfortunately, complete concrete data is not available, in so far as not all offices report the specific numbers of participants for each training event, nor do they always disaggregate between types of participants. For example, some list 60 participants “including government officials, representatives of international agencies and local NGOs”, but the proportion of each category is not recorded. In other cases, the number of events is recorded, but not the number of participants. It is therefore not possible for the evaluator to produce a complete and reliable table summarising the numbers of persons having received training, disaggregated by category.
4,287 in 2011 to 25,013 in 2014 (partial data for 2015 was not available), and AVR support went from zero in 2011 to 607 in 2014 (the partial data for 2015, up to April, was 227). It should be noted, however, that these figures cannot be interpreted as reflecting only improved coverage or outreach, as by all accounts the number of migrants has also increased. Nevertheless, these figures do reflect improved effectiveness in reaching vulnerable migrants.

One area of concern is the provision and accessibility of assistance in Puntland. MRC staff are unable to reach migrants in areas more than 100 kilometers from Bosaso, and therefore the majority of outreach activities are conducted around town, with occasional forays to the coast and border areas.

On the other hand, there has been progress with regards to the location of the MRC in Bosasso. Until October 2014, it was located in unsuitable premises, as it shared a compound with government offices, was surrounded by armed guards, and had limited space, as was noted in a previous evaluation. The new premises can accommodate up to 150 migrants and are exclusively dedicated to the MRC; as a result, there are fewer armed guards and access to the MRC is less intimidating to migrants who might be in need of assistance. It should be noted, however, that several respondents interviewed during the evaluation mission were unaware of the new location, which suggests that information about the new location needs to be better disseminated.

Regarding assistance to host communities, a good example is provided by the IOM team in Hargeisa, where the MRC provides NFIs and, especially, health services to migrants that are occasionally accessed by the host community. But perhaps more telling is the fact that a number of stranded migrants interviewed both in Djibouti and at the Transit Center in Ethiopia indicated that they were made aware of the existence of the MRCs by individuals in the host community. This is indicative of the MRCs’ success in developing a positive relationship with the host community and contributing to the latter’s understanding of migrants as people in need of assistance rather than vagrants or criminals.

With regards to the capacity building component of this outcome, from the perspective of infrastructure it is an important success that a migrant assistance hotline has been brought into service at all locations, which goes a long way to improving the accessibility of assistance services for migrants, especially those who may not be comfortable accessing government buildings. While the service has only recently become available, the widespread use of cellular phones in the region suggests that it would be used.

Still on the subject of infrastructure, MRC facilities have been created and/or upgraded in most locations, improving the capacity to provide services to more migrants, in particular providing food and/or shelter to those awaiting AVR. That said, the MRCs in both Bosaso and Hargeisa are not currently able to provide that service in sufficient quantity. Furthermore, IOM has provided been able to expand the health services provided by the MRC to be available also to host communities.

With regards to enhancing the capacity of government personnel to provide emergency assistance, a series of training workshops has been provided to Coast Guard authorities in Somaliland, Puntland and Djibouti on first aid and rescue at sea. Respondents indicated that this has been extremely helpful and has been utilised on various occasions since the training was received. Similarly, training has been provided on the rights of migrants. However, the trainings were provided primarily in the past few months and weeks, which makes it difficult to assess the extent to which the knowledge acquired is being consistently applied or diffused within the institution. The reasons for these delays are discussed in more detail in the section assessing the overall management of the project.
4.2.3 Outcome 3: Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders.

This outcome area focuses on the following outputs:

- Output 3.1: Existing coordination mechanisms and systems are strengthened.
- Output 3.2: Committee members implement recommendations of previous committee meetings.

Finding 10: IOM has contributed to strengthening existing coordination mechanisms, although these have a mixed record of effectiveness.

The Mixed Migration Task Forces (MMTFs) are intended to promote information-sharing and cooperation among relevant actors, including government agencies, OCHA, UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, Danish Refugee Council and Norwegian Refugee Council, in addition to IOM and UNHCR.

The MMTFs were established prior to the beginning of this project, and are intended to improve cooperation and coordination among agencies involved in mixed migration, for the purpose of avoiding duplication and of making the most of each agency’s expertise through information sharing and coordination of responses.

Based on relevant reports and respondent information, MMTFs are mostly meeting regularly in all locations, although some respondents consider that these meetings should be more frequent than once every month or two. It should be noted that, while the MMTFs are generally considered to be useful, there is a large amount of variability in terms of the level of engagement of the different members, which respondents tend to attribute to competing demands on people’s time as well as individual levels of interest. That said, an important success can be noted in Somaliland, where the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has taken on an active role in chairing the meetings.

Overall, respondents indicate that MMTFs serve a useful purpose in coordination and information sharing at the national level.

Regionally, the project has supported the annual meetings of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration (RCMM), bringing together key national level actors as well as IOM to discuss and exchange experiences about specific topics of relevance to mixed migration. An additional intended purpose of these meetings is to create and strengthen relationships across borders to foster cooperation and coordination. There have been four RCMM meetings:

- Djibouti 2011
- Djibouti 2012
- Nairobi 2013
- Addis Ababa 2014

Generally, respondents indicated a high level of interest and satisfaction with the regional meetings, although they all expressed the opinion that more frequent contact beyond the annual meetings would be helpful, such as the follow up dialogues that have taken place between government actors and IOM.

Further, participating agencies in the MMTFs conduct a joint assessment of needs, especially in emergencies, and develop joint responses. While they all might, for instance, distribute NFIs to stranded migrants, none of the agencies typically has the resources to provide them to all potential beneficiaries, whereas together they may be able to deliver them to most of those who need them. As a concrete example, while not directly related to this particular project, during the evaluation mission the evaluator had the opportunity to observe a meeting of the MMTF that was called in Hargeisa in response to the Yemen crisis. This meeting brought together the major agencies active in the area and sought to respond in a coordinated fashion to the needs that had been identified during previous meetings. Each agency provided a list of the resources they had available (financial, human and infrastructural, such as NFIs and trucks to transport them and/or migrants), the locations of those resources and the timelines needed for mobilising them, so that together they decided which agency could provide what to which group of migrants, in which locations. The crucial point for the purposes of this analysis, is that none of the agencies has sufficient capacity to provide all the necessary goods and services to all the persons in need, and that a de facto division of labour is created through the coordination mechanism of the MMTFs so that these resources can be pooled.
to maximise their effect and efficiently delivered through whichever agency is best situated in a given location or for a given type of migrant, according to their mandates, capabilities and geographic location.

In addition to providing support at the national level for the MMTFs, at the regional level the project is concerned with supporting the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration. One of the indicators of the project regarding the success of this component relates to the extent to which committee members implement the recommendations of previous meetings. Based on the RCMM facilitator’s notes, there has overall been a high level of success on this matter, in so far as almost all recommendations receive some follow up from committee members. It must be recognised that many of these recommendations will only be fruitful in the medium to long term; however, it is encouraging that there seems to be a sustained level of engagement from all parties. It should also be noted that the RCMM is not purely an operational body, but that it also or even primarily a political body, as reflected by the types of participants (such as State Ministers and Ambassadors/High Commissioners).

It should be noted, in assessing the effectiveness of the project’s role in convening and coordinating these meetings, that the relationships between the authorities of the countries/regions involved are especially complicated. On the one hand, the Federal Government of Somalia does not recognise Somaliland and Puntland as separate or autonomous entities. In addition, the activities of Al Shabab in the region contribute to a tense climate in the Horn of Africa, and especially to reticence with regards to the movement of people. As such, one could consider that ensuring that the RCMM continues to meet, and that State Ministers attend and participate in these meetings, is a non-negligible achievement in itself.

An additional benefit of the RCMM process, which is not explicitly identified in the project document as a desired outcome, is that the preparation for participation in the regional meetings has had a positive effect on the capacity of national governments. Indeed, IOM has provided support by organising pre-meeting workshops at the national level that assist governments to be better informed and aware of the issues to be discussed prior to attending the meetings. This also encourages a more informed and active participation in national MMTFs.

4.2.4 Factors Affecting Project Performance

This section discusses the factors that have enabled or hindered the achievement of planned results, as it is important to understand these in order to form a fair assessment of the project’s effectiveness.

Finding 11: The project has benefited from generally knowledgeable and overall highly dedicated staff, but has faced challenges primarily related to monitoring and evaluation processes, as well as coordination

During the field missions conducted in the course of the evaluation, the consultant had the opportunity to observe project staff in Kenya, Ethiopia, Djibouti and Somaliland, and to also interact with project staff in Puntland. It was quickly apparent that the vast majority of staff are highly dedicated and passionate about their work, as well as strongly committed to this project. In assessing the results of their efforts, it is important to recognise that the context of implementation is sometimes isolated and unpredictable, and that providing assistance to vulnerable migrants operating in clandestine circumstances is often psychologically and emotionally taxing. They deserve to be commended on that front.

That said, there is an important and generalised weakness with regards to planning and monitoring capacity (which will be discussed in more detail in section 4.3.2 below) which makes it rather difficult to assess the project’s performance rigorously. This was problematic for the conduct of this evaluation, but is perhaps more so in terms of weakened organisational learning and the absence of effective feedback loops to ensure timely problem solving, as well as planning for potential future phases of this project.

Finally, an additional challenge for the project’s effectiveness (and, as will be discussed in section 4.3 below, for its efficient management) is presented by the complex management structure needed to implement a multi-country, regional project managed from one Country Office with no formal authority over the others, and with reporting lines that occasionally overlap and duplicate (as is the case for the Somaliland and Puntland field offices, which are hierarchically under the authority of the Somalia country Office, which is based in Nairobi). This situation has created miscommunication and difficulties in coordination that may have contributed to delays in implementing particular aspects or activities of the project.
4.3 Efficiency and Process

Efficiency relates to the relationship linking inputs, to outputs to outcomes. The evaluation assessed the extent to which the project had clear and realistic criteria for allocating financial resources to meet its targets, as well as the alignment between planned and actual expenditures, and the timely delivery of outputs. These questions were applied to the project through using perception data and a review of financial documentation.

The notion of efficiency seeks an answer to the question “Does the programme use the resources in the most economical manner to achieve its objectives?” Otherwise stated, the analysis of the project’s efficiency queries on the one hand whether similar results could have been obtained with fewer resources, and on the other whether appropriate resources were allocated to achieve the expected results.

As such, the evaluation assesses the extent to which the project has had clear and realistic criteria for allocating financial resources to meet its targets, as well as the alignment between planned and actual expenditures, and the timely delivery of outputs.

This section responds to the following questions of the evaluation matrix:

- To what extent has the project been cost-effective?
  - Could activities have been undertaken at a lesser cost with similar results?
  - Have mechanisms been put in place to maximise the benefits and minimise the costs of project activities?
- To what extent has the project been efficiently managed?
  - How effectively were the programme performance and results monitored?
  - How efficient and appropriate is the project set up/approach to achieve the objectives?
  - Are there sufficient human and financial resources to manage the project and deliver high quality outputs (including M&E capacity)?
  - To what extent has project management been appropriate and effective (including establishment of baselines, monitoring procedures and ongoing evaluation/feedback for project adjustments as needed)?
  - Are administrative procedures appropriate and transparent?

4.3.1 Cost Effectiveness and Use of Resources

Finding 12: The project’s costs are appropriate and procurement procedures are in place to ensure cost-effectiveness

In the absence of comparable interventions (or even of detailed budgetary information on similar projects implemented by other actors), an in-depth cost-effectiveness analysis is not feasible for this evaluation. However, it is possible to assess the criteria for resource allocation and the mechanisms for expenditures.

The project consistently follows IOM’s procurement guidelines, which are intended to ensure that the IOM Procurement Processes are carried out in the most efficient, effective and ethical manner. The guiding principles are summarised as follows:

IOM has an obligation to ensure funds entrusted by donors are properly used with consideration for economy and efficiency, and without regard to political or non-economic influences. IOM’s procurement process shall be generally guided by:

- Efficiency and economy;
- Equal opportunity and open competition;
- Transparency in the process and adequate documentation; and
- Highest ethical standards in all procurement activities.

Contracts will be awarded to the bidder with the lowest compliant offer (offering best value for money based on required technical specifications), and which has fully complied with the terms of the competitive bidding.
The Mission/Procuring Entity shall ensure timely delivery and satisfactory quality of the goods, works or services. These principles are in line with best practices in the international cooperation sector.

A review of the project’s budgetary documentation suggests that resources appear to have been tight but appropriate for achieving the project outputs and outcomes, while the allocation of budgetary resources appears to be adequate and appropriate. The documents also show a close alignment between planned and actual expenses.

**Exhibit 4.1 Project Budget for 2010-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget item</th>
<th>Total CHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>111,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office costs</td>
<td>38,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational costs</td>
<td>278,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM Overhead (5% of total)</td>
<td>21,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Project Cost</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project budgeting documents

**Exhibit 4.2 Project Budget for 2012-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget item</th>
<th>Total CHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>132,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Costs</td>
<td>53,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational costs</td>
<td>338,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>523,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM Overhead (5% of total)</td>
<td>26,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>550,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project budgeting documents

---
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Exhibit 4.3 Project Budget for 2013-205

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. STAFF COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff Costs:</td>
<td>242,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. OFFICE COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Office Costs:</td>
<td>52,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. OPERATIONAL COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>108,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>261,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3:</td>
<td>97,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Costs:</td>
<td>467,304.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total A+B+C</td>
<td>761,904.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM Overhead (5%)</td>
<td>38,095.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluation</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>850,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project budgeting documents

The resource intensive activities contemplated for this project seem to justify the allocation of a high proportion of the budget for operational costs (CHF 467,304.76 or 61.3%). Since the documentation provided does not explicitly offer a clear rationale for how the budget was allocated among different countries\(^20\), it is difficult to pass judgment on this issue. That said, interview data indicates this allocation reflects the lessons learned from previous interventions, cost of living, currency fluctuation and the local cost of goods and services, as well as the salaries of professional and general service staff and their conditions of employment as either international or locally recruited staff. It should be noted, however, that several respondents indicated that they felt particular country offices had received a larger or smaller proportion of the overall budget than they might have needed. In other words, they felt that either their own office had received a disproportionately small share, while one or more other offices had received more than their fair share. This suggests that a more transparent allocation process should be adopted. There was no strong evidence, however, that the actual distribution of the budget had a noticeable negative effect on activities and outputs.

Similarly, the staff costs (CHF 242,400 or 31.8%) seem reasonable in light of the geographic and operational scopes of the project, based on the evaluator's experience of multi-country projects and programmes of similar scope conducted by this and other international cooperation agencies. Further, the staffing budget reflects the costs of international and national staff which, at IOM, follow the salary and post adjustment standards of the United Nations.

Regarding the maximisation of benefits/minimisation of costs, no formal mechanisms beyond the procurement rules appear to have been in place. However, it should be noted that the complementarity identified between this project and others in the mixed migration thematic area (see section 4.1.2 of this report) does allow for the pooling of resources for awareness raising activities and/or the provision of emergency services, as well as the holding of the annual regional committee on mixed migration meeting, supported by both the funding provided for this project by the Swiss Confederation and by PRM, as noted in section 4.1.2 of this report. This contributes both to the continuity of funding and to economies of scale.

With regards to human resources, the number of staff involved appears to be generally appropriate, as respondents indicate that in most cases staff is able to perform the tasks assigned in the context of the project without incurring overtime. However, the capacity of project staff is highly variable, with some having difficulties conceptualising their work in terms of good practices for mixed migration management and support, and in particular displaying sub-par skillsets with regards to project management, monitoring and evaluation. This is not to suggest that project staff are not generally competent, and even in some cases outstanding. However, there is an issue of staff turnover which involves a corresponding learning curve (this will be discussed in more detail in section 4.3.2).

\(^20\) Although the detailed budget exists that outlines the amounts allocated per country and per activity, it does not contain a narrative of the decision-making process for the resulting allocation
Finding 13: The project has experienced a number of delays in implementation, particularly of training activities, which have resulted in a slow disbursement rate

As of the time of the evaluation mission in April 2015, 60% of the planned budget had been disbursed, whereas 75% of the project timeline had elapsed (for the 2013-2015 phase). There is therefore a delay in disbursement that requires explanation.

In assessing the planned activities for the project, the most visible discrepancy is with regards to the trainings that were to be implemented as part of Outcome 1, specifically Output 1.2, corresponding to trainings conducted for government officials specifically on protection screening and referral (planned for months 4, 12 and 18), and for Outcome 2, specifically for Output 2.3, corresponding to Coast guards are trained on rescue-at-sea and first aid in Djibouti, Somaliland, and Puntland (planned for months 8, 9 and 10).

Indeed, a more detailed review of the project’s financial statements indicates that these categories have had a significant under-disbursement rate as of April 8, 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Djibouti</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Somaliland</th>
<th>Puntland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government training</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training to Coast guards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: the corresponding training took place a few days before the evaluation mission, and is not reflected in the budget document used for this table

Source: Project financial statement April 8, 2015

This important under-spending is due to the fact that the majority of these trainings either had not occurred, or had only just occurred at the time of the evaluation mission. The reasons given for these delays can be categorised as reflecting the difficulties in obtaining responses from government institutions to inquiries regarding appropriate timings for holding the trainings. This is not an unusual situation in this region, where relatively fragile state institutions experience significant turnover of personnel at the decision-making level. Thus, while there is institutional commitment to the activities, the individuals involved in selecting participating personnel are not always prompt in their responses.

Whether this reason is sufficient to explain the delays is unclear. While it is true, in the evaluator’s experience, that this type of activity frequently encounters delays in this region, various respondents indicated that there may be an unjustified delay in reporting expenses, and more importantly that these types of activities are not prioritised in day-to-day activities, since direct assistance to migrants is often perceived by some staff as the primary vocation of the organisation.

4.3.2 Overall Project Management

Finding 14: The project is appropriately managed, with transparent administrative procedures, within the constraints imposed by the institutional set-up of IOM

The project is managed by the Mixed Migration Project Coordinator of the IOM Kenya Country Office. Based on project documentation, direct observation and information provided by project staff in each of the countries, the project coordinator is knowledgeable and experienced, as well as responsive and proactive. The multi-country design of the project, however, brings a variety of challenges.

The first relates to the institutional structure of IOM, wherein each Country Office is relatively autonomous and staff are under the supervision of the Chief of Mission. Therefore, the operation of a regional or multi-country project depends, to some extent, on the voluntary cooperation of each Chief of Mission (COM). In this particular case, the Project Coordinator is also hierarchically inferior to the COMs, and therefore has little leverage to “force” cooperation, nor can he reprimand or remove –
or for that matter hire or promote—particular staff. This situation makes addressing delays in project implementation more difficult to address than they might otherwise be.

As a result of this structure, that there are sometimes communication and coordination issues that arise between the various offices working on the project. That being said, the project coordinator has put in place mechanisms to try to improve internal communications and information sharing as well as to ensure that the project is progressing appropriately, including regular telephone conversations with each office and monthly coordination bulletins that share project updates as well as information on donors and planning issues. Such measures have improved coordination, although some challenges remain.

The human resources allocated to the project are generally good and highly dedicated, as noted in section 4.2.4 above. That said, in some instances some staff is operating at full capacity, with very heavy workloads and little support. This runs the risk of undermining morale, especially since many are national staff recruited at relatively junior level and with little or no team support, especially in the smaller field offices. In other locations, some of the project staff have been working on temporary contracts until relatively recently. While this evaluation recognises that these situations are not strictly speaking within the control of the project coordinator, it is still relevant to the likelihood of maintaining staff that is more knowledgeable and invested in the project.

**Finding 15: Monitoring and evaluation practices are generally weak, which undermines the achievement of project results, or at least and their verification**

While important efforts have been made, institutionally, to strengthen monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity across IOM in recent years, the organisational culture still does not fully embrace appropriate M&E practices, especially when considering the practices of Management for Development Results (MfDR). Generally speaking, the attitude towards M&E activities appears to be that this is an added demand on staff whose purpose is not clear to them and is therefore easily postponed.

As a result of this, monitoring is primarily based on an accountability ethos and focuses on reporting on whether activities have taken place, where and when, and on the number of participants for specific events. Little attention is given to assessing the effects of activities or their contribution to the achievement of the higher level outputs and outcomes. Therefore, the information that is collected is not always useful for the purposes of assessing project performance. As an example, one of the MRCs provided the consultant with information about the numbers of migrants who had received services, yet this was not disaggregated by the type of service provided, making it impossible to determine, for instance, the proportion of AVR versus NFI.

This is particularly problematic for a project involving capacity building in the form of training. While there were participant lists for the majority of trainings given, and pre- and post-tests were applied, there were no plans to conduct follow-up assessments on whether training participants were using the knowledge acquired or whether what was learned had begun to be applied more broadly in the organisation. In addition, training evaluation questionnaires were distributed but, in at least one country, they were being immediately discarded or destroyed, on the reasoning that “since it’s the same training, there is no point in keeping them”. This illustrates a lack of understanding as to the purpose of these questionnaires, and demonstrates that they are not always being used to ensure that the training sessions are relevant to the specific audience. As such, there is a missed opportunity to learn and potentially improve the training on an ongoing basis.

### What is MfDR?

MfDR implies that goals are clear, measurable, limited in number and concrete, with time-bound targets. At the same time, they must be expressed in human terms (i.e. as development outcomes). For this reason, MfDR is more than a methodology: it is a way of thinking and acting, built on a practical toolbox for improved public management.

The **MfDR cycle** involves five core components or stages:

- setting goals and agreeing on targets and strategies;
- allocating the available resources to activities that will contribute to the achievement of the desired results;
- monitoring and evaluating whether the resources allocated are making the intended difference;
- reporting on performance to the public;
- feeding back information into decision-making

MfDR centres on gearing all human, financial, technological and natural resources—domestic and external—to achieve desired development results. It shifts the focus from inputs (“how much money can I spend?”) to measurable results (“what can I achieve with the money?”) at all phases of the development process. At the same time, MfDR focuses on providing sound information to improve decision-making. This entails tracking progress and managing business based on solid evidence and in a way that will maximise the achievement of results.


22
In addition, while all projects have recently begun to compile M&E folders, these are often incomplete and in one instance the folder was empty. While this is by no means a generalised practice, it does point to an important need to strengthen M&E capacities across staff.

On the other hand, administrative staff have found the reporting process for this project to be somewhat inefficient, in as much as reports are only required at the mid- and end-points of each phase. This, in the context of an insufficient M&E framework, results in an inefficient process of “reconstructing” project activities and results with insufficient documentation, which leads to delays in the submission of reports.

4.3.3 Sustainability

The sustainability of a project or program can be assessed through the question of whether activities and their results are likely to continue when external support is withdrawn. The notion of sustainability is therefore concerned with assessing whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. When evaluating the sustainability of a program or a project, it is useful to consider the extent to which the benefits of a program or project continue after donor funding has ceased.

The following questions of the evaluation matrix are addressed here:

- Are the project outcomes sustainable?
  - Has there been effective buy-in from government and other local counterparts?
  - Has capacity been sufficiently strengthened for local actors to continue the processes initiated by the project beyond the project’s lifetime? Has IOM developed sustainable exit strategies?
- Are there mechanisms to extend funding of project activities beyond the project lifetime?
  - Were suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented?
  - Have linkages/synergies been created with other regional and country specific initiatives?

**Finding 16:** The project outcomes are largely sustainable, since most activities are embedded within government structures, although there is some uncertainty as to the sustainability of training-based capacity building. Further, external factors could undermine some of the project’s achievements regarding migrant protection

One of the key characteristics of the project is that, for each of the outcome areas, activities have been conducted in conjunction with or through government structures. This is the case for awareness-raising activities such as the community conversations in sending communities as well as in the provision of information to actual migrants through MRCs (which are all, with the exception of the Obock MRC in Djbouti, staffed by government employees and/or housed in government property), for the provision of emergency and repatriation assistance to some extent, and through actively seeking the involvement of government actors in MMTFs and in the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration (RCMM).

This reflects good practices in institutional capacity building, whereby the target institution is supported through the learning process but is required to commit either human, financial or infrastructure resources, or a combination of these. As a result, from the perspective of sustainability, the interventions in question become part of “normal business” for the targeted institutions, and the commitment of government resources is generally recognised to be one of the primary sources of ownership. At the same time, experience is acquired and expertise developed during the course of the supported intervention, such that eventually external personnel will become unnecessary.

However, in light of the M&E deficiencies noted in section 4.3.2 above (under Finding 12), a question mark remains regarding the sustainability of the training-based capacity building activities of the project, as there is at present no systematic assessment of the application of the knowledge acquired or the eventual continuation of good practices learned. This is especially problematic in light of the fact that, in all locations, respondents indicated there is a high turnover rate in most institutions, with the possible exception of the police and coast guard. Therefore, the individuals who have received the training may or may not be in a position to use what they have learned in the medium to long term, as they may move to a different institution or out of the public sector completely.
The behaviour change components of the project, in particular those seeking to promote safer migration choices and those seeking to promote the respect of the rights of migrants, much be understood to be intrinsically extended over the very long term. As such, the five years of this project can only be considered a start in the direction of change. From a different perspective, the increased complexity of the migration flows in the region, coupled in particular with the securitization of the migration agenda due to increased threats from extremist groups, represents a clear and present danger for the respect of the rights of migrants. While this situation is clearly beyond the control of the project, it should still be taken into consideration when considering the advocacy component of the project, as it may undermine efforts to ensure the humane treatment of migrants in the region.

On a minor note, it should be noted that respondents in Somaliland and Puntland indicated that the location of the RCMM meetings can be problematic given the fact that neither region is universally recognised as independent states, which has created problems for their attendance in particular locations. Thus, this may create a disincentive for their continued participation.

Finding 17: The project has operated, from the beginning, in tandem with other interventions, which promotes the continuation of its efforts.

As was discussed earlier in this report, this project complements and supports other IOM projects in the region, with a variety of shared activities. As such, there is a framework for the continuation of its activities, even if it implies a reduced scale in the event that this project should be terminated.

In addition, the project design contemplates at least one additional phase, which is currently under review and for which funding is being currently sought, either for the continuation of project activities, or for the implementation of an exit strategy.

5. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

5.1 Relevance

The project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa, 2013-2015, and Previous Phases” has proved to be very relevant to the complex context of mixed migration in the region, addressing as it does the full cycle of migration. It also fits very well within the expertise and competencies of IOM, and complements its other interventions in the area, while it is well aligned with the donor’s priorities.

5.2 Effectiveness

In general terms, the project has been largely effective in implementing its planned activities, achieving most of its planned outputs and contributing to the achievement of planned outcomes. It has managed to engage sending communities in reflecting on the consequences of irregular migration, supported the capacity of national authorities to engage with actual and potential migrants, provided a variety of services and emergency assistance to migrants, strengthened government capacity to provide those services, and promoted, with some success, coordination and cooperation mechanisms within and across the project countries. It has done so in large part because of the dedication of project staff.

5.3 Efficiency and Process

The project has managed to deliver its planned activities within planned budgets, although with some delays in particular with regards to the training components of the project, resulting at least in part from a complex and somewhat unwieldy management structure. Nevertheless, at 75% of the project timeline, only approximately 60% of the budget has been expended, which highlights the effects of coordination and reporting challenges. Similarly, an important challenge in the management of the project, and in the assessment of project effectiveness, has been the result of insufficient M&E capacity across the organisation and in a few project staff. Resources allocated appear to have been generally appropriate for the planned activities, with transparent administrative procedures.
5.4 Sustainability

Overall, the project has utilised good practices for promoting national ownership and building national capacities, with some weaknesses related to the training-based capacity building activities. It has also been nested within a broader portfolio of projects in mixed migration, which promotes the continuation of project achievements. Finally, it was conceptualised with a final, as yet unfunded phase in which to deploy an exit strategy for the project, and focusing on ensuring the sustainability of project results and/or the continuation of project activities by other actors, as relevant.

6. Recommendations

The following recommendations follow from the findings in the report. They are organised under two general categories: recommendations addressed to IOM, and recommendations addressed to SDC/SEM.

6.1 Recommendations for IOM

6.1.1 Overall recommendations

**Recommendation 1: IOM should continue to strengthen M&E and Knowledge Management capacity among project staff to reflect MfDR**

As has been noted at various points in this report, the assessment of the project’s effectiveness, especially at the level of outcomes, was hindered to some extent by the absence of systematically collected and analysed suitable monitoring data. Rather than being purely an accountability mechanism, monitoring for results is a useful management tool that provides a timely feedback loop in the execution of a project, and as such allows for real-time adjustments, if needed, to project activities. More importantly, it is a tool that allows the project managers to continually test the validity of the project logic and of its assumptions. Concretely, in the case of this project, a more robust approach to M&E would be able to demonstrate whether or not training individual personnel is leading to expected changes in behaviour and/or in processes in the targeted institutions and, if needed, would have allowed for refresher training or for a revised strategy in the selection of participants for training activities.

In addition, it would simplify the report-writing process by, firstly, having up-to-date monitoring information on a continuous basis, and secondly by having a results framework that reflects the multi-country/regional structure of the project’s implementation.

**Recommendation 2: IOM should ensure that training-based capacity building activities are, whenever possible, complemented by institutional capacity building strategies**

The sustainability of capacity-building interventions has been noted as representing a weak link in the project results chain, in part due to the absence of an appropriate follow up strategy. However, it is important to recognise that training-based capacity-building is generally recognised as being the least sustainable form of capacity building.

Broadly speaking, capacity development is understood to involve three interrelated levels, specifically the individual, organisational and societal levels. At the organisational level, technical capacity building is aimed at addressing a specific issue concerning an organisation’s activities and normally entails a fundamental process of change. General capacity building, on the other hand, is provided to help organisations develop their own capacity to better fulfil their core functions, and achieve their own mission.

It would therefore be important to ensure that a critical mass of relevant personnel receives the trainings, in order to ensure its continuation. More importantly, this capacity-building approach should be complemented with more strongly institutional capacity strengthening strategies. This was also noted in particular by respondents in Djibouti, who suggested that, while specific training activities are welcome and useful, contributions to the revision of the institutional structure of the Office National d’Assistance aux réfugiés et aux sinistrés (ONARS) and of the legal framework governing the institution would be more effective in ensuring its ability to address the realities of mixed migration flows.
6.1.2 Specific Recommendations

Relevance

**Recommendation 3: IOM should consider incorporating the development of a detailed Theory of Change for all its projects**

While the project’s intervention logic is implicit in the results framework, the explicit articulation of a theory of change, including all assumptions and causal hypotheses would serve to ensure that these are clearly understood by all staff involved, and also that the monitoring processes collect data that is relevant to either proving or disproving these assumptions and hypothesis regularly throughout the implementation of the project. This would allow the project to be adjusted early on, should any of the assumptions and hypotheses be invalidated.

Related findings:

Finding 5: The project’s Theory of Change is generally sound, and its assumptions are largely validated, with the exception of lack of awareness of the risks as a main driver of irregular migration.

Effectiveness

**Recommendation 4: IOM should more explicitly acknowledge its coordinating and advising role with regards to regional coordination mechanisms and adjust its expectations accordingly**

While the analysis of his evaluation has been focused on a contribution analysis, recognising that the extent to which the effectiveness or efficiency of coordination mechanisms is dependent on a multiplicity of factors, many of which are beyond IOM’s control, the project’s results matrix includes some indicators that assess the functioning of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration on a level that cannot be solely attributable to IOM’s work. This tends to raise unrealistic expectations, both among donors and among partners and/or staff.

Related findings: Finding 10: IOM has contributed to strengthening existing coordination mechanisms, although these have a mixed record of effectiveness.

Efficiency and process

**Recommendation 5: IOM should develop, monitor and seek to enforce detailed project work plans to ensure the timely execution of planned activities**

Recognising that not all project staff are directly accountable to the project coordinator, it is nevertheless important to establish a project specific accountability tool. A detailed workplan with specific timelines for each activity that is agreed upon at project start-up and, most importantly, regularly monitored and included as the basis of reporting in a systematic manner, would go some way to ensuring that activities are not unduly delayed or pushed back to later stages.

Such a planning tool could also serve to enhance the coordination and communication among participating offices, and should be part of an enhanced monitoring function.

Related findings: Finding 13: The project has experienced a number of delays in implementation, particularly of training activities, which have resulted in a slow disbursement rate; Finding 15: Monitoring and evaluation practices are generally weak, which undermines the achievement of project results, or at least the verification

**Recommendation 6: With regards to strengthening the monitoring and evaluation function, IOM should consider developing country-specific planning and monitoring plans and frameworks for multi-country and regional projects**
As has been mentioned, the coordination mechanisms and M&E practices for this project have proved insufficient for its effective implementation (see Recommendations 1 and 2 above).

A stronger M&E function would also suggest the development of country specific results matrices for multi-country/regional projects, with corresponding budget allocations, reflecting the overall project results matrix, as well as detailed workplans and monitoring plans. This would facilitate a clearer understanding on the part of project staff of the specific actions for which they are responsible as well as the larger intended purpose of these actions, while providing a clear accountability structure for timelines and expenditures. This would have the added advantage of mitigating the challenges posed by the decentralised organisational structure.

Related findings: Finding 13: The project has experienced a number of delays in implementation, particularly of training activities, which have resulted in a slow disbursement rate; Finding 14: The project is appropriately managed, with transparent administrative procedures, within the constraints imposed by the institutional set-up of IOM; Finding 15: Monitoring and evaluation practices are generally weak, which undermines the achievement of project results, or at least and their verification

6.2 Recommendations for the Swiss Government

Recommendation 7: The Swiss Government should support IOM in ensuring that M&E plans of future collaborations meet SDC’s standards and needs

SCD/SEM have expressed a certain level of dissatisfaction with the project's M&E, justifiably so. Having had more experience with MfDR, and in their role as donor, they are in a good position to support IOM in the development of a suitable results matrix and advise on the implementation of an appropriate monitoring plan for any subsequent projects.

On this note, SDC/SEM might consider working with other donors involved in mixed migration to harmonise their reporting structures, which could serve to reduce the administrative burden of their grants, not only in their work with IOM but also more generally with other grant recipients.

Recommendation 8: The donor should consider providing longer-term funding for interventions aimed at addressing behaviour change

Given that SDC is considering refocusing its migration strategy towards an additional emphasis on protection and developmental initiatives to address protracted displacements, it should recognise that the implementation of durable solutions tends to involve slow, complex processes requiring sustained efforts over a long period of. As such, one- and two-year grant cycles may not be the most appropriate time-frame to achieve the desired changes. In such a context, SDC should assess whether a longer cycle would be possible in order to ensure the stability of funding.
## Appendix I – Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Main Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Methods of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>To what extent are the project’s intended results relevant for the context within which it operates?</td>
<td>To what extent does the project design support or complement the needs of stakeholders and the priorities of regional governments? To what extent does the project complement or support other initiatives in the same thematic and geographic areas implemented by other actors</td>
<td>Interviews with key informants (government counterparts, NGO counterparts) As relevant, interviews with NGOS, INGOs, UN Agencies</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the project support or complement the priorities of IOM focused on migration (regional and country office activities)?</td>
<td>What are IOM’s priorities in each country? In the region? What other programs/projects are being implemented by IOM in each country? In the region? How does this project support or complement them?</td>
<td>IOM strategic documents, planning documents IOM project team interviews</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the project support or complement the priorities of the donor (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation –SDC) in the region?</td>
<td>What are SDC’s priorities in the region? What other programs/projects are being funded by SDC in the region?</td>
<td>Interviews with key informants (SDC staff)</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the project’s Theory of Change, and has it been validated by the project’s implementation?</td>
<td>What are the assumptions underlying the project design? Are they appropriate for the context(s) where the project is implemented? What, if any, is the added value of creating a regional project as opposed to developing country-specific projects for the same purpose?</td>
<td>Review of project planning documents IOM project team interviews</td>
<td>Content analysis, comparison of good practices in project design with the project results framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How appropriate is project design to achieve its objectives in the context in which it operates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Report - IOM Improving Protection of Vulnerable Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Main Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions(^{21})</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Methods of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>To what extent has the project met its stated objectives in terms of outputs and outcomes?</td>
<td>To what extent do target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options? Do migrants have the necessary information to opt for a safer migration option? Do governments officials have the necessary knowledge and tools to advise migrants and potential migrants on alternative options to irregular migration? To what extent did vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanisms? To what extent are health, transport, AVR, and NFI services available to assist irregular migrants? To what extent have the infrastructure and capacity to deal with emergency and life-saving needs been enhanced? To what extent do government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders? To what extent have existing coordination mechanisms and systems been strengthened? To what extent have committee members implemented recommendations of previous committee meetings?</td>
<td>Review of IOM project results framework, project reports Interviews with IOM, stakeholders and counterparts</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has been the quality of the project outputs?</td>
<td>What is the quality of the project outcomes and what is the level of beneficiary satisfaction. To what extent have project activities been conducted/produced in accordance to stated guidelines? To what extent have trainings conducted been of appropriate quality and imparted to appropriately selected participants? To what extent have information campaigns reached their desired audiences? To what extent have awareness-raising activities impacted on the decision-making processes of migrants? To what extent have health, transport, AVR, and NFI services met the needs of vulnerable migrants?</td>
<td>Interviews with national and regional counterparts as appropriate, with project stakeholders, and with IOM teams Training evaluation questionnaires</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) The sub-questions for the effectiveness section are expressed at the level of outputs only for the purpose of clarity. It is understood that the analysis will build from the performance of the various activities contemplated in the project.
### Evaluation Report - IOM Improving Protection of Vulnerable Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Main Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Methods of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process and Efficiency</td>
<td>To what extent has the project been cost-effective?</td>
<td>Could activities have been undertaken at a lesser cost with similar results? Have mechanisms been put in place to maximise the benefits and minimise the costs of project activities?</td>
<td>Document review of project planning documents and project reports (narrative and financial) Interviews with IOM team</td>
<td>Cost effectiveness analysis Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the project been efficiently managed?</td>
<td>How effectively were the programme performance and results monitored? How efficient and appropriate is the project set up/approach to achieve the objectives? Are there sufficient human and financial resources to manage the project and deliver high quality outputs (including M&amp;E capacity)? To what extent has project management been appropriate and effective (including establishment of baselines, monitoring procedures and ongoing evaluation/feedback for project adjustments as needed)? Are administrative procedures appropriate and transparent?</td>
<td>Document review of project planning documents and reports Interviews with IOM team</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have project activities, outputs and outcomes been delivered in accordance with planned timelines?</td>
<td>What factors, if any, have enabled or impeded project delivery and management?</td>
<td>Review of project planning and reporting documents Interviews with IOM team and national counterparts</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Main Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Methods of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there mechanisms to extend funding of project activities beyond the project lifetime?</td>
<td>Were suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented? Have linkages/synergies been created with other regional and country specific initiatives?</td>
<td>IOM project team interviews Expert judgement</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the project outcomes sustainable?</td>
<td>Has there been effective buy-in from government and other local counterparts? Has capacity been sufficiently strengthened for local actors to continue the processes initiated by the project beyond the project’s lifetime? Has IOM developed sustainable exit strategies?</td>
<td>IOM project team interviews Document reviews Interviews with local counterparts</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II – Detailed Methodology

Overall Approach

The assignment was carried out in conformity with international evaluation standards including OECD-DAC and UNEG principles and guidelines. Within the resources available, the evaluation was evidence-based and utilization focused. Stakeholder participation was sought and incorporated into the evaluator’s understanding of the information collected, analysis performed, findings presented, recommendations made, and results disseminated. The consultant is independent, thus while factual errors will be corrected, the conclusions reached are those of the evaluator, based on the context and evidence presented.

An evaluation framework identifies the main questions of the study and provides the plan for how these questions can be answered. It defines the key terms and provides the sources of data, data collection instruments, and approach to analysis. This section provides in prose the broad aspects of the methodology placed in the form of an evaluation matrix in Appendix I.

An evaluation matrix is a way of organizing the evaluation questions around the major issues of concern to the evaluation. Further, as relevant, the matrix sub-divides the elements of the main questions into sub-questions that explicitly address the relevant issues under investigation. As such, the answers to these sub-questions combine to answer the overall questions, and are the primary focus of the data collection. The matrix also provides a structure to ensure that multiple data sources are used to answer each question, and a balance of stakeholder views is sought during the process.

This evaluation framework is structured around the key evaluation issues of relevance, effectiveness, process and efficiency, and sustainability.

Methodology

The overall approach for the evaluation is a focus on contribution analysis, aiming to assess whether or not the project can be understood to be one of the causes of observed change. This approach is based on chains of logical arguments that are verified through confirmatory analysis (in this case through the discussion of preliminary findings during the post-field mission debrief presentation), in order to disentangle the project itself and external factors that may impact on the observed change.

This process involves understanding the cause and effect chain connecting design and implementation to the planned and observed change, gathering evidence related to the various links in the causal or logic chain, including causal statements from interviewees, analysis of context and, when feasible, findings form similar studies, and assessing the effects of external factors.

This approach consists of collecting stakeholders’ views about causes and effects, and triangulating these across different respondent categories, to develop an interpretation. This includes document review, interviews, focus groups and/or questionnaires.

The consultant obtained data from a desk review of documents, as well as semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders. These elements will be described in more detail below. All methods of data collection were undertaken with a utilization-focused approach emphasising lessons learned and good practices with an aim to better inform future programming.

The research process was implemented in different components, broken down as follows:

---

In this context, the term “stakeholders” refers to those individuals, institutions and/or communities who are either involved in the implementation of the project, or benefit from the project. Therefore, the term includes the institutions whose capacities are intended to be built/strengthened, as well as migrants.
Document Review

The objective of the first phase of the evaluation process was to build a common understanding of the objectives and priorities of the evaluation, and to refine the methodology proposed for this assignment. An initial document review was undertaken during the preparation phase of this evaluation, serving to provide key background information to inform the other methods to be used, as well as identifying gaps in knowledge and data sources.

A further, more in-depth and expanded document review was conducted during the field visits as well as during the analysis and report writing phase, as a number of key documents were obtained during the field visits. The information contained in such documents was systematically triangulated and validated through management and stakeholder interviews.

Documents reviewed include, but are not limited to:

- Project planning and reporting documents, including event evaluation questionnaires; more specifically:
  - Memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between IOM and SDC for each funded phase of the project
  - MOUs between IOM and national government authorities, including with individual agencies and/or line ministries
  - MOUs between IOM and any implementing partners
  - Project logframes and rationales, as available, for the overall programme and for each project phase
  - Interim and final narrative reports for each project phase
  - Approved budgets for each project phase
  - Interim and final financial reports for each project phase
  - The equivalent documentation for each country office
  - Any documents produced as outputs of the project activities, including but not limited to:
    - Pre and post assessments
    - Action plans
    - Information materials
    - Training materials
    - Training event evaluations
    - Case report summary data
    - Meeting minutes
    - Websites

Semi-Structured Interviews

For the development of an understanding of the project’s logic and functioning, as well as the extent to which it has achieved expected results, semi-structured interviews were conducted with those involved in the development and implementation of the project. In addition, during the field visits, interviews were conducted with key stakeholders and beneficiaries. For the purposes of this evaluation, beneficiaries include the government agencies whose capacities are intended to be built and/or strengthened, as well as the communities from which migrants tend to originate, and migrants themselves. Key informants interviewed include:

In Nairobi:

- IOM Regional Office:
  - Project manager and staff as appropriate
  - Resource management staff as appropriate
  - Project support staff as appropriate
- SDC
  - Staff responsible for the project
- Interviews with additional relevant stakeholders, such as other organisations (national and international) working in mixed migration.

In each of the project countries
- IOM:
  - project manager and staff as appropriate
- Government counterparts as appropriate:
  - This should be technical staff familiar with the project and its implementation
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO) counterparts as appropriate:
  - This should be technical staff familiar with the project and its implementation
- As feasible, group interviews with members of potential and migrant communities prone to irregular migration receiving or having received services from IOM as part of the project (see Section Limitations, for further details).
- Interviews with additional relevant stakeholders, such as other organisations (national and international) working in mixed migration.

The semi-structured interviews were organised around the main themes of the evaluation matrix (see Appendix I). For each main category of informant, questions were asked according to their potential and actual familiarity with the different components of the project. As such, the exact structure and content of the interview was tailored according to the flow of the interview and the information received. An outline of the general interview protocol will be included in an appendix in the final version of the report.

Direct Observation

The field visit component of the evaluation allowed the consultant to directly observe the conditions and treatment of migrants receiving services at the MRC in Hargeisa and at the Transit Center in Addis Ababa, as well as to see the operation of the registration data base. This allowed her to assess the conditions of hygiene and overall accessibility of the locations.

Data Analysis

Data collected during the desk review and the field visit will be subjected to qualitative and, where applicable, quantitative analyses. Interview notes and general observations will be collected by the evaluator and will be included in the analysis. Data collected through document review and interviews will be triangulated across respondents and data sources in order to ensure the empirical validity of the information.

The analysis will be based on a review of the logical framework of the project, as well as on content analysis of responses to interviews and of project documentation. This will allow the consultant to assess the project’s relevance, efficiency and sustainability. The project's effectiveness will be analysed primarily through a most-significant change approach, assessing the respondents' perceptions of the project's effects.

Due to the complex nature of the project as well as to the relatively slow start up process, it is expected that evaluation findings will be possible primarily at the level of outputs. It should be noted also that interventions that aim to build institutional capacity as well as those that aim to effect behavioural change operate on long time scales (5 to 10 years), and this project’s objectives focus on those two areas. The consultant will, however, make every effort to assess progress towards outcomes and, as far as feasible, indications of project impacts.
Limitations

The relatively constrained timelines for this evaluation have meant that respondents to interviews were not given much time to make themselves available. As a result, some key actors could not be reached during this exercise. In order to mitigate this risk, the active cooperation of the project staff was requested to arrange meetings with relevant stakeholders.

Further, these same constraints made it impossible for the evaluator to conduct field visits beyond the capital of each project country. This limitation was mitigated by extensive interviews to be conducted with the field staff. Similarly, it was not possible for the evaluator to travel to Puntland. As a result, telephone interviews were conducted with project staff and key informants.

With regards to interviewing migrants, there are important limitations that relate to the transitory and vulnerable status of the desired respondents. Indeed, by their very nature, migrants are unlikely to remain in one location—they are either in transit to their desired destination, or returning to their communities of origin. This makes it extremely difficult to locate migrants who are known to have received the services provided by the project. In addition, most migrants in this region—and in particular those targeted by this intervention—are not in possession of legal documents, which puts them at risk of arrest and/or mistreatment by local authorities. Therefore, participating in interviews represents a risk that many of them may not want to take, and ethical standards demand that participation in any interview should be completely voluntary.

Furthermore, the evaluator was unable to review in detail the effects of the capacity building components of the project, in part due to the lack of available monitoring data. Moreover, the timeline and resource limitations did not allow for conducting in-depth interviews with a sufficient number of trainees that might have provided a basis for assessing their capacity. Thus, the evaluation can only report the levels of satisfaction indicated by the persons responsible for the beneficiary agencies.

In addition, due to the diversity of languages spoken by the potential migrant respondents, it was not possible for the consultant to interview them directly. Interpretation was provided by MRC staff and by staff at the Migrant Transit Center. This posed specific challenges, in that there was a potential for a positive bias in the interviewees’ responses and/or of mistranslation. This was, however, unavoidable, given that—in light of the vulnerability of the respondents noted in the previous paragraph—it is important to include in the interview process people with whom respondents have established a certain level of trust. Further, in the consultant’s experience and as well documented in social science research, a positive bias in responses is to be expected regardless of the identity of the interviewer/interpreter. The consultant took this potential bias into consideration for the analysis of responses and sought to triangulate the validity of the information thus obtained with both other types of respondents interviewed in the context of this evaluation, and with existing academic and grey literature on the subject in the region. Further, the majority of the interviews were focused on understanding the respondents’ decision-making process and their migration experience, so that information regarding the quality of services provided by IOM in the context of the project was only obtained when freely offered by the respondents, rather than as a result of direct questioning.
Appendix III – Country Profiles

This appendix presents a snapshot of the status of the project in each of the countries where it operates.
Ethiopia

Dates visited:
April 15-18, 2015

Main characteristics:

- Since Ethiopia is one of the main sending countries for mixed migration in the Horn of Africa, the project focuses to a large extent on Outcome 1 (Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options), although the AVR process for the same reason involves the provision of assistance to returning migrants, which is a component of Outcome 2 (Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanisms). There are also a number of activities related to Outcome 3 (Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders).

Main achievements:

- Under Outcome 1, the project implemented awareness raising activities including radio programs, theatre shows, local community conversation forums, school peer education, and print Information Education and Communication (IEC) materials. Of particular note for the evaluation was the community conversation facilitators’ training, in collaboration with the Labour and Social Affairs Offices in Oromio nationality Zone of Amhara Region, Jimma Zone of Oromia Region, and Debubawi Zone of Tigray Region, producing 200 trainees. Respondents indicated that the community conversations have proven to be especially effective in raising the awareness of sending communities regarding the need to ensure that youth do not engage in irregular migration, as well as to the necessity of creating livelihoods opportunities locally to obviate their need to migrate in search of economic opportunities.

- Related to both Outcome 1 and Outcome 3, the project implemented, in close collaboration with the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the Government Communication Affairs Office, a media workshop attracting 60 participants involving major media agencies, communication bureaus, and other stakeholders in sensitization efforts. The workshop has been deemed very valuable by respondents, and has been reported to have led to a more active engagement from the GCAO in terms of promoting more accurate and sensitive reporting on migration themes.

Success factors:

- Effective engagement with national and regional level authorities
- Pooling of resources between this project and especially PRM-funded projects to expand the geographic reach of awareness-raising activities
- Effective collaboration in particular with Unicef for the provision of assistance to unaccompanied minors

Main challenges:

- Contextual:
  - There is reportedly a temporary ban (of indeterminate duration) on legal migration options, which acts as an incentive for irregular migration

- Operational:
  - The sheer geographic size of Ethiopia presents challenges for the timely and effective implementation of project activities at the grassroots level
  - Weak, though improving, M&E capacity
Djibouti

Dates visited:
April 18-21, 2015

Main characteristics:
- As a result of its location, bordering on Ethiopia, Eritrea and Somaliland, and at the narrowest point of the Gulf of Aden, Djibouti is an important transit country in the mixed migration routes between the Horn of Africa and the Arabian Peninsula. Consequently, the project’s activities focus primarily on Outcome 2 (Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanisms), especially through the activities conducted by the MRC in Obock. There are also a number of activities related to Outcome 3 (Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders).

Main achievements:
- Registration of migrants:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of migrants registered</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>20,223</td>
<td>25,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  
  Note: No data provided for 2012 or 2015

- Assisted Voluntary Return (to Ethiopia)
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015 (first quarter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of migrants assisted</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Trainings for Coast Guard, border police and Office National d’Assistance aux refugiés et aux sinistrés (ONARS) reported by participants to be relevant and useful.

- MRC in Obock has increased collaboration with local authorities and support for local hospital. In addition, the infrastructure of the MRC has been improved (functioning database for registration, internet access, etc.).

Success factors:
- Effective engagement with national and local level authorities, especially with Obock Prefect
- Reorganisation of MRC staff to improve clarity on responsibilities, inclusion of female staff allows for outreach to more female migrants
- Holding of the annual meetings of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration in Djibouti on two occasions (2011 and 2012) raised the profile of the issue among local authorities and contributed to more active collaboration

Main challenges:
- Contextual:
  - The increase in mixed migration flows through Djibouti stretches the resources of the MRC
  - Structural capacity gaps among local authorities (in particular ONARS mandate as well as unclear legal framework for migration)

- Operational:
- Weak M&E capacity
Somaliland

Dates visited:
April 26-30, 2015

Main characteristics:

- Somaliland is both a sending and a transiting country for mixed migration. Hence, the project is active on Outcome 1 (Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options), engaging in awareness-raising activities regarding the dangers of Tahrib (irregular migration and/or human trafficking), Outcome 2 (Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanisms), providing emergency assistance to stranded migrants from Ethiopia in particular, but also to returning Somalilander migrants from Arabian Peninsula, and Outcome 3 (Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders), especially through the support provided for the Mixed Migration Task Force.

Main achievements:

- In terms of awareness-raising, fruitful collaboration has been established with Hargeisa University to deter recent graduates from engaging in irregular migration, and with Radio Hargeisa, broadcasting in Oromo to target Ethiopian migrants.
- The establishment of a collaborative relationship with the Ethiopian Community Center in Hargeisa has also enhanced the work of the MRC, especially in the provision of temporary housing to migrants awaiting AVR, and in liaising with the Ethiopian Consulate. The MRC also provides basic medical services for migrants residing in Hargeisa and to the host community.
- IOM Hargeisa is one of the main convenors of the MMTF and works closely with the national government in preparation for the meetings of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration, and has provided training to the Coast Guard which, according to respondents, has significantly improved their ability to provide emergency assistance at sea. It is also noteworthy that female officers have been included in the training.

Success factors:

- Very dedicated, though small, staff
- Proactive project management and above average M&E capacity
- Effective collaboration with national authorities (especially Ministry of Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction), civil society organisations, and international organisations and NGOs

Main challenges:

- Contextual:
  - Structural capacity gaps among local authorities (primarily lacking infrastructure and financial resources)
  - Geographic inaccessibility of the migration route restricts access to migrants in transit in a climatically hostile part of their journey

- Operational
  - Small staff
  - Dual lines of reporting (to IOM Somalia and to Project Coordinator) create occasional delays, miscommunication, and heavy administrative burden
Puntland

Dates visited:
Not visited (telephone interviews, April 26-30, 2015)

Main characteristics:
- Like Somaliland, Puntland is both a transit and a sending country for mixed migration, as it is on the route of migration from Somalia to the Arabian Peninsula, and as a lack of economic opportunities drives Puntlanders to migrate. Activities are primarily focused on Outcome 2 (Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanisms), especially through the provision of emergency assistance through the MRC in Bosaso, although it also contributes to Outcome 1 (Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options) through outreach to migrants, and works closely with the Mixed Migration Task Force and with the Ministry of the Interior in the context of Outcome 3 (Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders)

Main achievements:
- The project engages in outreach activities to migrants in remote areas as well as at the MRC, where activities focus on registration and AVR, as well as emergency shelter.
- Effective collaboration in particular with the Danish Refugee Council for the provision of referral and protection services

Success factors:
- Active participation in MMTF and collaboration with UNHCR, DRC and other international organisations

Main challenges:
- Contextual
  - Absence of a clear legal and policy framework on migration, especially regarding migrants’ rights, although IOM is providing support in that area
  - Significant capacity gaps among local authorities
- Operational:
  - Remoteness of location and poor communications infrastructure hinder operations and communications
## Appendix IV – List of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Programme Support Unit, IOM Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Management Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Program Assistant</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT/AVR Senior Program Assistant</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Voluntary Return/Counter Trafficking/Irregular Migration Programs Coordinator</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Assistant and Awareness and Outreach Focal Point</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programs M&amp;E Assistant</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
<td>Mixed Migration, IOM Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower Resources and Employment Services Director</td>
<td>Oromia Region Labour and Social Affairs Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Expert</td>
<td>Oromia Region Labour and Social Affairs Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Oromia Region Labour and Social Affairs Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection programme manager</td>
<td>Unicef Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection project assistant</td>
<td>Unicef Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed migration Project Manager</td>
<td>RMMS Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Government Communications Office, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>IOM Transit Center, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Officer</td>
<td>IOM Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Planning &amp; Statistics Department, Chair of Somaliland MMTF</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International cooperation Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and international Cooperation, Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>ONARS, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>ONARS, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and eligibility chief</td>
<td>ONARS, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Immigration Police, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-General</td>
<td>Ministry of the Interior, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming Assistant, responsible for MRC Obock</td>
<td>IOM Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy-director for international organisations</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Officer Admin/Fin/HR</td>
<td>IOM Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefet</td>
<td>Obock, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E focal point</td>
<td>IOM Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of sub-office</td>
<td>IOM Hargeisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Migration Assistant</td>
<td>IOM Hargeisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>MRC Hargeisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Ministry of Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Ministry of Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Coordinator and Focal Point for Mixed Migration</td>
<td>Department of Immigration, Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination officer</td>
<td>UNHCR Hargeisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commander</td>
<td>Somaliland Coastguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Ethiopian Community Centre, Hargeisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International cooperation officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Somaliland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Officer (formerly mixed migration officer)</td>
<td>DRC Hargeisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Official</td>
<td>Somaliland National Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Migration Assistant</td>
<td>IOM Bosaso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>MRC Bosaso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Coordinator</td>
<td>DRC Bosaso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable Solutions Officer</td>
<td>UNHCR Bosaso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Migrant interviews:**
- Group interview Ethiopia (4 men)
- Group interviews Djibouti (10 men in groups of five)
- Interviews in Somaliland (1 individual and 1 family interview)
Appendix V – List of Documents Consulted

Documents from IOM:

Administrative and financial records for the project, including:

- Contracts
- Cooperation agreements
- Deeds of donation
- Financial reports
- Funding proposals
- Internal correspondence
- Memoranda of Understanding
- Narrative reports
- Project documents

Documents from donor:


Credit proposals for the following projects:

- TdH Lausanne: Protecting Somali Refugee Children in Kambioos, Kenya (2014)
- UNHCR Regional Hub secondment WASH, Nairobi (2014-2015)
- Secondment UNHCR WASH, Gambella (Ethiopia) (2014)
- IOM- Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa (2013-2015)

Background documents:

- RMMS Country/Area Profiles:
Evaluation Report - IOM Improving Protection of Vulnerable Migrants

- Declaration of the Ministerial Conference of the Khartoum Process (EU-Horn of Africa Migration Route Initiative), Rome, 28th November 2014
- E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, G. Loescher, K. Long and N. Sigona, eds. (2014); The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies; Oxford University Press
- Martin, I. and Bonfanti, S. (2015); Migration and asylum challenges in Eastern Africa : mixed migration flows require dual policy approaches; Migration Policy Centre Policy Briefs, 2015/04
- UNICEF ESARO (2014), Documentation of UNICEF-IOM collaboration on the safe return and reunification of Ethiopian unaccompanied migrant children from third countries

Methodological references

- OECD, Managing for Development Results Information Sheet, September 2008 (http://www.mfdr.org/About/Final-MfDR-information-sheet.pdf
NOTE: This general interview protocol is presented here to provide an indication of the topics that were covered in the semi-structured interviews (individual and group). As noted in the methodology section of this report, the specific questions and the amount of introductory information pertaining to the project were tailored to the particular respondent type, and adjusted during the interview depending on the respondent’s actual familiarity with particular aspects of the project. As such, this protocol was not shared with respondents.

Introduction

IOM has been working with government and partners in Kenya, Somaliland, Puntland, Djibouti, and Ethiopia to promote the humane management of these mixed migration flows through the Swiss funded project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa.” This project commenced implementation in 2010 and is currently in its third phase of funding. Its aims are:

- Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options
- Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanism; and
- Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders.

It is in this context that the evaluator is seeking the input of various stakeholders, in order to gain a better understanding of the project’s results.

Please be assured that your responses to the questions below will be treated confidentially and will not be reported in such a way that the respondent can be identified. It is of primary importance to the evaluation that your responses be as frank and direct as possible.

Thank you in advance for your collaboration.

Some of these questions will be adapted depending on who the respondent is (not all questions will necessarily be asked of everyone). Note that the phrasing of the questions is for information purposes only, as the questions will be adapted to the respondents.

1.1 General information

Please describe briefly your occupation and role in your organisation.

To what extent are you familiar with the project?

To the best of your ability, can you describe the project’s purpose and activities?

1.2 Project relevance

To what extent does this project support or complement the broad lines of your organisation’s priorities and policies?

To what extent have the project activities helped to improve the capacity of the national/local authorities?

To what extent has the project provided you with information and/or services that are useful to you?

1.3 Project Effectiveness

For outcome 1: To improve protection of vulnerable migrants through advocacy, awareness and outreach and raise awareness among migrant source communities on the risks and dangers of irregular migration.

To what extent has the project improved protection of vulnerable migrants?
To what extent has the project raised awareness on the risks and dangers of irregular migration?

Have you received awareness raising training from the project? If so, what is your opinion of its usefulness?

Have you had occasion to use the training you received? If so, how useful did you find it?

What are your sources of information regarding migrant rights and the risks and dangers of irregular migration? How has this information affected your migration decisions?

What factors facilitated the achievement of project outputs in this area? (to be specified according to the respondent type)

What factors have hindered the achievement of project outputs in this area? (to be specified according to respondent type)

For outcome 2: To enhance the knowledge and capacities of authorities, NGOs and migrant and host communities in Somaliland, Puntland and Djibouti to provide protection and reduce human rights violations and abuses for vulnerable migrants; (in Ethiopia) to enhance the capacities of national and local government bodies and civil society organizations to plan and implement measures to improve the management of irregular migration flows and provide rehabilitation and reintegration assistance to vulnerable migrant returnees and victims of trafficking.

Have you received training/used equipment provided by the project? If so, what is your opinion of its usefulness?

Have you had occasion to use the training you received? If so, how useful did you find it?

Have measures been taken, as a result of the project, to improve the management of irregular migration flows? If so which ones?

Have measures been taken or mechanisms put in place, as a result of the project, to provide rehabilitation and reintegration assistance to vulnerable migrant returnees and victims of trafficking?/Have you made use of such assistance? If so which ones?

What factors facilitated the achievement of project outputs in this area? (to be specified according to the respondent type)

What factors have hindered the achievement of project outputs in this area? (to be specified according to respondent type)

For Outcome 3: To strengthen the referral mechanism and provide emergency assistance to vulnerable migrants in Somaliland, Puntland and Djibouti and support establishment of mechanisms to provide emergency, life-saving assistance to abandoned and/or intercepted migrants in Ethiopia along the borders with Djibouti and Somaliland.

What services are provided to vulnerable migrants in emergency cases?

What Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR) services are available to vulnerable migrants meeting IOM AVR criteria?

What factors facilitated the achievement of project outputs in this area? (to be specified according to the respondent type)

What factors have hindered the achievement of project outputs in this area? (to be specified according to respondent type)

For Outcome 4: To enhance the capacity of the Mixed Migration Task Forces (MMTF- Somalia and Djibouti) on interagency and intergovernmental levels in order to improve assistance to vulnerable migrants.

Have there any enhanced coordination mechanisms been adopted as a result of the project?
To what extent have these improved the MMTF’s work?

What factors facilitated the achievement of project outputs in this area? *(to be specified according to the respondent type)*

What factors have hindered the achievement of project outputs in this area? *(to be specified according to respondent type)*

*General:*

What, in your view, are the main achievements of the project? And its main weaknesses?

### 1.4 Project Sustainability

What, if any, additional activities should be undertaken to strengthen national capacity

Should a similar or follow on project be undertaken in future, what, if anything, should be done differently? What, if anything, should continue to be done the same way or in the same location?
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A CALL FOR APPLICATIONS - CONSULTANCY

Reference Number: IOMKE/CFA/007/2015
Title: Consultant (Evaluation on all three phases of the project entitled “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa and the context in which this project is placed)
Duty Station Nairobi with travel within the region to Djibouti, Somaliland, Puntland and Ethiopia.
Duration: 8 weeks (March 20th to May 20th, 2015)
Closing Date: 11 March 2015

Evaluation of the IOM Project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa, 2013-2015, and previous phases”

Evaluation context
The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As the leading international organization for migration, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration, and; uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Due to a variety of factors the Horn of Africa remains an area where volatile, insecure conditions continue to motivate large numbers of people to move within and across borders. These irregular migration flows include refugees, asylum seekers, smuggled and trafficked persons, and economic migrants. The push and pull factors mobilizing these population movements are varied, with some migrants fleeing from the Horn of Africa due to political unrest, persecution, and conflict, while others are leaving situations of extreme resource scarcity, drought, crop failure, food insecurity, and severe poverty.

IOM has been working with government and partners in Kenya, Somaliland, Puntland, Djibouti, and Ethiopia to promote the humane management of these mixed migration flows through the Swiss funded project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa,” This project commenced implementation in 2010 and is currently in its third phase of funding. The aims are:
1. Target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options
2. Vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanism; and
3. Government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders.

Evaluation purpose
IOM and Switzerland conduct project and programme evaluations as part of their commitment to improved results based management. Evaluation results are used to improve decision-making and evaluate performance of the project partner, and to improve project and programme design and implementation. The purpose of this evaluation is to review the effectiveness and impact of the Swiss funded project, assess prospects for sustainability, identify links/synergies between this action and other existing initiatives that deal with mixed migration, identify and document lessons learned and best practices (M&E
processes of the project design and implementation), and inform the development of follow up projects and programmes.

**Evaluation scope**
This evaluation will focus on all three phases of the project entitled “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa and the context in which this project is placed. The geographic scope consists of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia (Somaliland and Puntland) and potentially Yemen, dating from, March 2010 till present.

**Evaluation Objectives**
The objectives of the evaluation are to:
1. Assess the relevance of the project’s intended outcomes and impact.
2. Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation.
3. Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching its stated objectives.
5. Assess the appropriateness of the project design.
6. Assess management arrangements, including monitoring and evaluation, for achieving its stated objectives.
7. Identify lessons learned and best practices.
8. Assess the relevance and impact of the project within the regional context.
9. Assess existing proposed follow up programmes and make recommendations for improvements.

**Evaluation questions**
A complete list of evaluation questions and sub-questions will be jointly developed together with the evaluation consultant. The below questions are indicative of the types of questions to be addressed in the evaluation:

**Relevance**
1. How appropriate are the project’s intended results for the context within which it operates, as well as meeting the needs of the target group?
2. Has the project impacted on the theory of change underlying the project?
3. To what extent were the opportunities for synergies with or needs of stakeholders and the regional governments taken into account in project design?
4. How well does the project fit into other IOM activities in migration (country office activities) and how well does it complement activities of other actors?
5. What is the added value of creating a regional project vs project with the same content in every targeted country?

**Effectiveness**
1. To what extent did the project do target populations demonstrate increased willingness to opt for safer migration options?
2. To what extent did vulnerable irregular migrants and their host populations benefit from enhanced protection mechanism?
3. To what extent do government officials demonstrate an enhanced understanding of their role in mixed migration, and a related willingness to coordinate with other relevant stakeholders?
4. What is the quality of the project outcomes and what is the level of beneficiary satisfaction?
5. Were the project activities successful in meeting the intended impact hypothesis? Given the baselines set at the start of the project?

**Process and efficiency**
1. How cost-effective is the project?
2. How efficient is the overall management of the project? How appropriate is project design to achieve its objectives in the context in which it operates?
3. What external factors affected the implementation of the project and how were they managed?
4. How effectively were the programme performance and results monitored?
5. How efficient and appropriate is the project set up/approach to achieve the objectives?
6. How effective is IOM’s capacity for M&E in designing and implementing the proposed project?
7. What monitoring procedures were implemented?
8. How were the baselines established and used on subsequent results reporting?
9. To what extent have lessons learnt of previous phases been taken into account in the overall project steering?

Sustainability
1. Were suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented?
2. To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?

How well has IOM developed capacity building of local actors and developed sustainable exit strategies?
4. Have linkages/synergies been created with other regional and country specific initiatives?

Evaluation deliverables
The consultant will produce the following:
1. Revised terms of reference for the evaluation, if required.
2. A draft evaluation inception report, inclusive of evaluation matrix (questions and sub questions, indicators and data sources), proposed methodology, and proposed work plan.
3. A final inception report, incorporating IOM’s and Switzerland’s comments and agreed upon work plan.
4. A PowerPoint presentation debrief at the end of on-site data collection.
5. A draft evaluation report (including narrative and financial analysis).
6. A final evaluation report which includes a clear set of recommendations for eventual future phases.

Evaluation methodology
Review of existing reports and documents; A large stakeholder analysis including in-depth interviews with IOM, SDC, partners in Mixed Migration (eg DRC, UNHCR, IGAD etc), key informants such as front line law enforcement officials, government officials, and members of local, national, and regional coordination bodies; and questionnaires and focus group discussions with migrants.

For the document review, the following documents will be provided upon signature of contract:
- Project documents (for all three phases)
- Project budgets
- Interim reports and final reports
- Monitoring reports
- IOM strategy papers

Based on the initial desk review and interviews, the inception report (max 10 pages) should provide preliminary findings and details on the evaluation methodology. The inception report should clarify the evaluation questions (and specify what can be or cannot be answered) and if needed, suggest additional questions. It should ideally include an evaluation matrix. The inception report should also specify the limits to the evaluation and provide a realistic time frame, it is therefore important this is received finalized before the field work commences. Assistance will be provided in the identification of key stakeholders, and in organizing the schedule of interviews, focus groups, and site visits.

Evaluation Workplan
The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between the project manager in IOM
Kenya and the consultant. The evaluation will take place over an 8-week period (Mar 20th to May 20th, 2015), including two weeks travel and in country time in Kenya, Ethiopia, Djibouti, and Yemen. A general workplan is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial document review and revision of ToRs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft inception brief (10 pages)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management interviews and meetings</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final inception brief</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, in country interviews, and data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya, Ethiopia, Djibouti, SL, and PL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule of events, deliverables and payments

Payments will be made in two installment according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Installment</th>
<th>Approximate dates</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of contract and revised ToR</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Mar 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 March 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and field work</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td>1st installment</td>
<td>May 10th</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the draft</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 12th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerpoint debrief</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 13th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 14th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM review of draft report and submission of consolidated feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
<td>2nd and final installment</td>
<td>May 20th</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required Competencies

Behavioural

☐ takes responsibility and manages constructive criticism;
☐ works effectively with all clients and stakeholders;
☐ promotes continuous learning; communicates clearly;
☐ takes initiative and drives high levels of performance management;
☐ plans work, anticipates risks and sets goals within area of responsibility;
☐ displays mastery of subject matter;
☐ contributes to a collegial team environment;
☐ creates a respectful office environment free of harassment and retaliation and
promotes the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA);

- incorporates gender-related needs, perspectives, and concerns, and promotes equal gender participation
- displays awareness of relevant technological solutions;
- works with internal and external stakeholders to meet resource needs of IOM.

Technical
- delivers on set objectives on hardship situations;
- effectively coordinates actions with other implementing partners;
- works effectively with local authorities, stakeholders, beneficiaries and the broader community to advance country office or regional objectives.

Required Qualifications and Experience
- completed advanced university degree from an accredited academic institution preferably in Management, Business Administration, Sociology, Law or related field;
- five years of professional experience (or seven years for candidates holding a first level university degree) in project monitoring and evaluation);
- Background in Migration, Protection
- previous experiences with IOM and with UN specialized agencies an advantage;
- experience in liaising with national and international organizations.
- experience in evaluating projects of similar scope and complexity

Languages
Fluency in English is required. Working knowledge of French, Somali/Amharic, Arabic, and/or local languages an advantage.

Mode of Application:
Submit applications’ cover letter and updated CVs, including daytime telephone or e-mail contact to:
Human Resources Department, International Organization for Migration (IOM), P.O. Box 55040 – 00200, Nairobi, Kenya or send via e-mail to hrnairobi@iom.int

CLOSING DATE: 11TH March, 2015

Only shortlisted applicants will be contacted