EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Including how to perform self-evaluations

Prepared by the Office of Programme Evaluation

Geneva, December 1998

————————— ▬▬▬▬ —————————

The text of this document has been amended in April 2001 in order to reflect the most recent changes in IOM's organizational structure

IOM International Organization for Migration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEXES

EVALUATION GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

In the paper "An Evaluation Strategy for IOM", the evaluation process has been put forward as one of the oversight tools of the Organization at a time when decentralization and delegation of authority have given greater emphasis to this oversight function. These guidelines are intended to provide more practical assistance to IOM staff in putting the strategy into effect as it refers to projects and programmes developed according to IOM's project development process.

Emphasis must be placed on IOM's need to have a credible evaluation function that will help to reassure our funding sources and governmental partners that our projects are producing the anticipated results, that IOM can learn from experience. Evaluations not only support the well-being of the Organization as a whole but by applying the lessons learned they help project developers to create better projects, enhance project managers' skills and provide field offices with tools to prolong the life of their projects or to replicate them elsewhere.

This paper does not intend to provide the user with a detailed presentation and analysis of evaluation as a process. Rather, it has been prepared to give each project manager, Head of Office, Chief of Mission or Head of MRF a framework within which to plan and conduct the evaluation of their projects, especially through self-evaluation. It will also help to standardize the evaluation exercise throughout the Organization, so that all IOM staff have easy access to any useful information, recommendations or lessons learned that can be drawn from our project evaluations.

In addition to the above-mentioned Strategy Paper, these Guidelines should be read in conjunction with IOM's many documents on project development, including the Project Development Handbook. Training given in project development/PAT should also be kept in mind, as evaluation is an element of the entire project cycle.

These Guidelines review basic evaluation concepts (**Sections A and B**), examine the evaluation component in project design (**Section C**), and also provide information and procedures for carrying out evaluations (**Sections D,E,F**). **Sections G, H** and **I** cover the distribution policy and the planning of evaluations. **Annex I** provides you with matrices proposed for use in conducting self-evaluations in a systematic way and **Annexes II and III** different summaries: one referring to inserting evaluation concepts in the project design and the other providing a checklist for easy reference. **Annexes IV and V** provide you with practical information for use when conducting an evaluation, including a sample of a self-evaluation, and **Annex VI** examples of indicators.

This document does not claim to cover and analyze all the aspects of the evaluation concept. It has been prepared in order to facilitate the discussion, coordination and implementation of the evaluation component of a project, especially in the case of a

self-evaluation. These Guidelines have drawn heavily on evaluation references from other international organizations, in particular UNDP and ILO. **Annex VII** gives a list of references that OIG has on hand and also Internet websites where more information on evaluation can be obtained. Additional assistance on evaluation, especially for independent evaluations, can be obtained from EVA at any time.

It is recognized that as IOM does not have an 'evaluation culture' evaluation can sometimes be seen as a threat rather than as something from which we can learn. Evaluations may have to be carried out in a 'hostile' environment: where there are competing interests, uncertainty about a project's success, or where personal agendas may interfere with the results.

All the above factors may affect an evaluation and thus require careful and flexible management. Nonetheless, a well-planned and effective evaluation, which is based on observable facts, should be able to deal successfully with any extraneous factors.

Moreover, the project manager may, quite naturally, be concerned that a negative evaluation report might be detrimental to his/her professional development. Certainly, should an evaluation uncover project fraud or gross mismanagement, this could be the case. However, problems of this magnitude could very likely come to light in other ways as well. What project managers should consider is that an evaluation, particularly a self-evaluation, that finds that all has gone exactly as planned and that there is nothing that can be improved — in fact that the project has been perfectly managed from beginning to end — will be met with a great deal of scepticism. In the imperfect world in which all projects operate, such an outcome is highly unlikely.

A. BASIC EVALUATION CONCERNS

Carrying out an evaluation often entails making observations about an overall objective/project purpose/result/activity, as well as identifying problems and their causes so that they can be corrected and avoided in the future. To judge them, the evaluator should analyze them as a whole from a number of perspectives using a variety of measures and criteria.

They can be analyzed using basic concepts such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, validity of design etc., which have been defined and developed as part of the IOM project development process. The definition of these concepts and their importance may vary according to the practice of an organization. For instance, UNDP groups these notions into three main categories as the substantive focus for an evaluation:

- **Relevance:** is the degree to which the objectives and/or project purposes of a project remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified. The relevance of projects could be analyzed at different levels, for instance

development issues, target groups, the direct beneficiaries, the IOM comparative advantages, the IOM global mandate.

- **Performance:** looks at the progress being made by the project in relation to its overall objectives and/or project purposes. A restrictive assessment of performance could only focus on the delivery and transformation of inputs into outputs without insisting on the effectiveness of the results, which finally limits the scope and usefulness of the evaluation exercise. In order to avoid such a restrictive result, three criteria are commonly used to assess performance: *effectiveness*, which considers the extent to which a project achieves its objectives/project purposes or produces its desired results; *efficiency* which considers how well resources in general are used to undertake activities and achieve objectives; *timeliness* which considers appropriate planning of activities. A final criterion — which has become increasingly important in the assessment of performance and which is a bit different from efficiency — is the *cost-effectiveness* of a project. This mainly considers whether the objectives could be accomplished at a lower cost, or whether the results or benefits justify the cost, and is a primary concern of the donor community.

- **Success:** depends more on the type of project that is being evaluated. For example, in a project dealing with transportation of migrants, success can be easily assessed. However, the analysis of success becomes more complex with projects dealing with the notions of migration and development. Common criteria used are certainly: the *impact*, which can apply to all types of project and which normally considers an activity's contribution to the well-being of the beneficiaries and assesses change brought about; the *sustainability,* which is the durability of projects results, for example, the ability of the project to continue once external support ceases. This criterion is more appropriate for projects with development components or return programmes; the *contribution to capacity building,* which corresponds more to the structure of a technical cooperation type project/objective.

In its project development process, IOM makes reference to four additional notions which can explain 'deviations' in the results: *the validity of design,* which looks at the logic and coherence of the design; the *causality* looks at the factors or events which affected results; the *unanticipated effects* deals with unforeseen positive or negative effects; and *alternative strategies,* which analyze more effective alternative ways to address the problem and achieve objective(s).

While in independent evaluations, any or all of these elements may be examined, the self-evaluation process, which will be examined in later sections, will focus primarily on effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and impact, however, without excluding the other notions.

B. MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN THE PROJECT CYCLE

The definition of 'project' is summarized as follows in the IOM Project Handbook: "A project is a set of defined activities (or sometimes only one activity) designed to achieve specific objectives within a specified timeframe and budget. It usually aims to contribute to a broader national, regional or international development goal (unless it offers a direct migration service or humanitarian assistance). A programme describes a group of common projects". Being part of the project development and implementation process, both monitoring and evaluation will have to be defined during the project design phase. However, there should not be any ambiguity in the way the tools pertaining to monitoring and those to evaluation are presented.

One of the many definitions of monitoring could be: "monitoring is the continuous or periodic review of project implementation by the project manager to assess delivery, identify difficulties, ascertain problem areas and recommend remedial actions."(ILO – a training manual). According to IOM's Project Handbook, monitoring is the continuous oversight of the implementation of an activity; it seeks to ensure that input deliveries, work schedules, targeted results and other required actions are proceeding according to plan. The tools for periodic monitoring that exist within IOM are the work-plan and the progress review or activity reports, which are covered in IOM's project development workshop. The workplan, structured according to project results, assigns each activity a timeframe, organizational responsibility, interim results, personnel requirements, costs of inputs, and assumptions. Periodic reviews assess the quality, quantity, and timeliness of results and activities, the use of resources, management problems and constraints, validity of assumptions, unforeseen events. These reviews may result in adjustments to the workplan and follow-up action.

In contrast to the ongoing nature of monitoring which examines results and activities, evaluation takes place at a point in time, and focuses more on the project's overall objective and purposes. The responsibility for evaluation lies mainly with project management, and to a lesser degree with IOM's global management. To be useful, evaluation must feed back into current project execution and future project planning and formulation.

"An Evaluation Strategy for IOM" defines the evaluation concept as follows: "Evaluation is a tool for management. Evaluation focuses on providing information to all levels of management to facilitate decisions on: ways to improve project management; what projects deserve replication, strategic directions for the Organization etc. Evaluation assesses the effects and impact of project performance, focussing on the analysis of progress made towards the achievement of the project's objectives. Evaluation is a process which attempts to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, effectiveness and impact of activities in light of their objectives. It is thus concerned more with the results of a project or programme than with the inputs or administrative and financial aspects".

According to ILO, the distinctions between monitoring and evaluation can be summarized as follows:

Monitoring	Evaluation
- keeps track of daily activities on a continuous basis	- periodically examines project effect/impact (long-term view)
- accepts policies, rules	- questions pertinence of policies, procedures
- looks at production of outputs	- examines progress towards objective achievement and asks if objectives are appropriate or adequate
- focuses on transformation of inputs into outputs	- focuses on transformation of outputs to objectives
- concentrates on planned project elements	- assesses planned elements and looks for unplanned change, searches for causes, challenges assumptions
- reports on implementation progress	- checks on progress and seeks to identify lessons learned

C. PLANNING THE EVALUATION: THE PROJECT DESIGN PHASE

This section is divided into three sub-sections covering the issues and elements of evaluation when designing a project: the type and budget allocation; timing; and some reference to the other notions, such as indicators of achievement.

C.1 Type of evaluation and budget allocation

The monitoring and evaluation concepts and mechanisms, being part of the project design, need to be fully integrated into the project document, although they are not required for the SPROUT (Summary Project Outline). The primary responsibility for including them lies with the project developer. Depending on the context in which the project is developed, the MRF Head, the Chief of Mission/Head of Office, or MMS at Headquarters, have also to ensure that evaluation and monitoring components are covered by the project document (reference IOM project development procedures).

Being fully part of the project document, the evaluation component also implies a financial provision in the budget. It is necessary at this stage to recall the two main categories (depending on who carries them out) and the three types of evaluation (depending on timing) used by IOM. Apart from the budgetary constraints, the type of evaluation may also reflect the importance given to a project. The two main categories are the **self-evaluation and the independent evaluation**, the latter of which can be sub-divided into **internal** and **external evaluation.**

The **self-evaluation** is certainly the least expensive as it will be prepared and conducted by project management itself. As stated in "An Evaluation Strategy for IOM", IOM needs to institute a system of self-evaluation of **all** projects. One of the main problems with self-evaluation is that, if not well designed, the system could result in favorable evaluations only, to the detriment of all concerned. By keeping the process relatively simple and not too time-consuming, the system of self-evaluation can not only produce, in a relatively cost-effective way, a wealth of useful information on IOM projects but it can also be beneficial in the long term for programme planning. Although the self-evaluation does not imply any consultant fees (either internal or external), the programme manager must ensure that all costs are budgeted for: travel inside or even outside the country; any assessments/surveys to be conducted locally before the evaluation exercise; reporting costs if the evaluation is to be widely distributed; publication of the survey results and questionnaires; illustrated field reports.

Both **internal and external evaluations** are considered to be **independent evaluations**. An evaluation is considered as **internal** when conducted by IOM, but not by people directly involved in project management. The responsibility for internal evaluation lies with the EVA. The average cost for an IOM internal evaluation is USD 5,000-10,000, with the cost — primarily DSA and travel — being shared equally between the project budget and OIG.

An evaluation is considered to be **external** when one or more outside consultants are involved. In most cases, the latter is considerably more expensive in terms of budget. Costs for the consultant(s), including salary, per-diem and travel, costs for surveys/assessment (which may be higher than for a self-evaluation due to the complexity of the exercise) costs for 'internal' travel, including logistics, costs for reporting are to be carefully considered during the design phase of the project. On average, costs for independent external evaluations are estimated to be USD 20,000-50,000. Higher costs are incurred in other international organizations depending on the complexity and scope of the project. **However all evaluations of projects, even those carried out by project staff, need to be explicitly funded in some way.** This means that the inclusion of an evaluation component in the budget needs to be discussed with and accepted by the donor.

"An evaluation strategy for IOM" also identifies a global principle that should be taken into account when deciding which type of evaluation to apply to a given project, i.e. self-evaluation will normally be chosen for all projects of less than USD 1,000,000. For projects over this amount, the internal or external evaluation types should be discussed. However, the application of this rule should not be too rigid. Self-evaluation can be chosen for projects over USD 1 Million when an independent evaluation cannot be funded, as has been the case for the sample in Annex 5. In addition, there is also a need to consider during the design phase whether an internal and external evaluation for projects of less than USD 1 Million might be necessary for other reasons. For new projects or programmes with high visibility it may be advisable to opt for an independent evaluation, either internal or external. The same applies to projects that are politically or operationally sensitive, for instance those with a critical connection to IOM's strategic

goals, and that may require a broader involvement of the Organization as a whole. The donor could also request an independent evaluation for a project of less than USD 1 Million. **Annex II** gives a summary of points to when choosing the most appropriate type of evaluation.

Before discussing evaluation with the donor, it is important to analyze the sensitivity of the project, either from a political or an operational point of view, which might change the approach for evaluation. This sensitivity could be on the part of the donor, the country in which the project is carried out, or IOM. Is there any reason to believe that there would be support for including a (relatively) large amount for evaluation in the budget?

One note – before proposing an <u>internal</u> evaluation, it is necessary to discuss this with EVA, which only has the resources to carry out a limited number of evaluations during the year. Therefore, when developing a project it is important you bear in mind that there is no guarantee that EVA will be able to evaluate it, unless that agreement is confirmed in advance.

In addition, given the higher costs and greater visibility of both types of independent evaluations, the decision to propose an independent one should also be discussed with the MRF, and a consensus reached. EVA can be consulted as necessary.

In preparing for discussions with donors on evaluations and their budgets, some or all of the following steps can be taken to obtain additional information on potential evaluation costs:

- analyze any possible specific interests of the donor, such as whether the project or the country may be an evaluation priority for them, or whether they have a particular global interest in evaluation (donor information provided by DRD may be helpful here);

- explore with other organizations active in the country or sector what their experience has been with donors and evaluation locally;

- if any of those organizations have staff with evaluation experience, evaluations could be discussed with them in a more specific way;

- ask colleagues to refer you to evaluation expertise in the country, with universities being a good potential source;

A final consideration when designing the evaluation component of the project is project size. Normally, the bigger the project, the more the project manager will have to do in preparing an evaluation of any type. For instance, for a project covering several countries, there may be a need to conduct surveys, to check indicators or to collect data in a more complex environment. There could be a need for a short-term consultant/ employee to conduct the survey, but not necessarily the evaluation, which has financial implications. The same applies to an independent evaluation (preparation of the terms of reference, data collection, recruitment of the consultants etc.). Even in the case of a self-

evaluation of a large project to be conducted by the project manager, there might not be enough time to do everything single-handedly.

In summary, internal and external evaluation costs need to be thoroughly analyzed according to the type of project and its importance, and discussed with the donor during the design phase. For an easy reference guide to assist you in the choice of evaluation type, please see **Annex II**.

C.2   Timing of evaluation

Three options for timing need to be considered when designing a project: mid-term; terminal; and ex-post. The **mid-term evaluation** is carried out approximately at the mid-point of the project. Such a decision is usually taken for new projects for IOM, where there is a need to assess progress more closely, for instance in the case of pilot projects, or for projects that are planned for lengthier periods (e.g. four years). The mid-term evaluation, being conducted during the life of the project, will also be important for implementation issues, as well as for adjustments to be made to enable the project to achieve its goals. Even if not planned as such in the project document, a mid-term evaluation can also be decided upon during implementation in the case of major problems in properly implementing a project. It can then be used as a reference for the donor/government/IOM's decision to amend the project. The **terminal evaluation** is carried out at the end, or close to the end, of the project when all the aspects of a project can be considered. The third option is the **ex-post evaluation**, which is done some time after the project ends. It can be envisaged if there is a need to look at the sustainability of the project, in the case of a technical cooperation project with a strong capacity-building component.

Each of the three types of evaluation (self-evaluation, internal, external) can be carried out either as mid-term, terminal or ex-post. Ex-post evaluations will be the least common as by definition they can only happen sometime after the project is completed, and thus raise questions about who will conduct the evaluation and how it will be financed. The timing of the evaluation will depend on factors associated with the project. For example, a project of one year would be evaluated at the 6-month point if it was a very new type of project whose chances of success were uncertain, and where there was a need to have time to make adjustments before its completion. On the other hand, for a one-year project — where IOM has experience and there is no reason to question the eventual success — the evaluation may well be done at the end, which allows for maximum results to be attained and reported to the donor. A project with a two-year duration should normally be evaluated at both the mid-point and at the end, and those with longer duration could be evaluated more frequently. **Annex II** could also be a reference here.

C.3 Other considerations during the project design phase

Carrying out an evaluation often entails making overall objective observations about an activity as well as identifying problems and their causes so that they can be corrected and avoided in the future. The evaluator will have to analyze the project as a whole from a number of perspectives using a variety of measures and criteria. When designing a project, the basic measures or criteria to be clearly stated in the project document are the indicators and their means of verification. **The concept of indicators forms part of the IOM project development guidelines and procedures,** and are useful in both the monitoring and the evaluation of the project. Some basic notions will be reviewed in this document, as indicators will be a major reference during an evaluation exercise, whatever the type of evaluation.

Two questions could be asked when selecting indicators: what evidence, measures or indications will demonstrate that the project's objectives/purposes will be or have been achieved? What are the observable facts that will provide evidence of progress toward the overall objective? The indicators will demonstrate that the overall objectives and project purposes are on the way to being or have been met. They are tools to measure progress and define the objectives/project purposes more precisely and the desired impact. They will help to render more objective subjective notions such as 'improved', 'reinforced', 'made viable', 'comprehensive', 'enhanced', etc., which are commonly used when speaking of the objectives and project purposes.

Most projects aim to bring about changes in quality as well as changes in quantity. It is true that qualitative changes can be more difficult to measure, and even appear 'non-quantifiable', but suitable indicators can nevertheless usually be found. It is also evident that several indicators reflecting the different facets of change are better than one and are sometimes necessary.

The selection of objectively verifiable indicators is at least as difficult as the analysis of data collected through the indicators. Several factors need to be kept in mind when selecting them. They should be:

- Specific: in terms of magnitude and time. Terms such as 'an increased number' are of little value since it does not specify what sort of increase is called for.

- Measurable: in order to specify the change resulting from the implementation of the objective or project purposes and the way to tell whether it has been reached.

- Attainable: the sources of information on indicators should be reliable and accessible. The indicators should therefore refer to facts and not to subjective impressions or interpretation.

- Relevant: the indicators should reflect or measure the effect of the project rather than the effect of external factors.

- Trackable: the indicators should draw upon data that are readily available or that will be collected as part of the project management.

- Independent: each objective and project purpose should have its own set of indicators and, normally, the same indicator should not be used for more than one objective.

Once the indicators have been selected and the data source identified, the following aspects should be examined in order to verify the validity of the selection:

- the indicators selected are such that, if fulfilled, progress will have been made towards the achievement of the objective/project purpose;

- the indicators are objectively verifiable and specific in terms of target groups, quality/quantity, and time;

- the means of verification are identified;

- the indicators are not restatements of the results.

Developing good indicators in the project development phase will make the eventual evaluation a much more straightforward exercise. A lack of indicators in the project document will result in the evaluator having to develop indicators which, if an independent evaluator is involved, can be dangerous for the project. Indicators make the project's overall objective and purposes more concrete and objective. Allowing someone external to the project to do this may result in indicators which do not, in the eyes of project management, accurately reflect the project's objective. Even in the case of a self-evaluation carried out by project management, developing indicators at the time of the evaluation unnecessarily complicates the evaluation and leaves project management open to the charge that indicators were chosen on the basis of what the project was actually doing, not what it set out to do.

To assist project developers (and project managers, when necessary) in developing indicators, MMS and EVA are looking at indicators that have been used in various IOM projects. Unfortunately, as indicators have only been rarely used in IOM, the list attached as **Annex VI** is currently quite short. It will be added to and updated periodically. Please note that those indicators listed in **Annex VI** should be taken as examples, not as models.

D. PREPARING FOR AN EVALUATION

Adequate preparation is crucial to a successful evaluation. Before starting the evaluation exercise, a few key questions should be answered to place the evaluation in its overall context:

- What does the project say about evaluation, indicators and budget?

- What type of evaluation will be used? (for reference see Section C. Three main types: self, internal and external evaluations)

- Why is the evaluation being undertaken? (Even if, for all projects, the self-evaluation, at least, is automatically part of the project document, the answer to this question should not be limited to a "because we have to evaluate the project").

- What issues should the evaluation address?

- What products are expected from the evaluation exercise?

- Who is responsible for organizing and managing the evaluation?

- How much time will the evaluation require?

- Who are the stakeholders and the donor(s), and what is their interest in evaluation? Even if it is not imperative to invite the stakeholders or the donor(s) to participate in the evaluation — especially in the case of a self-evaluation — key stakeholders or donor(s) could be involved in the preparatory phase, so that their views and interests could also be reflected. However, in that case, evaluation results will certainly have to be shared with them, with all the implications of such a decision (see also Section G).

This set of questions could also be analyzed through the following notions: the **objectives** of the evaluation will tend to examine the reasons why the evaluation is undertaken and what the evaluation intends to accomplish. The **scope** of the evaluation could be described in terms of: the type of project that will be evaluated, the geographic coverage of the project and the time frame. The **issues** to be addressed by the evaluation are basically: the degree to which the objectives of a programme or project are valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified (relevance); the progress that is being made by the project relative to its objectives (effectiveness, efficiency); and the impact of the project. The **products** expected from the evaluation may include particular strategies or recommendations on some specific areas, and certainly a report. The **methodology** might include an analysis of a documentation review, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or other participatory techniques and the global gathering and analysis of data. **The party responsible** for conducting the evaluation needs to be identified, even if in the case of self-evaluation the responsibility lies with the project manager. A last question to be examined is the **implementation arrangement,** including a realistic timeframe and logistical arrangements.

E. MANAGING AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

The number of independent evaluations carried out in IOM in any given year will be limited. Internal evaluations will be limited due to the small size of EVA, and external evaluations because of their cost. Thus this section on independent guidelines is short, as it is expected that there will be a heavier reliance on EVA for this type of evaluation.

Should the project call for an independent evaluation, the next steps to be taken, after considering the elements in the previous section, are related to identifying someone to carry out the evaluation.

In the case of an internal evaluation, that is one carried out by EVA, contact should be made with EVA to initiate discussions on the Terms of Reference (TORs), which will include all elements to be covered by the evaluation, including purposes, outputs, timing, budget, etc. The TORs are crucial to focusing the evaluation on those points that will constitute the most important elements. This step is necessary because it is almost certain that there will not be enough time or money to cover absolutely all project elements in an evaluation.

If the project document calls for an external evaluation, then, in addition to developing the Terms of Reference, there will be a need to identify an expert to carry out the evaluation. It is recommended that the Terms of Reference be prepared before identifying an expert, as the type of evaluation being defined in the TORs will guide the choice of the expert (or experts). For example, if you foresee that a survey will be a major focus of the evaluation, it would be necessary to identify someone who is experienced in this facet of evaluation. As the evaluation is being funded by a donor as part of the project, it is recommended to include the donor representative in the discussion on TORs, as well as community representatives, if this is an important part of the project. As the number of external evaluations is limited during any one year, we suggest you contact EVA for assistance in drawing up TORs.

Once the TORs are drafted (for finalization when the expert is identified), then the search for the expert can begin. Local sources should be checked, e.g., donors, international and other organizations, universities, etc. EVA can also be consulted for possible expertise. It is usually a good idea to talk with a number of possible evaluators, basing discussions on the draft TORs. After a choice is made, the TORs have to be finalized and a contract signed (a standard consultant's contract is available in the PAT (PAT/PAT (Public) General Information/II Experts/(Consultants).

F. CONDUCTING AN EVALUATION: SELF-EVALUATION GUIDELINES

This section is more specifically related to the self-evaluation, and will provide you with the information necessary to conduct this type of evaluation.

F.1 General steps in the self-evaluation process

1)   Once you have determined from looking at the project documents that a self-evaluation is what is required, you should review your responses to the questions in Part D "Preparing for an Evaluation". Are any of these still unanswered?

Particular emphasis needs to be placed on the issue of what you as the project manager hope to accomplish with the evaluation. Generally speaking, if the only answer you can come up with is that it is required in the project document, it is likely that the result will reflect that thinking. Now is the time to think how an evaluation can benefit the project, the project manager, colleagues working on similar projects in other areas, and IOM as a whole. Ask yourself what it is that you would want to know about this project if you were considering developing a similar one elsewhere. Is it accomplishing what it was set up to do or not? What were the problems? What would I do differently?

2)   All the relevant data available on the project needs to be collected. This data will be found in the project document itself, the progress reports, data from project monitoring, correspondence with external partners, etc. It is strongly recommended that a record be kept of all resources used in the evaluation, in case you receive detailed inquiries at a later stage.

3)   Compare the data that you have with the requirements of the matrices (**Annex I**), starting with the most concrete elements first. Fill out a draft of the matrices with the data you have available, noting those areas where you will need to get more information, either by further research in project documentation, or through specific activities. Generally speaking, the information required to complete matrix 1 should be available from internal documents. If not, this may be a signal of some gaps in the project's data collection activities.

4)   Look now at the overall evaluation concerns (relevance, impact, etc.) Looking at the definitions and the various questions that you might ask about those elements **(Annex IV),** decide whether you have collected enough objective information to complete the matrices and to assess how the project is doing at addressing them. For example, to demonstrate the relevance of the project to the situation in the country are there reports on file that show government counterparts and donor representatives expressing support by concrete actions? (This would refer more to active participation in meetings rather than general expressions of support at a cocktail party.)

5)	For those elements where insufficient concrete information exists to allow you to make an assessment, decide what would be a reasonable way of acquiring more information. In an evaluation it is generally a good idea to get information from sources exterior to the project. For example, asking questions about the project from persons who have some knowledge of the project, but who have no stake in its outcome, would be ideal. Care should be taken to talk to a number of persons, rather than just one or two, so as to avoid any hidden biases. Developing a list of standard questions that are asked of all interviewees will help allow you to draw conclusions.

6)	It may be that you decide as well to undertake other kinds of evaluation activities, such as focus groups or surveys. As such activities may require some specialized skills, such as leading focus groups and drawing conclusions from them in an organized way, consultants may have to be sought locally for some assistance, or staff trained to handle these. Such costs would have to be borne by the project budget. For further information on the activities mentioned in some of the steps, you may wish to ask EVA or consult some of the references mentioned in **Annex VII.** Some of these references are websites that can be accessed through the Internet, and some are publications that can be borrowed from EVA.

7)	When you have gathered sufficient information that allows you to assess the elements of the project that are the focus of the evaluation, complete that matrix even if the information has to be somewhat abbreviated.

8)	Write the report, as described below, and distribute as per guidelines in Section G.

F.2 The self-evaluation report

Every programme manager certainly agrees that the more simple and practical the evaluation reporting system, the more efficient the self-evaluation process. This is the reason why the core of the self-evaluation has been placed in two matrices. Only some additional considerations will have to be written up as the narrative part of the report, as mentioned below.

The evaluation, and thus the report, should reflect the evaluator's assessment of the situation of the project based on pertinent and as concrete information as possible, and not simply give project management's opinions. Precise information, either quantitative or qualitative, gives the reader the possibility to better understand and accept the validity of the more general statements that will need to be made in the evaluation report. To say in a report that "migration management remains a key priority for the government" should be a summary that clearly comes logically from factual elements contained in the matrices, and not a statement that could appear as unsupported opinion only.

Information gathered for the self-evaluation can also be used for other reports, for instance donor reporting. In addition, if the self-evaluation report format required here for

internal use is considered to be too brief to be useful externally, the same information and analysis can be used as the basis for a more detailed evaluation report, in which additional information and explanations can be added. This is the choice of project management.

The narrative part of the report will certainly be prepared after completion of the matrices, even if it is presented before them. However, the sections below should not repeat in detail what has been already stated in the matrices and should not exceed four pages. The narrative part should be used to:

- elaborate on specific issues underlined in the matrices;
- provide the readers with a context which may help to better understand the content of the matrices;

- present the outputs of the matrices in a more sequential and general way; or

- bring out things that are important but not found in the matrices, e.g. political considerations which may be weighed against other elements.

An example of a self-evaluation is attached as **Annex V**.

As a final remark to this section, we would like to remind the programme manager/evaluator preparing the report that the reader does not necessarily have much knowledge about the project or programme being evaluated. It is therefore of particular concern that the report is clear for all readers, who should end up having a useful understanding of the project based on what you have written.

1. EVALUATION RATIONALE: This section should summarize purpose of the evaluation, as well as the key issues to be addressed by the evaluation.

2. THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT: the section should **briefly** provide the reader with the following information, much of which may be available in the project document:

- The context in which the project has been developed, starting with a brief description of the institutional, social, political and economic contexts, as well as any pertinent considerations on gender issues. A brief description of the stakeholders is also recommended, as well as any complementary activities or projects, either implemented by IOM or by another agent.

- The problems that the project seeks to address, and its duration. The project document itself, mainly through the overall objective and project purposes, should provide the information about those problems. The overall objective and project purposes as presented in the project document can be listed under this heading too.

- The strategy of the project, the linkages among objectives, activities and expected results. Considerations can be brought on the indicators to be used and on the implementation and management arrangements. The latter can include information on IOM partners, usually the Government, the donor, international agencies and the NGOs associated, as well as on external partners who played a more indirect role in the project (we can suppose for instance regular contact with some ILO projects/programmes when implementing micro-credit activities).

- Finally, the comparative advantages of IOM for the execution of the project can be recalled under this sub-section.

3. MAJOR EVALUATION FINDINGS AND POTENTIAL SUCCESS: this section should highlight those items from the matrices that are particularly noteworthy, or that may require further explanation, e.g.:

- the contribution of the project to meeting the needs of the target population. If other groups not mentioned as target population benefited from the project, they should be mentioned under this heading;

- any impact of the project beyond the beneficiaries, i.e. economic, social, political impact;

- factors that affected the implementation of the project, for instance at the level of government commitment or participation of the stakeholders;

- any indications of eventual success.

4. LESSONS LEARNED (IF ANY): what are the main lessons that can be drawn from the project experience that are applicable beyond this particular project?

According to ILO, lessons learned can be distinguished from other kinds of summing statements as follows:

- a finding is a 'factual statement' (such as "35 migrants returned");
- a conclusion is a 'synthesis' of 'factual statements' corresponding to a 'specific circumstance' ("the project failed to attain its target of 50 returns");
- a recommendation is a 'prescription' on what should be done in a 'specific circumstance' (for example, "in order to increase the return rate the service fee should be reduced"),
- a lesson learned is a generalization which does not refer to a specific circumstance but to a 'type' of situation ("in a project where the main service offered is access to low fares, close attention must be paid to fares available on the open market")

Another example of a lesson learned is: "While the overriding goal may be support of a political process, inevitably the foundations will be built on the proper management of human and/or material resources. To ensure the latter, appropriately qualified and experienced management and technical personnel must be recruited throughout all stages and areas of the effort to handle this administration effectively. Without effective management to guide the operation, the democratic process goals will suffer." (IOM/OTI: CGP evaluation - Haiti).

A clear differentiation needs to be made under this heading between recommendations and lessons learned. In effect the recommendations can be easily read under the matrices. If appropriate and of major importance, they can be recalled under this section, but they need to be worded in the same way than in the matrices, otherwise there is a risk of confusion.

5. MATRICES: as mentioned previously, the self-evaluation exercise is not intended to be a truly in-depth evaluation of the project, even if information and data collected could be used for such a purpose. For this reason, the information contained in the matrices should be summarized, with the need for details to support overall statements balanced against the need for brevity.

The matrices will list any recommendations made, followed by the person or office responsible for follow-up. It is certainly expected that recommendations of a self-evaluation will be directed towards improvement of the project/programme. However, if recommendations are more general and also concern a Department at Headquarters or an MRF, a proposal should be made after the recommendation on the responsibilities for follow up. Additional directives on this issue are mentioned under chapter H below.

Matrix 1: Effectiveness of the project – analysis through project results and indicators: this matrix is based on observable facts, looking at the indicators and results for the overall objective and for each project purposes and their deviation versus planned results or indicators, if any. List any recommendations that can be drawn about project effectiveness.

Matrix 2: Other evaluation concerns – general analysis and recommendations. The matrix should give an analysis of the relevance, impact and efficiency on the one hand and the validity of design, causality, unanticipated effects and sustainability of the project on the other. Concerning this second group, it is separated from the first as some of these concerns do not apply to all projects. For both groups, if some remarks are specific to one project purpose, it should be mentioned as such in order to avoid confusion. In addition, if the evaluator feels the need to separate the comments according to the overall objective and project purposes, he can do so. Finally, confusion should be avoided between effectiveness (Matrix 1) and efficiency (Matrix 2). Efficiency will look at the costs of the project to reach results. Any financial consideration should be reported under this concern. Further references to these concepts can be found elsewhere in the report, and in **Annex IV**.

G. DISTRIBUTION POLICY AND DONOR REPORTING

Until now, IOM's evaluation reports have been distributed internally and to the project donor(s). As IOM becomes more active in evaluation, and governments pay more attention to it, there is likely to be more interest in seeing evaluation reports. However, self-evaluations will continue to be considered part of the management of the project, and their external distribution will be kept basically within the sphere of the project. They will also be made widely available within IOM, but as internal documents only.

Based on those considerations, the following is the distribution policy for self-evaluation reports, taking consideration that EVA needs to be copied on all self-evaluation reports:

Self-evaluation reports, being internal to the project, are intended for project management, who can share them **locally** with interested parties, e.g., government, donor representatives, etc. A decision on local external distribution should be made by the project manager, in agreement with the head of the mission and/or the MRF. EVA can assist if there is any need to review the evaluation report for technical coherence.

Internally, self-evaluation reports, including lessons learned and recommendations, will be put on the PAT and will thus be available to all of IOM (to the extent that the PAT is not operative, these will be shared by e-mail, fax, etc. upon request, or systematically if considered to be of more general interest).

Self-evaluations will not normally be shared externally by IOM offices other than the one which produced it. Should another office identify a particular need to share a self-evaluation report externally, and this is considered to be in IOM's overall interest, authorization should be sought from the project manager, who should obtain the agreement of the Chief of Mission and/or MRF and guidance from EVA before agreeing .

Local distribution of reports resulting from independent evaluations of projects and programmes will be the same as for self-evaluations. However, it is perhaps more likely that the donor will insist on having a copy of an independent evaluation and that more discussion will be necessary with those to whom it is distributed. The content and presentation of independent evaluations are less under the control of the project management than those of self-evaluations, which is precisely the reason they may be of more interest to the donor and other stakeholders. Global distribution will be handled in the same way, except that what will be distributed will not be the full report, which can be lengthy, but rather the Executive Summary or similar section of the overall report. Independent evaluations will be made available to Member States upon request.

One final note: It is important to consider the donor reporting requirements foreseen in the project document. The results of an evaluation can form useful input to donor reporting, even if the evaluation itself is not distributed. It is possible for the

project manager to adjust the timing of the evaluation so as to incorporate its results in the donor report. The Donor Relations Division (DRD) can also provide you with guidance on this subject.

H. MAXIMIZING THE BENEFITS OF EVALUATION

As mentioned in the introduction, evaluation can unfortunately be sometimes perceived negatively as a reprimanding or threatening exercise. It should rather be seen as a positive element for improvement of the work carried out by the Organization. Among other things, evaluation can help to:

- develop management capacities,

- improve the design and implementation of projects, programmes, services and even policy,

- analyze choices available for different initiatives, leading to selection of the most appropriate,

- learn lessons for future project, programmes, services and policy planning,

- bring new elements for decision and policy making processes,

- highlight needs in the field of training or research,

- advocate support for a project/programme and for fundraising.

It is important to implement mechanisms to maximize the benefits of an evaluation. Different levels of follow-up will be required, mainly based on the nature of the recommendations.

It is possible to differentiate among recommendations based on where responsibility for follow-up lies. Some recommendations are limited to specific action to be taken by the field mission/project manager in order to improve the performance of the project. In these cases, the project manager has the responsibility for follow-up on the recommendations, either to implement them or indicate why they could not, or should not, be implemented. Other recommendations may be specific to the project evaluated, but may call for action which are beyond the authority of the project manager, e.g., action may have to be taken at different levels, or in some instances the responsibility for implementation could be shared. Other recommendations may be of a more general nature — similar to lessons learned — that arise in the evaluation of a project, but where the follow-up actions lead to a revision/implementation of a more global initiative or policy. In this case, the responsibility lies more with Headquarters Departments/Units concerned or with the MRF, or with the IOM Mission.

1) In the case of **a self-evaluation**, the decision as to who has the responsibility for follow-up on the recommendations lies with the Project Manager. In most instances the actual responsibility will also be with the Project Manager, or with someone reporting to that person.   The responsibility is either to implement the recommendation, or to report why implementation could not or should not take place. This corrective action would normally be reflected in subsequent activity reports, and thus the Project Manager's supervisor will be able to ascertain whether recommendations have been followed up. Should there be recommendations in the report that are beyond the project management's sphere of responsibility, the Project Manager will need to refer those recommendations to the most appropriate office or Headquarters Department and monitor follow-up.

2) In the case of **an internal evaluation**, the IOM evaluator will be responsible for making suggestions as to responsibility for follow-up. Once the evaluation report has been coordinated with the Project Manager or the Department concerned, it is sent to DGO for clearance. Attached to the transmittal memorandum, the evaluator will prepare a plan listing the recommendations and the follow-up responsibilities, including timing on reporting. If the report is cleared, DGO will ask the parties responsible for follow-up to keep him informed of progress within the prescribed timeframe. EVA will provide technical advice to DGO as required.

3) In the case of **an external evaluation,** which has not been very common within IOM, follow-up may be more complex. It is not so likely that persons external to IOM will be able to recommend specific responsibility for follow-up, so that task will normally lie with the Project Manager. It will generally be up to the Project Manager to respond to the evaluation, which would include a decision on who is responsible for follow-up of individual recommendations. The Project Manager's response to the evaluation report, including assignment of follow-up, should be copied to EVA.

In conclusion, it is important to mention again that as evaluation is being implemented for improvement of the work of the Organization, follow-up on recommendations will likely require a team effort, as the recommendations could cover all levels of the Organization.

I. YEARLY EVALUATION PLANNING

As evaluation will be included in all projects developed and implemented according to IOM's project development process, it will be useful to put in place a system which will help Departments, MRFs and Missions to share information on the evaluations conducted during a calendar year. Information-sharing can be done through the preparation of indicative plans of the evaluations to be conducted in a given sub-region in a given period. It will first help the Mission (or more specifically the

programme manager) to receive information on the planning of an evaluation (particularly in the case of independent evaluations), and the MRFs to know which evaluations will be carried out in their respective region during the year.

The primary responsibility for sending basic information lies with IOM Missions (or programme managers) within the sub-region. The information should be then put together by the MRF and forwarded to EVA and MMS. A yearly plan could be prepared in each MRF to facilitate management of the information. This plan is however a flexible tool and an evaluation which does not appear in the yearly plan can certainly be included if important for the project. As each MRF and Field Mission is requested by EVA to submit their proposals at the end of the year for internal evaluations to be conducted the following year, this yearly plan can include agreed-upon internal independent evaluations.

MATRIX 1 : EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT

Analysis through project results and indicators

A. Overall Objective (from project document)

Planned Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards Indictors of Achievement	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[I]: List any indicators, if applicable	**[I]: List corresponding reality according to verification of indicators**	**Analyze the level of achievement of the overall objective(s) and the capacity to reach target group : summarize to what extent the project produced desired global output through analysis of any deviation from indicators**	**List any recommendations (or corrective action) related to the effectiveness. Propose follow up responsibilities (see also point F2 and chapter H above, as well as Annex 5)**

B. Project Purpose 1 (from project document)

Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards indicators	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
As per project document list all planned results and/or corresponding indicators **[R]:** **[I]:**	**As per observable reality or per verification of indicators** **[R]:** **[I]:**	**Summarize to what extent the project purposes produced the desired results. Comment on deviation versus planned results and/or indicators – positive or negative (explain <u>briefly</u> reasons and consequences if appropriate).**	**List any recommendations (or corrective action) related to the effectiveness. Propose follow up responsibilities (see also point F2 and chapter H above, as well as Annex 5)**

B. Project Purpose 2 (from project document)

Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results amd towards indictors	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[R]: **[I]:**	**[R]:** **[I]:**		**Idem as above**

B. Project Purpose 3 (from project document)

Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards indictors	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[R]: **[I]:**	**[R]:** **[I]:**		**Idem as above**

MATRIX 2 : OTHER EVALUATION CONCERNS

General Analysis and Recommendations

CONCERN (if necessary, please refer to definition in the Evaluation Guidelines)	RECOMMENDATION (if any)
Relevance :	List any recommendations (or corrective action). Propose follow up responsibilities (see also point F2 and chapter H above, as well as Annex 5)
Impact :	Idem as above
Efficiency :	Idem as above
CONCERN (if applicable)	**RECOMMENDATION (if any)**
Validity of design :	Idem as above
Causality :	Idem as above
Unanticipated effects :	Idem as above
Sustainability :	Idem as above

PROJECT DESIGN AND EVALUATION - SUMMARY

The checklist is aimed at facilitating the project developer/project manager/Chief of mission or Head of SRO to analyze and include the evaluation in the project document during the design phase.

TYPE OF EVALUATION	TIMING	TYPE OF PROJECT	BUDGET ANALYSIS
SELF EVALUATION To be conducted by the programme management;	*MID-TERM* During project life	**New/pilot projects; covering 2 years and more; politically/operationally sensitive; major problems in implementation.** *(Global rule: for projects less than USD 1.000.000)*	*Minimal:* **Costs for assessment/surveys travel costs for self-evaluator; reporting costs, if any**
	TERMINAL At the end of the project life	**All types of project; covering 1 year or less (for project over 2 years, a terminal evaluation can be done in addition to a mid-term).** *(Global rule: for projects less than USD 1.000.000)*	**Idem as for self mid-term**
	EX-POST Some time after project ends	**With a strong component of sustainability but difficult to organize as end of project equals end of Programme management.**	**As an exceptional case: add costs for TDY of the Programme Manager**
INTERNAL To be conducted by IOM but somebody external to project; **To be approved by EVA;** To be discussed with SRO and donor (not only for budget purpose).	*MID-TERM* During project life	**New/pilot projects; covering 2 years and more; politically/operationally sensitive; major problems in implementation** *(Global rule: projects over USD 1,000,000).*	**International travel costs; Per-diem; internal travel costs; Deeper assessment/surveys; Reporting costs Average costs USD 5000 to 10000**
	TERMINAL At the end of the project life	**All types; covering 1 year or less (for project over 2 years can think of a self mid-term evaluation and an internal terminal one at the end).** *(Global rule: projects over USD 1.000.000)*	**Idem as for internal mid-term**
	EX-POST Some time after project ends	**Projects with a strong component of sustainability or in the case of capacity building** *(Global rule: projects over USD 1.000.000)*	**Idem as for internal mid-term**

EXTERNAL To be conducted by external Consultants; **To be discussed with SRO/Donor/SRA**	***MID-TERM*** During project life	**The same type of project as for Internal but** **a more independent approach is** **<u>requested by the donor, mainly</u>.**	**Consulting firm or** i**ndependent consultants;** **travel costs; per-diem;** **deeper surveys to support the** **investment of the evaluation.** **Average cost :** **USD 20.000 to 50.000 or more**
	TERMINAL At the end of project life	**T**he **same type as for external mid-term** **(and by deduction as for internal)**	**Same as for external mid-term**
	EX-POST Some time after project ends	**The same type of project than for internal** **ex-post but a more independent approach** **is requested by the donor, mainly**	**Same as for external mid-term**

THE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

The checklist is aimed at providing the person in charge of the evaluation with a list of actions to take and points to consider during the project design phase as well as during the preparatory and implementation phases. All elements are contained in the guideline.

A.   THE PROJECT DESIGN PHASE

When designing the project document, the following elements have to be considered:

➢ *What kind of project: over or under usd 1.000.000; new project; politically/operationally sensitive; long term project; normal.*
➢ *Decision on the type of evaluation : self, internal, external.*
➢ *Decision on the timing of the evaluation: mid-term, terminal, ex-post.*
➢ *Depending on above decision: is there a need to coordinate inside IOM and with whom(SRO, EVA)?*
➢ *Do I need to discuss the decision with the donor? (may not be necessary for self; yes for internal and external). Should pretty much always be discussed with donors first to see if they have any particular needs*

Based on above decision:

➢ *How much could it cost? – Travels; per-diem; consultants; assessment/survey costs; reporting costs.*
➢ *Is the amount to include in the budget realistic and does it contain all possible costs?*
➢ *Check reaction of the donor and amend decision on the type/timing if necessary.*

And on the global project design:

➢ *Are the indicators and means of verifications properly chosen and reported?*
- *specific*
- *independent*
- *factual*
- *valid*
- *based on obtainable data*
➢ *are all elements of evaluation specified in document*
- *type*
- *budget*
- *responsibility to conduct*
- *timing*
- *(others as needed)*

B.   PREPARING AND CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION

Let's remind some basic questions:

➢ *What does the project say about evaluation, indicators and budget?*
➢ *Why is the evaluation being undertaken?*
➢ *What issues will the evaluation address?*
➢ *What products are expected from the evaluation exercise?*
➢ *What is the evaluation's type?*
➢ *Who is responsible for organizing and managing the evaluation?*
➢ *How much time will the evaluation require?*

➢ *Who are the stakeholders and the donor(s)? Even if it is not imperative to invite the stakeholders or the donor(s) to participate to the evaluation, especially in the case of a self-evaluation, key stakeholders or donor(s) could be involved in the preparation phase, so that their view and interests can be also reflected. However, in that case, evaluation's results will certainly have to be shared with them, with all the implications of such a decision.*

Let's start to prepare the evaluation:

➢ *What is the situation at the level of the indicators? let's collect and put together data*
➢ *Is there a need for additional surveys/assessments?*
➢ *What about field visits?*
➢ *Who to question? The target group, the government, the donor? And at the sending or/and receiving country level, if applicable?*
➢ *How to do it? But is it really worth, too- time consuming for the project manager in charge of the self-evaluation?*

C. FINALIZING THE EVALUATION

➢ *Let's put together all the data and reports available.*
➢ *Let's refresh the mind with basic notions such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability.*
➢ *Let's structure the report:*
- *to fill-up first the five matrices*
- *to write "The project and its context" part*
- *to write "A potential success" part*
- *to write the "Lesson learned" part*
- *to write the "Executive summary" part*
- *to prepare the annexes (list of documents, persons interviewed, field visit…*

➢ *Do I have to share the report before finalizing and sending it and with whom?*
➢ *To whom do I have to send it?*
➢ * Does my audience make a difference in how the report is written?*

AND

➢ *Have fun!*

EVA UNIT AT HQS IS READY TO PROVIDE YOU WITH ANY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE YOU MAY NEED DURING THE DIFFERENT STEPS.

SAMPLES OF QUESTIONS YOU SHOULD ASK WHEN CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION

EFFECTIVENESS: to what extent the project produced desired global output and more specifically, to what extent the project purposes produced the desired results:

- Does the project document list all results and indicators that can be used as a reference?
- Is there sufficient information, data or material available to define the achieved results and/or the achieved level of the indicators?
- If a major gap exists between planned results and achieved results (indicators listed and verified data), how can it be interpreted? Is it due to poor project design, or are there other elements which can explain that gap?
- If the global finding is that the project has not been effective in reaching planned results, what are the specific reasons?
- Were the activities sufficiently well defined and implemented in order to reach relevant results? If results were not reached, would other activities have resulted in the results being reached?
- Did the achieved results reach the target group as planned?
- Did the achieved results reach any indirect beneficiaries? Was it planned as such or is it an unexpected consequence?
- What else can be said about the effectiveness of the project? Are the achieved results more numerous than the planned ones?

RELEVANCE: to what extent the project continues to make sense in light of current reality and remains valid and pertinent:

- Does the project document, i.e. overall objective, project purposes, results and activities, correspond to the external reality? In other words are the global context and the problems to be solved still the same (unless the project managed to completely solve them)?
- On what am I basing my assessment of "reality"? How objective is this? What exists to support this assessment, e.g., government documents, media reports, donor mission reporting, UN systems documents, etc.?
- Are there any elements which could lead to the conclusion that the overall objective or (one of) the project purposes have to be dropped, revised, amended or new ones added in order to make the project more in line with the current reality and needs?
- To which extent does it already become evident that additional or complementary activities/projects need to be implemented to make the project evaluated more in line with the level of the problems to be solved?
- Is this project still relevant to the expressed objectives and priorities of IOM? Where are those priorities found?

IMPACT: how activities of the project contributed to a change in a situation, positive or negative, that the project was expected to bring:

- Is the project document sufficiently well designed to understand which impact was expected from the project?
- Are there sufficient observable elements and/or data which could lead to any conclusion about the impact of the project? Did the activities of the project show sufficient evidences of leading to a change of the situation due to the implementation of the project?
- Does the impact only concern the target population or do we expect a greater impact, i.e. did another population benefit from the activities of the project?

- **Is there a possibility to draw conclusions, in addition to the impact on the target group, on a global impact at the social level? Political level? Economic level?**
- **Was or were the impact(s) of the project to be considered as positive or negative?**
- **Were there any impacts that were not foreseen by the project?**
- **Either positive or negative, does the impact only come from the project activities or from external factors or from both?**
- **As actually measuring a change in the situation may be very difficult, how can you go about this in a way that can be verified? Is there anything in the document itself that would help?**

EFFICIENCY: to what extent do the results justify the costs incurred:

- **Are the project expenditures reports and record sufficiently well prepared and kept to make a global analysis of the costs incurred to reach the results obtained?**
- **Are the project expenditures in line with the agreed upon budget, so we can already suppose that the costs incurred are coherent with the strategy of the project?**
- **Did the funds expended give the possibility to reach at least the expected results of the project?**
- **Were those costs appropriate to the results achieved? Were there other "lower costs" solutions to reach the same results?**
- **Are there additional results which were not expected but have been achieved without additional costs? If additional costs were charged to reach those results, was the investment level appropriate and useful?**
- **If the conclusion is that costs were not justified, which ones were too high, staff costs, office costs, operational costs? Was there another way to reach the results at a lower cost, or was the investment simply not worth for the achieved results?**

VALIDITY OF DESIGN: to what extent the project is properly designed taking into account the economic, social, political and developmental context of the project and the problems to be solved:

- **Is the project document designed according to IOM project handbooks, including relevant information on monitoring, indicators, budget…?**
- **Did the document contain sufficient information about the evaluation?**
- **Are the problems clearly stated or, in other words, do the overall objectives, project purposes and activities properly address the problems to be solved?**
- **Do the expected results mentioned in the project document cover the project purposes or in other words does the project document list all results which should be the reference for the achievement of the project purposes?**
- **Was the context of the project sufficiently developed in order to avoid confusions? For instance, does the project make reference to complementary activities/projects which, if not mentioned, could lead to the conclusion that the global design was not properly apprehended?**
- **Is there any major incoherence in the logical development of the project?**
- **Have the elements of gender mainstreaming been taken into account?**

UNANTICIPATED EFFECTS: any unforeseen effects, positive or negative, that resulted from the project:

- **Is it possible to observe a result or an effect, positive or negative, which has been indirectly and unpredictably "created" by the project?**

- **Are these effects complementary to other results or are they completely independent? Did these unanticipated effects affect (positively or negatively) other results of the project?**
- **If negative, is it possible to correct them in order to avoid such an effect?**
- **If positive, is it possible to build other project activities on these effects which can benefit the project and for which a revision of the strategy is needed?**

SUSTAINABILITY: to what extent the projct activities continue after external support is no longer available, or to what extent the project continues functioning without external financial support:

- **Do the overall objective and project purposes contain an element of sustainability, especially in the case of capacity building or technical cooperation projects?**
- **Are the results obtained sufficient to draw any conclusion on the sustainability before the actual end of the project? Or in other words are some activities of the project already on-going without anymore support from the project? Are there appropriate indicators and means of verification in place in order to demonstrate this?**
- **What should be done in order to guarantee the sustainability of the project if necessary (or planned)? Is there a way to keep the benefits of the project on a longer-term basis?**

CAUSALITY: to what extent some factors or events affected the results of the project:

- **Are there any external events or factors which strongly affected the results obtained versus the results planned?**
- **Are there evidences that the event or factor reported really affected the results or are there some other factors internal to the project which also play a role in this deviation?**
- **Was there or is there a possibility to adjust the project in order to reach the overall objective, in spite of the external factors?**

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING AND ASSISTANCE TO REPATRIATES AND INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

SELF EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT
December 1998

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI

IOM International Organization for Migration

1. EVALUATION RATIONALE

This is an evaluation of the project **"Institutional capacity building and assistance to repatriates and internally displaced persons" funded by the Office of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) of the American Government for an amount of USD 1,4 millions.** The project officially started in October 1996 for a 12-months initial period. A first 3-month extension of the programme was possible from October 1997 to November 1997 following a restructuring of expenses. In May 1998, another 12-month extension was approved by PRM with an additional instalment of USD 300,000, renewable within 6 months upon evaluation of progress achieved.

This project is a combination of two of the four initial components of the IOM Migration Management Programme in Haiti (MMP) approved by the Haitian Government in September 1996 (capacity building, direct humanitarian assistance, longer term reintegration, information). A second project entitled "Assistance to repatriates and displaced persons" covering the third component has been funded by UNDP for an amount of USD 565,000. Both components have been highly complementary, particularly for the reinforcement of the migration management capacities of the Government and of the reintegration of repatriates. The evaluation will not consider the component financed by UNDP.

This exercise is aimed at evaluating the degree of project completion compared to the global objective and project purposes, at gathering reliable information enabling a realistic appreciation of the achieved results and at making due recommendations in case of a further extension or of a definition of complementary activities.

2. THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT

For many years, Haiti has been confronted with major social, political and economic problems that constitute a serious handicap to its development. During the period between the military Coup d'état of September 1991 and President Aristide's return in October 1994, these problems increased significantly forcing about 300,000 Haitians to move within the country as well as to other countries in the region. The situation improved with the return to the constitutional regime in October 1994, and consequently the migration flows decreased. At the same time, the countries of reception have taken measures to organize the return of Haitians but, in many cases, through forced repatriation.

The management of mass arrivals of migrants, mainly from neighboring Caribbean countries — many of whom had lost all their belongings — gradually became a serious factor of political, social and economic unrest. In order to find solutions to this problem, the National Office of Migration (NOM) was created by the Haitian Government in March 1995 to manage all questions related to migration and facilitate the returnees' smooth reintegration into Haitian society. International assistance was sought in order to help NOM to accomplish its mission. In this respect, the project purposes of

this component have been defined as follows:

1. Assist NOM in the elaboration of a national migration policy, and corresponding legislation and procedures, in line with national development priorities
2. Enhance NOM's expertise and administrative resources in order to carry out the administrative and operational management of migration, both internally and internationally, and to increase NOM's organizational capacity.
3. Set up modern information systems, especially at NOM level, for collecting, analyzing and storing data on migration.
4. Implement, if possible, operational modalities in agreement with the authorities of host countries in order to facilitate an orderly return and reintegration of repatriates.

3. MAJOR EVALUATION FINDINGS

Globally, the evaluation shows that the project objectives and purposes have been achieved satisfactorily (implementation of NOM structures, staff training, elaboration of a draft paper on the national policy for migration and the corresponding legislation and procedures, repatriation management, a database on migratory movements at NOM Central Office). However, not all the anticipated results have been achieved as expected and some benefits are still tenuous. Due to progress achieved during this phase, further assistance would be justified in order to consolidate NOM's structure and achieve some important initiatives (finalization of the national policy on migration, staff training, database on migratory movements). Additional activities should concentrate not only on a more specific reintegration programme for target groups, but also on a reinforcement of social and economical integration and absorption capacities of the migrants' community of origin (or of resettlement). It will also be possible to raise awareness on migration problems in the communities most affected by the irregular migration phenomenon, and contribute, through economical community activities, to fighting against the root causes of migration. Likewise, further assistance to NOM to improve its collaborative relations with migrants' host countries would permit a better management of repatriation movements and, therefore, diminish its negative effects.

Migration in Haiti is a quasi permanent phenomenon which has increased during the recent years because of the persistence of the political and economic crisis (aside of the movements registered during the Coup d'état). Measures implemented to solve the problem will be successful if the structures in place continue to play their role and if the reintegration assistance to target groups becomes part of the different national development programme.

The strategy: the global strategy, as well as the objective and project purposes, have been properly defined. However, a duration longer than the 12 months initially foreseen for their realization would have certainly led to better results. Concerning the implementation arrangements, NOM's responsibility should have focussed more on the administrative management of the programme and the reception assistance to the repatriates, with a more direct intervention of IOM on the reintegration side in

coordination with the national and international partners. This statement is mainly justified by the lack of NOM experience in implementing micro-projects activities (or micro-credits schemes), and of technical background to guarantee regular and adequate monitoring.

Coherence between the objectives, the activities and the expected results: it has not been questioned after 12 months of project activities. However, the level of achieved results was lower than expected due to the financial constraints faced by the Government and the absorption capacity of new knowledge by NOM staff. Political and social instability definitively had a negative impact on Governmental institutions and on implementation of project activities.

The relevance of the project compared to the identified needs of the beneficiaries does not call for particular comment. The services provided to the Government and to the repatriates have been useful and well appreciated. However, the reinforcement of the reintegration component should be stressed, especially in the countryside. Any insufficiency at this level would compromise all the efforts currently undertaken. Repatriates with no real economic motivation to stay home will tend to choose migration again as an economic alternative. Specific attention has been brought to gender issues, either at the capacity building level or for assistance to vulnerable groups, especially women and children.

The indicators: Although some reference to indicators exists, the project document does not provide enough information on indicators and their means of verification. This gap should be corrected if the project is extended.

The main partners:
The Government: the Ministry of Social Affairs, NOM and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have actively participated in the implementation of the project. The Ministry of Internal Affairs also has significantly participated through its immigration services.

The donor(s): as already mentioned, this component of the Migration Management Programme has been funded by the Office of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) of the US Department of State, while the second has been funded by UNDP. Both components have taken advantage of each other and have been executed on a complementary basis. An ongoing reporting system was established with both donors. US Embassy provided constant support during project implementation.

Other partners: repatriates' organizations, Haitian Red Cross, local governmental representatives (especially along the Dominican border), as well as some local NGOs and other communities affected by internal and external migration have played an active role in the implementation of project activities. The ILO contribution in the identification of sub-contractors for implementation of micro-projects should also be noted. The direct assistance on the arrival of repatriates also received substantial support from the US Embassy in Haiti, especially for Haitians rescued offshore by the US Cost Guards.

IOM Turks and Caicos project[1]: for the voluntary repatriation of Haitians from Turks and Caïcos Islands (for which this project contributed with reception and reintegration activities), an active partnership has been established with the authorities of Turks and Caïcos, as well as with the representatives of the Haitian communities.

Relevance to IOM mandate: the project is in line with IOM's mandate and the assistance it can provide to a country. By intervening in Haiti, IOM participated in promoting peace in a post-conflict situation, in reinforcing national capacities for migration management, and in promoting an orderly and humane reintegration of repatriates and displaced people.

4. POTENTIAL SUCCESS

The project can be considered as successful, especially for the following achievements: implementation of institutional mechanisms for longer-term migration management; national staff training activities; reintegration mechanisms for repatriates and displaced persons; acknowledgment of NOM as the national institution in charge of migratory questions; strengthening of NOM structures and active contribution to a reduction of social tensions, and to implementation of the peace process.

Concerning the last point, the project gave the Haitian authorities the possibility to keep the promises made to repatriates after the restoration of democracy in 1994. The migrants encouraged to return home by the Haitian Government finally received some assistance thanks to the mechanism set up by the project. It significantly contributed to reducing the mounting tension, mainly in Port-au-Prince. The assistance given to some provinces also had a positive impact on the beneficiary population, including internally displaced persons.

However, political tensions (among others: absence of a Prime Minister for more than one year; parliamentary, regional and local elections contested) and economical problems (industrial structures abandoned during the Coup d'état, delays in the resumption of economic activities, frequent riots against high cost-of-living) have often interfered with the activities and affected proper implementation. The weakening of the institutions due to this situation also reduced the full participation of the Government.

5 LESSONS LEARNED

1) NOM as a governmental institution, suffered from the negative effects of the political and economic crisis generated by the post-conflict situation. Consequently, during post-conflict interventions in countries highly affected at institutional and economical levels, external assistance should be planned over a longer term in order to fill the gaps. Furthermore, due to the numerous and often unexpected external constraints, a certain flexibility is necessary in achieving the objectives.

---

[1] Assistance for the voluntary repatriation of Haitians from Turks and Caïcos was implemented by IOM in the Turks and Caicos territories and was also partially financed by PRM.

2) Considering the three essential levels of migration management in Haiti (i.e. governance, direct humanitarian assistance, longer term reintegration assistance) their gradual integration into the national development programmes will contribute to a more durable success of the current migration management activities. An integrated approach (as has been the case with the MMP) is still recommended.

<u>Main references:</u>

1) Basic Documentation:

- Journal "Le Moniteur": NOM status
- "Migration Management Programme in Haiti", global programme document
- Project documents of the two projects of the MMP
- Progress and activity reports of both projects
- Final report of the component evaluated
- Database reports on migration flows
- NOM staff training reports
- Training certificates and programmes
- National policy preliminary document
- Legislation on migration

2) Specific interviews conducted:

- NOM National Coordinator and his collaborators.

MATRIX 1 : EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT

Analysis through project results and indicators

A. Overall Objective *: To strengthen the capacity of the Government of Haïti to address migration issues in accordance with national development priorities and to meet its migration needs in a comprehensive, cooperative and ultimately self-reliant way*

Planned Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards Indictors	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[I] The Government has necessary technical and institutional capacities to manage migration in Haïti.	**[I]** – A national structure in charge of migration questions and programmes necessary to provide services to the repatriates exists: the NOM. **[I]** – Meetings on the management of migration are regularly held with concerned parties including other ministries and governmental services.	- Substantial results have been obtained in term of support to the implementation of NOM, but are still fragile. - It is still necessary to better define the direct involvement of other public institutions in migration management .	**1) The NOM staff as well as the staff of the concerned Ministries need to reinforce their experience and knowledge in migration management matters. (IOM PAP)** **2) The organization of meetings on management of migration problems needs to be continued at the Government level. (IOM PAP)**

B. Project Purpose 1*: To assist the NOM in the elaboration of a national migration policy, and corresponding legislation and procedures, in line with national development priorities*

Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards indicators	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[R]: A coherent and updated national migration policy, as well as a set of legislation and procedures that reflect the development needs of the country, are elaborated.	**[R]:** A preliminary document of the national policy on migration has been elaborated and a compilation of the legislation texts has been undertaken.	- National Policy on migration elaborated at 70% - 40% of legislation and procedures revisited.	**1) The document on the national policy needs to be completed especially at the statistical level (IOM PAP).** **2) It is necessary to have a national debate on the document in view of its approval. This will also facilitate a better and institutionalized use of the results of the project (IOM PAP).** **3) It is recommended to look for the services of a consultant at the legislative and procedural level (IOM PAP).**

MATRIX 1 : EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT

Analysis through project results and indicators

B. Project Purpose 2 *: To enhance the NOM expertise and administrative resources in order to carry out the administrative and operational management of migration, both internally and internationally, and to increase NOM organizational capacity.*

Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards indictors	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[R]: NOM staff and staff of other relevant Departments are sufficiently trained to carry out all aspects of the national migration policy management. NOM is assisted in the opening of 5 regional offices. **[I]:** - 100 staff members are trained **[I]:**- Two governmental officers received specialized training on migration. **[I]:**- Five regional offices are opened for NOM .	**[R]:** Workshops have been organized: management of migration, administration, accounting, computer skills, management of micro-projects etc. 5 regional offices have been opened **[I]:** – About 60 persons (60% of the staff) have been trained **[I]:**- Two government officers attended University courses in Buenos Aires on migration management (master degree) and 4 officers attended the one month OAS/IOM course on migration in Buenos Aires. **[I]:**- All the offices have been opened.	1) Training and training of trainers are still insufficient at the financial management level, for computer skills, on migration issues and for micro-projects implementation. 2) A smooth functioning of the offices has been compromised by the weakness of Governmental resources.	**Due to the risk of having the good functioning of the offces compromised by the institutional and economical problems in Haïti and because of the fact that training is not completed yet, it is still necessary to continue the assistance in order to strengthen the new structures and expertise of NOM as a national reference for migration matters. The training programme should be updated (IOM – PAP).**

B. Project Purpose 3: *To set up, especially at NOM level, modern information systems for collecting, analyzing and storing data on migration flows.*

Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards indictors	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[R]: A comprehensive migration database and an information system are operational	**[R]:** A database on migration flows is installed at the NOM central office with appropriate material	- Management of data related to migration is not yet fully operational and coordinated with other ministries or/and statistical services. - Database created is functional only at the central office level. Because of the lack of knowledge in this field, the programme has not been installed in NOM regional offices.	**1) Exploitation of data remains an important element of the analysis of the migratory phenomenon in Haïti. Data entry and processing not being fully under control, assistance and training are still necessary. (IOM – PAP).** **2) Information documents based on the collected data should be provided (IOM – PAP)**

MATRIX 1 : EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT

Analysis through project results and indicators

B. Project purpose 4 : *To implement, if possible, operational modalities in agreement with the authorities of host countries in order to facilitate an orderly return and reintegration of repatriates.*

Results [R] & Indicators of Achievement [I]	Verification of progress towards achieving results and towards indictors	Analysis of Effectiveness	Recommendations
[R]: Practical modalities to facilitate a smooth return and reintegration of migrants are operational. **[R]:** Approximately 500/month beneficiaries are offered assistance to facilitate their return to their community of origin. **(I)** A repatriation programme is planned in advance with host countries	**[R]:** Reception mechanisms for repatriates have been set-up at the main border points with Dominican Republic and in Port-au-Prince for repatriates from other counties (mainly Bahamas and Turks and Caïcos Islands) or those rescued offshore by US Coast Guards. **[R]:** An average of 700 repatriates have been received each month at the reception centers or at NOM offices. **[I]:** Regular contacts are established with concerned Governments or with their representation in Haïti (Dominican Republic, US, Bahamas, Great Britain, France…)	Management of Repatriation remains more complex and difficult at the Dominican Republic border. Due to the large number of repatriates recorded over short periods (20 000 in two months), a lot of repatriates could not take advantage of official reception services Assistance to repatriates in Port-au-Prince did not cause any major problems.	**1) Reception mechanisms and co-operation with local authorities, NGOs or the communities should be reinforced in Haiti, especially at the Dominican Republic border.** **(IOM – PAP)** **2) A real dialogue should be undertaken with the Dominican Authorities in order to elaborate planned repatriation programmes and discuss repatriation policy.** **(IOM – PAP)** **3) Reinforce the awareness of the communities strongly affected by migration on problems of illegal migration and on the repatriation policies of neighboring countries .** **(IOM – PAP)**

MATRIX 2: OTHER EVALUATION CONCERNS

General Analysis and Recommendations

CONCERN (If necessary, please refer to definition in the Evaluation Guidelines)	RECOMMENDATION (if any)
Relevance: - The overall objective of the project still remains relevant to consolidate and increase the technical capacities of the structures in place. - Migration still remains a reality in Haïti and managing the problems it generates requires competence and resources which the Government does not really have yet. - Definition and delimitation of project purposes have been logical and consistent with the Haitian context. However, it has been noted a certain inconsistency between the initial duration of the project – too short (12 mouths)- and its long term goal, also taking into consideration the post-conflictual situation existing in Haïti at the time of the launching of the project.	**The existing political and economic uncertainties in Haïti, as well as their negative impact on the institutions should also be taken into account in the determination of the strategy and the duration of the project, in the distribution of the roles between IOM and NOM, and consequently in the assistance that IOM can provide.** **(IOM – PAP)** **During the elaboration of the programme and because of its international status, it would be appropriate for IOM to approach other Governments concerned by the Haïtian migration in order to examine the possibilities of implementing an organized repatriation system, as it has been the case f.i. with the IOM Turks &Caicos repatriation project (IOM – PAP, SRO San José, SRO Washington).**
Impact : The project purposes have not all had the expected impact, including the assistance to the target groups. However, the project has helped to set up a valid base for a long-term management of migration in Haïti by its support to the creation of NOM, by the promotion of a dialogue and of a better coordination of the efforts to assist target groups and by starting awareness campaigns on the migration problematic in Haïti.	**The project has been designed on an emergency action plan. However, the analysis of interventions at mid and long terms for a better impact should be stressed on. This could avoid difficulties in the realization of some objectives (ex. Reinforcement of the institutional capacities) (IOM PAP; PFS)**
Efficiency : - Globally, results obtained justify the expenses. Resources have been used in the framework of planned objectives and related tasks to accomplish. No misuse or diverted use of funds is registered.Follow up was done with NOM for a proper justification of expenses. - The expenses are justified compared to the actual results, taking into account the needs of the NOM staff in training and for the reinforcement of the capacity to manage migration at national level. The fact that certain results are under the expected level can not lead to the conclusion that use of resources was not efficient. - The engaged funds have also helped to adequately set up the offices and acquire a performing computerized technology for carrying out planned tasks. **-** Finally, financial assistance of the project for supporting the repatriates could be done in a more orderly way if repatriations can be coordinated with host countries.	

CONCERN (IF APPLICABLE)	RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY
Validity of design : **1) _Globally_** : Global approach of migratory phenomenon in Haïti has been well apprehended and remains consistent through the project purposes. Complementary activities through other projects(UNDP/IOM, EU/NOM), have enabled to satisfy the short term objectives of the Government in managing the migration problems. **2) _On project purposes 2 and 3 :_** Although the project purposes in it-self (and the expected results) remain valid, an analysis of possible constraints would permit a more formal organization of the project responses towards NOM. **3) _On project purpose 4 :_** During the project design phase, it should have been appropriate to deepen the analysis of collabration possibilities between the States at this level and propose basic cooperation mechanisms.	**Alternative strategy :** **1) Concentrate all efforts of assistance to NOM on the political and institutional organization of migration management and reinforce interministerial collaboration.** **2) More implication of IOM for a period of time, in the long term reintegration aspect, while waiting for the completion of NOM reinforcement and for a more effective participation of the other governmental agencies. (IOM PAP)**
Causality : **1) _On project purpose 1 :_** Frequent popular riots, institutional problems (absence of a Prime Minister among others), insufficiency of funds compared to the number of repatriates who really need assistance, and pressures by the latter have hindered the full implementation of the objectives of the project. Lack of persuasive documents and/or difficulty to have access to them have also affected the results. **2) _On project purpose 2 :_** Professional inexperience of some employees, due mainly to social and professional disturbances during and after the coup d'état, have increased the needs in training as well as the related expenses. The expected progress could not be fully realized. **3) _On project purpose 3 :_** Lack of experience of the staff in computer skills did not permit the diffusion of the data base at regional offices level. The absence of a standard reference among all governmental services in the field of collecting basic information has not facilitated the collection and analysis of data. **4) _On project purpose 4 :_** The absence of pre-established repatriation programmes made it difficult to organize the reception. Permanent migration flow in Haïti did not facilitate the job either.	**It should be appropriate, whenever possible, to analyze and plan eventual constraints for the full achievement or at least, the revision of the results, especially in the situation faced by Haïti since several years . (IOM PAP)**
Unanticipated effects : It was originally planned to finance only a few NOM employees and have a more active cooperation from other departments. Meanwhile, becauce of the successive budgetary crisis at Government level, it has been decided to concentrate efforts and resources on the NOM capacity building and on its staff in order to have NOM structure in line with its mission and objectives.	

CONCERN (IF APPLICABLE)	RECOMMENDATIONS, IF ANY
Sustainability : **1)** *Globally and project purposes 1 and 2*: The support to the implementation and functioning of NOM has helped the country to create a governmental entity in charge of Migration management. The sustainability will mainly depend on the political willingness and the financial capacity of the Government to sustain this structure **2)** *On project purposes 3 :* Rational handling of the data base created at the central office of NOM is not effective yet. Lack of engagement from NOM in this case will compromise the functioning of this initiative. **3)** *On project purpose 4 :* The assistance mechanisms for rapatriation setup through the project can be functional on a long- term basis if further financial assistance for repatriates is provided.	**1) In order to guarantee the sustainability of the acquired results it is necessary to continue to support NOM in the collect and exploitation of data, especially if we consider the quasi absence of reference in Haïti in the field of statistics. (IOM PAP)** **2) Engage discussions with the Government to define the remaining needs (specially in capacity building) and its political support to NOM on a longer term basis. Eventually, share the approach with the donors community. (IOM – PAP)**

Category/Sub-Category	Project Title/	Time Frame	Indicators	Means of verification
I. Humanit. & Nat. Migration/ I.6 Return Of Migrants & Unsuccessful Asylum Seekers	Proj.Card No. Return and Reinsertion of 100 Turkish Asylum Seekers in Switzerland/ CH5Z001	(beg./end) 1 Feb. 1997 31 Feb. 1997	Applications for voluntary and independent return to Turkey during the twelve months of the project's implementation represent an increase over the preceding twelve months period; At least 70 persons return within the first six months of the project implementation; At least 90 % of the returned cases have received their full reinstallation assistance; At least 70 % of the returnees reside in Turkey one year after their return.	IOM will report every three months the number of applications received, broken down by applying entity, composition of case and points of final destination in Turkey; IOM will report every three months about the number and location of returnees assisted and followed in Turkey; IOM will survey and report the residence of all returnees twelve months after their return.
I. Humanitarian and Nat. Migration/ Other Humanitarian Programmes	Voluntary Return of Stranded Migrants from the Baltics (SMIBAL) FIIZ009	9 months/Oct. 1998-June 1999	100% of migrants confirm their return is voluntary. Pre-departure counselling sessions and surveys reveal that 100% of project beneficiaries return voluntarily and that it has provided 100 % of project beneficiaries with a mechanism for an earlier than anticipated return. 100 % of trained officials are applying new skills and knowledge to their duties on the job. Trained government officials take on increasing project responsibilities over the implementation period of the project Migration Management and in the logistics of direct assistance.	Signed statements by migrants. Reports of pre-departure counselling sessions and survey administered during pre-departure counselling session Survey results Project's Progress Reports
I. Humanitarian and Nat. Migration I.4 Other Humanitarian Programmes	Social Assistance to Reception Centres in Latvia and Lithuania FI1019	12 months/ 1 Oct. 1998 - 1 Sept. 1999	Morbidity due to the reduction of cases of infectious and mental diseases has decreased at a rate estimated at 40% as compared to the current levels. The number of escapes diminished in more than 50% as compared to the present levels.	Reports for physicians /officials of the Foreigner's Registration Centre in Pabrade and Foreigner's Reception Centre in Olaine. Reports of officials of Foreigner's Registration Centre in Pabrade and Foreigner's Reception Centre in Olaine.

Category/Sub-Category	Project Title/	Time Frame	Indicators	Means of verification
			Children's education and development is improved and they are enrolled in social and recreational activities.	Reports on the activities undertaken.
			80% of trained personnel are applying new skills and knowledge on their duties.	Survey results.
			IOM officials, in co-operation with administration of Foreigner's Registration Centre in Pabrade and Foreigner's Reception Centre in Olaine take on increasing project responsibilities over the implementation period of the project and in the logistics of direct assistance.	Project's Progress Reports.
III. Technical Cooperation III.1 Capacity Building	Training and Micro-credits for Returning and Potential Migrants in Egypt EGIZ004	24 months/ 1 Jan. 2000 - 31 Dec. 2001	70%, at least, of the target group trained or re-trained by the project with their skills and work competencies upgraded to meet the skill/needs of the job market. 60%, at least, of the target group employed or self-employed, within 6 months after finishing their respective training and re-training courses including small business training 60%, at least, of the 100 candidates given credit succeeded in establishing their own small-scale businesses and remained self-employed for the minimum of 2 years after receiving the loan. 80%, at least, of the national staff trained on project activities, and familiar with both the database operations, and the training modules formulated by the project.	Project database and target group profiles. Training records and samples of training modules. Feasibility studies and performance reports of small businesses. Minutes of project steering group meetings. Records of training seconded staff on project work.
IV. Other Migration Activities IV.2 Language Training and Cultural Orientation	Discouraging Irregular Migration through vocational training scholarships HTIZ003	40 months / 1 Jan. 199 -	During monitoring visits the IOM/UNESCO team observes that good and services offered locally to private employers and the population have visibly increased and improvement is verbally confirmed by both community leaders and populace alike. At least 80% (or 2.400 young people) of the scholarship recipients will have successfully completed the training course.	Reports on follow-up discussions held with representatives of the private sector and communes. Reports of Vocational Training Centers and master craftspeople on attendance and successful completion of courses.

Category/Sub-Category	Project Title/	Time Frame	Indicators	Means of verification
			Data gathering demonstrates that 75% of graduates are economically active.	Follow-up reports on graduates and reports of the private sector on number of graduates employed.
			At least 75% of graduates stay in their communities or region and are pursuing an economic activity.	Independent record keeping regarding deportation from the Dominican Republic shows a decrease of young irregular migrants from the northeast region of Haiti.
			Data gathering demonstrates that graduates are helping financially their families.	Follow-up reports on graduates and contacts with their families confirm that economically active graduates are supporting financially their families.
			Information provided by school directors during monitoring visits and statements made by graduates confirm that young people have developed a sense of responsibility and self-esteem.	Through a follow-up questionnaire graduates confirm that the efforts made in obtaining the scholarship and successfully completing the training course strengthened their vocational life and self-esteem.
			Community leaders confirm that sharing responsibility and a democratic transparent, objective discussion has become standard procedure for decision making.	Among the 13 communes of the northeast, at least 50% continue to use the decision-making process established by the project after the Community Selection Committee is disbanded.
III. Technical Cooperation III.1 Capacity Building	Technical Cooperation on Migration with Romania RO1Z002	12 months	Reception center fully operational within a 6 months period. Main points for Border control, Aliens & Migration issue offices and Passports offices around the country equipped with high performant computers, connected to the main unit in Bucharest within 12 months 200 officers within the General Directorate capable to directly communicate in one of the three languages at the end of the training courses	
I. Humanit. & Nat. Migration I.4 Other Humanit. Programmes	Return and Reintegration of Afghan Medical Experts (CAP 99)	18 months	75% of returnees fully supporting themselves through professional medical activities at the end of their first year in Afghanistan. Medical professionals have been returned to ten different communities.	

Category/Sub-Category	Project Title/	Time Frame	Indicators	Means of verification
			Qualitative and quantitative improvements in health services provided in communities of return linked to the returnees' professional activities. Precise definitions of what constitute acceptable measurements of improvements will be discussed and agreed to by the steering committee during the first two months of project implementation.	
I. Humanit. & Nat. Migration I.4 Other Humanit. Programmes	Return and Reintegration of Afghan NGO's	18 months	75% of relocated NGO staff remaining in Afghanistan and working with the NGO at the end of the first twelve month period of return. NGOs implementing generally accepted financial management principles and donor reporting practices. NGOs designing projects using logical framework and within the framework of principled common programming. All projects implemented by the NGOs meeting funding agency requirements (source: funding agencies). Three bilateral donors giving second stage consideration to funding one or more of each NGO's rehabilitation or development-oriented projects by the end of the first year of relocation (source: donors).	
I. Humanit. & Nat. Migration I.4 Other Humanit. Programmes	Return of Qualified African Nationals		a) Programme goal The returnees have been absorbed into key sectors of the economy in accordance with the priority manpower needs of the country concerned. · At least 70% of the support groups are still active after 2 years of project activities; · At least l0% of the government counterparts after 2 years of project activities are acquainted with the procedures required for the recruitment and placement of African nationals residing abroad;	a) Programme goal Assessment of the national priority sectors and type of positions for the reintegration of returnees; Sectors and type of positions in which returnees have actually been reintegrated under the programme

Category/Sub-Category	Project Title/	Time Frame	Indicators	Means of verification
			· At least 80% of the assisted returnees are still employed after 2 years of project activities in key areas of the economy in accordance with the available manpower development plans; · 70% of the returnees assisted as self-employed are still operating 2 years after return; · At least 70% of the returnees consider their job commensurate with the training or specialisation received abroad; · At least 70% of the returnees consider that a transfer of knowledge or experience to other persons working in the same procession does take place; · At least 80% of the returnees consider that the return of qualified nationals contribute significantly to the development process of the receiving country.	

LIST OF BASIC PUBLICATIONS AND WEB SITE ADDRESSES

IOM :

- ➢ **"An Evaluation Strategy for IOM"**, June 1998, available under All Public Folders/PAT and IOM Web-page.

- ➢ **"IOM Project Handbook",** August 1996, available under All Public Folders/ PAT.

- ➢ **IOM Project Development procedures (various),** available under All Public Folders/ PAT.

UN Agencies :

- ➢ UNDP, **"Results-oriented, Monitoring and Evaluation - A handbook for Programmeme Managers" ,** 1997, Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning – OESP, UNDP, http://www.undp.org

  UNDP, **"Guidelines for Evaluators – including the project evaluation information sheet",** August 1993, Central Evaluation Office, UNDP

- ➢ UNICEF, **"A UNICEF Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation – Making a difference",** 1990, http://www.unicef.org/reseval

- ➢ ILO, **"Guidelines for the preparation of independent evaluations of ILO programmemes and projects",** May 1997, PROG/EVA, ILO, http://www.ilo.org (Department web site, find under programmeme)

  ILO, **"Design, monitoring and evaluation of technical cooperation programmemes and projects: a training manual",** 1996, PROG/EVAL, ILO, http://www.ilo.org (Department web site, find under programmeme)

  ILO, **"Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues in the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmemes and Projects"**, 1995, PROG/EVAL, ILO, http://www.ilo.org (Department web site, find under programme)

  ILO, **"Guide to the ILO's Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting System (MERS)",** June 1996, PROG/EVAL, ILO, http://www.ilo.org (Department web site, find under programme)

  ILO, **"Guide to the preparation of workplans, progress review and self-evaluation reports for technical cooperation programmemes and projects",** 1994, PROG/EVAL, ILO, http://www.ilo.org (Department web site, find under programme)

  ILO, **"Procedures for the design and evaluation of ILO projects Technical cooperation",** 1981, PROG/EVA, ILO, http://www.ilo.org (Department web site, find under programme)

- ➢ UNHCR, **" Planning and organising useful evaluations",** January 1998, Inspection and evaluation service, UNHCR

Others:

➢ World Bank, **"Designing Project Monitoring and Evaluation ",** Lessons & Practices No 8, June 1996, Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank, http://www.worldbank.org/html/oed/index.html

➢ Canadian International Development Agency – CIDA, **" A practical guide for conducting project evaluations",** January 1985, Programme Evaluation Division, CIDA, http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca

➢ Danish International Development Agency, DANIDA: http://www.ing.olk/danida/danida.html

➢ USAID/CDIE, http://www.info.usaid.gov/pubs/usaid_eval