Report on IOM Development Fund 2018 Ex-post Evaluations

April 2019

IOM Development Fund

2019

Contents

Executive summary

The IOM Development Fund completed a review of all ex-post evaluations carried out on IOM Development Fund projects during the 2018 calendar year. The goal of the review was to collate the key findings from all the evaluations, analyse them, formulate lessons learned, and then provide recommendations. The recommendations are shared with project developers, managers and technical specialists and taken into consideration during funding disbursement decision-making.

This report constitutes a rapid assessment of 22 projects; 9 projects were assessed in 2017.

Key findings

The key findings from the review are as follows:

Relevance
- Project interventions were found to be highly relevant and suited to context.
- Conceptualization of the projects was found to have emanated from identified gaps.
- Most successful projects were found to be fully guided by the needs identified through the establishment of a project stakeholder consultation group in each benefiting country.
- Final project documents were overall well designed and logically constructed according to the *IOM Project Handbook*.
- The cause–effect relationship between the outputs and the outcomes was less strong and some issues were noted in relation to the formulation of results and indicators at the outcome level, which posed challenges for monitoring and evaluation planning in terms of setting a proper foundation for monitoring and reporting.

Effectiveness
- Active involvement of government counterparts in activity planning was found to be the main success factor for projects to deliver results, including the credibility of project products.
- Projects that reached or exceeded their stated outputs and outcomes involved close collaboration with partners and stakeholders.
- Key factors identified as contributing factors for the delay of project results included government-level requirements for special approval of projects, delays in hiring staff and consultants, a lack of implementation tools (standard operating procedures (SOPs), training and visibility material), and limited monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and planning throughout project implementation.
- Projects were found to be highly adaptive to external conditions, which can shift significantly from before implementation and during project implementation.
- Issues were identified with monitoring and reporting.

Efficiency
- Projects were cost-effective and implemented within budget, with established processes to ensure not only the minimization of costs but also the maximization of benefits by leveraging external resources from partners, many times in kind.
- The projects were efficiently managed overall, with national projects having appropriate human and financial resources available for implementation, appropriate and transparent administrative procedures and clear evidence of seeking ongoing feedback from stakeholders to adjust activities to reflect changes in context.
- Regional projects and projects with a remote management site were too ambitious.

- ➤ Monitoring procedures were relatively weak for all projects.
- ➤ Unrealistic time frames were evident for the majority of the projects, and no immediate presence and remote management were identified as issues delaying activities.

Sustainability
- ➤ Overall, it was found that the benefits emanating from the projects continued to be of value to the benefiting Member States and other stakeholders.
- ➤ The projects that had a high level of government partner engagement from their inception proved to be the ones where activities continued after project completion.
- ➤ Limitations to sustainability included a lack of human and financial resources and structural issues within government.

Impact
- ➤ Projects contributed to the development of government capacities, which in turn resulted or could potentially result in the development of policies on migration, informed inclusion of migration issues in any planning and policy formulation, and changes for the better in the livelihoods and well-being of migrants and communities in both their countries of origin and destination.
- ➤ Many of the initiatives were considered "eye openers" to potential improvements in migration management in countries, as well as the original aim of providing start-up funding.

Cross-cutting issues
- ➤ Gender mainstreaming was considered during most project design, however mainly at the request of the IOM Development Fund and rarely initiated by the regional offices during the review.
- ➤ Adherence to a rights-based approach was evident in most projects even if not explicably mentioned in the project documents.
- ➤ Visibility of actions and the donor was found to be mixed.

Key recommendations

Key recommendations from this review for any future project development are as follows:

Relevance
- ➤ Improve cause–effect relationship between the outputs and the outcomes.
- ➤ Improve formulation of results and indicators, at the outcome level, in order to set a proper foundation for monitoring and reporting.
- ➤ Establish a project stakeholder consultation group in each benefiting country proposed for a new project to ensure ownership from day one and its sustainability in the long term.
- ➤ Critically assess the viability of and requirements for regional projects and projects where the management site is remotely located.

Effectiveness
- ➤ Actively involve government counterparts in activity planning, for example, through committees and advisory boards.
- ➤ Identify risks that may cause delays, such as government-level requirements for special approval of projects, delays in hiring staff and consultants, a lack of implementation tools (SOPs, training and visibility material), and limited M&E and planning throughout project implementation.

- ➤ Ensure sharing of products with all stakeholders, in particular the ones involved in their development, and plan well ahead any product distribution and awareness activities.
- ➤ Improve results monitoring and reporting by planning for and tracking the progress of each result, rather than re-stating the activities carried out, and improve activity monitoring by updating the basic workplan from the proposal and converting it into a more detailed workplan with dates and sequencing, adapted as needed in line with contextual changes since initial design.
- ➤ Consider requiring the project team to allocate some project funds to develop necessary monitoring tools and systems in the first quarter of project implementation and build the capacity of staff and partners to use the tools and systems, and hold regular (quarterly) project review meetings with partners to identify and address issues and challenges in a timely manner.

Efficiency
- ➤ Consider larger budgets or complementing other donor funding for regional initiatives or remotely managed projects.
- ➤ Ensure that a monitoring framework is established for each project from the onset.
- ➤ Use less ambitious project time frames and targets to avoid the need for no-cost extensions.
- ➤ Sound assumptions/risk analysis are required at the project development stage.
- ➤ Ensure a realistic time frame for the completion of any planned translation, editing and publication of products.

Sustainability
- ➤ Initiate engagement of high-level government partners from the project design stage and continue on a regular basis – at minimum every two months – during implementation to discuss not only activities but also an exit strategy.
- ➤ Discuss issues related to human and financial resources, structural issues and technical capacity gaps to be addressed from the beginning of the project and as part of the exit strategy.

Impact
- ➤ For regional projects, ensure that there is sufficient funding and time to allow coordination of activities between country partners to prevent the loss of regional elements.

Cross-cutting issues
- ➤ Include a gender analysis and rights-based approach in all project design and ensure that gender and human rights are considered in all activity implementation.
- ➤ Always be proactive in raising the visibility of every activity, output and donor (logo and acknowledgement), through media channels, newsletters, websites, publications and so forth.

Objective

The objective of this review was to examine all of the ex-post evaluations carried out on IOM Development Fund projects during the 2018 calendar year, summarize and analyse the key findings, formulate lessons learned and then provide recommendations to be taken into consideration during funding disbursement decision-making. More specifically, the review of the reports was aimed at collating results in regard to the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues, such as gender and human rights, of the projects implemented. The report will be shared widely with IOM staff developing and implementing projects, as well as those at the regional offices.

Methodology

The methodology for this review consisted of reviewing all of the evaluation reports submitted during 2018 and then extrapolating and analysing the key findings with regard to the five standard Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD-DAC) core evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact – into a qualitative database. Cross-cutting issues, such as the use of a gender and rights-based approach in project development and implementation, were also considered. Lessons learned were summarized in order to then develop recommendations.

In keeping with social science ethics standards and the *IOM Data Protection Manual*, consent was explicitly sought in all interactions during the ex-post evaluations, and all efforts were made to ensure confidentiality of data provided by respondents.

Limitations

It is important to note that this report details a rapid assessment carried out over a 15-day period. The core activity involved reviewing the evaluation reports and final reports of the projects specified.

A total of 22 ex-post evaluations were reviewed compared with evaluations of nine projects in 2017. Although this is a qualitative review, the evaluation criteria assessed during each ex-post evaluation can be considered to provide an accurate evaluation of each project. Some limitations need to be highlighted:

> ➢ Some evaluations did not consider one of the five OECD-DAC core evaluation criteria, such as impact or sustainability, thereby reducing the ability to make comparisons between the different evaluations.
> ➢ The evaluations varied in scope and quality, which resulted in some challenges when trying to extrapolate comparable findings.
> ➢ In some cases, there was limited participation by certain stakeholders in the evaluations.
> ➢ Transferring of government officials made it sometimes difficult to assess the knowledge transfer achieved.
> ➢ In the case of regional projects, evaluators were limited in most cases to visiting one country, thereby creating an imbalance in the amount and quality of information available since surveys and remote interviews do not usually yield the same wealth and nuance of information that a series of in-person interviews provides.

Findings

This section presents the findings organized according to the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, based on the OECD-DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance. The evaluation criteria and the findings are provided.

The findings were analysed by evaluation criteria on a scale from 1 to 5 in which each rating means the following:

Evaluation criteria scaling explanation

Rating	Explanation
5 Excellent (always)	There is evidence of strong contribution and/or contributions exceeding the level expected by the intervention
4 Very good (almost always)	There is evidence of good contribution but with some areas for improvement remaining
3 Good (mostly, with some exceptions)	There is evidence of satisfactory contribution but requirement for continued improvement
2 Adequate (sometimes, with many exceptions)	There is evidence of some contribution but significant improvement required
1 Poor (never or occasionally, with clear weaknesses)	There is low or no observable contribution

Relevance (4/5)

All project interventions were found to be highly relevant for and suited to the context and challenges of the countries, responding to direct requests and priorities of the benefiting countries.

The conceptualization of the projects was found to have emanated from identified gaps and the design of the most successful projects was found to be fully guided by the needs identified through the establishment of a project stakeholder consultation group in each benefiting country. Those projects with thorough stakeholder consultation were also found to be the most sustainable in the long term.

While direct consultations with migrants and migrant communities were limited at the design stage, the projects aimed to reflect their needs via the consultations with government counterparts.

The project documents were overall well designed and logically constructed according to the *IOM Project Handbook*. The theory of change (TOC) of the projects was overall feasible in that the project outcomes contributed to the project objectives. However, the cause–effect relationship between the outputs and the outcomes was less strong. Furthermore, some issues were noted in relation to the formulation

> *In many cases, result statements are phrased as activities and not as results. Most outputs and outcomes incorrectly use activity-focused language (capacities assessed, procedures developed) rather than results-focused language. For instance, Outcome 2 describes an activity ("Develop" a strategy) rather than the intended end result (for example, "Strategy is in place"). Results-focused language is important to make clear the change we want to see, which then facilitates the development of indicators to measure.*
> Ex-post evaluation TC.0859 (2018)

of results and indicators at the outcome level, which posed challenges for monitoring and evaluation planning in terms of setting a proper foundation for monitoring and reporting.

> *Many indicators are phrased as result statements, rather than providing specific qualitative or quantitative factors to operationalize measurement of the result. Some indicators are imprecise, some include multiple elements that would be better split into separate indicators, and there is not always coherence between indicators, baselines and targets.*
> Ex-post evaluation TC.0859 (2018)

For regional projects, even though the projects delivered on their envisaged outputs, a reflection on project design indicates a very high ambition in terms of the envisaged results vis-à-vis the human and financial investment from the project. These projects have to rely mostly on staff with existing responsibilities. Projects located far from the management site, for example, in a different region of the country, were also formulated in a very ambitious way in terms of envisaged results.

All the projects were found to be strongly aligned with the relevant government institution as well as with IOM and IOM Development Fund objectives. Most of the projects directly responded to Objectives 1 and 3 and Principles 1, 2 and 3 of the IOM Migration Governance Framework. The majority of the projects were aligned to target 10.7 (Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies) of Sustainable Development Goal 10, with one project aligned to Goal 8 and another to Goal 13.[1]

Relevance relates to the extent to which the project's objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified for the beneficiaries that it is intended to serve. An assessment of the project's relevance to the main stakeholders is aimed at determining whether the objective and outcomes identified and formulated during project design are consistent with the priorities of the beneficiaries, the national or local government, and the donor. These perspectives were explored by the evaluators through project document review, participatory observation, stakeholder interviews, direct beneficiary surveys, focus group discussions and questionnaires.

In addition, the evaluations explored the alignment of the activities undertaken through the project with the strategies and workplans of the relevant institutions, as well as the broader institutional objectives of IOM and the objectives of the IOM Development Fund. These lines of enquiry allow the evaluation to reconstruct and make explicit the TOC underlying the project, and assess the various links between outputs and outcomes.

Theory of change
The theory of change is a way of understanding the larger change (impact) that an organization seeks to bring about and the steps that it envisages to do so, taking into account the context within which this will occur. Just as importantly, TOC articulates the underlying assumptions within these various steps, and can thus help to ensure that the assumptions are theoretically sound. (Center for Theory of Change)

---

[1] IOM Migration Governance Framework (C/106/40 of 4 November 2015), endorsed by the Council at its 106th Session; Sustainable Development Goals: Goal 8 – Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all; Goal 10 – Reduce inequality within and among countries; and Goal 13 – Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts.

Effectiveness (3/5)

Overall, the projects that reached or exceeded their stated outputs and outcomes involved close collaboration with partners and stakeholders. The financial and technical capacities provided by the projects were said to have contributed to the achievements with satisfaction, which assured both support to the government and good communication with all stakeholders. A small number of stakeholders felt that for some activities it would have added value to engage local experts to bring local content and context when working with an international consultant, but they also questioned whether the expertise existed in-country and proposed that a technical committee could also play this role.

The active involvement of government counterparts in activity planning was found to be the main success factor for projects to deliver results, including the credibility of project products. Failure factors mentioned included political instability and competing development priorities.

> *Effectiveness* is an assessment of the extent to which a project achieves its intended results. It investigates if the activities have led to the outputs and if the delivery of the outputs has led to the expected outcomes, and the degree to which the achievement of outcomes has contributed to the realization of the project's objective. An assessment of effectiveness will consider if beneficiaries have used the services and products availed by the project, if they were of the required quality and, if so, whether this has led to the intended benefits specified in the project outcomes.
>
> *The evaluations sought to use interviews and documents to explore effectiveness.*

Government counterparts were satisfied with IOM project management and particularly the setting up of project advisory or steering committees, co-chaired by government officials who were considered experts in the subject matter. This ensured stakeholder engagement from the beginning on tasks ranging from reviewing project deliverables to providing comments and feedback on the project workplan.

Key factors identified as contributing factors for the delay of project results included government-level requirements for special approval of projects, delays in hiring staff and consultants, a lack of implementation tools (SOPs, training and visibility material), and limited M&E and planning throughout project implementation.

Most of the risks associated with external factors, which could have prevented the projects from achieving and implementing the planned activities and delivering the required outputs, were anticipated in the log frame. However, in most cases, the external risk (not included in the log frame) was the inability of the project to influence government decision-making and time frames. Though IOM is found to have more influence and leverage with government counterparts compared with other stakeholders, it nevertheless was unable to influence enough government processes, which caused delays in project implementation and completion.

Further areas found to be weak in certain projects included sharing of products with all stakeholders, in particular the ones involved in their development, no clear plan for their distribution and, once distributed, no follow-up to ensure product awareness.

Projects were found to be highly adaptive to external conditions, which can shift significantly from before implementation and during project implementation. Counterparts were highly

appreciative of the flexibility of IOM to adapt to emerging needs and priorities while still achieving the aim of capacity-building of government counterparts.

The projects developed and used some tools and systems for monitoring, such as Excel spreadsheets and PRIMA.

However, the following points were observed: (a) lack of monitoring in many cases on change in knowledge among training participants and migrants, (b) lack of monitoring of follow-up on outputs to achieve outcomes, for example, trafficking victim cases that were referred to partner nongovernmental organizations and government officials, (c) lack of reports in some cases for organized events including training and workshops, (d) some inconsistencies between the contents described in the narrative sections of project interim and final reports and the results matrix, and (e) issues relating to the reliability of the reported data.

Efficiency *relates to the relationship linking inputs to outputs to outcomes. The evaluations assessed the extent to which the projects had clear and realistic criteria for allocating financial and other resources to meet their targets, as well as the alignment between planned and actual expenditures, and the timely delivery of outputs. These questions are applied both to the projects as a whole and to each of their components, using perception data, in the form of various interviews with key stakeholders. These perceptual data were complemented by a review of available financial documentation.*

Efficiency (4/5)

Overall, the projects were cost-effective and implemented within budget, with established processes to ensure not only the minimization of costs but also the maximization of benefits by leveraging external resources from partners, many times in kind, and the selection of appropriate participants in capacity-building activities. The projects took various further measures to make sure that resources were used efficiently. This included close coordination with the main project partners to ensure ongoing assessment of priority needs, as well as creation of synergies with other projects and interventions.

In many cases, the projects were able to deliver activities beyond those listed and budgeted in the original project document to complement activities carried out by the counterparts.

The projects were efficiently managed overall, with national projects having appropriate human and financial resources available for implementation, appropriate and transparent administrative procedures and clear evidence of seeking ongoing feedback from stakeholders to adjust activities to reflect changes in context. However, regional projects were found to have benefited from a higher budget to reach the greater number of beneficiaries and achieve the activities proposed. Projects managed remotely, for example, the management site in the capital but the project located in a different region of the country, certainly were found to have encountered challenges with delays in activities without staff on the ground to follow up regularly and drive implementation.

Monitoring capacity and procedures were again relatively weak for all projects. Apart from the submission of interim reports, the projects did not include detailed monitoring systems, including results monitoring frameworks to capture progress.

For at least 60 per cent of the projects, the project duration was extended, proving the unrealistic time frame set during project development, as well as a lack of comprehensive risk analysis. A review of project implementation timelines revealed that projects started later than planned and therefore output delivery and consequently outcomes were delayed. Delays were due to several reasons, including the need of governments to officially approve the

projects in writing before the start of any activity, delays in identifying consultants and hiring, staffing was not in place at the beginning of the project and the need to consult all stakeholders and set up steering committees.

Translation, editing and publication of products were again found to take time and were rarely forecasted correctly in the original workplans, leading to delays and the need for an extension to projects, as these activities are usually planned near project end.

Sustainability (3/5)

Overall, it was found that the benefits emanating from the projects continued to be of value to the benefiting Member States and other stakeholders. In particular, the knowledge gained will be retained and be beneficial for ongoing and future formulation of programmes, policies, strategies and interventions in migration.

> *The* **sustainability** *of a project or programme can be assessed through the question of whether its results and benefits are likely to continue after the project is no longer active and donor funding has been withdrawn. In the case of capacity-building interventions focused on training, sustainability examines the extent to which the knowledge acquired through the training activities is institutionalized in the relevant organizations by becoming standard practice. The evaluations assessed this dimension through interviews and, as far as the available documentation allowed, through a review of documents detailing policies and practices of the relevant organizations.*

> *We are beginning to absorb different components of the project into our normal work, yet there is still much to be done when the project ends.*
> *(Government staff)*
> Ex-post evaluation CE.0221 (2018)

The projects that had a high level of government partner engagement from their inception proved to be the ones where activities continued after project completion.

Examples of follow-up activities:

- Task committees set up continued despite government changes due to strong leadership
- Mass media campaigns funded by governments as follow-up/replicated activities
- Development of standard operating procedures by relevant departments
- Referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking published
- Inclusion of migration in development policy frameworks
- National strategies and action plans developed and validated by governments
- Migration policies validated by governments
- Updates to migration profiles
- Laws relevant to irregular migration and protection of vulnerable migrants
- Inclusion of specific units in government structure with budget for staff
- Budget inclusion for migration activities to be implemented by governments

> *We are very grateful for the collaboration with IOM; it has been immeasurable. This project has allowed us to do the things for which we are responsible but usually cannot do for lack of funds. It also allowed us to better perform our role. We truly wish for more opportunities to do this kind of work with IOM.*
> *(Government staff)*
> Ex-post evaluation CE.0221 (2018)

- Further training due to Train the Trainer manuals and training conducted
- Ongoing coordinating structures such as steering committees and technical working groups
- Sector working groups

Limitations highlighted included a lack of human and financial resources, structural issues related to mandates and legislative frameworks, and technical capacity gaps that challenged the ability of stakeholders to act on the recommendations resulting from the projects.

An exit strategy was not always developed during project implementation, but in many cases outputs or reports were used to feed into existing and future projects to support governments in implementing recommendations.

Impact (N/A)

Even 12 months after the projects ended, it was still early in most cases to cite any impact. It was decided to review in most ex-post evaluations the prospects of any impact from the projects. In general, it was possible to conclude that the projects contributed to the development of government capacities, which in turn resulted and could potentially result in the development of policies on migration, informed inclusion of migration issues in any planning and policy formulation, and changes for the better in the livelihoods and well-being of migrants and communities in both their countries of origin and destination.

> *Impact* *speaks to long-term results and changes to which an intervention contributes. Impact analysis was used to assess achievement of the outcomes and overall objectives. Evaluators wished to assess if the intervention contributed towards reaching the higher-level objective, and to determine the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those affected.*

Improvement of migration options was made by migrants through increased awareness and improved services provided by government counterparts. Many of the initiatives were considered "eye openers" to potential improvements in migration management, as well as the original aim of providing start-up funding.

Furthermore, in many cases coordination between migration actors continued after projects ended. Unintended positive effects included the visibility of migration issues well beyond the original identified project stakeholders as well as a wider breadth of coverage of initiatives, for example, from mainstreaming migration in a health policy to developing a separate migration health policy.

No negative impact or effects were noted during the ex-post evaluations as a result of the projects implemented.

For regional projects, various stakeholders lamented that planned regional elements were lost, for instance in terms of original plans and the lack of efforts due to complications in coordinating activities between country partners.

Cross-cutting issues (2/5)

Gender mainstreaming was considered during most project design, however mainly at the request of the IOM Development Fund and rarely initiated by the regional offices during the review. Gender dynamics information was seldom present in original documents submitted by Country Offices to regional offices.

Gender was not sufficiently taken into account during implementation apart from research and assessment work. Some IOM staff emphasized and proposed gender-balanced participation in meetings, decision-making, workshops and training events during implementation. This was reported, but clearly numbers did not reflect a gender balance, which led to the conclusion that the project only partially controlled the selection of participants.

Adherence to a rights-based approach was evident in most projects even if not explicably mentioned in the project documents.

Visibility of actions and the donor was found to be mixed. In some cases, the project was very proactive in raising the visibility of every activity, output and donor, whereas in others it was the donor who reminded the country office to raise visibility. In some cases, the project had minimal visibility.

Cross-cutting issues: The proper inclusion of and adherence to a rights-based approach to programming and gender mainstreaming starts at the design stage of a project. The IOM policy on protection states that IOM protects migrants "by emphasizing the promotion of the dignity of migrants, their well-being and respect for their rights and by adopting a rights-based approach in all its policies, strategies, projects and activities, going beyond simply the physical and material needs of migrants",[2] thus making a rights-based approach a key priority for the organization. Similarly, the IOM Gender Equality Policy 2015–2019 sets out a commitment to gender mainstreaming in project review and endorsement processes. As such, gender mainstreaming also constitutes a priority for IOM, and its inclusion in project design and execution is a measure of its alignment with this organizational priority.

These two components were assessed through document review as well as through interviews with relevant stakeholders.

Recommendations

Relevance
1. Improve the overall quality of the results matrix and workplan to lay a stronger foundation for monitoring and reporting on results and activities.
2. Formulate interventions using a participatory process, identifying needs through the establishment of a project stakeholder consultation group in each benefiting country.
3. For regional projects, do not make the envisaged results too ambitious and consider the challenges in coordinating between countries.
4. For projects located far from the management site, plan carefully and conservatively to avoid delays and failure to deliver results.

---

[2] IOM Policy on Protection, as contained in the annex to document C/106/INF/9 of 7 September 2015, submitted to the 106th Session of the Council.

Effectiveness
1. For some activities, it would have added value to engage local experts to bring local content and context.
2. Ensure active involvement of all stakeholders during the implementation period through committees, advisory boards, and their involvement by taking the lead, in particular, delivering results to encourage ownership and so forth.
3. Ensure sharing of products with all stakeholders, in particular the ones involved in their development, and plan well ahead any product distribution and awareness activities.
4. Improve results monitoring and reporting by planning for and tracking the progress of each result, rather than re-stating the activities carried out, and improve activity monitoring by updating the basic workplan from the proposal and converting it into a more detailed workplan with dates and sequencing, adapted as needed in line with contextual changes since initial design.
5. Consider requiring the project team to allocate some project funds to develop necessary monitoring tools and systems in the first quarter of project implementation and build the capacity of staff and partners to use the tools and systems, and hold regular (quarterly) project review meetings with partners to identify and address issues and challenges in a timely manner.

Efficiency
1. Consider larger budgets or complementing other donor funding for regional initiatives or remotely managed projects.
2. Ensure that a monitoring framework is established for each project from the onset.
3. Use less ambitious project time frames and targets to avoid the need for no-cost extensions.
4. Sound assumptions/risk analysis are required at the project development stage.
5. Ensure a realistic time frame for the completion of any planned translation, editing and publication of products.

Sustainability
1. Initiate engagement of high-level government partners from the project design stage and continue on a regular basis – at minimum every two months – during implementation to discuss not only activities but also an exit strategy.
2. Discuss issues related to human and financial resources, structural issues and technical capacity gaps to be addressed from the beginning of the project and as part of the exit strategy.

Impact
1. For regional projects, ensure that there is sufficient funding and time to allow coordination of activities between country partners to prevent the loss of regional elements.

Cross-cutting issues
1. Include a gender analysis and rights-based approach in all project design and ensure that gender and human rights are considered in all activity implementation.
2. Always be proactive in raising the visibility of every activity, output and donor (logo and acknowledgement), through media channels, newsletters, websites, publications and so forth.

Annex 1: Challenges encountered and discussed during the ex-post evaluations

Political instability

Changing government partners

Changing governmental priorities

Changing government counterparts

Internal government approval processes

Lack of buy-in by the government counterparts

Travel to remote locations and cost of travel to remote locations, for example, the Pacific

Difficulty accessing existing data

Lack of reliable information

Disagreements (related to legal documents) between media companies and governments regarding hosting rights for websites developed

Lack of collaboration among partners

Quality of the outputs delivered by consultants

Publications review process

Annex 2: List of projects

Funding year	Project code	Project title	Total USD allocation (budget line)/ Final expenditure	Duration (months)/ Original duration (months)
2013	CE.0221	Enhancing the Migration Evidence Base for the Development of Tanzania	200 000/154 177	45/18
2014	CE.0276	Capacity-building for Strategic Management of Diaspora Resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	200 000/96 713	26/18
2015	CE.0301	Mapping of the Mauritanian Diaspora	100 000/83 357	19/16
2016	CS.0837	Development of a National Framework for Durable Solutions in Vanuatu	100 000/85 275	9/9
2016	CT.0975	Strengthening the Capacities of the MERCOSUR Countries to Combat Human Trafficking and Improve the Conditions of Female Migrants	138 687/114 840.93	19/18
2014	FM.0390	Vocational Training and Livelihood Opportunities for Regularized Migrants in Morocco	200 000/181 282	32/24
2016	IM.0041	Reinforcing the Human Rights Approach to Migration Policies of the MERCOSUR Member States and the Associated States	100 000/94 996	18/18
2014	LM.0254	Building the Capacity of Cambodia to Manage Outward Migration (BECOME)	200 000/197 500	34/24
2014	LM.0258	Strengthening Labour Migration Management in Ethiopia	200 000/175 320	29/15
2015	LM.0277	Strengthening Labour Migration Management in Malawi	100 000/81 042	21/18
2015	LM.0280	Developing a Roadmap to Facilitate South–South Labour Mobility in Southern Africa	300 000/286 218	18/15
2015	LM.0281 *(part 2 of project LM.0280)*	Validating a Roadmap to Facilitate South–South Labour Mobility in Southern Africa	60 000/43 128	17/15
2015	LM.0283	Strengthening Labour Migration Management in Madagascar	150 000/135 362	18/18
2015	LM.0290	Enhanced Skills Development and Qualification Recognition of Labour Migrants from Bangladesh	200 000/193 599	26/24
2013	MA.0291	Mobilizing Medical Diaspora Resources for Lesotho	200 000/195 104	38/12
2016	MA.0377	Towards an Effective Migrants' Right to Health in Central Asia: Assisting Governments in Enhancing the Provision of Health Services for Migrants	100 000/92 876	12/12
2014	PR.0144	Assessing the Climate Change, Environmental Degradation and Migration Nexus in South Asia	300 000/291 681	27/ 24

Funding year	Project code	Project title	Total USD allocation (budget line)/ Final expenditure	Duration (months)/ Original duration (months)
2015	PR.0179	Strengthening the Jordanian Economy Diaspora Links	130 000/106 689	15/15
2015	RM.0025	Improving Capacities to Leverage Remittances for Development in Ghana	200 000/180 935	18/18
2014	TC.0815	Technical Assistance for the Development of a National Migration Policy in Botswana	130 000/121 892	18/18
2015	TC.0859	Increasing the Capacity of the Government of Serbia to Address Irregular Migration	130 000/90 277	22/18
2016	TC.0961	Enhancing Migration Management in Belize through an upgrade of the Migration Information Data Analysis System (MIDAS)	100 000/96 929	12/12