

Third Joint Donor Review of International Organization for Migration (IOM) Programmes on Emergency Assistance to Mobile and Vulnerable Populations in Zimbabwe, Humanitarian Assistance to Returned Migrants and Mobile Populations at the South Africa-Zimbabwe and Botswana – Zimbabwe Borders, and the Safe Journey Information Campaign



*Plumtree Reception and Support Centre
(Photo: P. Holdsworth 2009)*

February / March 2009

For DFID, Sida, USAID, ECHO and the Netherlands Embassy

**Marion Pratt (Team Leader)
Peter Holdsworth
Justine Smith**

Executive Summary

This is the third jointly-commissioned donor review of IOM Zimbabwe. The specific purpose of the review was to:

- *Assess IOM's progress against agreed outputs in the programme logframe*
- *Assess the appropriateness of IOM's current programmes¹*
- *Identify opportunities to enhance donor harmonisation*

Since the last Joint Donor Review in 2007, the operating conditions for humanitarian and other organisations have been among the worst in the world. Events that had immediate impacts on emergency operations have included flooding, drought, post-election violence, a post-election state ban on NGO operations, the highest inflation rate in recorded world history (peaking at 213,000,000%), intermittent closing of schools, strikes by teachers and health workers, commodity price controls, a severe cholera epidemic, continued farm evictions, Operation Stop Illegal Mining, and a recently-established Unity government and dual currency system. The combination of events has severely complicated and slowed ongoing emergency responses, and caused the cancellation of the 2008 joint review.

This review took place over a two week period, preceded by a period of document review. During the two weeks the review team conducted extensive interviews with a wide range of stakeholders, and made several field visits, including to five MVP communities, both Reception and Support Centres and the Bulawayo 'Safe Zone'.

The team has made various recommendations for addressing the key issues identified by this review, a summary of which can be found in Annex 1.

Overall the team found that some aspects of IOM's programme in Zimbabwe were very impressive indeed. The main examples that stand out are:

- IOM continues to be at the forefront for responding to new displacements and emergencies. In the past 18 months this has included not only emergencies that directly resulted in displacements (floods, political violence, ongoing farm evictions), but also to the wider country-wide cholera outbreak. In this latter IOM played a key role alongside other agencies in responding quickly and appropriately to the outbreak.
- The reception and support centres at Bulawayo and Plumtree are world class models for managing irregular migration. IOM continues to innovate in this field and to build on and improve systems in place for managing and responding to migration issues at the border. A key success is found in the careful attention paid to protection issues, with a reported decrease in abuses of deportees by the South African authorities, to which IOM's outreach and training activities have undoubtedly contributed.
- IOM has also developed an impressive multi-media information campaign, which appears to accurately target the group identified as most likely to become potential migrants. Although it is inevitably difficult to measure the specific impact of the programme, the youth focussed campaign has devised a variety of approaches for engaging young people in debate and information sharing on safe migration and HIV/AIDS.
- In the Mobile and Vulnerable Populations programme, the Migration Health Unit continues to deliver effective and appropriate health solutions to MVP communities, as commended in previous reviews.

¹ This refers to the three specific programme areas considered within this review, namely the MVP programme, the information campaign and the reception and support centres.

- The team also identified some impressive examples of gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming, including some highly appropriate applications of gender analysis.

However, the team also had some very grave concerns relating mainly to some specific components under the MVP programme, and also for the wider strategic direction of IOM in Zimbabwe. In discussing these issues it is important to note that the operating context of the past 18 months has been exceptionally difficult, and has inevitably strained IOM's systems, procedures and staffing, and may account for some of the overall problems identified below. Nevertheless, this does not reduce the importance of these issues, nor the urgency and concern with which they need to be addressed. Specific issues of concern included:

- The review team felt that the extent to which IOM was diversifying its activities was reaching a stage where it had potential to negatively impact on the overall quality of individual programmes. For example, IOM's project database identifies numerous projects at differing stages, which the team believes to be beyond the manageable interests of the organisation. Evidence of this was observed in an overall lack of strategic vision in some components, i.e., some aspects were seen as a series of projects or interventions, rather than as a holistic programme of support. Staff also appeared overstretched, with limited opportunity for technical follow-up and effective monitoring in the field, or providing adequate support to partners, which further compromises quality.
- Of greatest concern was the livelihoods aspect of the MVP programme. In particular, IOM appears to have failed to consult with an adequate number of organisations and programmes in Zimbabwe with wider experience of income-generating activities that are appropriate within the specific, and highly complicated, context of Zimbabwe. Overall, the livelihoods programme lacked both depth and reach; even where specific 'projects' appeared successful, the scale on which they were implemented meant that overall impact was very limited.
- There were similar concerns for the shelter component of the project. Again, the team acknowledges that the Zimbabwean context is incredibly complex and that the push / pull factors between local government regulations and donor limitations are a further complicating factor. However, it was felt that the solutions developed lacked overall vision for addressing the needs of the communities. At the site visited by the team, the 'transitional' shelters were not habitable, with 'beneficiaries' still living under plastic sheeting, that itself was starting to deteriorate. Despite the various limitations cited, the team feels that it would be a much better choice to include one door and one window for each unit to make one habitable room. IOM and its donors should discuss this possibility. Instead, after 3 years the site has just 54 incomplete houses.
- Finally, the team found that the once strong relationship between IOM and its implementing partners was in danger of breaking down. Implementing partners were frustrated by the lack of support from IOM and cited various examples of weaknesses in the relationship. For its part, IOM – and in particular the Chief of Mission – has also identified that there are weaknesses and gaps in the support to partners and are in the process of developing strategies to address this.

Overall, it is the assertion of the review team that most of these problems are symptomatic of the increasing expansion and diversification of IOM's overall strategic direction in Zimbabwe. The strongest recommendation hailing from this review is that IOM needs to urgently review its strategic advantages and internal weaknesses with a view to developing a more streamlined strategy for its three programmes in Zimbabwe.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations	v
Abbreviations	vi
1. Background and context.....	1
2. Purpose of the review	2
2.1 Methodology	3
2.2 Limitations	4
3. Review findings.....	5
3.1 Progress towards purpose.....	5
3.2 Achievement of outputs to date.....	8
3.2.1 Mobile and Vulnerable Populations.....	8
3.2.2 Reception and Support Centres	24
3.2.3 Information Campaign	26
3.3 Appropriateness of IOM's current programmes	28
3.4 Donor harmonisation.....	33
4. Conclusions	35
<u>Annexes:</u>	
Annex 1: Summary of Recommendations	II
Annex 2: Risks and Assumptions	VII
Annex 3: Logframe	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 4: Review Schedule	XII
Annex 5: Key Informants.....	XXI
Annex 6: Documents Reviewed.....	XXIII
Annex 7: Terms of Reference	XXVI

Acknowledgements

The review team would like to express their considerable gratitude to everybody who, unhesitatingly, assisted us in this review, with their advice, comments, information, expertise, and physical help. We have tried to list most of you in Annex 5, but we have probably missed some of you, for which we apologise.

We realise that you all facilitated our mission to the very best of your ability and so it may be invidious to single anybody out, but, without the administrative support of DFID, DG ECHO, USAID, and IOM itself, we would have had much more difficulty with logistics and local knowledge and contacts. We would also wish to thank IOM, additionally, for formulating the programme and for making itself so willingly available during the period of the review. No doubt the hard working personnel in IOM had to sacrifice valuable time to assist us.

Similarly, on all our visits we were, unequivocally, supported by IOM, hosting agencies as well as government bodies. In some cases this went well beyond the call of normal duty. We are grateful for the briefings and debriefings arranged for us in Harare as well as all the time that was set aside by individual staff and experts to inform, educate, and alert us to specific issues.

Throughout our mission we encountered nothing but considerable kindness and cooperation. Meetings were efficiently arranged, sometimes at short notice; when for many in the humanitarian community it was an extremely busy period. We thoroughly enjoyed meeting all of you, whether dedicated member of IOM and implementing partner or bemused beneficiary, and we hope that this report, critical though it may be in places, is a true reflection of all that you told us and all that we saw.

Marion Pratt
Peter Holdsworth
Justine Smith
March 2009

Abbreviations

Agritex	Ministry of Agriculture's Agricultural Extension programme
ART	Anti-retroviral Therapy
CAP	Consolidated Appeal Process
DFID	UK Department for International Development
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office
GNU	Government of National Unity
GoSA	Government of South Africa
GoZ	Government of Zimbabwe
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IP	Implementing Partner
ISAL	Internal Savings and Lending
ISL	Integrated Sustainable Livelihoods
JI	NGO Joint Initiative for Urban Zimbabwe
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTLC	Monitoring, Technical, Learning and Co-ordination Unit (PRP)
MVP	Mobile and Vulnerable Population
NFI	Non-Food Item
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
ORO	Operation Restore Order
OVC	Orphans and other Vulnerable Children
PROCAP	Protection Capacity (surge capacity for protection officers)
PRP	DfID's Protracted Relief Programme for Zimbabwe
PSI	Population Services International
PVO	Private Voluntary Organisation
SGBV	Sex and Gender-Based Violence
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TB	Tuberculosis
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV and AIDS
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	US Agency for International Development
VPV	Victims of Political Violence
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organisation
ZCDT	Zimbabwe Community Development Trust
ZimVAC	Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee
ZRCS	Zimbabwe Red Cross Society

1. Background and context

Since the last Joint Donor Review in 2007, the operating conditions for humanitarian and other organisations have been among the worst in the world. Events that had immediate impacts on emergency operations have included flooding, drought, post-election violence, a post-election state ban on NGO operations, the highest inflation rate in recorded world history (peaking at 213,000,000%), intermittent closing of schools, strikes by teachers and health workers, commodity price controls, a severe cholera epidemic, continued farm evictions, Operation Stop Illegal Mining, and a recently-established Unity government and dual currency system. The combination of events has severely complicated and slowed ongoing emergency responses, and caused the cancelation of the 2008 joint review.

For the main recipients of this report, the situation in Zimbabwe is well-known, and so it is unnecessary to provide additional detail. It is, nevertheless, worth emphasising that the situation is an unusual combination of factors that are difficult to address from either a totally humanitarian emergency response or from a longer-term developmental approach. It is in this ambivalent scenario that IOM finds itself; a situation where the HIV/AIDS pandemic continues to cause untold misery and creates a serious demographic and labour trough in a population that is already broken by draconian political reforms and a devastating breakdown of the economy.

The economic breakdown has led to the very recent 'dollarization' of the monetary system, although it is not clear at this early stage whether this will contribute to the recovery of the country from hyperinflation or cause a further decline, given the sudden increase in prices that the lack of small denominations has caused. Nor is it clear how much more the parallel breakdown in the global economy will aggravate the situation in Zimbabwe. Although the government has imposed devastating change on the population of Zimbabwe, its absence following the election combined with its incapacity to reverse the social and economic chaos that it has triggered, has done little to provide a weakened population with protection from the effects of disease such as cholera, malaria, and TB, combined with the collapse of the health structures, and natural disasters such as drought and flooding.

The displacement and migration of large portions of the working population has further exacerbated the economic breakdown, as have many other ill-considered political initiatives. At the time that this report is being written the cholera epidemic, which has further exposed the weakness of the health infrastructure and the difficulties faced by the international agencies in mounting an effective response, has only just come under control.

Concurrently, fresh government initiatives for land reform have been announced that will exacerbate the humanitarian situation. Further displacement looks inevitable, and although migration figures recorded by IOM have shown a small decline, there are some reasons for believing that they could rise again in the future, not least of which include fresh farm evictions, the indications of potential retribution for politically motivated violence, and the possibilities of a rise in deportation from South Africa as 'World Cup 2010' approaches.

Although the severe difficulties caused by the limited access to the most vulnerable populations appear to have eased, allowing a greater number of agencies to provide assistance to more of the vulnerable population, both IOM and other agencies continue to work in a difficult environment, where they have to balance the possibilities of providing emergency response against the need to seek sustainable solutions that will allow the vulnerable population to recover in the long term. It is in this context that IOM, the other agencies, and

the donors have to work, and in doing so have to deploy their limited resources in the most efficient way, using strong leadership, co-ordination, maximum efficiency, and carefully considered, well-targeted projects to provide maximum support to those with the greatest needs.

2. Purpose of the review²

Since 2006, IOM's major donors have come together to support multi-donor annual reviews of IOM centred around the logframe for DFID's £5 million multi-year programme of support (2006-09).

The purpose of the review was to:

- Assess IOM's progress against agreed outputs in the programme logframe³
- Assess the appropriateness of IOM's current programme
- Identify opportunities to enhance donor harmonisation

The Specific Objectives of the Review were to:

Assess IOM's progress against agreed outputs in the programme logframe

Specifically, the review team was tasked to address the following issues:

1) Assess progress towards purpose

- Consider the extent to which planned programme Outputs⁴ are contributing to the Purpose and whether they are still relevant and realistic.
- Consider the contribution of the Purpose to the programme Goal
- Consider whether the Risks/Assumptions identified during programme design remain valid; whether they are impacting on the programme Purpose; how they are being managed and whether any new Risks/Assumptions have been identified or are emerging.
- Assess the likelihood of the programme achieving its purpose, and make recommendations accordingly.

2) Assess achievement of outputs to date

Output 1: *To address the humanitarian needs of mobile and vulnerable populations*

- Assess the quality, range and appropriateness of the interventions
- Review assessment and targeting methodologies for their effectiveness and applicability
- Assess the effectiveness of HIV and gender mainstreaming
- Assess the effectiveness of IOM's capacity building of its implementing partners

Output 2: *Address the humanitarian needs of returned migrants at Beitbridge and Plumtree⁵ and increase the involvement of stakeholders in promoting and protecting the rights of migrants*

² The full terms of reference for this review are attached as Annex 7

³ Note that the logframe referred to in this review is developed by IOM mainly for the purposes of the multi-donor programme, and in line with DFID requirements. It is not an operational tool used within IOM, although it does draw heavily on the actual programme logframes in terms of the indicators etc used.

⁴ The 'Outputs' referred to in this review are from the donor logframe. These 'outputs' reflect three of IOM's programmes, namely the MVP programme, the information campaign and the reception and support centres.

⁵ Plumtree Reception Centre only opened in May 2008

- Assess the quality, effectiveness and appropriateness of the assistance provided to returned migrants at the Reception Centres
- Assess the capacity of the Centre to deal effectively and appropriately with protection issues and the needs of deported children
- Assess the extent to which cooperation has been improved between the relevant stakeholders in Zimbabwe and South Africa and Botswana

Output 3: Provide potential Zimbabwean migrants with sufficient information to make informed choices about migration while also increasing their levels of knowledge on potential risks and vulnerabilities including the threat of exposure to HIV/AIDS

- Assess the quality, effectiveness and appropriateness of the information campaign
- Review the appropriateness of communication tools and channels
- Consider the extent to which the Information Campaign is effectively linking with other parts of the IOM programme

1. Assess the appropriateness of IOM's current programmes in the donor logframe:

- How appropriate is IOM's current programme in responding to Zimbabwe's rapidly deteriorating environment?
- How resilient and responsive are IOM's current programmes to changing circumstances in Zimbabwe, such as positive reform, weak, stop and start reform and further deterioration?
- Are there areas where IOM needs to expand its operations and others where it should scale back and hand over responsibility to others?
- How appropriate is IOM's current strategic plan?

2. Identify opportunities to enhance donor harmonisation

- How effective is donor coordination at the moment?
- How can donor coordination and harmonisation be enhanced?
- What can IOM do to assist donors in improving harmonisation and coordination?

2.1 Methodology

The methodology for the review was largely defined by the Terms of Reference. The two-week review schedule was developed by IOM in consultation with the donors, and with some input from the review team. IOM also put together a substantial amount of documentation for each of the three programme areas covered by this review (see Annex 6 for a full list of documents reviewed). In summary, the methodology for the review comprised the following activities:

- a. *Extensive document review*
- b. *Site visits:*
 - i. MVP Communities:
 - Lionsden (Mashonaland West)
 - Hatcliffe Extension (Harare)
 - Hopley Taisekwa (Harare)
 - Muchena (Manicaland)
 - Odzi (Manicaland)
 - ii. Reception and Support Centres (Plumtree and Bulawayo)
 - iii. Bulawayo Safe Zone
- c. *Key informant interviews with:*
 - i. IOM staff
 - ii. Beneficiaries

- iii. Donors
- iv. Implementing partners
- v. Ministries of Labour and Social Welfare and Foreign Affairs
- vi. UN Agencies

The complete review schedule and a full list of key respondents can be found in Annexes 4 and 5 respectively.

2.2 Limitations

As with previous reviews, the review team found that the two weeks allocated for the review were insufficient to address the full extent of the IOM programme. As such, some areas were addressed in limited detail. In particular, the lack of specific health expertise on the review team meant that the Migration Health component was addressed in significantly less detail than other aspects of the programme. However, it is also the team's opinion that this component of the programme is one of IOM's strengths and should be examined in detail to determine why it has been so successful as part of the next joint review. It is a specific recommendation of this review that future reviews have a specific technical focus, with the first being on Migration Health. Overall this review team recommends that future donor reviews be held every two years, allowing for a more in-depth review process. (See section 3.4).

The review team also felt that some of the site visits organised by IOM for the review were somewhat over-engineered, potentially to the point that it could be counter productive to the review process. The review team felt that formal presentations and prepared testimonials were of limited use, compared with opportunities for informal discussions with beneficiaries in their normal settings. However, where this was identified as a possible problem, IOM and partner staff reacted quickly and ensured that formal proceedings were limited and that the team had adequate opportunity to interact informally with beneficiaries.

As a point of note for future reviews, the review team also felt that team meetings with large numbers of IOM staff at once were of limited use compared with shorter, more focussed meetings with two or three staff members at a time.

Recommendations for IOM for future reviews:

- *Informal interaction with beneficiaries, in the fields or at livelihood sites, for example, is a more useful and unbiased way to gather information than through prepared testimonials. In fact, prepared testimonials and speeches should be avoided as much as possible.*
- *Where possible is it better for the review team itself to identify the beneficiaries to interview or speak with.*
- *IOM programme team meetings: it is more productive for the review team to meet with two or three people for shorter time periods than longer meetings with many participants, which also are not the best use of IOM staff time.*

3. Review findings

3.1 Progress towards purpose

The stated overall goal of IOM in Zimbabwe is '*...to contribute to the management of cross-border (international) and internal migration and to address the needs and vulnerabilities of migrants and mobile populations*'. It is almost unnecessary to say that this goal is designed to address a wide range of activities.

The **purpose** stated in the donor logframe is '*...To protect the rights and address the needs and vulnerabilities of migrants and mobile populations*'.

IOM's strategic plan for 2009 to 2011 addresses a large number of activities. In the limited amount of time that the review team had, it was able to cover only a small part of this overall programme. This review of the programmes will (a) mainly focus on the projects seen and the possible implications, and (b) cannot without considerable access over a longer period of time to detailed budgets, provide an accurate judgment on the cost-efficiency of the programme, which is inevitably a factor in deciding whether the outputs are contributing to the purpose and whether they are still relevant and realistic.

Overall, the review team believe that IOM is broadly likely to achieve the programme purpose, and that the outputs remain relevant and appropriate to achieving this. However, the following key issues were noted:

3.1.1 Overall progress towards purpose

IOM is making strong and vigorous efforts to tackle the humanitarian situation in Zimbabwe especially as it relates to the needs of the migratory and mobile vulnerable populations. IOM's specific purpose and mandate relate to mobility, migration, and displacement, all of which are relevant to the context in Zimbabwe; its provision of humanitarian relief is widely regarded to be successful.

Many IOM programmes and programme components are appropriate in responding to the rapidly deteriorating environment in Zimbabwe, although the review team was not able to assess the full extent of the impact. Nevertheless, an overwhelming factor in its favour is that by its very presence in many different parts of Zimbabwe, working with many different affected communities, IOM does provide at the very least a sincere gesture of solidarity with the vulnerable population which mitigates the full effects of the dire humanitarian situation, i.e., a measure of protection and support is provided by IOM's very presence in these communities

In some areas IOM has been very strong - in particular in emergency response and in tackling irregular migration. These have demonstrated IOM's long institutional experience in these areas and would no doubt benefit from reinforcement.

Emergency Response

IOM has continued with its dynamic response to new emergencies. It was quick to respond to the humanitarian consequences of the election violence, and recently responded rapidly to the cholera outbreak.

The outbreak of cholera occurred in places such as Beitbridge, where resources were particularly scarce and many of the normal partners in this sort of situation such as WHO and other medical agencies were virtually absent, IOM - with the assistance of MSF/Spain - set up

cholera treatment systems and centres that clearly benefited large numbers of the affected population.

3.1.2 Concerns

In the complex humanitarian situation that has evolved in Zimbabwe, especially in the last two years, IOM has developed into one of the most able agencies in the country, and has quintupled in size since it first began operations in Zimbabwe in 2002. Its programmes have expanded proportionately and its scope has also widened. IOM explains that this growth in their programmes is necessary (1) to meet the growing needs of the vulnerable population and (2) to fill the gaps that are left by the limited presence of other agencies combined with their restricted access. The strategic plan for 2009-2011 has therefore increased in ambition and scope.

IOM's overall goal '*...to contribute to the management of cross-border (international) and internal migration and to address the needs and vulnerabilities of migrants and mobile populations...*' through facilitating the orderly and humane management of international migration in Zimbabwe by: (i) tackling the issues of migration and development; (ii) facilitating migration; (iii) regulating migration; and (iv) addressing forced migration, remains relevant. For the review team, in judging progress towards purpose, one of the elements where there was concern was ensuring that the projects implemented towards assisting the victims of these issues did not stray away from IOM's core strengths and thus dissipate its effectiveness

The impression left with the review team was that there were many small interventions (and being a project-based organisation with little central funding this inevitably hampers IOM's overall approach) which (a) only covered a very limited number of the vulnerable population (IOM probably achieves its greatest coverage as an implementing partner of WFP in distributing food, and as a distributor of agricultural inputs), and (b) were often so small in scale as to have negligible impact and probably very limited multiplier effect. Possibly IOM had anticipated that by engaging in many projects overall its programme would become more resilient or responsive to the constantly changing environment of Zimbabwe, but the outcome appears to have been that many programmes have had little impact, in terms of numbers reached, because of their small size and their temporary nature.

There is one main overall finding of the report, which echoes concerns presented in the last Joint Donor Review in 2007:

- ***Diversification beyond areas of manageable interest:*** The extent to which IOM was diversifying into areas beyond its manageable interests is the major concern of the review team. Furthermore, this concern was echoed by other humanitarian agencies, including IOM's own implementing partners, donors, and government representatives. This view was strongly expressed in the two previous reviews of 2006 and 2007. In the past few years, IOM has asserted that the reason why it has become involved in some projects was because of the weaknesses or the limited presence of other partners. Whilst the review team accepted this reasoning to a certain degree, there is little doubt that some projects have only achieved limited success because of insufficient monitoring, expertise, and/or technical follow up. The review team saw evidence of this on two occasions where problems with crops (pests and diseases) - despite complaints from the beneficiaries - were not addressed adequately, which could have led to a swift resolution of the problem. As it was, some of the beneficiaries felt ignored or neglected.

It was clear that the IOM staff, although spending some time in the field, did not have enough time to adequately monitor all the components of the various interventions, follow-up is vital to livelihoods and agricultural inputs distribution (see example 1). It is important to consider, however, weaknesses of other partners, the constraints that they have suffered (possibly more than IOM, in that IOM has managed to develop a more productive working relationship with the authorities), and in some cases the more adversarial stances that they have adopted in Zimbabwe compared to IOM's more pragmatic approach.

Recommendations for achieving programme purpose:

- **The overall IOM programme would benefit from a more streamlined strategic focus,** increasing its depth and reducing its overall scope. *At the moment, it appears that IOM is facing difficulties in balancing the number of projects against the numbers of staff available to follow up with monitoring and evaluation. In particular the review team believes that IOM could better utilise its strategic advantages to focus on:*
 - a. **Optimising relationships:** *IOM has gained widespread access to vulnerable populations through its own implementing partners. Now that the situation in Zimbabwe appears to be less restrictive for other agencies, it may be an appropriate time for IOM to collaborate more closely with them; the MVP working group, which is currently finalising its own strategic plan, would be an ideal forum for this. IOM is a key player whose potential links to many partners, and leadership of the MVP working group, will facilitate strategic planning for bringing MVP communities into mainstream humanitarian, potential development and government initiatives*
 - b. **Advocacy:** *IOM could focus its strategic advantages in order to advocate for the inclusion of migration issues into other agencies' planning when they consider the larger humanitarian problems of Zimbabwe. To date, IOM has already had some successes in this area –for example encouraging the incorporation of migration issues into the ZimVAC – but there remain other areas where IOM could also use its influence, such as further lobbying with WFP to address MVPs which are considered to be separate from mainstream communities; and continued lobbying of UNHCR to look more closely at some of the protection issues associated with the blurred areas between political and economic migration. The establishment of the MVP unit within the Ministry of Social Welfare is an important step in this, and a key accomplishment for IOM, but clearly there is still much to do given the historical reluctance of other agencies to work with MVP communities.*

3.1.2 Risk and Assumptions

The risks and assumptions in the donor logframe utilised for this review have not changed since 2007⁶. It was also noted that each 'risk / assumption' was framed as an assumption rather than as a risk. While these assumptions remain broadly appropriate, the review team felt that given the volatility of the Zimbabwean context, it would be an important exercise for IOM to carry out a more in-depth risk analysis. This would include identifying specific risk events associated with each assumption, determining the likelihood of each event occurring and the likely impact, and identifying appropriate mitigation and response strategies. A suggested framework for this is illustrated below:

⁶ As noted previously IOM does not find this logframe to be a useful operational tool, although it draws heavily of the specific programme logframes.

Assumption:	Associated Risks:	Likelihood:	Impact:	Mitigation:	Response:

A detailed analysis of the specific risks and assumptions in the programme logframe can be found in Annex 2.

Recommendation for risk assessment:

- *IOM should develop a more detailed/pertinent risk analysis framework that properly extrapolates the actual and perceived risks to the programme and defines impact and response strategies.*

3.2 Achievement of outputs to date

3.2.1 Mobile and Vulnerable Populations⁷

Output 1: To address the humanitarian needs of mobile and vulnerable populations

3.2.1.1 Quality, range and appropriateness of interventions

When IOM first began its programmes in Zimbabwe in 2002/2003, its added value, as IOM saw it, was the special knowledge that it had in the sectors of migration, and assistance to mobile and vulnerable populations - specifically, in that time period, with evicted farm workers. Since then, IOM has become heavily involved with these particularly vulnerable groups and has built up considerable institutional knowledge over the past years. This could be one simple reason why IOM has developed greater access to the MVPs than have other agencies. Furthermore, as these populations are politically sensitive and many are in locations not traditionally serviced by the wider NGO community, e.g., commercial farming areas, other agencies have historically tended to not be willing to work with these communities. Thus IOM has evolved as the main operator responding to MVP issues in Zimbabwe.

IOM has been quick to respond to the deterioration of the situation of the MVPs – due to the various government eviction operations, for example - and are also aware of the special needs of groups who, as well as facing eviction also are affected by the lack of means to provide themselves with a sustainable living, and vulnerability to HIV/AIDS and other diseases.

IOM has developed a number of assessment tools used to profile these groups (and sub groups within the main MVP groups) and used them to produce detailed databases and profiling. Using the information derived, IOM has been able to target specific groups and identify special needs, developing a needs-based approach to the humanitarian situation.

However, overall there are various specific components on the MVP programme that gave the review team quite serious cause for concern. Details of these are outlined below. However, in discussing these issues it is also important to note that the operating context of the past 18 months has been exceptionally difficult. The period has been characterised by violent elections, suspension of all NGO activities, lack of effective government, economic

⁷ As the Government of Zimbabwe does not recognise the occurrence of Internal Displacement (as defined by international conventions) in Zimbabwe, the term 'Mobile and Vulnerable Populations' (MVPs) is used in Zimbabwe to describe populations that in other contexts would be described as 'Internally Displaced Persons' (IDPs).

meltdown, break down of public health, water and sanitation systems and a country-wide cholera outbreak. All of this has inevitably strained IOM's systems, procedures and staffing, and may account for some of the overall problems identified below. Nevertheless, this does not reduce the importance of these issues, nor the urgency and concern with which they need to be addressed. Furthermore, the team believes that some of the difficulties experienced in the MVP programme may also be indicative of a wider concern relating to IOM's continued diversification into areas beyond its manageable interests, i.e., that by spreading resources far and wide, overall attention to quality and impact has been diminished. The following specific observations were made by the team during the course of the review:

Livelihoods:

IOM's livelihoods activities within the MVP programme are based on two types of activities: agricultural livelihoods and income generation. The agricultural livelihoods programme focuses on input distribution, mainly of cereal crops, sweet potatoes and more recently soya beans, and the associated basal and top dressing fertilisers. This component is one of IOM's biggest MVP interventions in terms of reach, with approximately 70% of households participating in this programme (33,904 households out of the 48,315 identified in the MVP database). The income-generating component of the programme comprises largely of small-scale projects, which are supposed to be identified in a consultative process between IOM or its implementing partners and the communities (some of the communities interviewed felt that certain livelihood activities had been strongly suggested to them). These projects include such activities as mushroom cultivation, community and communal gardens, bread, candle and soap making and other small-scale production activities. More recently IOM has been collaborating with CARE to conduct a small-scale pilot of CARE's Internal Savings and Lending (ISAL) activity within one of the MVP communities in peri-urban Harare.

Overall, the review team is concerned about the scope, quality and appropriateness of the livelihoods approach taken by IOM. In particular, it was felt that in the initial planning of the livelihoods approaches IOM had failed to consult with an adequate number of more experienced development organisations and programmes operating in Zimbabwe⁸ to determine the most appropriate livelihoods interventions for Zimbabwe's unique operating environment, particularly for the income-generating activities. Instead, in many cases, IOM has repeated mistakes already documented as lessons learned by others, and implemented projects that are largely inappropriate for Zimbabwe's macro-economic environment. Furthermore, the team was concerned about the overall cost efficiency of a strategy that entailed a series of small projects spread thinly across all of the communities. **Overall, the team felt that the livelihoods component of IOM's support to MVP communities would be more efficient and effective if more resources were directed into a smaller number of proven approaches, delivered at scale, taking into account the variable characteristics of different types of communities (rural and urban, for example) would need to be taken into consideration. The one activity that is already at scale is the agricultural input distribution, which needs greater attention to technical support and follow-up.**

Specific concerns identified during the review include:

Agricultural Livelihoods

- Of greatest concern for this component of the programme was the lack of impact assessment at the most basic level, i.e., post-harvest data demonstrating productivity. This

⁸ For example, CARE International in Zimbabwe, DfID's multi-agency Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) and the NGO Joint Initiative for Urban Zimbabwe (JI) consortium, all of which have a core livelihoods focus.

would be considered a very basic stage in any inputs-delivery programme by more experienced livelihoods-oriented NGOs.

- At the first site the team visited (Lionsden), a lack of technical backstopping in the field by IOM was evident from the lack of effective pest management in the crops and limited knowledge of these issues by the beneficiaries. This conclusion was further reinforced during the team's meetings with implementing partners, who also noted the lack of field support by IOM staff. Even though local authorities, e.g., Agritex, are actively engaged by IOM to provide field level technical support, the inherent lack of capacity of organisations such as Agritex on the ground (observed by the review team) necessitates that IOM take a stronger role in technical back-stopping than is currently evident.
- Drip irrigation was still being used in two locations visited, despite the well documented limited success rate of this technology in Zimbabwe. In fact, this was noted in the 2007 review, and in Manicaland IOM estimated only a 30% success rate. At Hopley Taisekwa the use of drips kits appeared to be adding little or no value to the communal garden site. Stands used to support the water barrels were frequently stolen to use as firewood and there were the usual problems of blockages on the lateral lines. Evidence of bucket irrigation was obvious. This was particularly disconcerting as the site was close to a large dam, and therefore the garden should have been highly productive. (Note that IOM has stopped further distribution of the drip kits as a result of their poor performance). Consultation with other, more development-focussed, programmes in Zimbabwe would have identified more productive methods of harnessing this water resource for the project. (Indeed, there did not appear to be any formal management of the dam. The team also had grave concerns about the viability and appropriateness of a proposed fish farming project utilising the dam, the technical aspects of which appear to be seriously misguided and which again did not appear to have benefited from greater consultation with organisations with greater experience with such activities.)
- IOM has also been slow to identify the potential for conservation farming, an approach now widely supported by most major development-oriented actors in Zimbabwe, and that has a well documented success rate. Although IOM cites lack of long-term land security as a limitation (as a three-year commitment is necessary to see real results from this approach), it was felt by the review team that a more in-depth understanding of local conditions might identify several specific sites where conservation farming would be appropriate. For example, the MVP programme M&E framework identifies that 61.5% of supported populations have permission to stay where they are⁹. In some of the sites visited by the team, beneficiaries had fairly long-term relationships with their plots of land and felt relatively secure. For example, in Lionsden, three of the beneficiaries interviewed had been farming the same plot of land for more than 12 years.

Income-Generating Activities

- The focus of this to date has been on small-scale income-generating activities, which are supposed to be identified in consultation with the communities. These have included such activities as soap and candle making, which more experienced organisations (e.g., CARE, the JI) identified as uneconomical and unsustainable much earlier in the current economic crisis.
- The scope and success rate of these projects appears to be, not surprisingly, very limited. The most successful projects visited by the team were in Odzi, Manicaland, where a

⁹ This number is based on the 2006 MVP assessment (which came out in 2007). IOM is currently re-assessing the MVPs under the PRP. The figure of 61.5% was based on 60 out of 150 communities; there are now 330 communities so the actual percentage may be different. However, even based on the initial figure of 60 communities, it should be expected that *at least* one in five of the communities has some level of security.

relatively new bakery project appeared to have good potential and an established community garden appeared highly productive. However, the reach of these projects was very limited, with 50 households participating in the bakery and 27 in the gardens, out of a total caseload of 649 families. The potential for overall impact is therefore very limited, even where the specific interventions are more successful.

- One of the most successful and well documented livelihoods approaches in Zimbabwe's challenging economic environment has been the Internal Savings and Lending (ISAL) methodology developed by CARE (see Box 1, next page). Although the potential of this was identified by one of IOM's largest and most livelihoods focussed partner (Integrated Sustainable Livelihoods – ISL) IOM did not initially agree to support it. In fact, ISL actually found alternative support to roll out this methodology among the MVP communities that it works with. Very recently, CARE approached IOM to conduct a small-scale pilot of ISALs within one MVP community. However, the need for a 'pilot' was perceived by CARE based on the 'mobile' nature of MVP communities, whereas in practice the some of these communities are largely stable and appear to be functioning much like any other urban or rural community. Therefore there appears to be no reason why this methodology could not be rolled out more broadly across all communities identified as largely stable.
- However, the main limitation of the ISAL approach is that it targets the 'economically active' poor, and therefore does not cater for the poorest and most marginalised members of society. With the recent dollarization and its potential for more economic stabilisation in the country it would be appropriate for IOM to consider more direct social transfers as a safety net mechanism for these groups. Given the long-term commitment necessary for delivering unconditional cash transfers (which by definition need to be long-term, regular and predictable) and the extent of the need for public works in many of the MVP communities, it would seem that there could be potential scope for cash-for-work programmes targeting the more vulnerable households. However, clearly these also require labour to be available so those households without labour (such as elderly or child-headed households) will also need to be supported with a more comprehensive safety-net, e.g., ongoing food support.

Box 1: Internal Savings and Lending (ISAL)

This model is based on self-selected groups of people who pool their money into a savings fund from which members can borrow. The money is paid back with interest, causing the fund to grow.

This lump sum distribution provides a large amount of money that each member can then apply to his/her own income generating activities, and is greater than the amount that any individual member could leverage alone.

Members receive training on the planning and management of the savings/loans, group formation procedures, information and record-keeping, and leadership. Additional training in selection, planning, and management of income generating activities is provided when groups and group members are ready to grow or diversify their income generating activities. As a group-based approach, the ISAL methodology contributes to improved social capital and also has peace-building potential for broken communities.

Overall, the livelihoods component of the programme is the area which has given the review team the greatest cause for concern, in terms of both appropriateness and cost-effectiveness of the approaches taken. While some IOM staff felt that involvement in activities was worthwhile even if they were not successful, the review team felt strongly that unproven, experimental initiatives drain people's hope and energy, and could negatively impact their willingness to embrace other opportunities in the future.

Recommendations for livelihoods:

- *IOM may wish to consider contracting an immediate external review of IOM's livelihoods interventions to identify specific livelihoods solutions appropriate for communities at different stages as identified in the exit strategy document, and why activities undertaken to date have or have not been successful. This could also potentially be part of the community development planning proposed under PRP.*
- *Scale back on small-scale projects and focus instead on wider-scale roll-out of the ISAL methodology wherever appropriate. (NB CARE, as the leading expert in this area in Zimbabwe, should be contracted to directly train all implementing partners).*
- *Investigate the potential for social transfer mechanisms in viable communities, including cash-for-work linked to needed public works activities. (NB these should be developed with an end-date in mind for completion of all necessary works, i.e., projects should not continue to be 'found' once all identified works have been completed). IOM should not commit to direct cash transfers unless there are clear mechanisms for sustaining these over the longer term.*
- *Put more resources into delivering a more comprehensive agricultural inputs package, including:*
 - *Appropriate scale to maximise use of available land;*
 - *Tailor-made packages for each location (in consultation with local partners and Agritex office), which may include cash crops where cereal crops are less viable;*
 - *Integrated pest management;*
 - *Ongoing technical support to farmers (delivered through partners and Agritex); and*
 - *Comprehensive technical back-stopping and monitoring in the field (by IOM)*
- *Introduce Conservation Farming to complement the inputs distribution. (NB this should be done with adequate consultation with other organisations or projects that are already successfully implementing this approach, such as PRP.)*
- *Consult with more experienced organisations, such as CARE International in Zimbabwe, to learn about and implement effective dam management strategies where such a resource exists. (NB The review team does not believe that IOM has the technical capacity yet to support fish farming projects and would strongly recommend that where possible plans for such projects are put on hold until feasibility studies have been undertaken.)*

Shelter

The transitional shelter component of the MVP programme was another area of serious concern for the review team. While the political complexities of these interventions are well understood, the team felt that the solutions developed by IOM lacked creativity and responsiveness to the primary needs of the beneficiaries, i.e., to have a safe, habitable shelter. As with some other areas of the programme, it appeared that IOM's ability to oversee activities in the field was very limited, with just two shelter experts based at head office. The implementing partners felt that the level of support received for the shelter interventions was very limited. Despite a high level of staff turnover within IPs, IOM has only two shelter experts to provide ongoing support for this programme, although some efforts have been made to enable partners to directly employ an appropriate profile of staff for managing their shelter projects. One of the main areas where IOM could better support its partners for shelter was in negotiating and advocating with local authorities. Overall it was felt that IOM could leverage its position for improved national level advocacy for the standardisation of building requirements and standards across all locations. Currently, this is one of the greatest challenges faced by implementing partners and it was felt that IOM did not fully appreciate

the complexities of the differing requirements. In practice, plans and materials accepted by one local council may not be accepted by another, with no apparent national standards. Consequently partners found themselves with materials delivered by IOM that were not deemed acceptable by their local councils. On a similar note, partners also found that materials were often delivered piecemeal, meaning that it was not possible to complete work on schedule. This also caused problems for retaining builders who would often find other projects while waiting for additional materials to arrive. However, it is noted that procurement within the macroeconomic environment in Zimbabwe during the period review has been exceptionally difficult, and that some of the problems probably could not have been avoided. However, it is possible that closer attention could have been paid to specific local authority requirements to prevent the delivery of materials that were known to be unacceptable.

The provision of temporary shelter continues to be effective and useful. At Hopley and Hatcliffe, however, beneficiaries noted that the plastic sheeting distributed two years ago or longer was now wearing out and needed to be replaced. The poor state of the sheeting was confirmed by the review team.

Example 1: Visit to Hatcliffe Transitional Shelter Project

An Appropriate Project? A Microcosm of all the Difficulties Faced by the Humanitarian Agencies in Zimbabwe.

As part of the review the team were taken to look at the transitional shelter/housing project for the MVP at Hatcliffe, where an incomplete and uninhabitable house was shown to the team by the implementing partner of IOM, St Gerard's Church. This was one of the 55 houses that had been erected since the project commenced three years ago, with building starting in late 2007. The review team was surprised to discover that during that time only one house out of those 55 has been completed and is being lived in (very happily). Not even rudimentary sanitation facilities have been installed in an area where cholera is rife. Whilst the team was there the MSF/Spain cholera treatment



'Finished' transitional shelter in Hatcliffe
(Photo: P. Holdsworth 2009)

centre had diagnosed 184 cases of cholera since they had opened three weeks previously. It is fully understood that there are many political issues involved in this shelter programme, and that the primary aim of the project was to address a fundamental protection issue concerning the tenure of lease and basic stability. It is, nevertheless, difficult to understand why 54 houses could not be completed to a habitable stage, even if it was only to make one room in each house habitable. In this situation the humanitarian imperative appears to have been subsumed by political issues. What is particularly perplexing is that the reasons given for not completing the houses were that (a) IOM and its partners had only agreed to put up the basic structure in the (unlikely) expectation that the beneficiaries (once again the very most vulnerable part of that particular vulnerable population, whose livelihoods had been destroyed when they were evicted) would find the means to complete the building, (b) that there was inadequate funding (over 3 years) to complete the houses to a habitable standard, and (c) that IOM and its partners considered that they had fulfilled the terms of the project, whilst at the same time pointing out that the plastic sheeting under which the so-called beneficiaries were living was beginning to wear out. Unfortunately on the visit the review team was accompanied by a livelihoods person from IOM who knew nothing about the shelter project of St Gerard's. It was clear that the St Gerard's staff members were frustrated by the outcome of the project but they are totally dependent for support and finance on IOM. It was also clear that there were overlaps with other projects in the vicinity indicating a lack of co-ordination. There was evidence that other agencies in the area had completed shelters, and that there was a lack of evidence of consultation with established local NGOs working in the shelter sector, e.g. Dialogue for Shelter / Housing People of Zimbabwe. The issue of co-ordination was raised and IOM had recently pulled together a co-

ordination meeting for the partners working at Hatcliffe. Interestingly, OCHA - which should be the lead in co-ordination - was not informed of this meeting, nor of the co-ordination problems identified at this site.

The observations that were drawn were:

- a) As always, shelter projects are supremely difficult to implement in this type of political environment, and despite the humanitarian needs it becomes questionable to what extent and how appropriate it is to become involved in housing projects as compared to the provision of basic, temporary shelter. While the protection issue was significant, the very small number of transitional shelters constructed has limited even the protection aspect of the programme.
- b) Nevertheless, where there is a humanitarian imperative, and despite the political difficulties in implementing this project, it is somewhat contradictory that in three years the structures could not be made habitable, when it was acknowledged that the temporary shelters were becoming uninhabitable.
- c) IOM does not have sufficient expertise or adequate personnel to deal with the complexities of a project such as this, and it should have assessed the situation more carefully before embarking on this project to ensure that there was a greater level of co-ordination and consultation (for example some agencies had, completed shelters for some of the most vulnerable households). The challenge now is to revisit the design of the shelters so that they can be lived in.

The conclusions may be:

- 1) Whilst it is acknowledged that there are serious limitations in terms of the push/pull factors created by donor limitations with transitional shelter and local authority minimum standards, IOM has not successfully identified appropriate creative solutions for this. E.g. 'lack of funding' as an excuse does not address the reality of the incremental cost of adding one window and one door to provide a completed, habitable room. Either more effort needs to have been made to make the houses more habitable, or if it was deemed that this was solely a protection issue where tenure was pre-eminent, then only the very minimum should have been done for the structures and more effort should have been made to improve the temporary shelter, or, given the extremely limited numbers of houses that were being built in this project against the cost, possibly the funding should have been used differently.
- 2) Whilst one can understand IOM's urgent desire to provide assistance this is possibly an example of 'a project too many' or a project that required considerably more monitoring and assistance to the implementing partner than was made available.
- 3) A much greater level of interaction and co-ordination with both IOM's own implementing partners and other agencies working in the area is required. The locally gathered co-ordination meeting didn't identify – and missed an opportunity for – wider co-ordination as the meeting had a focus on livelihoods.

Recommendations for shelter:

- *IOM urgently needs to review its transitional shelter interventions in consultation with other agencies that have successfully delivered shelter solutions in Zimbabwe, as well as its own implementing partners. This should include an understanding of the local complexities in terms of differing standards and requirements, as well as determining more appropriate logistics solutions.*
- *IOM should leverage its position to advocate at the national level for greater standardisation for minimum standards for building plans and materials.*
- *IOM should reassess households' need for the replacement of plastic sheeting that is wearing out after two or more years of use.*

Migration Health

This was not an area addressed in depth by the review team, which did not include a health specialist¹⁰. However, overall, based on literature review, meetings with the Migration Health Unit team and some observations in the field – and consistent with previous reviews – the team was impressed by the professional response to migration health issues and delivery of services. In particular the team was impressed by the readiness with which requested data was made available, demonstrating sound data collection and management within the programme.

Some specific observations were:

- IOM assistance to the national cholera response was very quick, well co-ordinated and appreciated at all levels. However, IOM should not have a long-term role in this, except from a disaster preparedness stand point, both strategically and at the community level (i.e., continued integration of cholera prevention and preparedness into WASH programmes).
- Facilitating access to ART through referral systems is commendable, but IOM should not have a role in delivery of treatment, due to the short-term nature of its funding, compared with the very long-term commitment needed to deliver ART services. Furthermore, the service delivery side of this is already well funded and supported through other mechanisms. However, there is potentially a role for IOM to support ART delivery by working with local health service providers to ensure the MVP communities can *access* ART where it is available. This might include transport or treatment literacy support activities.
- It was felt that given the relatively high HIV prevalence rates in some MVP communities it would be appropriate for IOM to identify potential links to the Zimbabwe Red Cross Society or others for linking to existing Home-Based Care mechanisms. Currently, the lack of care and support for people affected and infected by HIV/AIDS is a clear gap for a comprehensive package of support for communities, particularly given the high prevalence rates in some communities, e.g., 52% at Caledonia. However, it is recognised that this may not be possible in the short-term, unless funding priorities for Zimbabwe change. For example, IOM have approached Zimbabwe Red Cross Society (ZRCS) to provide Home Based care support at Hatcliffe but were told that this was the responsibility of the City of Harare and as such ZRCS would not get involved. However, IOM should continue to advocate for this and to work with others to identify creative solutions as much as possible.

¹⁰ It is a specific recommendation of this review that the next review team include a health specialist and that the review have a specific focus on migration health. (See section 3.4)

Recommendations for health:

- *While the Migration Health Unit appears to be delivering efficient and appropriate services, the review team would warn against expanding beyond the areas of IOM's strategic and comparative advantages, e.g., into ART service delivery.*

Food Aid

The review team found that the impression gained from the meeting held with WFP was somewhat contradictory to IOM's own impression of its relationship with WFP. It is therefore recommended that IOM urgently convene a high-level meeting with WFP to clarify these positions. Based on the meeting with WFP, the review team had concluded that:

- WFP has not seen any real improvement in IOM's delivery and has granted them a conditional three-month extension by which time they are expected to (i) provide an effective classification of their different caseloads and (ii) provide a clear exit strategy for food assistance for more stable MVP populations. These issues have been under discussion between IOM and WFP for some time and the hope is to establish clear strategies for the future.
- WFP was concerned that some communities have been 'displaced' for many years and that it was not appropriate for them to continue to be considered as a separate caseload from the wider population receiving assistance.
- IOM's lack of presence in the field was seen as a serious restriction on its monitoring capacity, particularly as WFP then has no direct capacity building role with the organisations that actually deliver the food (i.e., IOM's own implementing partners).
- WFP felt that IOM had high overall staff numbers for the food programme compared with the metric tonnage distributed (although specific data for this was not readily available). WFP also noted that IOM utilised 6 'sub offices', although a large proportion of IOM programme staff were in Harare, so in order to do any monitoring they had to spend all of their time in vehicles driving from the capital.

However, these conclusions were not shared by IOM, which had a different perception of the relationship with WFP and the status of the food programme. For example, whilst the impression gained from WFP was almost of a 'probation' period for IOM to improve its delivery, IOM's understanding was that this was for IOM to fall in line with the Vulnerable Group Feeding (VGF) cycle. It was also noted that IOM had engaged in discussions with WFP on issues relating to targeting that had not been fully resolved. For example, previously agreed upon criteria were rejected by new staff resulting in the need for re-registration of households. IOM feels that there is a lack of institutional memory within WFP resulting in the same discussions on the issues of displacement being held repeatedly whenever there are new staff at WFP.

Overall, the review team felt that there was such a serious disconnect between the meeting with WFP and the responses of IOM that it was not entirely possible to reach firm conclusions on this aspect of the MVP programme; there was insufficient time to follow up on these issues in more detail. However, what is clear is that the relationship between WFP and IOM will need ongoing and careful management and IOM should proactively seek to improve communications with WFP.

Recommendations for food aid:

- *IOM urgently needs to convene a meeting with senior WFP personnel to discuss the issues raised in this report. To address the issue of institutional memory within WFP it may be advisable to propose the joint development of a strategy paper for food aid*

and MVPs in Zimbabwe that would clearly set out all of the current issues, as well as proposed longer term solutions.

- *Consider decentralising more staff out of Harare, basing them out in the field, for the ongoing monitoring of the food aid (and other) programme(s). Targeting and technical monitoring problems were noted by the field team in Lionsden, for example.*

Monitoring & Evaluation

Following on from previous reviews, IOM has gone along way in developing quality data collection tools, for which they should be commended. However, it appears that some of these may be too extensive, therefore generating a deluge of programme information. Furthermore, despite the availability of the M & E tools on which IOM has undoubtedly expended considerable effort with its IT experts, there are some gaps which are not reflecting the realities on the ground. Furthermore, the tools that have been developed, whilst useful, become emasculated if they are not followed up by regular visits and effective monitoring in the field. Overall, the wide reach of programme means IOM monitoring is limited, and staff are increasingly becoming removed from communities and the practical realities of 'grass-roots' evaluation and monitoring.

Example 2: Monitoring and Evaluation for Development

One example of IOM's lack of orientation for delivering development as opposed to humanitarian assistance is found in the organisation's approach to monitoring and evaluation (M&E). While emergency relief traditionally focuses on the items delivered (e.g., MT of food, number of NFIs), longer term development-oriented interventions more typically focus on the impact of the assistance on the overall well being of the targeted households and / or community. Some effort has been made to include impact-level indicators in project logframes, but for the most part, the IOM M&E systems are still intervention or input-focussed. This means, for example, that while separate indicators may track the success of several separate interventions in a community, the system is not designed to assess the overall level of impact of multiple interventions delivered at household or community level. Although the organisation has developed an increased awareness of the need for impact level indicators, this has not yet translated into clear impact-focussed programme planning.

Recommendations for M&E:

- ***Ongoing development of quality data collection tools:** IOM has, sensibly, identified this issue and have contracted a UN Volunteer to look in more detail at the information needs of the organisation and the range of monitoring and evaluation tools available, with a view to streamlining the system to produce the most relevant information. A major recommendation would be to emphasise that this needs to be looked at in a more practical way, that addresses the specific needs of the programmes, rather than specifically in a narrow 'information technology' perspective. Overall **there is a requirement for improved impact assessment and documentation.** The emphasis should be on 'impact' or effect rather than the measurement of 'outputs' delivery.*
- *IOM would also benefit from consulting more widely with other organisations and programmes (e.g., large NGOs, PRP, JI) to determine a wider range of potential M&E tools, both qualitative and quantitative, that address the need to determine impact. These might include:*
 - *Household Livelihoods Assessment approaches (NB these are currently used in other aspects of IOM's country-programme and therefore could potentially be rolled out into the MVP programme).*

- *Case studies / household tracking (i.e., tracking the progress of specific individual households receiving different combinations of benefits).*
- *Community-based Participatory Appraisal techniques.*

3.2.1.2 Assessment and targeting methodologies

IOM's primary targeting criteria are associated with the overall identification of a community as a 'Mobile and Vulnerable Population'. Potential new MVPs are usually identified by implementing partners, or by donors or through articles in the local press. This then triggers a systematic response starting with a rapid assessment to determine whether the community fits within the broad definitions of a 'mobile and vulnerable population'. If the rapid assessment identifies the population as an MVP in need of assistance, then a response is formulated to address the most pressing humanitarian needs, typically food and NFIs. At the same time, a more in-depth analysis is made to determine the longer term needs of the population in areas such as shelter, water, sanitation and hygiene, and livelihoods. Overall, this system appears to be appropriate and robust. However, the review team noted a lack of contextual information used to assess the needs of the MVP groups; that is, how their needs and vulnerabilities compare to those of the external population. MVP community needs should not be determined or assessed in isolation, but rather should be framed within the context of the wider population.

Furthermore, based solely on the experiences of the review team there appears to be some additional concerns relating to specific household targeting for individual interventions. Although the review team only visited a limited number of sites, some of the anomalies identified (see box - 'Example 2: Visit to Lionsden') raise concerns relating to the wider issues identified throughout the review. That, for example, limited follow-up in the field by IOM and limited capacity for technical backstopping (attributed by this review team to the unmanageable level of diversification) has the potential to result in inappropriate and / or ineffective targeting.

In other cases, such as the livelihoods interventions, the scope of the targeting appeared to be limited to the extent that questions were raised about cost-effectiveness and appropriateness of the interventions. In other words are the numbers targeted too small to have a significant impact compared with the overall needs of the community? One example would be the targeting of 27 out of a 649 families in Odzi to participate in a community garden project. Another would be supporting the construction of just 55 transitional shelters in Hatcliffe, with only one completed to a habitable stage in three years.

Under the DfID's Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) IOM, as a technical partner to the programme, are currently conducting a rapid assessment of all active MVP communities in their database. The aim of this is to develop appropriate exit strategies for each community, including identifying potential opportunities for other organisations to eventually take on more MVP caseloads into their mainstream development activities. As part of this, IOM is partnering with Practical Action to develop Community Development Plans for each community. This is an excellent step towards having more appropriate and focussed approaches that respond specifically to community-identified needs.

Example 3: Visit to Lionsden

Targeting and Monitoring

On the first field mission that the review team undertook, five (pre-selected) beneficiaries were visited. These beneficiaries were receiving agricultural inputs in the form of seeds and fertilizer, but no pest or disease control inputs. Bearing in mind that the specific aim of IOM is to **'... assist the mobile vulnerable population (MVP) who were displaced by Operation Restore Order of May 2005...'** (quoted from the IOM briefing note), the review team was surprised to discover that three out of the five beneficiaries had been farming their particular plot of land for between 12 and 15 years, contradicting claims of vulnerability due to displacement. One of these three was a Malawian who had been working in the area for over 30 years, originally in the mines until he became redundant. Of the remaining two beneficiaries, one was not a knowledgeable farmer - the only crop that he recognised was maize. He could not distinguish between his soya beans and potatoes and had to be prompted by the Zimbabwe Community Development Trust (ZCDT) representative accompanying the team. His command of English was impressive, and he worked for the Ministry of Health, which clearly placed him out of the ranks of the most vulnerable. Three out of the five were growing the Soya beans as a **cash crop** rather than **improving nutrition of the household** (IOM briefing note) and had little interest in learning how to process them for flour or milk, one of the stated aims of the project. One of the five beneficiaries was a woman with 6 children whose husband had died and who had been displaced only three months previously. She was targeted appropriately but, oddly, was not receiving food aid. None of the five had been displaced by Operation Restore Order in 2005. Three out of the five had crops that were affected by pest or disease (aphids, leaf eaters, hoppers, and mildew), and complained that they had received no assistance to deal with these problems, and consequently were in danger of losing their crops; they were not likely to **'ensure success that will then be replicated throughout the community'** (IOM briefing note). The IOM briefing note also stated that the 50 households that were benefiting from the project **'...are being monitored throughout this agricultural season to ensure success...'** None of the five had met the IOM livelihoods person that accompanied us until the day before our visit. Considering that the beneficiaries were supposed to be MVP from the population displaced in Operation Restore Order in 2005, **'...that they were determined to be food insecure and vulnerable...'**; that they had been **'...trained in land preparation, planting, managing the production cycle, hygiene and pest and disease identification and control...'** some doubts were left in the minds of the review team.



Malawian beneficiary (left) in the field he has farmed for more than 30 years with local councillor.
(Photo: P. Holdsworth 2009)

The inevitable observations that were drawn from this visit were:

- a) If these 5 were typical of the 50 households benefiting from the project (out of 450 households in the target population) then **only 10% of the group are appropriate beneficiaries from among the vulnerable population defined by IOM** (MVPs displaced by Operation Restore Order). They would mostly appear to be **'some of the proud homeowners'** that the background information vaguely alludes to. The monitoring visits from IOM appear to be limited, and do not appear to follow through on some of the fundamental issues raised by the beneficiaries.
- b) The needs of the beneficiaries do not appear to be completely aligned with what IOM believe them to be. As stated earlier, three out of the five beneficiaries spoken to were more interested in producing a cash crop rather than a crop to meet household needs, and whilst this is perfectly acceptable and logical, it does not coincide with the stated aims of the project.
- c) If one of the stated aims is to ensure success that will be replicated throughout the community then possibly not enough care is being taken to guarantee that it happens.

The conclusion might be:

- 1) The lack of proper identification of the beneficiaries, the fact that the beneficiaries wish to draw a different result from the project to IOM's objective, the limited follow up for a project on which much hope of success is pinned would seem to indicate (a) a lack of expertise in this particular aspect of livelihoods, (b) limited time devoted to effective targeting and monitoring, and (c) that IOM, in the context of all the other projects that it is trying to implement, is involved with too many small projects and diversifying too much instead of focussing on a few core activities - a manifestation of the problems with the IOM programme as a whole.

Recommendations for assessment and targeting:

- *Overall, targeting needs to be reviewed to ensure that it appropriately and adequately reflects the overall goals of the programme, and further, that these goals are consistent with those of the participating communities.*
- *There is an urgent need to ensure that any future needs assessments and research focussing on MVP communities include appropriate contextual information, i.e., comparing the situation of the MVPs with that of the wider population.*
- *Similarly, contextual factors should be used in the design of programmes and projects (for example the fact that 61.5% of the MVPs has permission to remain on the land)*

3.2.1.3 HIV and gender mainstreaming

While the team did not focus in depth on these areas, the document review and informal discussions in the field and with IOM staff in Harare indicate that the IOM has continued to make considerable efforts and achievements in this area. IOM has partnered with a variety of organisations to discuss and address these topics, and applied the lessons learned from an extensive joint UNAIDS/IOM/UNICEF/UNFPA external evaluation. Information on SGBV and HIV/AIDS is provided at distribution points for food and agricultural inputs.

Gender mainstreaming activities have included SGBV workshops in Musina, South Africa, and in Beitbridge. The IOM Information Campaign has been focusing on why relatively few girls have been using the Safe Zones in Bulawayo and Chiredzi, and designing ways to encourage them to attend (see box – Example 4: Application of sex-disaggregated data, next page). Efforts have also been made to ensure that the Safe Zones are accessible to both genders by recruiting assistants for each Safe Zone who are different genders to the current facilitators (i.e., a male has been recruited where the facilitator is female). Similarly, a smaller percentage of women use the services at the Reception and Support Centres, a fact which is being examined by IOM staff.

The application of sex-disaggregated data collection for the Information Campaign, health, and HIV/AIDS programmes has been extensive and should be applied to more of the MVP programmes. In particular, the livelihood programmes would benefit greatly from a gender analysis.

Example 4: Application of sex-disaggregated data: Chiredzi Safe Zone

Sex disaggregated attendance data for the Chiredzi Safe Zone identified that significantly fewer girls than boys were using the facilities. IOM attributed this to several factors, including girls' participation in domestic chores, and the reluctance of parents to allow their daughters to attend an unfamiliar place. To try to address this latter issue, the Safe Zone formed 'women's clubs', allowing mothers to use the centre in the hope that they would then encourage their daughters to do the same. Although the women's clubs themselves were successful, there was no corresponding increase in the number of girls attending the Safe Zone. A further strategy was to have activities that specifically targeted girls, but although girls attended for these activities, they tended to go straight home afterwards, and not stay around to use the wider facilities of the centre. The review team commends IOM for its initiatives to address the issue identified through the disaggregation of the attendance data. A further possible strategy may be to devise 'girls only' times for the centre. The specific times would need to be determined in consultation with girls to determine when they are most likely and able to attend.

Recommendations for gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming:

- *IOM is encouraged to continue its excellent mainstreaming efforts in these areas. The next annual review should include a specific focus on these activities, examining the overall impact of the mainstreaming.*
- *Continued efforts should be made to encourage girls to use the Safe Zones (perhaps by establishing time periods where the centres are only open to girls), and women to use the services at the Reception and Support Centres.*
- *The IOM referral services for HIV/AIDS care and treatment appear to be highly appreciated and should be expanded in the areas where IOM works.*
- *IOM should apply similar gender analysis approaches to the wider MVP programme, particularly the livelihoods interventions.*

3.2.1.4 Implementing partner capacity building

IOM directly delivers programme activities in just over half (57%) of the 334 MVP sites identified in its database. In the remaining 145 sites programme activities are delivered through the following implementing partners:

Partner	Number of sites
• Integrated Sustainable Livelihoods (ISL)	91
• Zimbabwe Community Development Trust (ZCDT)	27
• Help Age Zimbabwe (HAZ)	19
• LEAD Trust	5
• Evangelical Fellowship of Zimbabwe (EFZ)	2
• St Gerard's	1

The review team met with both ZCDT and St Gerard's in the field, and conducted a group interview with ISL, ZCDT, EFZ and St Gerard's. LEAD Trust and HAZ were not directly represented during the review.

For the most part the IPs were very positive about IOM's specific capacity building activities, such as HIV and SGBV mainstreaming training, and the tools provided for M&E and report writing. Partners also felt that IOM was very efficient and supportive in addressing new emergencies, such as new evictions, floods and the 2008/9 cholera outbreak. In particular IOM, as opposed to other international partners, was felt to have "stuck it out" with its partners during the turbulent 2008 political upheaval. Following the 2008 NGO ban, IOM has also

assisted some partners that are registered as Trusts to apply for PVO status. Partners also felt that they benefitted from IOM's wider good relationships around the country.

However, the group meeting with four of IOM's implementing partners overwhelmingly identified a very serious breakdown in the relationship between IOM and its partners. It was noted by the review team that during previous reviews IOM's relationship with its IPs has been relatively strong, and it is possible that this breakdown has largely resulted from the tumultuous operating environment of the last 18 months where certain systems and protocols may have been allowed to slide. For its part, IOM – and in particular the Chief of Mission – have also identified that there are weaknesses and gaps in the support to partners and are in the process of developing strategies to address this. This will include developing a framework for partner capacity building that will identify what support is needed to take partners to the next level in terms of project development and design and fundraising.

Box 2: Selected quotes from the joint partner meeting:

"IOM commit themselves to too many things"

"(IOM's responses to needs are) not consistent with the goal of stabilising communities as soon as possible"

"The feeling is that we are not equal partners so it is not easy for us to call a meeting"

Some specific issues identified during the partner meeting included:

A. Programme Quality

- Overall there was a lack of technical support and oversight in the field. This was also directly observed by the review team, which noted a lack of technical back-stopping to various agricultural livelihoods programmes. Partners felt that their main interaction in the field with IOM was during food distributions, with very little on-site technical support to other interventions.
- Partners also felt that IOM was not always adequately responsive to needs, citing examples of incomplete or insufficient packages for agricultural inputs programmes, and unresponsiveness to suggestions for more appropriate crops for specific locations.
- Many partners had experienced problems with transporters under the food aid component of the programme. IOM had addressed these issues in some cases, but not others. Also, IPs were not included in meetings convened with transporters to address problems.
- There were a number of examples, particularly relating to the shelter and agricultural livelihoods interventions, where IPs felt that IOM did not respond appropriately to the IP's direct experiences of the complexities of the local operating context. For example, that building materials or designs accepted by local authorities in one location may not be accepted by local authorities in another (see section 3.2.1. – Shelter). Several examples were also identified where IOM had failed to harness the knowledge and experience of partners in designing and delivering livelihoods approaches (see section 3.2.1.1 – Livelihoods).
- Overall, there was a strong feeling that more "intensive and professional" training on livelihoods was needed.

B. Relationship between IOM and IPs

- It was widely felt that there was a general lack of co-ordination within IOM. For example one unit would call for a meeting of all field officers at the same time that another unit would want field officers available to go into the field. Partners also felt that it was difficult to ascertain "who does what" in IOM and were frequently

frustrated by dealing with various different technical staff who lacked an overall picture of the IP's programme.

- Partner programme planning was very restricted by the very short-term MOUs prepared by IOM. These started from as little as 3 months. Given the various delays in delivering programme inputs (e.g., shelter materials), many programmes were barely under way before the MOU expired. Some partners had also attempted to start renegotiating MOUs more than two months in advance of the current one expiring only to find that IOM did not respond until after the MOU had expired. Given IOM's own experience of the perceived restrictions caused by short-term funding, it would be appropriate for IOM to devise mechanisms that minimise the extent to which this is passed on to IPs.
- IPs also felt there was a lack of open (i.e., not activity-specific) fora for them to share problems, ideas and experiences. Previously IOM used to convene monthly meetings with IPs to discuss programme activities, which were felt to be very useful by the IPs.
- Partners were frustrated that IOM has resisted supporting salary adjustments based on increased the cost of living. IPs felt that IOM was building its good reputation – and proposals – on the basis of their (the IPs) hard work, but was not willing to reward them for this.
- Some partners felt that the access they facilitated for IOM to their communities was sometimes abused. For example, through calling meetings or introducing new partners in the name of IP without advising and / or inviting them.

Recommendations for partner capacity building and support:

IOM should:

- *Urgently convene a feedback meeting for IPs to address the issues highlighted in this report.*
- *Have a single focal point for implementing partners who can then direct them to technical specialists as necessary, but retain overall co-ordination and history.*
- *Reintroduce monthly IOM-IP meetings. IPs should also be encouraged to establish their own networking fora for addressing common problems and solutions for specific sectoral activities (e.g., shelter).*
- *Develop more appropriate MOUs. These should be for no less than 6 months, i.e., MOUs should be tied to funding periods, not project-based.*
- *Conduct a proper assessment of appropriate salaries and establish a salary structure that shows acceptable ranges for key positions, taking into account the increased cost of living.*

3.2.2 Reception and Support Centres

Output 2: Address the humanitarian needs of returned migrants at Beitbridge and Plumtree¹¹ and increase the involvement of stakeholders in promoting and protecting the rights of migrants

General quality, effectiveness and appropriateness

In providing assistance to returned migrants (deported from South Africa and Botswana) IOM has implemented an excellent and humane approach through the inception of the reception centres in Beitbridge and Plumtree. Unique in Africa, these centres are highly appropriate to the regional situation, and key to assisting desperate Zimbabweans who are seeking a way out of poverty, lack of employment, harassment, social depredation. These reception centres provide services ranging from care for unaccompanied minors to negotiating with South African or Botswanan authorities, and from providing counselling on HIV/AIDS to providing medical assistance to returnees who are ill. A much needed and appreciated basic hot meal for migrants who register at the centre is also provided, as part of IOM's partnership with WFP. Additional meals are provided to unaccompanied minors and those who stay at the centres for one or more days for medical attention or other reasons. One issue that arose at Beitbridge that needs to be addressed is the fact that some of the cooked food has had to be thrown out when the expected number of migrants does not arrive on a given day. The excess food has been donated to the local prison and/or local farmers, but that is not the intention of the program. Adding a set of smaller cooking pots would enable the centres to cook smaller amounts of food and thus waste less. The reception centres are recognised by the South African and Botswanan government authorities, and the information and outreach campaigns have ensured a more sensitive approach towards the migrants by the deporting authorities, police, and border officials.

The management of irregular migration is one of IOM's areas of key strategic advantage, and in the context of Zimbabwe it has fulfilled expertly a role that other agencies cannot accomplish. A positive aspect in the managing of irregular migration has been that IOM is constantly moving on and learning, and therefore refining its systems. An example of this would be the introduction of the e-registration system - a digital database system that should provide IOM with a much more accurate picture of the migrant population. It should also go some way towards defining what the problems are that lead to recycling (which may themselves raise different humanitarian issues that have to be addressed)¹². An example of the analysis that has been produced is, for example, that 60% of women returned migrants registered in Plumtree, as opposed to 30% in Beitbridge, use the centre's services (it is not yet known why). IOM should be commended for this type of gender analysis in these centres.

The review team was particularly impressed with the following components of the reception and support centres:

There is little doubt that IOM is setting a shining example in one of the main areas of its expertise - managing irregular migration. Progress towards achieving this has been exemplary as manifested by the recent setting up of the Plumtree reception centre, which has derived much from the example of the Beitbridge centre. In addition there are plans for setting up many additional services within these centres, including the refinement of the e-registration system.

¹¹ Plumtree Reception Centre only opened in May 2008

¹² The latest information available from January 2009-now (since the system has been in place) is just over 4% of people e-registered had been to the centre before (in that same time period) which is significantly less than expected.

The well established centre in Beitbridge has been excellent in facilitating migrants' return to South Africa to prosecute abuses, get health care and collect wages owed, and has been successful in terms of decreased number of abuses reported. It also should be commended for information collection and analysis (for example using the information collected at Beitbridge and linking to the information campaign to identify target groups). The staff at the centres has paid consistent attention to training for stakeholders, in the form of outreach, negotiations, and workshops.

Protection, mitigation of the consequences of irregular migration: In the context of the reception centres IOM has also been a champion of protection issues at the border, especially in the sub context of basic human rights violations. The mere presence of these structures together with the IOM personnel who staff them have done much to mitigate the effects of the dangers of irregular migration; the injustice, banditry, rape, violence, theft, blackmail, trafficking, and racketeering which lurk in the anarchic regions of inadequately controlled borders, where any form of government control or regulation has little effect or is not imposed. One illustration of the 'protection' and mitigation that has had positive benefits has been the changed attitude of the South African police which has been transformed into a more benevolent attitude toward the migrants when they deport them.

Excellent application of lessons learned from Beitbridge for both design and operational aspects to the second centre in Plumtree. Indeed, IOM should be particularly commended for having been able to establish such a centre on the Botswanan border, given that Botswana is not a member state of IOM.

Looking after unaccompanied minors has become an important 'protection' issue for IOM (assisted by UNICEF and Save the Children - Norway) and for the reception centres a sound system has been set up, where any unaccompanied minors are identified early (sometimes involving early notification from South African or Botswanan authorities) and looked after in separate sites within the reception centre. For their onward journey back to parents or guardians considerable care is taken with the reunification process.

Concerns: Despite the overall excellence of the Reception Centres there are areas that can be improved even more:

- ***Continuity of Reception Centres:*** IOM should distinguish carefully between emergency relief and longer-term sustainable development in terms of capacity building with regard to the reception centres. Ultimately, the reception centres, set up as an emergency response system to the large numbers of irregular migrants crossing the borders, have to be handed over to local authorities if the orderly migration is to be sustained. Ultimately all the elements involved in migration should be under the control of the police, the border officials, government medical personnel, and other officials on both sides of the borders. IOM has set a fine example in running the reception centres to date, but it would not make strategic sense for it to control the places ad infinitum. Although the head of one of the reception centres recognised this concern and estimated that they could probably be handed over in the next two years, this fact is not reflected in IOM's 2009-2011 strategic plan. However it is recognised that there are many complex factors that will affect the potential for handover to the government. For example, signs of irregular migration and deportation dropping, as well as the government having an ability to finance operations, especially transport and health operations, should be evident before a handover can be feasible and practical. However, ultimately the eventual aim should be that the government take over these functions (although not necessarily the physical structures).

Recommendations for Reception and Support Centres:

Generally IOM should continue its good work in this area, with the following recommendations:

- **Management of irregular migration:** IOM should continue in its robust management of irregular migration; continue to refine its systems, especially the e-registration system which currently still needs to be tweaked to become a fully pragmatic tool for the processing of migrant data (for example, the system does not have the capacity yet to determine how many times a migrant is cycling—whether it is three times a week, month, or year), and continue to apply lessons learned from Beitbridge to Plumtree.
- **Protection:** Above all IOM should be robust in continuing to address the complicated protection issues that arise over migration issues, but should increasingly share these responsibilities with UNHCR, which is in the process of taking over the lead of the protection working group/cluster¹³.
- **Documentation:** Overall, so impressed was the review team with the ongoing success of the systems and procedures established at the Reception and Support Centres that it is a specific recommendation of this review that these important experiences and lessons learned be documented in a book. The team feels that although current documentation in the 'grey' literature is commendable, for these systems to be truly replicable a more thorough documentation is required. This may require, for example, that the programme manager be awarded a sabbatical in which to focus on documenting the programme experiences in a book, or working with a writer to do so.

3.2.3 Information Campaign

Output 3: Provide potential Zimbabwean migrants with sufficient information to make informed choices about migration while also increasing their levels of knowledge on potential risks and vulnerabilities including the threat of exposure to HIV/AIDS

The aim of the information campaign is to provide potential Zimbabwean migrants with sufficient information to make informed choices about migration while also increasing their levels of knowledge on potential risks and vulnerabilities including the threat of exposure to HIV/AIDS. The information campaign is implementing this strategy through work at youth centres, known as 'Safe Zones', in Bulawayo and Chiredzi, through information dissemination at the migration reception centres, through outreach, and a variety of other creative youth-focussed approaches. IOM has already commissioned a comprehensive evaluation of its information campaign. With the report of this evaluation readily available this particular review will not go into a second detailed analysis but will highlight some of the issues that the review team found.

Overall, the review team found the information campaign approach to be creative and appropriate. In particular the team was impressed by:

- **Targeting:** The target group for the campaign is well defined, based on the data from the Beitbridge Reception and Support Centre identifying that the majority of returned migrants were males aged 15 – 24. The responses devised appear to very appropriately target this demographic, focussing on such areas as music CDs and videos, sporting

¹³ IOM has noted that UNHCR has not had a permanent presence in the area, and whilst may help with lobbying, cannot directly assist with the hands-on practical protection work which is done from the Centre. In addition, IOM has built up trust and reputation with the stakeholders (both at the border and within the returnees) that it should continue to provide this individual assistance.

tournaments, youth centres, schools outreach and youth forums, as well as print media and radio campaigns. However, it is not clear to what extent this target group have been directly involved in devising and critiquing the campaign. IOM may find it particularly valuable to involve the target group in the design process for future print media campaigns, which are typically very hard to target accurately.

- ***Captive audiences and outreach:*** IOM has sought to maximise its potential for disseminating its information campaign through targeting 'captive' audiences such as deported migrants, MVPs during food and other sorts of distributions, potential youth migrants at the Safe Zones, and through outreach such as the IOM personnel at the Safe Zones visiting schools, attending youth sporting events, and linking with other youth centres.
- ***Self examination:*** IOM has taken the initiative to get an evaluation of its information campaign and it is clear that those involved have read the report and are attempting to take measures to rectify recognised deficiencies in the information campaign. Similarly, IOM conducted a self evaluation of the Safe Zone in Chiredzi with a view to identifying areas of concern and documenting lessons learned before opening the second Safe Zone in Bulawayo.
- ***Types of information:*** Many of the ways of presenting information, such as on HIV/AIDS are well tested methods that have proven to be successful - an example would be the use of drama to put across messages on HIV/AIDS and the audiences that the review team witnessed at the reception centres watching the dramas certainly appeared to be engaged.

Concerns

The main concern relating to the information campaign is how widespread the campaign is (and therefore its effectiveness/impact) and the extent of 'linkages'.

- ***Linkages:*** Various linkages that may enhance the information campaign do not appear to have been given adequate consideration. Examples of this are Diepsluit in South Africa and Nkulumane in Bulawayo. It seems to be commonly known amongst the Zimbabweans that Diepsluit in Johannesburg is where the largest community of Zimbabwean migrants lives, and yet there is no information campaign taking place there. Similarly data has shown that many of those deported at the Plumtree border originate from the neighbourhood (also a bus terminal) of Nkulumane in Bulawayo, but there is no information campaign there either. The review team asked why the current site for the 'Safe Zone' in Bulawayo was selected but was told there was no particular strategic reason other than it was a site allocated by the city council. Given the information that is now being collected in Plumtree, rehabilitation of the city council youth centre nearest to Nkulumane would be very appropriate.

Another area where linkages were missing, bearing in mind that migration is by definition a cross-border issue, is with IOM's regional/South Africa office. It was felt that the IOM office in Zimbabwe could do more to engage the South African office (or vice versa) and an information campaign in Diepsluit and other areas that Zimbabweans go to, could be facilitated by the regional office.

- ***It really is not clear how much impact the Safe Zones have*** – i.e., how effective the two 'Safe Zones' in Bulawayo and Chiredzi really are. There is nothing to show whether youths who are deported and end up in Beitbridge or Plumtree have ever been to the Safe Zones, even though when they arrive at the Reception Centres they are given the

addresses of the Safe Zones. Despite the impressive attendance figures at the Safe Zone in Bulawayo most of these are probably repeat attendances, and certainly most of the youth that the review team saw were from the immediate area

- ***Supporting the work of other Youth Centres:*** Another complex issue is whether, through refurbishing one of many youth centres and attracting such people as the peer advisors to whom they pay very high incentives of between \$30 and \$40 per month, IOM has undermined the functioning - however limited - of neighbouring city council centres, drawing attention and activities away from them. This raises the question of whether the resources could have been spread between two or three different centres rather than focussing on just one, which would have provided wider coverage for Bulawayo and greater outreach for the information campaign. An alternative solution being explored by IOM has been for a mobile centre, which would facilitate greater outreach.
- ***Lack of integration with the MVP programme:*** The team also noted that while HIV/AIDS prevention messaging was mainstreamed throughout the MVP programme, Safe Migration issues were not. This appears to be a missed opportunity as MVPs would certainly appear to fall into the category of potential economic migrants and are less likely than others to be able to afford to do this through the legal channels. The potential for irregular migration is therefore strong. Indeed, some of the beneficiaries interviewed as part of this review stated that they were interested in cross-border trading and other opportunities out of the country.

Recommendations for the information campaign

- *IOM should devise strategies for proactively engaging the target group in developing the programme, in particular the print media campaign. This might include, for example, holding focus group discussions to get feedback on different draft poster designs to determine which are the most appropriate.*
- *IOM should consider a strategy of providing wider support to youth centres in the Bulawayo and Chiredzi areas to widen of the Safe Migration Campaign. This might also include rolling out initiatives such as the video in production that could be used for training purposes at other centres, or through a mobile safe zone team. For example, IOM could link with other centres to provide a weekly or monthly 'Safe Zone' day at other centres, using a mobile team.*
- *IOM should devise strategies for adapting the Safe Migration messages for MVP communities.*

3.3 Appropriateness of IOM's current programmes¹⁴

There is little doubt that IOM's programmes are a central part of the aid effort in Zimbabwe, and have a vital, widespread and active implementation in the complex situation there. Most importantly, the projects contribute significantly to the alleviation of the suffering of many of the vulnerable population. In its core strength or expertise - that of contributing to the regularisation and management of cross-border (international) migration and mitigating the effects of irregular migration - IOM has set a fine example through the setting up of projects that enable its reception centres at Beitbridge and now at Plumtree. They are, possibly, the only examples of their kind, worldwide, and may set vital precedents for future situations

¹⁴ This refers to the three programme areas reviewed, namely the MVP programme, the information campaign and the reception and support centres, although the wider context of IOM's overall strategic plan is also addressed.

where large outflows of population are caused by a stressful economic breakdown combined with other exacerbating factors such as the HIV/AIDS pandemic and ineffectual and incompetent governance. IOM should be very strongly commended for these two reception centres which do so much to mitigate the effects of the dangers of irregular migration; the injustice, banditry, rape, violence, theft, blackmail, and racketeering which lurk in the shady regions of inadequately controlled borders.

Impact

IOM programmes have also had a positive impact in the overall humanitarian situation in Zimbabwe through its widespread implementation of projects to assist mobile vulnerable populations (MVPs) and on occasion as a result of its rapid execution of aid such as occurred in response to the recent cholera outbreak. IOM has also received much praise from the government for its co-operation and at the same time, perhaps thanks to this co-operation IOM, has been able to implement programmes in areas where other agencies appear to have had limited access or capacity¹⁵. IOM has therefore been instrumental in relieving the suffering of otherwise isolated communities.

Dynamic Response

In the context of its projects IOM should be praised for its dynamism, its rapid responses, for its initiatives, for its ability to fill many of the humanitarian gaps, for the fine examples it has set with its reception centres at Plumtree and Beitbridge and generally for the work that it has done to mitigate the humanitarian situation in Zimbabwe.

Unique Access/Wide Range of Activities (diversification):

The 'unique access' (the term used by IOM in its discussions with the review team) aspect has encouraged a wide scope of humanitarian activities to be taken on in Zimbabwe, with activities that range from immediate humanitarian relief, such as the response to the land evictions, to the urban cleansing operation and the outbreak of cholera to rehabilitation and development-orientated activities such as involvement in agriculture and livelihoods. Whilst on the one hand IOM could be praised for adopting a holistic approach that links relief to the initial phases of rehabilitation and development, on the other hand the identification of problematic outcomes earlier in this report, specifically within the MVP programme, reveals that IOM has not been able to adequately manage the programme portfolio it has designed.

There is a risk of losing focus and effectiveness as a whole. A constant refrain from all the projects visited was that there was always too little money resulting, sometimes, in projects that were in danger of losing any impact they might have otherwise had. Some of the agricultural projects that were visited, for example, were in jeopardy of being emasculated by the fact that there was no money for pesticides and fungicides meaning that some of the crops were being destroyed by pests and diseases such as aphids and mildew witnessed by the review team. After visiting only some of the projects, the review team began to get the impression that the 'butter was being spread thinly'; that instead of concentrating all its efforts on doing a limited number of projects really well (and they were doing some projects very well) IOM was experimenting with a wide range of projects that were only on the fringes of

¹⁵ From a humanitarian point of view it may be extremely beneficial to other agencies in the future for IOM to explain how it was able to achieve this 'unique access', where virtually all other agencies have failed to establish any sort of meaningful rapport with the Government of Zimbabwe. It would be pertinent and valuable to understand; whether, for example, IOM has relied on its quasi UN status; whether it has been more dynamic in its approach; whether it has developed unique skills which could be passed on to other aid agencies, whether it has been through its long-term presence, or whether the other agencies have been less prepared to compromise their particular positions or whether it is a combination of factors.

its expertise, such as the 'revolving livestock' project, which appeared to involve considerable expense (\$207,879) and numerous other agricultural livelihood projects where targeting and monitoring appeared to be random and follow-up inadequate.

Causes for Reflection

In its programming, nevertheless, IOM should reflect on some important issues;

- ***Whether it should focus more on its core strengths and unique specialities;*** Although IOM has a broad mandate, is it in danger of expanding its programmes beyond its managerial capacity or interest? This has been identified as a factor in both the 2006 and 2007 reports and by donors, other agencies and government. The 2006 report stated that '*...IOM has not had the technical capacity to meet all the needs...*' and that '*...it is now time for IOM to explore opportunities for handing over activities to organisations with more appropriate skills...*' During the 2009 review the director of social services said in an interview with the review team '*...because of the developmental nature of the needs of these communities, IOM needs to build up more linkages with organisations that are more developmental orientated for long term sustainability...*'. Overall IOM would benefit from a more streamlined strategic vision that identified and focussed on the organisation's core strengths, i.e., those areas in which it has a clear comparative and strategic advantage compared to other organisations.
- ***Whether there are potential disconnects:*** Is IOM making the most effective use of many of the excellent M & E tools that it has developed or is developing, or by creating a large number of tools is IOM in danger of putting too much burden on its personnel allowing them little time to follow through with effective 'grass-roots' monitoring that provides an early opportunity to identify problems in a project and remedy them? Are the tools fulfilling its desired end purpose? Also, should some of these tools be used on a more regional basis to address some of the Zimbabwean migration issues in some of the known migration destinations, e.g., in the locations in South Africa and Botswana where most illegal migrants tend to congregate.
- ***Whether the important and ultimately essential relationship that it has with its various partners, UN, NGOs, government at all levels can be enhanced or rationalised:*** Can the 'unique access' that IOM has achieved for its programmes be used more to empower other agencies with specific competencies to move forward on projects that go beyond IOM's interests, such as the initiative that IOM is taking with an MVP strategic planning workshop with 30 different groups, leaving IOM to focus on its proven strengths, harnessing strong relationships to facilitate access for others.
- ***Whether 'Disaster Preparedness' should be given greater consideration:*** Given the current situation of Zimbabwe, that the economic situation is unlikely to recover quickly, despite the 'dollarization' of the monetary system, the further weakening of the population against more shocks, the more frequent occurrences of disasters, and the incapacity of the government to assist, should IOM include more disaster preparedness in its programmes, even if it is only to raise awareness amongst the vulnerable communities? This need not necessarily require significantly more funding, if it is combined with other community activities in which IOM is already involved. One key opportunity for integrating disaster risk reduction may be in the development of 'Community Development Plans' currently planned in consultation with Practical Action.

3.3.1 Scope of programme

The IOM Zimbabwe office has expanded significantly since the last joint donor review, managing over \$14m in funding from 17 different funding sources in 2008 alone. IOM currently manages and tracks more than 60 17 different active projects¹⁶, and is now delving into new, complex areas of responsibility related to education, livestock initiatives, and transfer of labour skills, for example. Because IOM does not receive core funding that would support overhead and core staff costs, it depends on individual project income to support all of its operations. However, the expansion and large number of programmes has resulted in an extremely heavy management and reporting burden, less time spent in the field to monitor activities and implementing partners, diminished quality of some activities (notably livelihoods, transitional shelter, and capacity building of implementing partners) and the production of large amounts of data to gather and process. The staff has not had adequate time to analyse and process the data and apply the findings to improve many of the ongoing programme activities. . These problems were noted in the 2007 review, and appear to be worsening as IOM continues to expand the scope and range of its activities. Recommendations for IOM to refocus its attention away from longer-term development-oriented activities were made by representatives of the GOZ, NGOs, UN agencies, donors, and implementing partners - virtually the whole range of those interviewed by the team. If these problems are not corrected, IOM risks further damaging its overall reputation in Zimbabwe

The need to manage all of its activities may distract IOM from devoting adequate time to making contingency plans for a wide variety of actual and potential developments/needs involving migrants and MVPs, including:

- The need for negotiated access to land by returning and newly displaced migrants or MVPs;
- Possible abuse of Zimbabwean migrants as a result of the World Cup event in South Africa in 2010, including a clean-up campaign, high levels of migration of youth and adults to watch the games; return of migrants who were working on construction for the Games (IOM is also anticipating higher trafficking potential);
- The potential for engagement with the GOZ on a nation-wide assessment of vulnerability and total populations of MVPs/IDPs (IOM has begun this dialogue);
- Results of the new farm evictions in Mashonaland East and other sites;
- The identification of old (graduated) MVP communities that are newly vulnerable and merit assistance and / or ex-post evaluations of these sites to assess long term sustainability;
- Assistance to households that need new distributions of NFIs;
- Incorporation of cholera awareness and prevention into ongoing WASH information messaging;
- Complications that arise from the next elections, predicted between six months and two years from now; and
- The potential impacts of South Africa's revised migration policy.

Recommendation for the overall scope of the programme:

- *For the third time in an annual review, it is strongly recommended that IOM reduce the scope and scale of its operations in Zimbabwe and refocus on a more manageable portfolio of activities more closely aligned with more recent displacements and migration.*

¹⁶ As shown in IOM's project tracking tool

3.3.2 Appropriateness of IOM's strategic plan

The review team reviewed both the 2008 – 2010 strategic plan, and the most recent version of the updated 2009 – 2011 strategic plan (currently at advanced draft stage). This section is primarily related to the latter, more recent version of the strategic plan. According to the document, the strategic plan “*provides a summary of IOM Zimbabwe's strategic direction for the three-year period from 2009 – 2011. It considers the operating environment, the challenges of migration in Zimbabwe and prioritises a set of strategies based on scenario planning*”.

On the whole the strategic plan appears to be a very appropriate and solid planning tool. In particular, the review team felt that scenario planning was a good strategy for identifying different emphases in programming relating to different potential scenarios (‘improved’; ‘likely’; and ‘worst case’). However, overall the scope of the strategic plan, in terms of the number of projects and potential projects identified, appears to be too broad. In particular, the review team is concerned that it would be difficult for such a large and multi-faceted programme to rapidly change direction between the different scenarios. The overall scope of the programme outlined in the strategic plan also risks losing focus on quality of delivery, as also noted in previous sections.

The review team also felt that the strategic plan failed to demonstrate a clear analysis of IOM's own internal limitations and weaknesses, although IOM has explained that this was carried out as an internal exercise prior to developing the Strategic Plan. Nonetheless, it would be useful to include some of this self analysis in the strategy document itself and identify how this analysis has related to the development of the strategy. Similarly, the document does not clearly define IOM's comparative or strategic advantages, and how these relate to the overall strategy. Clearer identification of weaknesses and comparative and strategic advantages would be a key stage in streamlining the overall scope of the strategy to a more appropriate and manageable level.

As noted in other sections of this report, IOM's monitoring and evaluation capacity is disproportionately focussed on outputs, as opposed to outcomes, and this is once again demonstrated in the strategic plan. The document identifies IOM's ‘successes’ almost entirely as the results of specific processes or deliverables, rather than as the overall impact of the consolidated programme at household or community level.

Also as mentioned in other parts of this report, IOM would also benefit from more integrated Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) strategies across its programme, as well as more in-depth risk-analysis, both of which could be more solidly reflected in the overall strategy document.

Finally, it was noted that the exit strategies defined for the current rapid review of all MVP communities (under PRP) were not included in the strategic plan. If IOM is committed to a long term vision of reintegrating these communities into mainstream government and development activities, then this should be an integral part of the strategic plan. Ultimately, bringing communities into formal development structures (both NGO and ultimately government) should be a **primary goal** of the programme **even if it is not achievable in the short-medium term**. There is a danger of compounding marginalisation of these communities by continuing to treat them outside of the mainstream. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that the actual opportunities for doing this in the short term are extremely limited. It was acknowledged, for example, that although the current process under PRP is aimed at facilitating ‘handover’ it is not anticipated to see any short term results – PRP is envisaged as a

5 year programme – (three years plus possible 2 year extension), and that is the timescale being looked at in this context.

Recommendations for strategic planning:

- *IOM should review the strategic plan to include the following activities, leading to a more streamlined overall programme strategy:*
 - *Analysis of internal limitations and weaknesses;*
 - *Analysis of IOM Zimbabwe’s strategic and comparative advantages;*
 - *Inclusion of exit strategy process;*
 - *Risk analysis; and*
 - *Disaster Risk Reduction mainstreaming*

3.4 Donor harmonisation

Both previous joint donor reviews identified ways in which IOM and its donors could work together more efficiently and harmoniously, keeping in mind the various structural constraints and limitations faced by all entities.

This current review finds that some limits to the harmonisation process have been reached; certain donors with structural and legal limitations will not be able to increase the flexibility of their relationships with IOM. This must be accepted. IOM currently receives funding from 17 entities; each relationship has expanded the management and reporting requirements for IOM. On a positive note, the new global IOM financial tracking tool—PRISM—should enable IOM to improve its capacity for tracking and reporting. This system allows IOM to track programmes individually or as part of an overall budget, each project with a unique identification number. IOM also invited its donors to engage in the development and finalization of its 2009-2011 Strategy (although no comments were forthcoming). Donors were also consulted in the early stages of strategy development through discussions with the consultant hired to assist in developing the strategic plan.

All organizations receiving humanitarian assistance funding must adjust to changing levels of funding, since funds are allocated according to needs spread across countries all around the world. IOM has been receiving long-term funding from its largest donor, DfID (three years). Similarly, SIDA and other major donors reported that their funding has been so consistent over the past few years that IOM’s claims that it cannot count on a minimum level of assistance are somewhat false, and that they should not be used as an argument to not undertake such programmes as Conservation Farming or Internal Savings and Lending. Although specific levels of funding may be unknown from year to year, a certain level of *continuity* of funding is expected, hence there may be scope for longer term programming. The long-term DfID funding has been very useful in filling gaps and responding to sudden emergencies. But because DfID has been increasingly concerned about IOM’s rapid expansion into services for more stable populations, it has been working with IOM staff to re-assess the vulnerability of all of the households IOM assists, with the aim of handing over households in more stable areas to development-oriented partners. Furthermore, there may be more opportunities to use the multi-year DFID funding more strategically, i.e., to specifically address interventions that require a multi-year approach. The more focused a program IOM has, the easier it would be to react to changes in funding levels from one year to the next; adjusting 15 activities rather than 30, for example.

IOM is in discussion with its largest donors about a pooled/basket funding mechanism, but was also concerned that such a mechanism may affect its bilateral relations with each. Pooled funding would ease the tensions associated with operating with multiple pools of smaller funding.

One of the most serious problems the review team identified with IOM's programmes is the poor performance and tracking of some of the livelihood programmes. This was raised during the previous two reviews as well, and it is incumbent upon both the donors and IOM to see that this problem is addressed immediately. Poorly designed, implemented, monitored, and tracked programmes waste tax-payer money and beneficiary time and energy. This cannot be emphasised more strongly.

Recommendations for IOM for donor harmonisation:

- *IOM should strongly consider reducing the number of partnerships with small donors to ease its management and reporting burden.*
- *IOM should provide the standardised reporting format to the donors.*

Recommendations for donors for donor harmonisation:

- *Any pooled/basket funding mechanism developed with IOM should clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of all entities involved, in particular as they relate to setting priorities.*
- *Donors that are able should allow for a small (5-10%) contingency budget line item to allow IOM to respond quickly to fast developing emergencies, with a rapid approval system for allocation by the donor.*
- *Donors should exercise the leverage they have to ensure that IOM greatly improves the quality of its livelihood programmes, focusing on better design, implementation, monitoring, and impact evaluation.*
- *The joint donor review should be held on a biennial basis, for a month instead of two weeks. The longer time on the ground will enable the team to examine programmes more in depth. Each review should have at least one topical focus, with the next examining the Health programmes, as well as the HIV/AIDS and SGBV mainstreaming.*

4. Conclusions

Overall, IOM is making good progress towards achieving its programme purpose, and the individual outputs appear to be appropriate to achieving this. Most impressive among the activities reviewed were the Reception and Support Centres, which represent a significant innovation for replication in other similar contexts. The information campaign also appears to be largely well managed and appropriately targeted, although it is inevitably difficult to measure or attribute the success of specific information strategies. IOM has also been commended for its responses to new and rapid onset emergencies, often being at the forefront of such responses. IOM is also providing ongoing support for highly marginalised and often difficult-to-access MVP communities. However, it is here that the review team found greatest cause for concern, in particular within the livelihoods approaches and shelter solutions, and more generally with the impact monitoring and overall quality control and support at field level. The team also identified a potentially serious breakdown in the relationship between IOM and its implementing partners. Overall, it is the assertion of the review team most of these problems are symptomatic of the increasing expansion and diversification of IOM's overall strategic direction in Zimbabwe. The strongest recommendation hailing from this review is that IOM needs to urgently review its strategic advantages and internal weaknesses with a view to developing a more streamlined strategy for its overall programme in Zimbabwe.

Annexes:

1. Summary of recommendations
2. Analysis of programme risks and assumptions
3. Log Frame
4. Review schedule
5. List of key informants
6. List of documents reviewed
7. Terms of reference

Annex 1: Summary of Recommendations

(a) Recommendations for IOM

Recommendations for IOM for future reviews:

- *Informal interaction with beneficiaries, in the fields or at livelihood sites, for example, is a more useful and unbiased way to gather information than through prepared testimonials. In fact, prepared testimonials and speeches should be avoided as much as possible.*
- *Where possible is it better for the review team itself to identify the beneficiaries to interview or speak with.*
- *IOM programme team meetings: it is more productive for the review team to meet with two or three people for shorter time periods than longer meetings with many participants, which also are not the best use of IOM staff time.*

Recommendations for achieving programme purpose:

- **The overall IOM programme would benefit from a more streamlined strategic focus,** increasing its depth and reducing its overall scope. *At the moment, it appears that IOM is facing difficulties in balancing the number of projects against the numbers of staff available to follow up with monitoring and evaluation. In particular the review team believes that IOM could better utilise its strategic advantages to focus on:*
 - a. **Optimising relationships:** *IOM has gained widespread access to vulnerable populations through its own implementing partners. Now that the situation in Zimbabwe appears to be less restrictive for other agencies, it may be an appropriate time for IOM to collaborate more closely with them. IOM is a key player whose potential links to many partners, and leadership of the MVP working group, will facilitate strategic planning for bringing MVP communities into mainstream development and government initiatives..*
 - b. **Advocacy:** *IOM could focus its strategic advantages in order to advocate for the inclusion of migration issues into other agencies' planning when they consider the larger humanitarian problems of Zimbabwe. To date, IOM has already had some successes in this area –for example encouraging the incorporation of migration issues into the ZimVAC – but there remain other areas where IOM could also use its influence, such as further lobbying with WFP to address MVPs which are considered to be separate from mainstream communities; and lobbying UNHCR to look more closely at some of the protection issues associated with the blurred areas between political and economic migration.*

Recommendation for risk assessment:

- *IOM should develop a more detailed/pertinent risk analysis framework that properly extrapolates the actual and perceived risks to the programme and defines impact and response strategies.*

Recommendations for livelihoods:

- *Contract an immediate external review of IOM's livelihoods interventions.*
- *Scale back on small-scale projects and focus instead on wider-scale roll-out of the ISAL methodology. (NB contract CARE to directly train all implementing partners).*
- *Investigate the potential for social transfer mechanisms, including cash-for-work linked to needed public works activities. (NB these should be developed with an end-date in mind for completion of all necessary works, i.e., projects should not continue to be 'found' once all identified works have been completed). IOM should not commit to direct cash transfers unless there are clear mechanisms for sustaining these over the longer term.*
- *Put more resources into delivering a more comprehensive agricultural inputs package, including:*
 - *Appropriate scale to maximise use of available land;*
 - *Tailor-made packages for each location (in consultation with local partners and Agritex office), which may include cash crops where cereal crops are less viable;*
 - *Integrated pest management;*
 - *Ongoing technical support to farmers (delivered through partners and Agritex); and*
 - *Comprehensive technical back-stopping and monitoring in the field (by IOM)*
- *Introduce Conservation Farming to complement the inputs distribution. (NB this should be done with adequate consultation with other organisations or projects that are already successfully implementing this approach, such as PRP.)*
- *Consult with more experienced organisations, such as CARE International in Zimbabwe, to learn about and implement effective dam management strategies where such a resource exists. (NB The review team does not believe that IOM has the technical capacity to support fish farming projects and would strongly recommend that where possible plans for such projects are put on hold.)*

Recommendations for shelter:

- *IOM urgently needs to review its transitional shelter interventions in consultation with other agencies that have successfully delivered shelter solutions in Zimbabwe, as well as its own implementing partners. This should include an understanding of the local complexities in terms of differing standards and requirements, as well as determining more appropriate logistics solutions.*
- *IOM should leverage its position to advocate at the national level for greater standardisation for minimum standards for building plans and materials.*
- *IOM should reassess households' need for the replacement of plastic sheeting that is wearing out after two or more years of use.*

Recommendations for health:

- *While the Migration Health Unit appears to be delivering efficient and appropriate services, the review team would warn against expanding beyond the areas of IOM's strategic and comparative advantages, e.g., into ART service delivery.*

Recommendations for food aid:

- *IOM urgently needs to convene a meeting with senior WFP personnel to discuss the issues raised in this report.*
- *Consider decentralising more staff out of Harare, basing them out in the field, for the ongoing monitoring of the food aid programme.*

Recommendations for M&E:

- **Ongoing development of quality data collection tools:** IOM have, sensibly, identified this issue and have contracted a UN Volunteer to look in more detail at the information needs of the organisation and the range of monitoring and evaluation tools available, with a view to streamlining the system to produce the most relevant information. A major recommendation would be to emphasise that this needs to be looked at in a more practical way, that addresses the specific needs of the programmes, rather than specifically in a narrow 'information technology' perspective. Overall **there is a requirement for improved impact assessment and documentation**. The emphasis should be on 'impact' or effect rather than the measurement of 'outputs' delivery.
- IOM would also benefit from consulting more widely with other organisations and programmes (e.g., large NGOs, PRP, JI) to determine a wider range of potential M&E tools, both qualitative and quantitative, that address the need to determine impact. These might include:
 - Household Livelihoods Assessment approaches.
 - Case studies / household tracking (i.e., tracking the progress of specific individual households receiving different combinations of benefits).
 - Community-based Participatory Appraisal techniques.

Recommendations for assessment and targeting:

- Overall, targeting needs to be reviewed to ensure that it appropriately and adequately reflects the overall goals of the programme, and further, that these goals are consistent with those of the participating communities.
- There is an urgent need to ensure that any future needs assessments and research focussing on MVP communities include appropriate contextual information, i.e., comparing the situation of the MVPs with that of the wider population.
- Similarly, contextual factors should be used in the design of programmes and projects (for example the fact that 61.5% of the MVPs has permission to remain on the land)

Recommendations for gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming:

- IOM is encouraged to continue its excellent mainstreaming efforts in these areas. The next annual review should include a specific focus on these activities, examining the overall impact of the mainstreaming.
- Further efforts should be made to encourage girls to use the Safe Zones (perhaps by establishing time periods where the centres are only open to girls), and women to use the services at the Reception and Support Centres.
- The IOM referral services for HIV/AIDS care and treatment appear to be highly appreciated and should be expanded in the areas where IOM works.
- IOM should apply similar gender analysis approaches to the wider MVP programme, particularly the livelihoods interventions.

Recommendations for partner capacity building and support:

IOM should:

- Urgently convene a feedback meeting for IPs to address the issues highlighted in this report.

- *Have a single focal point for implementing partners who can then direct them to technical specialists as necessary, but retain overall co-ordination and history.*
- *Reintroduce monthly IOM-IP meetings. IPs should also be encouraged to establish their own networking fora for addressing common problems and solutions for specific sectoral activities (e.g., shelter).*
- *Develop more appropriate MOUs. These should be for no less than 6 months, i.e., MOUs should be tied to funding periods not project-based.*
- *Conduct a proper assessment of appropriate salaries and establish a salary structure that shows acceptable ranges for key positions, taking into account the increased cost of living.*

Recommendations for Reception and Support Centres:

Generally IOM should continue its good work in this area, with the following recommendations:

- ***Management of irregular migration:*** *IOM should continue in its robust management of irregular migration; continue to refine its systems, especially the e-registration system which currently still needs to be tweaked to become a fully pragmatic tool for the processing of migrant data (for example, the system does not have the capacity yet to determine how many times a migrant is cycling—whether it is three times a week, month, or year), and continue to apply lessons learned from Beitbridge to Plumtree.*
- ***Protection:*** *Above all IOM should be robust in continuing to address the complicated protection issues that arise over migration issues, but should increasingly share these responsibilities with UNHCR, which is taking over the lead of the protection working group/cluster.*
- ***Documentation:*** *Overall, so impressed was the review team with the ongoing success of the systems and procedures established at the Reception and Support Centres that it is a specific recommendation of this review that these important experiences and lessons learned be documented in a book. The team feels that although current documentation in the ‘grey’ literature is commendable, for these systems to be truly replicable a more thorough documentation is required. This may require, for example, that the programme manager be awarded a sabbatical in which to focus on documenting the programme experiences in a book, or working with a writer to do so.*

Recommendations for the information campaign

- *IOM should devise strategies for proactively engaging the target group in developing the programme, in particular the print media campaign. This might include, for example, holding focus group discussions to get feedback on different draft poster designs to determine which are the most appropriate.*
- *IOM should consider a strategy of providing wider support to youth centres in the Bulawayo and Chiredzi areas to widen of the Safe Migration Campaign.*
- *IOM should devise strategies for adapting the Safe Migration messages for MVP communities.*

Recommendation for the overall scope of the programme:

- *For the third time in an annual review, it is strongly recommended that IOM reduce the scope and scale of its operations in Zimbabwe and refocus on a more manageable portfolio of activities more closely aligned with more recent displacements and migration.*

Recommendations for strategic planning:

- *IOM should review the strategic plan to include the following activities, leading to a more streamlined overall programme strategy:*
 - *Analysis of internal limitations and weaknesses;*
 - *Analysis of IOM Zimbabwe's strategic and comparative advantages;*
 - *Inclusion of exit strategy process;*
 - *Risk analysis; and*
 - *Disaster Risk Reduction mainstreaming*

Recommendations for IOM for donor harmonisation:

- *IOM should strongly consider reducing the number of partnerships with small donors to ease its management and reporting burden.*
- *IOM should provide the standardised reporting format to the donors.*

(b) Recommendations for Donors**Recommendations for donors for donor harmonisation:**

- *Any pooled/basket funding mechanism developed with IOM should clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of all entities involved, in particular as they relate to setting priorities.*
- *Donors that are able should allow for a small (5-10%) contingency budget line item to allow IOM to respond quickly to fast developing emergencies, with a rapid approval system for allocation by the donor.*
- *Donors should exercise the leverage they have to ensure that IOM greatly improves the quality of its livelihood programmes, focusing on better design, implementation, monitoring, and impact evaluation.*
- *The joint donor review should be held on a biennial basis, for a month instead of two weeks. The longer time on the ground will enable the team to examine programmes more in depth. Each review should have at least one topical focus, with the next examining the Health programmes, as well as the HIV/AIDS and SGBV mainstreaming.*

Annex 2: Risks and Assumptions

This table shows the risks / assumptions from the current donor logframe along with the comments of the 2009 review team. For interest, the 2007 review team comments have also been included as many of these remain relevant. As noted previously, this logframe is not used as a programming tool by IOM, but does draw on the specific programmatic frameworks that are utilised for project monitoring.

2006-2009 Framework Risks and Assumptions For Programme Purpose and Goal	Comments from 2007 review	Comments (2009 review team)
The political and security situation does not deteriorate sufficiently to make the project unable to meet its objectives	<i>The harsh political realities and conflict between the GoZ and opposition parties have brought on international condemnation New risks and assumptions: Chances are very high that the political situation will further deteriorate with upcoming presidential and parliamentary elections in 2008</i>	IOM needs to take into account several potential socio-political-economic evens that may lead to a significant deterioration of the operating environment. These may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential failure of the Government of National Unity (GNU) • Revenge attacks from victims of political violence • Reversal of dollarization (and ensuing shortages) Continued Increasing costs (exaggerated cost of living)
Safety of IOM staff and its implementing partners will not be compromised	<i>This past year, the security of IOM staff, highly respected in Zimbabwe, and unique access largely has not compromised its work.</i>	This may become a bigger issue if GNU collapses
The authorities will abide by generally recognized humanitarian principles; non-discrimination on aid delivery, humanitarian access to beneficiaries, and protection of humanitarian workers;	<i>The GoZ tardiness in providing permits for stands for the so-called "Mbare" annex populations in Hopley Farm for example, is limiting IOM and its partners from providing shelter and other basic services. GoZ is reluctant to provide stands for temporary shelter rather than permanent ones.</i>	Due to its unique position as an international organisation of which Zimbabwe is a member state, and yet outside of the formal UN system has so far allowed IOM to continue access during times of severe political upheaval where others have failed.

2006-2009 Framework Risks and Assumptions For Programme Purpose and Goal	Comments (2007)	Comments (2009)
Adequate and comprehensive funding is made available to IOM by donors to ensure the effective implementation of all programmes including reaching of all targets	<i>There is still inadequate funding to assist all of the humanitarian and transitional livelihood needs. New risks and assumptions: The threatened eviction of 800-1000 more commercial farmers if carried out will mean an increase in caseloads which would require increased donor funding. The 2006/07 crop failure due to drought in Matabeleland North and South provinces as well as pockets of other provinces will continue to add to the numbers of newly vulnerable. Between the last review and the current one, there has been another operation dubbed "Chikorokoza Chapera" targeted at illegal mining countrywide. This narrowed livelihood options for communities and is likely to increase the caseloads</i>	Potential for under-funding is always a risk of such programmes. IOM should rather focus on their areas of manageable interest within the scope of funding that's available.
Government will adhere to its commitment to land tenure for the stabilized affected populations	<i>The GoZ still needs to be encouraged to facilitate access to land for vulnerable populations and provide permits for stands in the urban settings.</i>	IOM needs to further extrapolate the associated risks of this assumption, i.e. what strategies are available if Government does not adhere to its commitment, and what mitigation strategies are in place?
The concerned international and national project partners continue to offer the necessary comprehensive support as defined by their respective mandates within all three programme areas	<i>The continued lack of access to sensitive resettlement areas by any organization but IOM and some of its partners makes the unique responsibility with IOM a weakness in the overall humanitarian programme for the country. Thus the UN Team and donors should push for additional access to enhance sustainability.</i>	It would be useful to identify lack of UN co-ordination in some areas, in particular overall co-ordination through OCHA and to some extent through WHO as a limitation and identify appropriate responses.
The macroeconomic climate does not negatively impact the implementation of the programme	<i>The severely contracting economy (over 4000% inflation, the worst in the world, at the time of this report) in fact has had a major negative effect on the targeted populations as well as the planning, logistics, accounting, and day-to-day operations of IOM and its partners.</i>	The challenges of the macroeconomic environment are a fundamental part of the Zimbabwean operating environment and most likely WILL negatively impact on the programme (as seen during 2008) – therefore this assumption is inappropriate.

Risks and Assumptions for Output 1 (MVPs)	Comments (2007)	Comments (2009)
IOM is receiving unequivocal access to most locations and beneficiaries affected by displacement	<i>Those households in the urban and rural areas that have not yet been allocated stands do not receive improved shelter and some services.</i>	During the 2008 NGO ban IOM successfully managed to retain access in many locations by leveraging local churches and other faith based organisations that were able to deliver basic humanitarian services to affected populations. To date, access to remote or forgotten populations has been one of IOM's key strengths, although there is possibly a window of opportunity in the current climate to leverage this success to identify more opportunities for facilitating access for others.
The authorities will abide by generally recognized humanitarian principles on aid delivery, humanitarian access to beneficiaries, and protection of humanitarian workers;	<i>GoZ continues to discriminate in the assignment of stands in the Harare urban areas eg "Mbare" annex population in Hopely Farm</i>	See above
IOM will ensure that protection measures especially for most vulnerable categories of the assisted caseload, including women and children, are appropriately implemented	<i>There has been only little progress by IOM and other humanitarian partners in acquiring identification papers for many of the 'stateless' people, originally from Mozambique, Zambia, and Malawi.</i>	It would be useful to identify specific factors within the wider operating context might prevent them from doing this. This might include: Government policies, interference, access – lack of protection co-ordination from OCHA, security.
There will be no adverse government policies directly affecting the project	<i>In the areas visited, there have been no major additional setbacks in this domain over the past year. Elsewhere, however, there are reports from IOM that one of its IP was prevented from operating in one district because the partner is a trust not a PVO.</i>	IOM needs to develop a specific disaster preparedness or contingency planning framework for identifying potential threats to the programme from the external environment. These might include further elections (predicted any time within the next 6 – 24 months), SA government policy regarding the 2010 world cup, and continued land evictions

Risks and Assumptions for Output 2 (Migrants and Deportees)	Comments (2007)	Comments (2009)
That all concerned stakeholders retain their commitment in the process and that obligations are met through the required coordination meetings	<i>Monthly stakeholder meetings have ensured continued levels of support from all stakeholders.</i>	Again, it would be a good idea for IOM to specifically extrapolate potential risks and develop response and mitigation strategies. For example, relating to the fact that Botswana is not a member state of IOM, or potential changes in South Africa's migration policies (e.g., 2010 world cup and associated risks).
That the political and security situation does not deteriorate sufficiently as to make the project unable to meet its objectives	<i>If numbers of deportees continue to increase there is the challenge of providing the same level of service to migrants.</i>	As above, IOM needs to identify potential risks and response strategies.
Border officials are stationed long enough in Beitbridge area to instil change within their behaviour towards and understanding of the rights of the deportees	<i>Work towards sensitising border and other key officials underway, but behavioural change will remain a long term objective.</i>	The assumption here should be that border officials WILL change and that therefore the programme needs to be a rolling programme aiming to reach as many people as possible.
There are no major changes in the migration environment—availability of passports and visas, and deportation policy of the South African Government	<i>Availability of passports has become more difficult over the period due to GoZ shortage of finance. GoSA policy remains constant, but they are increasing their capacity to deport with the opening of a new centre in Musina</i>	Again, rather than making this an assumption it would be more useful to identify the possible changes and related mitigation strategies. For example, what is the potential impact of the recent dramatic price increase for Zimbabwean passports.
That overall practice and policy with regard to availability of passports in Zimbabwe, accessibility of visas to RSA, and overall deportation policy do not change to reduce or raise volume of deportees from current volumes and push factors influencing irregular migration decisions	<i>Over the year accessibility to passports become more difficult, whilst deportations increased from last year. Not yet clear if trend will continue or peak. New risks and assumptions: Increased capacity of GoSA to deport coupled with political push means IOM may be unable to maintain current levels of service delivery with the existing staffing/resources capacity.</i>	As above

Risks and Assumptions for Output 3 Information Campaign	Comments (2007)	Comments (2009)
That all concerned stakeholders retain their commitment in the process and that obligations are met through the required coordination meetings	<i>Stakeholders remain committed to the process, but failure to secure full funding means some of the activities have had to be scaled back.</i>	As with previous assumptions, it might be more useful to identify specific associated risks and mitigation strategies.
That the political and security situation does not deteriorate sufficiently as to make the project unable to meet its objectives	<i>The political and economic situation continues to be difficult, but objectives should still be achievable.</i>	As above.
Government will continue to allow IOM to reach out and target youth within both urban and rural areas	<i>IOM have continued to obtain access to rural areas, and have built good relationships with government who are content with IOM's work.</i>	Apart from a two-week period prior the elections where it was felt that it would not be safe, IOM's 'Safe Zones' were allowed to continue operating throughout the 2008 NGO ban period.
The teachers will embrace the opportunity to work with IOM and follow through on the initiatives with the incentives on offer from IOM (e.g. prizes for school projects)	<i>One schools' competition held so far with 100 or so entries. Exploring possibilities for further work with schools.</i>	Although IOM appear to have successfully implemented several activities with schools, some activities may have been negatively impacted by the teacher's stay-away at the start of 2009. As with other assumptions, it would have been useful to identify a specific mitigation and response strategy for this, e.g., strategies for scaling up activities at the Safe Zones during times of school closure, or increased school drop-outs due to increasing school fees.
That the concerned international and national project partners continue to offer the necessary support as defined by their respective mandates	<i>Stakeholders still appear to be bought into the process.</i>	There appears to be widespread support for the information campaign. It would be useful for IOM to leverage this support to deliver more on the South African side of the border, e.g., in the primary destination areas for Zimbabweans in Johannesburg (e.g., Diepsluit)
IOM is aware that there are people in Zimbabwe of 'stateless' nature who would not be able to request a passport hence the targets are only meant for those who can legally request a passport	<i>It has been very difficult for Zimbabweans to get passports. IOM has therefore refocused the campaign to focus on warning against dangers of irregular migration and suggested changing the target accordingly. Messages will also be appropriate for "stateless" persons.</i>	This raises the wider question of how the issue of statelessness is addressed? Also as noted previously the cost of obtaining a passport is now prohibitive for most Zimbabwean and this also need to be factored into the information campaign strategies.

Annex 3: Donor Logframe

Strategic area, outcome, output (Information automatically exported from worksheet on 'Activities')	New Indicators	Baseline	Donor Log frame (3 year target)	Assumption/Risk for each indicator (if there is one)	Overall Assumptions/Risks	Sources of verification	
GOAL: To contribute to the management of cross-border (international) and internal migration					The political and security situation does not deteriorate sufficiently as to make the project unable to meet its objectives;		
Project Purpose: To protect the rights and address the needs and vulnerabilities of migrants and mobile populations	Output 1: Percentage of registered households who have additional vulnerability (orphan/child-headed, single-headed, elderly-headed, chronically ill-headed or having a chronically ill member in household)		70% (105,000 out of 150,000 individuals)		The Authorities will abide by generally recognized humanitarian principles: Non-discrimination on aid delivery, humanitarian access to beneficiaries, and protection of humanitarian workers;	Registration Database	
	Percentage of districts serviced as compared with total districts in need of assistance (shelter, watsan, HIV/AIDS and health specifically)			Assuming we are not reaching all in need due to lack of funding and/or lack of knowledge.	Adequate and comprehensive funding is made available to IOM by donors to ensure the effective implementation of all programmes including reaching of all targets;	Monitoring Database and Managers	
	Number of the IDPs identified as vulnerable will be assisted through immediate or recovery humanitarian assistance				Government will adhere to the its commitment to land tenure for the stabilized affected populations;		
	Output 2: 174,600 deportees deported from South Africa will be assisted through the Beitbridge reception centre with either transport, food or medical assessment			174,600		That the concerned international and national project partners continue to offer the necessary comprehensive support as defined by their respective mandates within all three programme areas; and	Beitbridge database
	Output 3: Number of people will be reached through the Information Campaign on migration			3,000,000		That the macroeconomic climate does not negatively impact the implementation of the programme.	Information Campaign Database and tally sheets
	Overall: All beneficiary communities will be monitored and all incidents reported to ensure the protection of assisted beneficiaries						All database (protection side)

Output 1: To address the humanitarian needs of mobile and vulnerable populations						
	Emergency Food Assistance and Livelihood: Number of communities who graduate out of emergency needs (food) and now engage in livelihoods		Households: 6,000 or 30,000 beneficiaries	hard to graduate out- this will be provided based on reporting period but these households may have to be pulled back in the following year.	IOM is receiving unequivocal access to most locations and beneficiaries affected by displacement;	Monitoring database
	Percentage of households who indicate that their food security (access, utilisation, and availability) has improved due to assistance.				The Authorities will abide by generally recognized humanitarian principles: Non-discrimination on aid delivery, humanitarian access to beneficiaries, and protection of humanitarian workers;	PDM
	Domestic and Shelter Needs: Percentage of households who report that assets are of good quality, appropriate and sufficient for households				IOM will ensure that protection measures, especially for most vulnerable categories of the assisted caseload, including women and children, are appropriately implemented;	PDM
	Percentage of households who indicate that shelter assistance has lessened the impact of environmental hazards				There will be no adverse government policies directly affecting the project.	PDM
	Environmental and community health: Percentage of households satisfied with sanitation assistance, water and health					PDM
	Prevalence of communicable diseases (cholera, pneumonia, scabies) decreased by 30%		50%			Disease Surveillance Info
	HIV/AIDS and GBV mainstreaming: Increase in HIV/AIDS knowledge					PDM or BSS
	Number of GBV cases reported to IOM					Protection database
	Number of communities who have stabilized their place of residence through negotiations on land tenure	61.5% of the communities have permission to stay on the	30,000 beneficiaries (6,000 HH)	Given difficulty in getting documents only based on the perception and target communities to be determined.		PDM, Managers

		land that they occupy -				
	IP Capacity Building: Satisfaction rate of the IPs on IOM's capacity building and their own ability to work in emergency settings					Evaluations of workshops
Output 2: Address the humanitarian needs of returnees in Beitbridge (and Plumtree) and increase the involvement of all stakeholders in promoting and protecting the rights of migrants						
	Humanitarian needs: Breakdown of types of assistance compared to total registered (health, food, transport)		174600 registered		That all concerned stakeholders retain their commitment in the process and that obligations are met through the required coordination meetings;	Monitoring Database
	Number of deportees (including unaccompanied minors) registered compared to the number being deported [show as a percentage as well]		174,600		That the political and security situation does not deteriorate sufficiently as to make the project unable to meet its objectives;	Monitoring Database
	Migration knowledge: Percentage of target population with comprehensive correct knowledge of legal/regular migration	5.90 %	60%		Border officials are stationed long enough in Beitbridge area to instill change within their behavior towards and understanding of the rights of the deportees;	BB migration Survey

	Percentage <i>without a passport</i> saying they will return to South Africa in the next three months	42.40 %		3 months is insufficient time to plan for safe migration; Currently we are receiving this information from the Beitbridge survey which targets sample group. Ideally, we would get better information through the e-registration (with exact information on the number of people who have come through the centre more than once) however, until E-registration takes place, the survey is the best source of information.	There are no major changes in the migration environment – availability of passports and visas, and deportation policy of South African Government;	Currently BB migration survey
	HIV/AIDS Knowledge: Percentage (60%) of target population with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS				That overall practice and policy with regard to availability of passports in Zimbabwe, accessibility of visas to RSA, and overall deportation policy do not change to reduce or raise volume of deportees from current volumes and push factors influencing irregular migration decisions.	BB migration Survey
	Number of returnees tested at any VCT clinic in Zimbabwe compared to number registered at the Centre					New Start Clinics, PSI
	Protection: Number of incidents reported and actioned (stratify by sex, age and type of incident) to IOM					Protection (Monitoring Database)
	Percentage of target population to report on treatment of deportees: receiving food/water at detention centre, separation of families, harassment and use of phones)					BB migration Survey

	Reduction in the number of unaccompanied minors deported along with adults			IOM is trying to advocate for unaccompanied minors to be deported in a more humane fashion.		Monitoring Database
Output 3: Provide potential Zimbabwean migrants with sufficient information to make informed choices about migration while also increasing their knowledge on potential risks and vulnerabilities, including HIV/AIDS (Phase 2: 15-24 year old)						
	Safe Migration: Percentage of target population with comprehensive correct knowledge of risks of irregular migration				That all concerned stakeholders retain their commitment in the process and that obligations are met through the required coordination meetings;	Baseline and subsequent surveys
	Increase the number of 15-24 year old Zimbabweans who can correctly identify the steps for legal migration				That the political and security situation does not deteriorate sufficiently as to make the project unable to meet its objectives;	Baseline and subsequent surveys
	HIV/AIDS: Percentage of sample target population with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS		60%		Government will continue to allow IOM to reach out and target youth within both urban and rural areas;	Baseline and subsequent surveys
					The teachers will embrace the opportunity to work with IOM and follow through on the initiatives with the incentives on offer from IOM, i.e. prizes for best school/ youth project on designing a community service advertisement;	
					That the concerned international and national project partners continue to offer the necessary support as defined by their respective mandates; and	
					IOM is aware that there are people in Zimbabwe of 'stateless' nature who would not be able to request a passport hence the targets are only meant for those who can legally request a passport	

Annex 4: Review Schedule

Donor Review 23 February - 6 March 2009

Date	Activity	Agenda	Who	Where
	Pre-Review Preparation			
Before 23 Feb	Dissemination of Preliminary Documentation to consultants	Includes draft ToRs, proposals, reports, Strategic Plan etc	Consultancy Team (CT)	
	IOM Pre-preparation			
	Week 1 – Meetings and Field Work			
Mon 23 February	Reading and Meeting day for Consultants 9:30-10:30 IOM Briefing to hand over documents	Team to meet and discuss logistics. IOM can also come by and provide the folders to CT for them to read and review Logistic for review, schedule of meetings, detailed documentation handover	CT CT, Diana Cartier	<i>Amanzi boardroom To determine USAID/ECHO driver</i>
Tues 24 Feb	0820–0915: Meeting with IOM Chief of Mission and Programme Managers	Presentation on IOM mission: staff, funding, programmes, mandates etc	CT (all), Marcelo Pisani and Programme Managers	<i>IOM (outside) USAID driver to pick up Peter and Marion</i>
	0930-1130 Meeting with donors	ToRs, background, areas of emphasis for CT review	CT, Donors	<i>DFID USAID driver to drop off team at</i>
	1200-1300 Meeting with Information Campaign team	Programme Overview of the Youth Campaign, strategy, management. Including Safe Migration strategy in Beitbridge	CT, Erin Foster, Judith Chinamaringa and Folen Murapa	<i>IOM (outside) Brought to IOM by USAID driver</i>
	1300-1400 Lunch			<i>USAID driver to bring team members to lunch place</i>
	1400 -1600: Meeting with IOM Emergency and Reintegration and Migration Health Teams on the MVP Programme	IOM Humanitarian Programmes, in detail, logistics, reporting, supervision, partnerships with IPs, Participatory planning and assessment. Targeting, beneficiary verification. Humanitarian/Livelihoods linkages. Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS activities within humanitarian settings	CT, Norberto, Tete, Andres, Richard, Lucas, Joyce, Linda, David S.	<i>IOM (outside)</i>
	16:00- 17:00 Meeting with Programme Support team	Overview of M&E, Project Development, Research, Reporting and Protection	CT, Diana, Daihei, Emmanuel, Cecilia, David S	<i>IOM (outside) Driver to bring back to Amanzi Lodge after meeting</i>
Wed 25 February	0800-1230 Departure for field visit: Makonde District- Lionsden 0930 - Chinhoyi 1020 – Lions Den 1300 – Return to Harare	Field visit to Lions Den for livelihoods (agric inputs) Brief meeting with the DA Meeting with local Agritex officer and project tour Possible stopover in Chinhoyi for fast food	CT, ZCDT, IOM (Naison and Richard)	<i>USAID vehicle to pick up team at 7:30 to bring to IOM.</i>

Thursday 26 Feb	<p>Visit to Harare field sites: 0800 – 1300 - <i>Hatcliffe Extension</i> on Internal Savings and lending, shelter, water and NFI</p> <p>1400 – 1700 - <i>Hopley Taisekwa</i> on oyster mushroom project and summer crop agriculture inputs</p> <p>1400 – ZCDT offices 1500 – Waterfalls Council Offices 1530 – Hopley Taisekwa 1700 – Return to IOM office</p>	<p>Meet with CARE Zimbabwe at IOM offices Meet St Gerard’s at Hatcliffe Catholic Church (0900) Meet the Councillor and the local leadership Project tour</p> <p>Meet ZCDT Meet the DA Meeting with the Agritex Officer and local leaders Project tour</p>	<p>CT, CARE Zimbabwe, St. Gerard’s, IOM (Doreen and Clara), ZCDT, Harare South DA, Councillors and local leadership in Hatcliffe and Hopley Taisekwa</p>	<p><i>USAID driver to pick up members at Amanzi Lodge at 7:30 to print to IOM.</i></p> <p><i>Same vehicle will take team members and IOM staff to field locations. IOM staff will direct.</i></p> <p><i>Same vehicle will drop off team to IOM at 17h00 and then proceed to airport to drop off Marion and Peter for BYO flights.</i></p> <p><i>USAID driver 2 will drive to BYO to pick up team by 20:00.</i></p>
	<p>1900-2000 Flight to Bulawayo</p>			<p><i>Staying at Holiday Inn</i></p>
Fri 27 Feb	<p>Team A: 0800-1100 Safe Zone Visit</p>	<p>Safe Zone is the Youth Centre for the Information Campaign</p>	<p>CT, Thembi</p>	<p><i>USAID vehicle to take team to Safe Zone and then onwards to Plumtree. Drive to PT is about 1.5 hours.</i></p>
	<p>1100-12:30 Drive to Plumtree</p>		<p>CT</p>	
	<p>12:30-16:30 Visit the Plumtree Reception Centre</p>	<p><i>More information will be added</i></p>	<p>CT, Andrew Gethi</p>	
	<p>16:30-18:00 Drive back to Bulawayo</p>	<p>Stay in Bulawayo</p>	<p>CT</p>	
Fri 27 Feb	<p>Team B: 0730 - Drive to Mutare</p> <p>1045 – IOM Mutare office 1100 – Governor’s office 1130 – Mutare DA’s office 1200 – Trip to Muchena 1430 – Trip to Odzi</p>	<p>Visit Mutasa - Muchena on agriculture inputs: maize and sweet potatoes Mutare - Odzi: shelter and livelihoods</p> <p>Meet with IOM Mutare Meet the PA Meet the DA Project tour Meet the Councillor and the District Rural Council Project tour</p>	<p>CT, IOM Mutare + IOM Harare, Manicaland PA, Mutare DA, Councillors and local leadership in Muchena and Odzi</p>	<p><i>ECHO vehicle to pick up Philippa Thomas and Justine Smith to drive to Mutare. Meeting head of sub-office at the Mutare office (map will be provided)</i></p>
Saturday 28 Feb	<p>Team A: 06:00 Drive to Beitbridge from Bulawayo</p>			<p><i>USAID vehicle to drive to Beitbridge Centre (using map)</i></p>
	<p>10:30 – 12:00 Meeting with Nick van der Vyver</p>	<p>Overview of the programme</p>	<p>CT, Nick van der Vyver</p>	
	<p>12:00 – 16:00 Meeting with Government Meeting with beneficiaries</p>	<p>Meeting with Government officials for their view on the programme Meeting with beneficiaries</p>	<p>CT, Immigration, Police, Social Welfare, SCN-Z,DA</p>	

	Team B: 0730 – Drive back to Harare			<i>ECHO vehicle to drive back to Harare</i>
Sunday 1 March	Team A: Drive back to Harare from Beitbridge			<i>USAID vehicle</i>
Monday March 2	09:00-10:00 Consultants meet together		CT	<i>Amanzi Team to be picked up by ECHO vehicle at 10:00 and brought to IOM</i>
	10:30- 11:15 Meeting with Info Campaign team	Opportunity to ask further questions on the programme	CT, Erin	<i>IOM boardroom</i>
	11:15-13:30 (Lunch meeting) Meeting with the MVP Programme teams	Opportunity to asks further questions on the programme		<i>IOM boardroom</i>
	14:00 -15:00 Meeting with Government officials	Government perspective on IOM	CT, Mr Mishi (Director), Mr. Chinake (Deputy Director) and Perm Secretary Museka of MSLSW 12 th floor, Compensation House (Mr. Museka's office)	<i>MoSPLSW ECHO vehicle to pick up team at 13:45 to go to MoSLSW</i>
	15:15-16:15 Meeting with Government	Government perspective on IOM	CT, Mr. Tapera from Foreign Affairs	<i>MoFA ECHO vehicle to pick up team at 15:00 to drop off at MoFA</i>
	16:30 – 18:00 Donor harmonisation and Government liaisons	Donor harmonisation, Donor liaison and reporting – opportunities for improvements. Opportunities for improved joint donor funding modalities, Government liaison	CT, Marcelo, Dyane, Natalia, Diana, Peter	<i>IOM Boardroom ECHO vehicle to drip off team at IOM and then bring back to Amanzi at 18:00</i>
Tues 3 March	0800- 0900 Meeting with SIDA (Donor)	Donor perspective with an emphasis on donor harmonisation	CT, Goran Engstrand	<i>SIDA offices ECHO vehicle to pick up team at 7:30 and bring to SIDA</i>
	0930-1030 Meeting with OCHA	IOM's role in coordinated response to displacements. Rights and protection.	CT, Muktar Farah	<i>Takura House ECHO vehicle to take to Takura House from SIDA</i>
	1045-1145 Meeting with UNHCR	Interagency collaboration, working on agricultural and livelihoods	CT, Marcelin Heppie	<i>UNHCR Offices</i>
	1200-1300 Meeting with WFP	IOM food aid programmes, inter-agency collaboration	CT, Alberto Mendes	<i>WFP ECHO vehicle to take team at 11:45 to WFP for meeting</i>
	13:00-14:00 Lunch	Lunch	CT	<i>CT to go out to lunch</i>
	14:15 – 15:15 Free hour			
	15:30 – 16:30 WHO	Interagency collaboration, health programming and cholera	CT, Dr. Custodia MANDLHATE	<i>WHO offices After WHO visit go to UNICEF.</i>

	16:45 – 17:45 UNICEF	Interagency collaboration, cholera, MVP programming, working together during post-election crisis	CT, Roeland Monasch	UNICEF ECHO vehicle
Wed 4 March	0900-1000 Meeting with TLC/GRM	PRP programme, IOM as a technical partners	CT, Rod Charters	TLC offices Pick up team at 8:30 (ECHO vehicle)
	10:15-12:15 ZCDT, ISL, EFZ, St. Gerald's	IP perspective on IOM as a partner	CT,	ZCDT offices
	12:15 -17:00	Opportunity for consultant team to ask final questions or seek additional information from IOM.	CT and all on standby	IOM boardroom ECHO vehicle to return CT to lodge after meetings
Thurs 5 March	09:30-11:00 Meeting with Resource Management officer	Financial management procedures and reporting. Audits, Opportunities for improved joint donor funding modalities. IP financial reporting and oversight, human resource gaps	CT, Helder Castro, Marcelo Pisani	Amanzi meeting room
	11:00-12:00 Meeting with Chief of Mission	Final meeting with IOM chief of Mission	CT, Marcelo	Amanzi boardroom
	11:00-13:30 Extensive reading, additional institutional meetings , preparation of preliminary findings, and compilation of preliminary findings for power point presentation	Preparations for presentation	CT	IOM Boardroom or DFID CT to let us know if
	14:00-15:00 CARE	IP perspective on IOM as a partner	CT, CARE, Stephen Gwynne-Vaughn	CARE offices ECHO driver to collect team at Amanzi and bring to CARE. After meeting, they will return to Amanzi
Friday 6 March	0800 –930 Final Meeting with IOM Chief of Mission and Management Team	Some preliminary findings	CT, Marcelo, Dyane, Natalia, Helder, Diana, Norberto, Tete, Erin, Peter	IOM, Boardroom ECHO driver to collect Marion from Amanzi lodge and bring to IOM
	1100-1300 Presentation of Preliminary findings	Power point presentation and discussion	CT, IOM, Donors	IOM boardroom ECHO driver to drive Marion back to Amanzi after the meetings
	Report Writing			
Friday 13 March	Submission of draft report to donors and IOM by e-mail	CT write draft report		
Monday 23 March	Deadline for submission of comments on draft report from donors and IOM to consultants	CT to incorporate		
Friday 27 March	Deadline for submission of final report to donors and IOM			

Annex 5: Key Informants

IOM Harare:

Chief of Mission	Marcelo Pisani
Deputy Chief of Mission	Dyane Epstein
Senior Operations Officer	Norberto Celestino
Programme Support Officer	Diana Cartier
Information and Communications Officer	Erin Foster
Migration Health Advisor	Tete Amouh
Programme Officer (Education)	Nina Stuurman
Resources Management Officer	Helder Castro
Programme Officer (Protection)	David Sezikeye
Programme Director	Natalia Perez
Associate Expert/Project Development	Daihei Mochizuki
Monitoring and Evaluation Assistant	Kennedy Chibvongodze
Agricultural Specialist	Doreen Chimwara
Information Assistant	Judith Chinamaringa
Emergency Health Officer	Lucas Halimani
Community Stabilisation Officer	Richard Machokolo
Project Development National Officer	Emmanuel Murwisi
HIV/AIDS National Programme Officer	Joyce Siveregi Machingauta
Field Assistant (Shelter)	Tinashe Nyahwedengwe
Programme Assistant – Agriculture	Naison Chakatsva
Programme Assistant – Small Business	Clara Katena

Beitbridge:

Head of Sub-Office	Nick Van der Vyver
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other IOM Beitbridge staff members</i> • <i>Government Officials including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Foreign Affairs representative - District Medical Officer - Other District officials - Representatives from City Council 	

Plumtree:

Head of Sub-Office	Andrew Gethi
Principle Immigration Officer	Innocent Hamandishe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other government officials including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District Officials - District Medical Officer - Town Council Representatives • <i>Save the Children Norway Representatives</i> 	

Bulawayo:

Manager, Bulawayo Safe Zone	Thembekile Moyo
Volunteer, City Council Youth Centre	Tabiso

Mutare:

National Programme Officer	Wonesai Sithole
Livelihoods Assistant	Farai Marashe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Local Councillor – Odzi</i> 	

IOM Partners:ZCDT

Project Manager
Executive Director

Felida Gumbo
Winston Matebela

ISL

Director

Lifa Mlithie

St Gerard's

Programme Officer
Project Co-ordinator
Programme Officer

Arthur Tambudze
Fr Trevis Moyo
Francesca

EFZ

General Secretary
Programme Officer

Rev. Andrew Muccheteze
Johnathan I. Chikumbu

CARE

Country Director

Steve Gwynne-Vaughan

Government Officials:

Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare

Mr S.G. Mhishi (Director of Social Services)

Mr L. Ngorima (Acting Chief Labour Officer)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr J. Mhishi Tapera (Director, Department of Multilateral Political Affairs)

Donors:

DfID

Philippa Thomas (Social Development Advisor)
Nyasha Mayanga (Programme Officer)

USAID / OCHA
SIDA

Mark Adams
Goran Engstrand (Country Director)
Goodhope Ruswa (Programme Officer – Development Co-operation)

ECHO
Netherlands Embassy

Francois Goemans
Brechtje Klandemaans

UN Agencies:

UN OCHA

Mustafa Mohammed Omar (Humanitarian Assistance – Protection)
Lillian Nduta (CERF)
Thembi Dube (Humanitarian Affairs Officer – Geographic Co-ordination)

UNHCR
WHO
WFP

Igor Ivancic (Protection Officer)
Dr Oladapo Walker (Inter-country Co-ordinator)
Jon Larsen (Head of Operations)

UNICEF

Masae Shimomura (Programme Officer)
Roeland Monasch (Programme Co-ordinator / Acting Representative)

Other:

PRP MTLC Manager (GRM)
PRP MTLC Programme Co-ordinator (GRM)

Roderick Charters
Erica Keogh

Annex 6: Documents Reviewed

Donor Review 2009 Document List

Institutional Folder for Donor Review

Information on IOM

- Briefs about IOM Globally
- IOM Facts and Figures
- IOM Member States
- IOM Humanitarian Action
- IOM Offices
- IOM Publications
- The IOM Four-Box Chart

Project and Financial Tracking:

- IOM Zimbabwe Financial Tracking since 2003 (stratified by donor, project, and year)
- IOM Zimbabwe Project Tracking

IOM External Reports

- Joint Donor Review, May 2007

Strategic Documents and Planning

- IOM Zimbabwe, 2008-10 Strategic Plan
- Strategy Document for 2006, November 2005

Internal Reports and Proposals

- Donor Logframe from 2007
- Self-evaluation for DFID 2008

IOM Donor Reporting

- Donor Harmonisation Proposal (from 2006)

IOM Financial Guidelines

- IOM Accounting Procedures for IOM Field Offices

IOM Harare Newsletters

- No. 1 – 8 issues

Beitbridge Programme Donor Review Folder

In this folder you will find the following information about the programme.

Proposals, budgets and MoUs for Beitbridge

- Example of Beitbridge proposal (*May 2007 – DRAFT*)
- MoU from DFID or SIDA
- LM Proposal

Donor Reports

- Donor Report from September 2008 - submitted to DFID and Sida
- Donor Report from March 2008 – submitted to DFID and Sida

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Monitoring Framework
- Field Activity form and guidelines
- Evaluation on Messaging (July 2008)

Protection Information

- Incident Report format
- Protection Monthly Reports

Statistics

- Monthly Statistic Reports/ Information Sheets

Plumtree Programme Donor Review Folder

In this folder you will find the following information about the programme.

Proposals, budgets and MoUs for Plumtree

- Example of Plumtree proposal ()
- MoU from DFID or SIDA

Donor Reports

- Donor Report from May 2008 - submitted to

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Monitoring Framework
- Field Activity form and guidelines

Protection Information

- Incident Report format
- Protection Monthly Reports

Statistics

- Monthly Statistic Reports

Information Campaign Donor Review Folder

In this folder you will find the following information about the programme.

Proposals, budgets and MoUs for the MVP programme

- Example of Proposals on Info Campaign

Donor and Research Reports

- Report: Sept 2008 - submitted to DFID
- Report: March 2008 - submitted to DFID
- Research: National Baseline Survey of Youth in Zimbabwe to Assess Knowledge on Legal Migration of HIV/AIDS and on Information Sources (February 2007)
- Report from the National Youth Dialogue

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Monitoring Framework
- Registration and Field Activity forms and guidelines
- Examples of Field Activity Reports completed by field staff

Photos and Informational Materials on the Information Campaign

- Photos of Information Campaign activities
- IEC materials and campaign materials (e.g. music video, cd and film)

Emergency Assistance to Mobile and Vulnerable Populations (MVP) Programme Donor Review Folder

In this folder you will find the following information about the programme.

Proposals, budgets and MoUs for MVPs (a selection)

- Example of proposals on MVPs and cholera response
- MoUs (a selection of recent MoUs between IOM and governments)

Donor Reports (a selection)

- MVP Report: Sept 2008 - submitted to Governments of US, UK and Sweden

- MVP Report: March 2008 - submitted to Government of US, UK, Sweden

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Monitoring Framework
- Tools used for the programme

Situation Reports

- United Nations Humanitarian Situation in Zimbabwe Reports (including IOM contributions)

Implementing Partner Work (examples from ISL – one of IOM's IPs)

- Project Proposal submitted to IOM
- MoU between ISL and IOM
- Activity plan
- Monthly reports (3) submitted to IOM

MVP Working Group

- Terms of Reference for MVP WG
- Example of WWW

Protection

- Procedures for Incident Reporting
- Incident Reporting Form
- Protection Reporting Data

HIV and GBV

- Report on : Tackling Sexual and Reproductive Health for Population of Humanitarian Concern(GBV)
- Proposal: Protecting and Responding to Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Among Returned Migrants in Zimbabwe (HIV and GBV) [not funded yet]

Community and Environmental Health

- Weekly Cholera update
- Proposal: Up-scaled Cholera Outbreak Response for Migrant and Mobile and Vulnerable Population Setting

Annex 7: Terms of Reference

IOM Multi-Donor Annual Review 2008-9

Terms of Reference

Summary

Zimbabwe has been experiencing a protracted humanitarian crisis characterised by economic decline, food insecurity, high HIV & AIDS, social and political turbulence resulting in high levels of migration and displacement.

In 2008 the pace of decline has accelerated rapidly and a protracted crisis is rapidly becoming an acute emergency. Nearly half the population (5.1 million) will require food aid by the beginning of 2009. Hyperinflation is now estimated to be the second highest ever in recorded history. Basic services, health and education are on the point of total collapse. Cholera is becoming endemic. A political settlement is proving elusive. Migration (internal & cross border) and displacement continues to rise. It is estimated that some 36,000 people were displaced in the post-election violence earlier this year. Zimbabweans continue to leave for neighbouring countries, and whilst the numbers claiming asylum have risen dramatically, most are deemed to be economic migrants and run the risk of deportation. South Africa deports approximately 15,000 Zimbabweans every month and Botswana approximately 4,000.

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) has been at the forefront in providing assistance to displaced people and migrants. Since 2006 IOM's major donors have come together to support multi-donor annual reviews of IOM centred around the logframe for DFID's £5 million multi-year programme of support (2006-09). This year's review has been delayed because of post-election violence and deteriorating conditions. IOM, is responding to new emergencies such as the cholera outbreaks. The review's delay offers the opportunity to not only assess IOM's current performance against the logframe, but to look at IOM's strategic approach and options for enhancing donor harmonisation.

Purpose

The purpose of the review is to:

- Assess IOM's progress against agreed outputs in the programme logframe
- Assess the appropriateness of IOM's current programme
- Identify opportunities to enhance donor harmonisation

Specific Objectives for the Review

- *Assess IOM's progress against agreed outputs in the programme logframe*

The overall **goal** as stated in IOM Zimbabwe's Strategic Plan 2006 and logframe is *to contribute to the management of cross-border (international) and internal migration and to address the needs and vulnerabilities of migrants and mobile populations.*

The **purpose** of the project is *to protect the rights and address the needs and vulnerabilities of migrants and mobile populations.*

The review will:

3) *Assess progress towards purpose*

- Consider the extent to which planned programme Outputs are contributing to the Purpose and whether they are still relevant and realistic.
- Consider the contribution of the Purpose to the programme Goal
- Consider whether the Risks/Assumptions identified during programme design remain valid; whether they are impacting on the programme Purpose; how they are being managed and whether any new Risks/Assumptions have been identified or are emerging.
- Assess the likelihood of the programme achieving its purpose, and make recommendations accordingly.

4) *Assess achievement of outputs to date*

Output 1: To address the humanitarian needs of mobile and vulnerable populations

- Assess the quality, range and appropriateness of the interventions
- Review assessment and targeting methodologies for their effectiveness and applicability
- Assess the effectiveness of HIV and gender mainstreaming
- Assess the effectiveness of IOM's capacity building of its implementing partners

Output 2: Address the humanitarian needs of returned migrants at Beitbridge and Plumtree¹⁷ and increase the involvement of stakeholders in promoting and protecting the rights of migrants

- Assess the quality, effectiveness and appropriateness of the assistance provided to returned migrants at the Reception Centres
- Assess the capacity of the Centre to deal effectively and appropriately with protection issues and the needs of deported children
- Assess the extent to which cooperation has been improved between the relevant stakeholders in Zimbabwe and South Africa and Botswana

Output 3: Provide potential Zimbabwean migrants with sufficient information to make informed choices about migration while also increasing their levels of knowledge on potential risks and vulnerabilities including the threat of exposure to HIV & AIDS

- Assess the quality, effectiveness and appropriateness of the information campaign
- Review the appropriateness of communication tools and channels
- Consider the extent to which the Information Campaign is effectively linking with other parts of the IOM programme

• ***Assess the appropriateness of IOM's current programmes***

- How appropriate is IOM's current programme in responding to Zimbabwe's rapidly deteriorating environment?
- How resilient and responsive are IOM's current programmes to changing circumstances in Zimbabwe, such as positive reform, weak, stop and start reform and further deterioration?
- Are there areas where IOM needs to expand its operations and others where it should scale back and hand over responsibility to others?
- How appropriate is IOM's current strategic plan?

• ***Identify opportunities to enhance donor harmonisation***

- How effective is donor coordination at the moment?
- How can donor coordination and harmonisation be enhanced?

¹⁷ Plumtree Reception Centre only opened in May 2008

- What can IOM do to assist donor's in improving harmonisation and coordination?

Timing

The review will take place in late February and early March 2009. The last two annual reviews comprised approximately a week of field visits and key informant interviews in Zimbabwe and a further week in background reading and report writing, however, a slightly longer time-frame has been recommended.

Review Team's Competencies and Expertise

The Team will be made up of 3 consultants with expertise in the areas of humanitarian and IDP programme evaluation, migration, institutional appraisal and evaluation, joint donor working, and report writing.

The most experienced consultant with relevant programme review and management skills and experience will be appointed Team Leader.

The consultants will require a balance of backgrounds, experience and contextual knowledge of Africa and Zimbabwe.

Outputs

The consultants will produce a draft report and Powerpoint presentation for discussion with donors and IOM prior to leaving Zimbabwe.

The final report will be produced within 1 week of receiving feedback on the draft report. The main body of the final report will have an executive summary, a section on key recommendations to IOM, a section on key recommendations for donors, and will report directly to the ToRs and be no longer than 50 pages. Additional material should be contained in annexes.

Background

Zimbabwe has been experiencing a protracted humanitarian crisis characterised by economic decline, food insecurity, high HIV & AIDS, social and political turbulence resulting in high levels of migration and displacement.

In 2008 the pace of decline has accelerated rapidly and a protracted crisis is rapidly becoming an acute emergency. Nearly half the population (5.1 million) will require food aid by the beginning of 2009. Hyperinflation is now estimated to be the second highest ever in recorded history. Basic services, health and education are on the point of total collapse. Cholera is becoming endemic. A political settlement is proving elusive. Migration and displacement continues to rise. It is estimated that some 36,000 people were displaced in post-election violence earlier this year. Zimbabweans continue to leave for neighbouring countries, whilst the numbers claiming asylum have risen dramatically, most are deemed to be economic migrants and run the risk of deportation. South Africa deports approximately 15,000 Zimbabweans every month and Botswana approximately 8,000.

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) has been at the forefront in providing assistance to displaced people and migrants. Its scope of activities and scale of response and funding has increased rapidly since 2004. In 2006 donors came together, for a multi-donor review to assess IOM's impact and achievement, its institutional capacity and the appropriateness of its priorities. The review was very favourable and highlighted the need for

IOM to develop a more strategic approach and for donors to support this by improving harmonisation and reducing earmarking.

DFID developed a new multi-year programme (£5 million 2006-9) with IOM and worked with other donors to enhance harmonisation around a shared logframe. The programme has three outputs:

- 1) Assistance to mobile and vulnerable populations - also supported by Sida, CIDA, ECHO, USAID / OFDA, Netherlands, and Spain
- 2) Assistance to returned migrants at Beitbridge Reception Centre and now Plumtree Reception Centre – also supported by Sida and Netherlands
- 3) Nationwide information campaign on safe migration – DFID only donor

A joint donor review was conducted in mid 2007 which focused on assessing IOM's performance against the logframe. The findings were broadly positive and modifications were made to the logframe accordingly. The next annual review was planned for mid 2008 but had to be postponed because of election violence. The review is now planned for February 2009.

In advance of the review and in response to the deteriorating situation in Zimbabwe DFID has agreed to provide IOM with an additional £1 million in a costed extension to the programme up to March 2010. DFID are exploring the possibilities of developing enhanced donor harmonisation with IOM's other largest donor Sida.

IOM is increasing its scope of activities as it responds to new emergencies such as the cholera outbreaks. The review's delay offers the opportunity to not only assess IOM's current performance against the logframe, but to look at IOM's strategic approach and options for enhancing donor harmonisation.