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Ex-post Internal Evaluation of CS.0936

**Inception Report**

This inception report is provided for the ex-post internal evaluation of the project “Community-based Approach to Support Youth in a Targeted Municipality in the Republic of North Macedonia”.

**Project code:** CS.0936

**Project donor:** IOM Development Fund (IDF)

**Project period:** 1 Jan 2018 – 31 Dec 2018

**Evaluation Commissioner:** IOM Mission in North Macedonia

**Evaluation Manager:** Biljana Simeonova, Project Manager, IOM Mission in North Macedonia

**Evaluator:** Sarah Harris, Regional M&E Officer, IOM Regional Office in Vienna

**Field visit dates:** 25-28 November 2019

During the inception phase, the evaluator reviewed the **evaluation** **Terms of Reference (ToR)** and gathered available project documents from PRISM, IOM’s online project management system. The evaluator compiled a list of documents available and additional to request, and compiled a map of all stakeholders mentioned in the proposal and donor reports.

The evaluator then had an initial call with the evaluation manager to review stakeholders, available documents, and discuss the agenda.

This inception report presents a summary of those discussions and analysis to date, in preparation for the upcoming field visit during 25-28 November 2019.

Outline:

1. **Evaluability Assessment** – The extent to which the project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible manner, based on the data available to respond to evaluation questions in the ToR.
2. **Document List** – Available and requested documents.Several are already confirmed to not be available, with pending documents to check for highlighted in yellow.
3. **Stakeholder Mapping** – Mapping of all stakeholders and prioritization of those to meet.
4. **Agenda** – Meetings arranged based on evaluator suggestions.
5. **Evaluation Matrix** – Data collection and analysis plans.
6. **Interview Guides**

**1. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT**

Based on documents available and meetings that will be possible (see details below), there are significant limitations to the **evaluability of this project**, i.e. the extent to which a project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible manner.

**Overall, there are significant challenges that will likely limit the ability of the evaluator to assess results at outcome and impact levels, as well as to verify the delivery of activities and outputs.** This is due to limited data available from project monitoring and other documentation, as well as limited ability to meet with members of key target groups during the field visit. Some limitations are posed by weaknesses or inconsistencies in the project logic and the donor reports.

* Project logic: The results matrix is clear in terms of the vertical logic. The results and indicators are mostly SMART, except for objective level. At objective level the result statement uses incorrect syntax combining multiple elements (preventing spread of VE, building capacity of institutional stakeholders, building resilience), thereby making it unclear what exactly is the intended change. The objective indicator covers only individual resilience and the formulation is weak. It incongruently combines two parts: the first about short-term change in IC thinking after workshops, and the second about participation to other preventative activities.
* Project theory of change: The theory of change is well explained throughout the narrative. However, community profiles and a local theory of change were also to be developed for each community targeted, based on a community self-assessment. The assessment was done for Tetovo but not for Debar; according to the evaluation manager this is because Debar was added late. It is not clear whether or how the assessment in Debar was used to develop a local theory of change nor how that informed design and/or implementation of the interventions.
* Documents: As seen in Annex 2, there is very limited supporting documentation available, apart from the proposal and the donor reports. Supporting documentation for activity and output level results were requested but none have been provided by the evaluation manager (e.g. monitoring forms and questionnaires, monitoring reports, workshop reports, participant lists, etc.). It is assumed that most of those do not exist.

The main source of information is from the proposal and donor reports, and the donor reports provide only very limited details on activities and results, especially at outcome level. There are a few inconsistencies (e.g. what was achieved by interim vs. final reporting period). There is also no reflection i.e. on the logic behind adding Debar with only limited activities there, nor on how delay of training of local facilitators impacted on the intended results. Finally, various of the indicators were not monitored and reported on.

* Monitoring data: Only half of objective and outcome indicators were measured and reported on in the final report. As mentioned, the first part of the objective level indicator is measuring only short-term change (IC Thinking) and the second part is not reported at all (participation to other preventive activities). No other monitoring data or reports exist.
* Meetings: Given lack of monitoring data and documents, it is especially important to meet with all key stakeholder groups and sufficient number of persons from each group. However, as explained in the next section, there were challenges to arrange all the requested meetings.
* Access to project locations: Debar not included in field visit, though some persons may be able to meet in Skopje or via phone.

**2. DOCUMENT LIST**

The Evaluator reviewed of available documents and requested various additional documents from the Evaluation Manager. Only one of the requested documents was provided. It is assumed that none of the other documents are available, though this will be confirmed during the field visit.

The below shows the status of documents gathered to date, including those still to be confirmed whether they are available (highlighted yellow):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Documents requested** | **Available** | | **Notes** |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| Project documents and donor agreement | Project proposal | X |  |  |
| Project budget | X |  |  |
| Project budget with WBS line | X |  |  |
| Government support letter | X |  |  |
| Letter of request translated - NCCVECT | X |  |  |
| Budget monitoring and revision | X |  |  |
| Donor reports | Interim narrative report | X |  |  |
| Interim financial report (Excel, PDF) | X |  |  |
| Final narrative report | X |  |  |
| Final financial report (Excel, PDF) | X |  |  |
| Project-related documents | Community assessment report for Tetovo | X |  |  |
| Community profile for Tetovo |  |  |  |
| Local theory of change for Tetovo |  |  |  |
| Community assessment report for Debar |  | X |  |
| Community profile for Debar |  | X |  |
| Local theory of change for Debar |  | X |  |
| Activity monitoring | Basic workplan (from PRISM) | X |  |  |
| Detailed workplan |  | X |  |
| Project team meeting minutes |  | X |  |
| CLP weekly reports |  |  |  |
| Results monitoring  Component 2 | 1.1 TWG meeting participants/minutes/report |  |  | Biljana will ask, thinks government kept a list |
| 1.1 List of persons that received the report |  |  |  |
| 1.1 Results of TWG meeting to present report |  | X |  |
| 1.1 Report on contribution/use of report (using questionnaire distributed in activity 1.1.3) |  |  | Interim report states this was done, was it an error? |
| 2.1 MoviEQ agenda | X |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ methodology ALB | X |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ methodology MKD | X |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ training of trainers report |  |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ report #1 – 11-14 June |  |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ report #2 – xxx |  |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ report #3 – xxx |  |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ report #4 – xxx |  |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ report #5 – xxx |  |  |  |
| 2.1 MoviEQ pre/post results (in database) |  |  | To request from BiH staff |
| 2.1 MoviEQ follow-up results from other PVE projects (proxy indicator for this one) |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Community consultation reports |  |  |  |
| 2.2 PVE workshop agenda and kit |  |  | ` |
| 2.2 PVE workshop kit or a list of contents |  |  |  |
| 2.2 PVE workshop reports |  |  |  |
| 2.2 PVE workshop participant lists |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Report on meeting for participants (Dec) |  |  |  |
| Financial monitoring | Financial tracking tools |  | X |  |
| Risk monitoring | Risk management plan |  | X |  |
| IOM strategies | IOM Migration Governance Framework | X |  |  |
| IOM Country Strategy |  |  |  |
| IOM Sub-regional Strategy |  |  |  |
| IOM Regional Strategy | X |  |  |
| Internal PVE guidance documents |  |  |  |
| National and international legal and policy frameworks | National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (2016-2020) |  |  |  |
| National Strategy for Violent Extremism and Combatting Terrorism (2018-2022) | X |  |  |
| PVE National Action Plan |  |  |  |
| Other national frameworks |  |  |  |
| Regional frameworks |  |  |  |
| International frameworks |  |  |  |
| Other | Report related to roll-out of inception phase of BiH pilot project that was also implemented in communities in Kosovo and Macedonia |  |  |  |
| Needs assessment reports by national PVE consultant |  |  |  |
| Community Baseline Risk Assessment in Saraj and Vrapchishte |  |  |  |

**3. STAKEHOLDER MAPPING**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Stakeholder (organization or group) | Role / involvement in the project | Individuals (names and titles) | Priority to meet? | Estimated time (min.) |
| **IOM staff** | **Senior Management in the Mission** | Overall oversight; high-level liaison | **Sonja BOZINOVSKA, Chief of Mission** | **X** | **20** |
| **Project Manager (PM)** | Day to day management of the project | **Biljana SIMEONOVA, Project Manager** | **X** | **60** |
| **Project support staff** | Implementation/monitoring/admin | **Alexandra LAZAROVA, Project Assistant** | **X** | **20** |
| **Other IOM staff** | Coordinate a separate PVE regional project | **Erda QAZIM, PVE Coordinator** | **X** | **30** |
| MoviEQ trainers from IOM BiH that delivered trainings and training of trainers | **Danijela TORBICA, IOM BiH** | X | 20 |
| **Alena VELAGIC, IOM BiH** | X | 20 |
| Resource Management Officer | Financial oversight | Vera MISKOVSKA, RMO |  |  |
| Relevant IOM staff at RO and HQ | Technical guidance and support | Dragan ALEKSOSKI, DOE RTS in RO Vienna | X | 20 |
| Alex DOGGEN, DOE Assistant, RO Vienna |
| Jason APLON, Post Conflict Advisor, HQ |  |  |
| **Consultants, firms, and others supporting the project** | **Community focal points (CLPs)** | Data for assessment (1.1.1); distribute questionnaire (1.1.3); help to organize meetings (1.1.2), consultations (2.2.1), workshops (1.2.3) | **Ismael KAMBERI** – Tetovo (from the start) | **X** | **20** |
| **Trime HALILI** – Tetovo (left before the end) | **X** | **20** |
| **TBC** – Tetovo (replaced the one that left) | **X** | **20** |
| **Pajtim MASHKULLI** – Debar | **X** | **20** |
| **TBC** – Debar | **X** | **20** |
| **Consultant for inception phase** | Inception phase analysis and report (1.1.1) | **Artan SADIKU** | **X** | **20** |
| **Community expert** | Provided support and advice to the project | **Veton LJATIFI** | **X** | **30** |
| National experts | Develop PVE workshop modules (2.2.2) | Sabina SMAILOVIK | X | 20 |
| Delivered three PVE workshops (2.2.3) | **Afrodita MUSLIU** | **X** | **30** |
| **Beneficiaries** | **Local psychologists (national)** | Trained to deliver IC Thinking workshops (2.1.1), Delivered IC/MoviEQ workshops (2.1.2) | **Sara OSMANI** | **X** | **20** |
| **Arafat SHABANI** | **X** | **20** |
| **Ivana HADJIVANOVA** | **X** | **20** |
| **TBC** | **X** | **20** |
| **TBC** | **X** | **20** |
| **National Committee for Countering Violent Extremism and Terrorism** | **Outcome 1: Design PVE measures**  National meetings (1.1.2) | **Borce PETREVSKI, National Coordinator** | **X** | **60** |
| **Safet NEZIRI,** Ministry of Education and Science | X | 30 |
| **Teachers, School psychologists,**  **Social Workers, Community leaders** | **Outcome 2: Active engagement**  Community workshops (2.2.3) | **10-12 of the 51 participants for FGD.** | **X** | **60** |
| **At-risk youth** | IC Thinking workshops (2.1.2) | **5-6 of the 75 youth participants for FGDs.** | **X** | **45** |
| **Partners and stakeholders** with similar projects | **Center for Research and Policy Making (CRPM)** | Jointly delivered a PVE workshop (2.2.3), were implementing a similar PVE project | **Marija RISTESKA, Executive Director** | **X** | **30** |
| **Mayors’ office, Tetovo** | Coordinated on planning of the activities | **Ahmed QAZIMI** | **X** | **30** |
| OSCE | Working on some similar PVE projects | TBD | X | 15 |
| UNESCO | Working on some similar PVE projects | TBD | X | 15 |
| **Donor(s)** | IDF | Financial support | Alessia CASTELFRANCO, IDF Administrator |  |  |

**4. FIELD VISIT AGENDA**

***Meetings requested***

Based on document list and stakeholder mapping, the evaluator identified the following as priority to meet during the visit. The list was shared with the evaluation manager for planning the agenda.

High priority:

* **National Committee for Countering Violent Extremism and Terrorism (NCCVECT)** *(Outcome 1: stakeholders design PVE measures)* – National Coordinator meeting (around 45-60 min)
* **Other NCCVECT members** as relevant/available (e.g. Ministry of Education, TBD) – 30-45 min
* **Teachers, School psychologists, Social Workers, Community leaders** *(Outcome 2: improve their active engagement)* – Focus group discussion of around 10-12 persons, 45-60 min, mix of male/female and profiles (teacher, psychologist, social worker, community leader).
* **Youth participants in MoviEQ workshops** *(Objective: increase youth resilience)* – TBDif this will be possible, but they are focus of objective and there were no follow-up focus groups, as in other PVE projects. If possible, to discuss how to arrange (group size, who to invite).

Medium priority:

* **IOM staff in the Mission** (Biljana, Project Manager; Aleksandra, Project Assistant; Sonja, Chief of Mission; and Erda, managing other PVE projects) – separate meetings, ideally on Monday. For example: 20 min Sonja, 60 min Biljana, 20 min Alexandra, 30 min Erda.
* **Two MoviEQ trainers in BiH** (20 min each) – Via phone, evaluator to arrange.
* **CLPs** – Request to invite all CLPs, either to meet or call, including CLP that left the project early. Either a group meeting (45 min) or separate (15-20 min).
* **Local psychologists** **trained to deliver MoviEQ workshops**. Request to invite all that are available. Either a group meeting (45 min) or separate (15-20 min).
* **Center for Research and Policy Making (CRPM)** – 30 min
* **Mayors’ Office, Tetovo Municipality** – 30 min
* **Community expert** – 30 min.
* **Other experts** **that assisted implementation of community workshops** – including the one paid under this project, and the other paid by CRPM – 20 min each

***Challenges in arranging meetings***

The final agenda is available in Annex 4. The evaluation manager advised from initial call that many persons requested may not be available. The following meetings could not be arranged in the end; **precise reasons are unclear and will be discussed more** with evaluation manager during the visit.

* Focus group discussions with teachers, school psychologists, social workers, and other community leader participants to the PVE workshops is not possible in the end. Only two participants are available to meet, and both are community leaders working for the municipality. **TBC why others are not available to meet with.**
* Focus group discussion with youth participants to MoviEQ workshops. Evaluator requested to discuss how to arrange, if it will be possible (e.g. group size, who to invite). One meeting was arranged without coordinating with evaluator. **TBC why/how that one was selected.**

***Current agenda***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Meeting with** | **Time** | **Location** |
| 25.11.2019, Monday | Sonja Bozinovska, IOM Head of Office | 13:30-14:30 | IOM Skopje Office |
| Erda Qazim, PVE Coordinator, Project Moving Towards Sustainable Approaches in Prevention of Violent Extremism in WB  Biljana Simeonova, Project Manager IDF Project  Aleksandra Lazarova Project Assistant, IDF Project | time to be agreed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Local psychologist: Arafat Shabani, MoviEQ Facilitator | 16.30 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Local psychologists : Ivana Hadjivanova, MoviEQ Facilitator, Sara Osmani, MoviEQ Facilitator | 18:30 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
|  | | | |
| 26.11.2019, Tuesday | Ahmed Qazimi, Mayors’ Office, Tetovo Municipality  Biljana Radiceska, Sema Halili, municipality representatives, participants at training | 10:30 confirmed | Public Sector Office, Municipality of Tetovo |
| Merita Mustafi, participant at third MoviEQ workshop in Tetovo | 12:30 confirmed | Office of NGO Sonce in Tetovo |
| Consultant Sabina Smailovik, developing education modules for PVE workshop | 14:30 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Ismail Kamberi, CLP in Tetovo | 16:00 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Trime Halili, CLP in Tetovo | To contact during the day | skype call |
|  | | | |
| 27.11.2019, Wednesday | Pajtim Mashkulli, CLP in Debar | 10:30 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Community Expert Veton Ljatifi | 12.15 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Safet Neziri, Ministry of Education, Member of National Committee for Countering Violent Extremism and Counter Terrorism | 14:00 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Marija Risteska, Executive Director, Center for Research and Policy Making (CRPM) | 15:00 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
| Borce Petrevski, National Coordinator, National Committee for Countering Violent Extremism and Counter Terrorism | 16:00 confirmed | Government Building, room 117 (main entrance). |
| Consultant Artan Sadiku, performed community self-assessment in the city of Tetovo and the village of Sipkovica | 17:30 confirmed | skype call |
|  | | | |
| 28.11.2019, Thursday | Consultant, Afrodita Musliu, Trainer of Capacity building training for teachers, parents and social workers (three workshops in Tetovo) | 09.00 confirmed | IOM Skopje Office |
|  | | | |
| 29.11.2019, Friday | Velagic Alena, Danijela Torbica, IOM BiH | During the day | skype call |
|  | | | |

**5. EVALUATION MATRIX**

This Evaluation Matrix lists the criteria and questions presented in the TOR (first two columns). It then provides further details on the **data collection plan**: sub-questions, indicators, data sources and related data collection (in this case, **document review, interviews and focus groups**). For the documents highlighted, evaluator still needs to confirm what is available.

| **CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)** | | **SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS** | | **DATA SOURCES** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Evaluation questions** | **Sub-questions** | **Indicators** | **Documents** | **Stakeholders** | | | | | |
| IOM­ | CFPs, Consult | Experts, Partners | Natl govt | Local auth | Comm + Youth |
| **Relevance** | To what extent were the project interventions relevant and appropriate in relation to national and international **legal and policy frameworks**? | What wasthe **theory of change**? Did it change during implementation? Any local theory of change for Tetovo or Debar? | Reconstruct theory of change from the project documents and from IOM staff understanding. | Project documents; Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do the staff and partners share a common **understanding of the theory of change**? | Comparison of theory of change as documented and as described by different stakeholders. |  | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What are the relevant **frameworks** (national, regional, international)? How well does project align? Any gaps? | Assessment of frameworks, Perceptions of stakeholders | National Strategy on PVE, National Action Plan on PVE | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Has the project responded to the needs of the **target beneficiaries**? | How were needs of target beneficiaries **assessed** in design and implementation?  *National Coordinator and other NCCVECT members, Local authorities, Local community members, At-risk youth* | Assessments as documented and as described by stakeholders. | Project documents; Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What are **needs** **and priorities** of the target beneficiaries? How well did project **align**? | Needs as documented and as described by stakeholders. | Project documents; Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Is the project aligned with and supportive of **IOM** national, regional, and/or global **strategies** and the Migration Governance Framework? | How well does the project align with IOM’s MiGOF and with IOM national, sub-regional, and regional strategies? IOM global guidance and priorities on PVE? | Assess alignment to documents, IOM staff perceptions | Project documents; MiGOF; National, sub-regional, and regional strategies, PVE guidance | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent were **gender** mainstreaming issues taken into account in design? | Does the proposal meet the **standards** laid out in the project handbook? | Assessment using checklist items from IOM Project Handbook | Proposal | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** | To what extent were **gender**-based approaches integrated into the implementation of the project? | Did implementation and monitoring meet **standards** per IOM project handbook? | Assessment using checklist items from IOM Project Handbook | Donor reports, Monitoring data | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What is **perception** of IOM staff, partners and beneficiaries?  What are concrete **examples** of attention to gender during implementation? | Perceptions of stakeholders, Examples of how gender-based approaches were used | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| To what extent were intended outputs and outcomes achieved in accordance with stated plans? | Is the **results matrix** well designed to be able to measure the intended results? | Assessment of quality of the results matrix | Results matrix | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is **monitoring data** available for all results? | Progress against indicators | Donor reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.1: National research and **recommendations** on PVE on a community level in the targeted communities is distributed to national stakeholders | Number/percentage of stakeholders that **received** it | TWG participant list, others that received it, Donor reports | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Perceptions of **quality** of report, Inclusion of all intended aspects | Assessment report, Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Outcome 1: Technical working group on PVE ***designs PVE measures*** based on analytical and comprehensive data | Number/percentage of stakeholders that found it **useful** | Monitoring data, Donor reports | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| **Examples** **of use** in designing PVE measures ‘based on analytical and comprehensive data’ | National Action Plan for PVE | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Output 2.1: **Psychologists** are capacitated to apply the IC thinking methodology | Number of psychologists provided with methodology and **trained** on it | Training report,  Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perceptions of the participants on their capacity improvement | Training report |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Number of psychologists that implemented MoviEQ workshops before the end of the project | MoviEQ reports | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Output 2.2: **Teachers, social workers and community leaders** capacitated to recognize and independently respond to VE signs, as well as replicate the capacity building activities in target community | Number of community members **participating** in the PVE workshops | Workshop reports, Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of participants that **improved** capacities to recognize + independently respond to VE signs | Workshop reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Perceptions** of participants on their improved capacities to recognize + independently respond to VE signs |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Percentage of participants that reported **proactively engaged** in structured discussion on VE by the end of the workshop | Workshop reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2: Teachers, local school psychologists, social workers and community leaders are ***actively engaged*** in structured discussions about VE | Number of psychologists that implemented MoviEQ workshops since the end of the project  Number and locations of workshops  Other examples of engagement by psychologists, or reasons why not |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Percentage of participants that report having discussed VE issues  Examples of discussions of VE issues, successes and challenges | Workshop reports, Donor reports | X |  |  |  | X | x |
| Continued existence of a structured parent mechanism to discuss and seek assistance on VE related issues  Other examples of local coordination mechanisms | Donor reports | X |  |  |  | X | X |
| Objective: To contribute to preventing the further spread of VE *through capacitating the institutional stakeholders to directly engage with local communities and* build their **resilience** against extremist influences and ongoing recruitment | Progress in implementing PVE measures in **National Action Plan** |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Percentage of **youth participants** that enhanced their IC Thinking (resilience and empathy) | MoviEQ pre/post results (database) | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Longer-term average results from similar PVE projects in the country | MoviEQ average follow-up results | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of MoviEQ and other preventive activities for at-risk youth since the end of the project  Number of at-risk youth in those MoviEQ or other activities | Photos?  Participant lists? | X |  |  |  | X | X |
| To what extent did the project **adapt** to changing external conditions to ensure project outcomes? | Were there any external conditions that posed **challenges** to implementation? | Challenges as documented or identified by stakeholders | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| **Mitigation** measures taken (substantive, operational, stakeholder cooperation)? | Mitigation as documented or identified by stakeholders | Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What are the major factors influencing the achievement of the project’s expected outcomes? | What are the key factors affecting design and implementation of PVE measures?   * National stakeholders interest in community-based PVE approaches? * Local stakeholders interest in recognizing and preventing VE? * Partnership strategy and ownership? * Other factors? |  | Donor reports | X |  | X | X |  |  |
| What are the key factors affecting the active engagement in structured discussions around VE?   * Has social stigma and social norms prevented active involvement? * Other factors? |  | Donor reports | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| **Efficiency** | Was the project management of the project appropriately carried out? | Team dynamics, internal communication, procedures, and roles – **PMan** | Described and documented roles, procedures and mechanisms | Proposal,  Donor reports | X | X |  |  |  |  |
| External coordination and planning | Described and documented practices | Proposal,  Donor reports | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| M&E tools – **PMon**  *Activity* and work planning?*Budget* monitoring?*Result* measurement? *Risk* management? | Review of M&E tools, reports, and practices used by the project team | Monitoring tools; Monitoring data | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| How well were resources (funds, expertise, time) converted into results? | Staff and consultants (funded), leverage of other external (non-funded) assets like experts and partner support | Appropriateness of staff plans and budget, examples of leveraging assets | Proposal, budget, donor reports | X | X |  |  |  |  |
| Budget | Assessment of spending per budget line, burn rate, any reallocations | Budget, donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activities | Timeliness and quality of activities | Proposal, Workplan, Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Impact** | To what extent can long-term changes be observed (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative)? | What are the **most significant changes** that can be observed? For example:   * National coordination, strategies * PVE policy development * PVE measures in more communities * Continued delivery of PVE measures * Local institutions and structures * Individual-level changes in youth | Stakeholder perception of ‘most significant changes’ observed | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What role did the **project** play in those changes? What are **other key factors**? | Contribution analysis based on stakeholder perceptions. |  | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Did the project take timely measures for mitigating any unplanned **negative impacts**? | Were the project team, beneficiaries and partners aware of any negative impacts?  If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time? | Stakeholder perception of any negative impacts observed and related mitigation measures | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Sustainability** | What are the major factors affecting sustainability, including any identified challenges faced by the implementing organization? | Did the project design incorporate any elements of sustainability? | Assessment of proposal according to criteria in IOM Project Handbook, IOM project staff perceptions | Proposal, Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What challenges related to sustainability arose during implementation, and what was the response?  Was an exit strategy developed?  Was any follow-up planned, including through other projects? | Stakeholder perceptions and examples of challenges, Evidence of exit strategy or follow-up | Donor reports | X | X |  |  |  |  |
| Are necessary structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support? | What is the current situation, now that the project has ended? Have any aspects been sustained without external support?  For example: trained local actors continuing work, further preventive actions or trainings, structures, etc. | Examples of continued benefits | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What are the key factors re sustainability?  For example: funding, structures in place, political will, coordination, etc. | Stakeholder perceptions of key challenges and related factors | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What would IOM and other stakeholders suggest for future projects – what appears to work, what should be done differently? | Stakeholder perception of good practices and lessons learned | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**6. INTERVIEW GUIDES**

The below Interview Guides will be used by the evaluator in the interviews with key stakeholders. The interviews will be semi-structured, so the questions listed are intended as a guide. The evaluator may choose to omit some or to ask additional or follow-up questions depending on the direction of the conversation.

**Interview introduction**

My name is Sarah Harris. I work for IOM in our regional office in Vienna.

Are you comfortable speaking in English, or you prefer interpretation?

I’ll first explain the purpose of my visit. I am here to evaluate a project that IOM implemented, which ended in December last year. *It carried out activities mainly in Tetovo, swith some activities also in Debar.* *For Tetovo, the project carried out a community assessment report that was shared with TWG members, workshops for youth, and workshops for teachers, social workers, and other community members. In Debar, the only activity was the youth workshops.*

I wasn’t involved in the design or implementation, and I am also not an expert on the national context, so I bring a fresh and independent perspective.

Now that some time has passed since the end of the project, I am carrying out a comprehensive evaluation of how well the project responded to needs, how effective and efficient it was, and what results we can see – not only positive results, but also any negative impacts.

I want to hear your experience and your opinions. Please be open about what worked and what didn’t, so that we can learn and improve.

All information you provide is confidential. The findings won’t refer to any individual person or agency. I will only attach a list of the people interviewed.

Is that clear? Any questions?

I’d also like to record the interview on my phone. This will make sure that I can pay attention to the conversation, without worrying about having to write everything down. Later, the interpreter will help me to transcribe the recording, and then the recordings will be deleted.

Is that OK that I record the interview?

The interview should take no more than XX minutes. I have a list of questions prepared, and I will also give some time at the end for any final comments you want to add.

**IOM – Biljana**

Agenda

* Review who is included, challenges faced in including certain stakeholders.

Design

* Who designed the project?
* Was it based on other PVE projects, e.g. the pilot project in BiH?
* Is the model/approach consistent with other PVE projects?
* How was the approach adapted in Macedonia?
* How and why were Tetovo and Debar selected?
* What was the reasoning behind adding Debar in the middle of the project with limited activities?
* Did you develop any ‘local theories of change’?

Inception

* How long was inception? Was it long enough in both cases?
* How were CLPs selected? Any challenges?
* How were CLPs trained and supported?
* Was sufficient time available to build trust and lay foundations?

Needs

* How much of a national priority has PVE been over the last years?
* How do projects like this align with IOM’s strategy for the country? Or regional/global strategy?
* What are the relevant frameworks (national, regional, international)?
* How well did project align to those strategies and frameworks? Any gaps?
* How were beneficiary needs assessed in design and implementation?
* Do you think that the project responded well to the needs of all those groups?
* How does this project align with other projects? How does the Mission promote alignment?

Management and monitoring

* Review who was involved in the project.
* How did you promote internal coordination, including with other PVE projects?
* How did you support coordination with external partners? National actors – through TWG? Bilaterally with any Ministries? Local actors and participants?
* Were any ‘sustainable partnerships’ maintained or established? National Coordinator, TWG?
* Any challenges? Anything you would do differently next time?
* What mechanisms and approaches were used to monitor and learn?
* Did CLPs interact with or otherwise learn from each other (Tetovo – Debar)?
* Were any other stakeholders involved in co-leading, monitoring or evaluation of activities?
* Did you use any global guidance on PVE, or lessons from other projects, during implementation?
* Did you use the results of the Tetovo assessment when managing this project?
* Activities
  + How did you monitor activities?
  + Any major delays or challenges?
* Finances
  + How did you monitor expenditures?
  + What was the reason for the cost savings?
  + Why was the project still underspent by the end?
* Risks
  + How were risks monitored?
  + Were any actions taken to monitor unintended negative effects on participants?
  + Were any major risks realized? Unexpected external conditions that impacted the project?
* Gender: How well did this project mainstream gender? What are some examples? *Gender checklist.*

Results

* How did you monitor results?
* Do you think the proposal including the results matrix was well designed?
* Did you face any challenges when monitoring or reporting on results?
* Community assessment for Tetovo
  + What is your impression of the quality?
  + How was it shared to stakeholders – at a meeting? Who attended? Shared with anyone else?
  + Did it reach all relevant stakeholders? Anyone missed?
  + What was the impression of how useful it was? Why was a questionnaire not used?
* IC Thinking/MoviEQ
  + How did you identify and reach participants? Was it hard?
  + What is your impression of the capacities of the facilitators by the end of the project?
  + What evidence – did you attend? Did you receive workshop reports? Did you measure?
  + By the end of the project, had they all helped implement workshops?
  + Did delaying the training of local facilitators impact the results? If so, how? If not, why not?
* PVE community workshops
  + How did you identify and reach the participants? Was it hard?
  + What is your impression of the quality of methodology? Was it sufficiently context-specific?
  + What evidence that participants improved capacities to recognize and respond to VE signs?
  + Did you measure how many actively engaged in structured discussion on VE by the end?
  + Can you explain the parent mechanism that was established?

Impact

* In terms of longer-term results, what did you hope to see?
* In Tetovo and Debar? At national level?
* What factors may be helping or hindering the impact?
* How does this fit with other projects/initiatives for a combined impact?
* What are the most significant changes, in your opinion?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?

Sustainability

* Which changes or other benefits are likely to be sustained?
* What will be the long-term benefits for youth? Will resilience and empathy changes be sustained?
* What are the key challenges regarding sustainability? - *funding, structures, will, coordination…*
* Were there plans for further external support, e.g. under other projects?
* Are you aware of what has been happening there in the last year?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**IOM – Aleksandra**

Agenda

* Review who is included, challenges faced in including certain stakeholders.

Needs

* How were beneficiary needs assessed in design and implementation?
* Do you think that the project responded well to the needs of all those groups?

Management and monitoring

* Do you think the project management was appropriately carried out?
* How did the coordination work, both internally and with partners? Any ways it could be improved?
* What mechanisms and approaches were used to monitor and learn?
* How were activities monitored? Any major delays or challenges?
* How were finances monitored? Why was the project still underspent by the end?
* How were risks monitored? Any major risks realized?
* How well did this project mainstream gender? What are some examples? Gender checklist.

Results

* How were results monitored?
* Do you think the proposal including the results matrix was well designed?
* Did you face any challenges when monitoring or reporting on results?
* Community assessment for Tetovo
  + What is your impression of the quality of the assessment?
  + What is your impression of the usefulness, for IOM and for partners?
* IC Thinking/MoviEQ
  + Did you attend or observe any of the MoviEQ workshops?
  + What is your impression of the quality, including capacities of the facilitators?
* PVE community workshops
  + What is your impression of the quality of the workshops?
  + What do we know about the parent mechanism that was established, does it still exist?
  + How was it trying to contact participants for a meeting?

Impact

* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes, in your opinion?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* How does this fit with other projects/initiatives for a combined impact?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?

Sustainability

* Which changes or other benefits are likely to be sustained?
* What are the key challenges regarding sustainability?
* Were there plans for further external support, e.g. under other projects?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**IOM – Sonja**

Design

* Who designed the project?
* Is the model/approach consistent with other PVE projects?
* How was the approach adapted in Macedonia?

Needs

* How much of a national priority has PVE been over the last years?
* How do projects like this align with IOM’s strategy for the country? Or regional/global strategy?
* What are the relevant frameworks (national, regional, international)?
* How well does project align to meet those needs?
* How does this project align with other projects? How does the Mission promote alignment?

Implementation

* What are the key challenges in implementing projects like this one in Macedonia?
* Were there any external conditions that posed challenges to implementation?

Results

* Community assessment for Tetovo
  + What was the impression of how useful it was for national stakeholders?
  + The final report lists three examples of PVE measures included in the NAP *(Action teams within communities; Key integrated task forces; State working groups for focused multi-agency activities).* Do you know of any progress implementing those?
* IC Thinking/MoviEQ
  + What is your impression of the capacities of the facilitators?
* PVE community workshops
  + What is your impression of how useful this was for Tetovo?
* Do you think the project management was appropriately carried out?
* Any challenges with the internal coordination? External coordination with partners?

Impact

* In terms of longer-term results, what would did you hope to see?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors or challenges?

Sustainability

* What activities are most likely to sustained?
* Were there plans for further external support, e.g. under other projects?
* What are the key challenges?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**IOM – Erda**

* Are you familiar with the details of this project?

Needs

* How much of a national priority has PVE been over the last years?
* How do projects like this align with IOM’s strategy for the country? Or regional/global strategy?
* What are the relevant frameworks (national, regional, international)?
* How well does project align to meet those needs?
* How well does a community-based approach like this meet needs?
* How does this project align with other PVE projects? How does the Mission promote alignment?
* Have there been external conditions that pose challenges to implementing PVE projects?

Implementation

* What are the key challenges in implementing projects like this one in Macedonia?
* Were there any external conditions that posed challenges to implementation?

Results / Impact

* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project, or similar PVE projects?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* What are the long-term impacts on youth that you have observed from MoviEQ workshops?

Sustainability

* What are the challenges to sustainability for PVE projects?
* Was there follow-up or continued work through other projects? Such as other activities in Tetovo or Debar? Or ongoing work to support the National Action Plan?
* Progress in integrating PVE approaches like MoviEQ into the schools?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**IOM – Danijela, Alena**

* In your experience, how should projects with MoviEQ components be planned?
* What else needs to be carried out, in order to achieve results?
* How was the methodology adapted to Macedonia? What changes were made?
* Does it address feelings of injustice and victimization? Lack of opportunities faced by at-risk youth?
* Do the activities include attention to gender issues?
* How did the activities go? Any challenges delivering the workshops?
* What is your impression of the capacities of the five trained local facilitators?
* During the project, did any of the local facilitators help to implement workshops?
* By the end of the project, were all facilitators ready to give workshops on their own?
* How were their capacities measured or tested? What evidence?
* Do you know if any of the facilitators have delivered other workshops this year?
* How was coordination with the team in Skopje? Any ways it could be improved next time?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes you would expect from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts from this or similar projects?
* What are the long-term impacts on youth that you have observed from MoviEQ workshops?
* What are the key factors regarding sustainability?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Consultants**

* How did you get involved into this project?
* Can you describe your role and the support provided?
* Do you think that a project like this responds to the needs of national authorities? Local authorities? Community members, including at-risk youth?
* Have there been external conditions that posed challenges to implementing the activities?
* In your opinion, are there any challenges to implementing PVE projects like this?
* Did the project give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts?
* What are the key factors regarding sustainability?
* Did you face any issues with coordinating with IOM project team?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Community expert**

* How did you get involved into this project?
* Can you describe your role and the support provided?
* Do you think that a project like this responds to the needs of national authorities? Local authorities? Community members, including at-risk youth?
* Did the project give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* Have there been external conditions or development in the past year or two, that pose a challenge to implementing PVE projects? Or to sustaining the results?
* How was your interaction with IOM staff? Do you feel the activities were well coordinated?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**CLPs**

* How did you get involved into this project? What was your role?
* Do you think that a project like this responds to the community needs?
* How did you identify and reach participants? Was it hard?
* What are the key challenges when implementing these types of activities? Were there any major challenges that you faced yourself?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* Did the project give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* Do you see any continued benefits of the project? What are the challenges?
* How has participation in the project affected you personally?
* How was your interaction with IOM staff? Do you feel the activities were well coordinated?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Center for Research and Policy Making (CRPM)**

* How did you get involved into jointly organizing the workshop with IOM?
* Are you familiar with any other aspects? If so, what do you think of the overall approach?
* Do you think that a project like this responds to the needs of community members?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the workshop?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* Did the project give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* What are the key challenges when implementing these types of activities? Were there any major challenges that you faced yourself?
* Have there been important developments in the past year or two, that pose a challenge to implementing PVE projects?
* What are the sustainability challenges for this type of project?
* How was your interaction with IOM staff? Do you feel the activities were well coordinated?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Tetovo municipality**

* How did you learn about this project?
* Were you involved in planning or promoting any of the activities?
* Do you think this project responded well to the needs of the municipality?
* What is your impression of the workshops? Have you heard any feedback about them?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have participants have continued to discuss these issues? Have you observed anything?
* Is it hard to discuss these issues here?
* I understand there was some sort of parent group that was established. Is this true? Is it still operating? If so, who is involved? How does it work?
* Did the project give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* The project also tried to influence and support national policy on PVE. In your opinion, what are the key factors affecting design and implementation of PVE measures?
  + Are national stakeholders interested? Do they provide support?
  + Do you think many other communities are open to trying these types of approaches?
* In your opinion, what are the key challenges when implementing these types of activities?
* What are sustainability challenges?
* How was your communication with the IOM staff and the local community liaisons?
* Were you able to share your feedback, including any issues or problems that you had?
* Should the workshops for community members and youth be offered in other cities facing similar issues? Or would other activities be more useful?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**National Coordinator**

* How did you learn about this project?
* Were you involved in planning or promoting any of the activities?
* What is your view on such community-based interventions for PVE - are they needed?
* Do you think that a project like this responds to the needs of other national institutions? Local authorities? Community members, including at-risk youth?
* How does the project align with national priorities and strategies?
* What is your impression of the usefulness of the community assessment report from Tetovo?
* What percentage of NCCVECT members found that report useful? Or what is your impression of the usefulness of reports like this in general for the NCCVECT members?
* I understand that those were used in the National Action Plan for PVE?
* What are some examples of PVE measures that were developed?
* What progress has been made in implementing those?
* What are the successes and challenges?
* How many communities have received any of those PVE measures?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* What are the key challenges when implementing community based PVE activities?
* Have there been any recent developments in the past year or two that pose a challenge?
* What are the key factors affecting design and implementation of PVE measures?
* What are sustainability challenges for this type of project?
* What is the current situation? Have any aspects been sustained without external support?
* Was there follow-up or continued work through other projects in Tetovo or Debar?
* Were community-based approaches expanded to other communities? National Action Plan?
* How was your communication with the IOM staff? Were the activities well coordinated?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Ministry of Education**

* How did you learn about this project?
* Were you involved in planning or promoting any of the activities?
* What is your view on such community-based interventions for PVE - are they needed?
* How does the project align with national priorities and strategies?
* Do you think that a project like this responds to the needs of other national institutions? Local authorities? Community members, including at-risk youth?
* For this project, IOM shared a community assessment report carried out for Tetovo. Have you seen or heard of that report? If so, do you have any opinion on its usefulness?
* Are you aware of any examples of PVE measures that were developed based on the report?
* What progress has been made in implementing those?
* What are the successes and challenges?
* How many communities have received any of those PVE measures?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project, or other projects like this?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* What are the key challenges when implementing community based PVE activities?
* Have there been any recent developments in the past year or two that pose a challenge?
* What are sustainability challenges for this type of project?
* How was your communication with the IOM staff? Were the activities well-coordinated?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Local psychologists**

* How did you get involved into the activities?
* Do you think that MoviEQ responds well to the community needs?
* What is your impression in general of the need for preventing violent extremism in the country?
* How did the activities go? Any challenges in the trainings, or delivering the workshops?
* What is your impression of the capacities of the two IOM trainers from Sarajevo?
* What is your impression of the MoviEQ methodology? Was it hard to learn? Materials are good?
* How was coordination with the team in Skopje? Any ways it could be improved next time?
* Does the workshop give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* During the project, did you or other facilitators help to implement workshops?
* Have you delivered other workshops this year, or do you plan to?
* Have you been involved in any other way, such as in local discussions or coordination on PVE?
* What are sustainability challenges for this type of project? *funding, structures, will, coordination…*
* What is the current situation? Have any aspects been sustained without external support? *trained local actors continuing work, further preventive actions or trainings, structures, etc.*
* What are the key challenges when implementing community-based PVE activities?
* Have there been any recent developments in the past year or two that pose a challenge?
* Are you familiar with any other project activities? If so, what do you think of the overall approach?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes that you have observed since last year?
* Have you observed of the following types of changes? If so, what evidence?
  + Continued delivery of PVE measures?
  + Local institutions and structures, discussion or coordination?
  + Individual-level changes in youth?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Teachers, school psychologists, social workers, community leaders**

* How did you learn about and get involved in the workshops?
* What was your impression of the quality of the workshops, including the facilitators and materials?
* Did you learn how to better recognize VE signs, and how to respond?
* Did the workshop give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* What types of people would find this workshop useful?
  + Is it be useful for both men and women, and for different ages? Certain profiles?
  + I noticed that most of the participants were women. Why do you think that is?
* In your understanding, what did this project aim to achieve?
* What are the most significant changes from the project that you can see?
* How did your participation in the workshops affect you personally?
* Have you engaged in discussions with anyone you thought was at risk of being radicalized or joining an extremist group? If so, can you give an example?
* Is it hard to discuss these issues? If so, what are the main challenges that you face?
* Have you passed on or shared what you learned with anyone? Such as the toolkit?
* I understand there was some sort of parent group that was established last year. Is this true? And is the group still operating? If so, who is involved? How does it work?
* Are you still in contact with others that participated?
* Do you notice any changes in cooperation and coordination among local actors on PVE issues?
* More discussion on PVE issues?
* What was your action plan developed at the end of the workshop?
* Do you think many other participants have continued to engage and discuss these issues?
* Do you know of any other preventive activities with youth since last year?
* More interventions with at-risk youth?
* More preventive measures/activities with youth?
* Individual-level changes in youth?
* What role does the project play in those changes? What other factors were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
* If so, were actions taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* Did they respond well to your needs? And the needs of your community?
* Should the workshops be offered in other cities facing similar issues with violent extremism and radicalization? Or would other activities be more useful?
* What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?

**Youth**

* How did you hear about the workshop?
* Do you know anyone else that participated?
* What is your impression of the workshop?
* Do you think the facilitators were good?
* Did the workshop respond well to your needs? What about the needs of your community?
* Who do you think the workshop targets? Would it be useful for all types of people, including for men and women, and for different ages?
* Did the workshop give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
* Do you think the workshops had a positive impact?
* What are the most significant changes that you have observed, in yourself or in others?
  + Do youth participants feel that they gained the tools, skills and confidence to engage with their community and resist solutions offered by recruiters?
* Did anything else contribute to those change? Any other factors that were important?
* Have you seen any negative impacts of the workshop?
* If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
* Should we plan more of these workshops, or would other activities be more useful?
* Is there any way that the workshops can be improved?
* How was your communication with the local support person?
* Did you interact with anyone else from IOM?
* Were you able to share your feedback, including any issues or problems that you had?