

### Annex 3. 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**).

CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		SOURCES OF DATA	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents & Stakeholders	Desk review, Interviews, FGDs
Relevance	Is the intervention well-designed ( <b>Results Matrix, Theory of Change, and risk analysis</b> in particular) to address the needs and priorities identified in the project document?	What was the <b>programme theory</b> ? Did it change during implementation?	Reconstruct programme theory from the project documents and from IOM staff understanding.  Comparison of project document, revisions and donor reports.	Project documents; Donor reports  IOM staff	Document review  Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff
		Do stakeholders feel the <b>programme theory was appropriate</b> for addressing the needs and responding to the priorities.	Comparison of results matrix and theory of change as documented and as described by different stakeholders.	Programme partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders	Document review  Semi-structured interviews and FGD with partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders
		Was the programme able to <b>analyse risks and adapt its design to new emerging needs and current context</b> , in order to maintain its relevance over time?	Perceptions of staff, beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders; Comparison of programme goals to documented and reported priorities	Project documents; Risks Management Plan; Donor reports  IOM staff, Programme partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders	Document review  Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff, partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders
	Has the programme been implemented taking into	What are the relevant <b>frameworks</b> (national, regional,	Assessment of frameworks, Perceptions of stakeholders	National Strategy on Diaspora Engagement ; UNDAF ?	Document review

CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		SOURCES OF DATA	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents & Stakeholders	Desk review, Interviews, FGDs
	account the <b>IOM Migration Governance Framework and IOM twelve-point strategy, the IOM Strategic Vision for 2019-2023, and the regional and country strategic priorities</b> related to diaspora engagement?	international)? How well does programme align? Any gaps?		IOM staff and governmental counterparts	Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff and governmental counterparts
		How well does the programme align with IOM's MiGOF and with IOM national, sub-regional, and regional strategies related to diaspora engagement?	Assess alignment to documents, IOM staff perceptions	Project documents; MiGOF; National, sub-regional, and regional strategies IOM staff	Document review Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff
		Does the programme meet the <b>pillars</b> laid out in the IOM Strategic Vision for 2019-2023?	Assess alignment to IOM Strategic Vision for 2019-2023?	Project documents; Donor reports	Document review Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff
<b>Coherence</b>	Do synergies exist with other interventions carried out by IOM as well as partners?	Is the intervention consistent and complementary with other initiatives implemented by IOM and other actors?	Perceptions of IOM staff, governmental counterparts and other actors; Stated objectives of other similar projects	Project document and Donor reports; Project documents or summary of other similar projects IOM staff, governmental counterparts and other actors (UN, EU, GIZ)	Document review Semi-structured interviews
	Have the activities of this programme positively or negatively affected the achievement of the desired outcomes of another programme?	Do stakeholders and other actors feel the programme impacted the achievement of other initiatives?	Perceptions of IOM staff, governmental counterparts and other actors; Evidence of specific, concrete examples	Donor reports IOM staff, governmental counterparts and other actors	Document review Semi-structured interviews
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Did the programme effectively reach its planned results (outputs and outcomes)?	Is the <b>results matrix</b> well designed to be able to measure the intended results?	Assessment of quality of the results matrix	Results matrix IOM staff	Document review Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff
		Is <b>monitoring data</b> available for all results?	Progress against indicators	Donor reports	Document review



CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		SOURCES OF DATA	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents & Stakeholders	Desk review, Interviews, FGDs
				IOM staff	Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff
		Are each of the outputs and outcomes achieved by the end of the programme?	Progress against indicators; Stakeholders perception and evidence provided	Donor reports IOM staff and all stakeholders	Document review, analysis of indicators progress Semi-structured interviews and FGD
	Did the programme respond to the needs of the target groups?	What are <b>needs and priorities</b> of the target beneficiaries? How were needs of target beneficiaries <b>assessed</b> in design? How well did programme <b>align during implementation</b> ?	Needs and assessments as documented and as described by stakeholders and programme beneficiaries	Project documents; Donor reports Stakeholders and project beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGD with stakeholders and project beneficiaries
	Did the programme work effectively with all relevant stakeholders, beneficiaries?	Are the stakeholders and beneficiaries satisfied with the programme?	Perceptions of stakeholders and beneficiaries; Satisfaction or challenges reported by beneficiaries; Percentage of respondents providing positive feedbacks in the interviews	Stakeholders and beneficiaries	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs with IOM staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
		Do IOM staff feel that the programme reached successfully all relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries?	Perceptions of IOM staff	IOM staff	Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff
		If the programme has not addressed the needs of all relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries, would a different set of activities have produced better results?	Perceptions of IOM staff, Programme partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders; Satisfaction or challenges reported by beneficiaries; Percentage of respondents providing positive feedbacks in the interviews	IOM staff, Programme partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs with IOM staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		SOURCES OF DATA	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents & Stakeholders	Desk review, Interviews, FGDs
	Were there any barriers which constrained and delayed achievement of planned outputs? What were the external and internal factors/constraints?	Were there any internal and external conditions that posed <b>challenges</b> to implementation?	Challenges as documented or identified by IOM staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries	Monitoring and Donor reports IOM staff, Programme partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs with IOM staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
		What are the key factors affecting the active engagement of Diaspora?	Key factors as documented or identified by IOM staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries	Monitoring and Donor reports IOM staff, Programme partners, beneficiaries, Stakeholders	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs with IOM staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
	Were there any unexpected external developments that affected the implementation, and if so, how were these mitigated?	To what extent has the programme adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions in order to ensure programme outcomes, including in relation to COVID-19 impacts?	Perceptions of IOM staff, beneficiaries and partners	Monitoring and donor reports, IOM, Programme partners, Beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews, FGDs
<b>Efficiency</b>	How well is the availability/usage of means/inputs managed?	How do expenditures compare to the budget? How was the burn rate?	Comparison of budget, expenditures, and timeline	Budget, financial reports IOM staff	Document review Semi-structured interviews with IOM staff
		Did budget allow for appropriate staffing? Were competent staff available?	Perception of quality and availability of appropriate staffing	IOM staff	Semi-structured interviews
	How well is the partner(s) contribution/involvement working and how did this cooperation impact programme objectives?	Was the budget allocated to programme partners and beneficiaries appropriate?	Perceptions of programme partners and beneficiaries; Satisfaction or challenges reported by beneficiaries; Percentage of respondents providing positive feedbacks in the interviews	Programme partners and beneficiaries	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
		Were activities implemented by the partners completed on time?	Comparison of initial workplan with effective implementation timeline	Project documents; Donor reports IOM staff, partners and beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGDs



CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		SOURCES OF DATA	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents & Stakeholders	Desk review, Interviews, FGDs
		What are the reasons for any delays?	Perceptions of IOM staff, beneficiaries and partners		
	Are the programme expenditures in line with the agreed upon budget, and the cost incurred consistent with the strategy of the programmes?	Have the programme management structures and processes contributed to the efficient management of the programmes?	Perceptions of IOM staff; Descriptions of monitoring practices and procedures (results, activities, financials, and risks)	Project documents; Donor reports IOM staff	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
	Could the activities have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results?	What is the perception of cost-effectiveness? Are there ways that it could have been improved?	Perceptions of stakeholders	IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
<b>Impact</b>	To what extent has progress been made towards enhancing the engagement of the Albanian diaspora in the development of the country?	What are the <b>most significant changes</b> that can be observed in the engagement of the Albanian diaspora in the development of the country?	Stakeholder perception of 'most significant changes' observed by stakeholders; Evidence and examples cited by stakeholders	Project documents; Donor reports IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
	Is there evidence of any other unplanned/unintended changes (whether positive or negative)?	Did the programme team, beneficiaries and partners observe any unintended positive or negative changes?	Description of changes perceived, supporting evidence	IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs

CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		SOURCES OF DATA	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents & Stakeholders	Desk review, Interviews, FGDs
		Did the programme take timely measures for mitigating any unplanned negative impacts that were observed or perceived as likely to occur (related to, for instance, changes in the national and local authorities, or in the priorities of partners and beneficiary institutions, or others)?	Perceptions of staff, beneficiaries and partners	Monitoring and donor reports IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Desk review Semi-structured interviews, FGDs
<b>Sustainability</b>	What elements were included in the design and implementation to promote sustainability?	Did the programme design incorporate any elements of sustainability?	Assessment of project document IOM programme staff perceptions	Project document, Donor reports IOM staff	Document review Semi-structured interviews
		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 programmes?	Stakeholder perceptions and examples of challenges, Evidence of exit strategy or follow-up	Donor reports IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
	Were the activities appropriately designed to ensure sustainability of programme benefits?	What is the current situation, now that the programme has ended?	Examples of continued benefits described by all stakeholders	IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
	What should be done in order to guarantee the sustainability, if necessary?	What would IOM and other stakeholders suggest for future programmes – what appears to	Perceptions of good practices and lessons learned	IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Semi-structured interviews and FGDs



CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		SOURCES OF DATA	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents & Stakeholders	Desk review, Interviews, FGDs
		work, what should be done differently?			
<b>Cross-Cutting Issues</b>	Have practical gender needs, strategic gender interests and other gender-related issues been adequately considered in the programme design and implementation?	How and how well was gender addressed?	Assess alignment to IOM Project Handbook and to specific elements included in checklist extracted.	Monitoring and Donor reports	Document review
		What are <b>concrete examples</b> of attention to gender during implementation?	Perceptions of IOM and stakeholders, Examples of how gender-based approaches were used	Monitoring and Donor reports IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
	Is the programme respecting/addressing environmental needs/problems?	What strategic plans and operational actions did IOM undertake to address <b>environmental considerations</b> ?	Plans and actions documented or explained by IOM Perceptions of stakeholders	Monitoring and Donor reports IOM staff, governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGDs
		What are <b>concrete examples</b> of attention to environmental needs during implementation?			
	Have the communication and visibility actions been implemented in an appropriate manner?	Has IOM established a <b>communication strategy</b> and implemented it during this programme? Who was the target and how well did it work?	Review of communication and visibility documents and material as well as analysis of outreach.	Communication strategy if available, Visibility material produced and Monitoring and Donor reports IOM staff	Document review Semi-structured interviews with IOM Staff
Do stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries believe that the communication and visibility strategy was appropriate.		Perceptions of stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries	Governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	Document review Semi-structured interviews and FGDs with governmental counterparts, programme partners and beneficiaries	

