Final internal independent evaluation of the “Tajik-Afghan Integration, Resilience and Reform Building Programme” (TAIRR)

Evaluator: Sarah Harris, ROMEO for RO Vienna

**Evaluation Matrix – 4 March 2020**

| **Evaluation criteria** | **Evaluation questions** | **Sub-questions** | **Indicators** | **Data sources** | **Data  collection** | **Data  analysis** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|
| Relevance | Do the expected outcomes and outputs remain valid and pertinent as modified in the **reformulation** of August 2018? | What are the key contextual factors and needs related to the project’s objective? | Documented factors and needs | Project document, monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| Perceptions of stakeholders | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Are the intended results identified in the reformulation of the project in line with the current context and needs? | Comparison of results matrix to contextual dynamics | Results matrix | Desk review | NVivo |
| Perceptions of stakeholders | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Are the project **activities** and **outputs** consistent with the intended outcomes and objective? | Is the vertical logic of the results matrix well developed, including the assumptions? | Assessment using the IOM Project Handbook standards | Project document | Desk review | NVivo |
| Do stakeholders feel the activities were appropriate ones for achieving the outputs? And the outputs for achieving the outcomes? | Perceptions of stakeholders | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Is the **theory of change** appropriate for the context? | Does the theory of change match the context? | Comparison of theory of change to contextual dynamics | Project document, Monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| Perceptions of stakeholders | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Is the planning in line with **government** priorities and **IOM’s** global strategy? | Is the project in line with government priorities, and with IOM strategies at national, regional and global levels? | Comparison of project goals to documented and reported priorities | Project document, Donor reports, National strategy, IOM global strategy | Desk review | NVivo |
| IOM, government | Interviews | NVivo |
| **Effectiveness** | Have the project **outputs** and **outcomes** been achieved in accordance with stated plans? | *Output 1:* More capable, trusted, and coordinated Border Management forces have increased capacity to prevent/detect transnational crime and increase community security | Indicators in the RM, triangulated with stories of change | Monitoring and donor reports | Excel matrix | Excel matrix |
| IOM, government, IP | Interviews | NVivo |
| *Output 2:* Grants, vocational training and cross border linkages are facilitated to provide income opportunities and employment for VCMs, SMEs, RM in communities | Indicators in the RM, triangulated with stories of change | Monitoring and donor reports | Excel matrix | Excel matrix |
| IOM, government, IP, direct beneficiaries | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| *Output 3:* Tajik migrants to Russia have improved access to information on safe migration and access reintegration support | Indicators in the RM, triangulated with stories of change | Monitoring and donor reports | Excel matrix | Excel matrix |
| IOM, government, IP, direct beneficiaries | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| *Outcome:* Increased resilience to crime and conflict amongst migrants in communities near the Tajik/Afghan border | Indicators in the RM, triangulated with stories of change | Monitoring and donor reports | Excel matrix | Excel matrix |
| IOM, government, IP, direct beneficiaries | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Are there any **gaps** observed between planned and achieved results? How can they be explained? | - | Documented reasons for delays and gaps | Monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| Perceptions | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Are the **target beneficiaries** being reached and satisfied with the services provided? | What does each beneficiary group think of the reach and the quality of the services? | Satisfaction reported by beneficiaries | Monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| What specific results can be observed in terms of location, sex, age, disability, financial vulnerability (poverty) and psychological vulnerability?  Can any differences be observed? | Documented results | Monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| Perceptions and stories of change | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| How effective was the **modification** of the project to reach the proposed results? | Has there been a change in the level of results achievement since the reformulation? | Comparison of pre and post formulation | Monitoring and donor reports | Excel matrix | Excel matrix |
| Perceptions | IOM, government, IP | Interviews | NVivo |
| Has there been any **synergy** between different elements of the implementation? |  | Documented synergy | Donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| Perceptions of synergies | IOM, government, IP | Interviews | NVivo |
| **Efficiency** | **How well are the resources (funds, expertise and time) being converted into results?** | *Funds*: How do expenditures compare to the budget? How was the burn rate? | Comparison of budget, expenditures, and timeline | Budget, financial reports  IOM staff, IP, donor | Excel matrix  Interviews | Excel matrix  NVivo |
| *Expertise*: Did budget allow for appropriate staffing? Were competent staff available? | Perception of quality and availability of appropriate staffing | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| *Time*: Were activities completed on time? What are the reasons for any delays? | Comparison of actual activities to workplan | Detailed workplan, donor reports | Excel matrix | Excel matrix |
| Perceptions of timeliness | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| **To what degree were inputs provided or available in time to implement activities from all parties involved?** | - | Documented delays in funds and other resources allocations | Donor reports |  |  |
| Perceptions of stakeholders | IOM, IPs | Interviews | NVivo |
| **Are the costs proportionate to the results achieved?** | How do expenditures per output compare to the achieved results? | Comparison of budget to results, | Donor reports (financial, narrative) | Desk review | Excel matrix, visualization |
| What is the perception of cost-effectiveness? Are there ways that it could have been improved? | Perceptions of stakeholders | IOM, IPs, donor | Interviews | NVivo |
| Impact | **What changes can be observed in the target population/key stakeholders?** | In addition to the intended outcomes, what other changes have been documented by IOM for the target population / key stakeholders? | Description of changes perceived, supporting evidence | Monitoring and donor reports  IOM staff | Desk review  Interviews | NVivo |
| What other changes can be observed on the target population / key stakeholders? | Description of changes, evidence | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| **What other unplanned changes can be observed, whether positive or negative?** | What other changes can be observed, whether positive or negative, including for non-target populations / other stakeholders? | Description of changes perceived, supporting evidence | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| What is the likely contribution of the project to observed changes? | What other factors can be identified, and how do those factors compare to project contribution? | Factors identified by stakeholders and in monitoring (risks, assumptions, context) | Monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | Contribution analysis |
| Sustainability | To what extent have target groups and partners been involved in the planning and implementation process? | Which groups and partners have been involved in planning and implementation processes, and were any left out?  How were the various groups and partners involved, and was it participative and effective? | Participants in and functioning of coordination mechanisms | Monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Perceptions of stakeholders | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| Are any results or benefits likely to continue after the project? Which ones, and how/why? | Is an exit strategy in place? Has the project team identified results or benefits that will continue? | Documented exit strategy and plans | Monitoring and donor reports | Desk review | NVivo |
| Perceptions | IOM | Interviews | NVivo |
| Do the target groups have any plans to continue making use of the services/products produced in the project framework? | What is the perception of stakeholders on likelihood that results or benefits will continue? What plans do they have to continue making use of any of the services/products? | Perceptions of stakeholders, examples of plans | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGDs | NVivo |
| **Cross-cutting issues** | To what degree was **gender** successfully mainstreamed in project design and implementation? | - | Analysis using the checklists from IOM Project Handbook | Project documents, monitoring and donor reports | Document review | NVivo |
| How (and how well) was gender addressed? |  | All stakeholders | Interviews, FGD |  |
| To what extent did the project address **vulnerability** (disability, financial vulnerability i.e. poverty, and psychological vulnerability) and consider special needs of vulnerable persons (including re-entry banned migrants)? | What strategic plans and operational actions did IOM undertake to address vulnerabilities and consider special needs of vulnerable persons? | Plans and actions documented or explained by IOM | Project documents, monitoring and donor reports  IOM | Document review  Interviews | NVivo |
| Are there any unaddressed needs related to vulnerabilities and special needs of vulnerable persons? | Gaps documented or explained by IOM, perceptions of stakeholders | Project documents, monitoring and donor reports | Document review | NVivo |
| All stakeholders | Interviews, FGD | NVivo |
| To what extent has **disability** been integrated in the project?  What are the results? | Were the strategic plans and operational actions related specifically to disability well integrated into all of the project components?  *Effectiveness already covers results* | Plans and actions documented or explained by IOM | Project documents, monitoring and donor reports | Document review | NVivo |
| All stakeholders | Interviews, FGD | NVivo |
| Has the project been **conflict** sensitive, including attention to risk management and mainstreaming Do No Harm? | Has IOM purposefully and consciously applied risk management? How well did it work? | Described and documented examples of conflict sensitive approaches | Project documents, monitoring and donor reports | Document review | NVivo |
| IOM, IPs, donor | Interviews |  |