



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

**Ex-Post Evaluation of the *Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania (MiREG)* project
(TZ10P0503/IB.0080)**



JIANDIKISHE UTAMBULIWE



Donor: United Kingdom's Foreign Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO), previously known as the Department for International Development (DFID)

Commissioned by: IOM Tanzania

Internal Evaluator: Marta Walkowiak, Programme Development and Communications Officer, IOM Cambodia

Report date: December 2022



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
LIST OF ACRONYMS	7
CHAPTER ONE: CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	8
1.1. Project background	8
1.2. Evaluation, scope and purpose	9
1.3. Approach and methodology.....	10
1.4. Cross-cutting issues	12
CHAPTER TWO: EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	13
2.1. Effectiveness	13
2.2. Sustainability	19
2.3. Impact	20
CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
3.1. Conclusions	23
3.2. Recommendations	25
3.3. Lessons learned and good practices	26
ANNEXES	28
ANNEX 1. Evaluation terms of reference	28
ANNEX 2. Inception report.....	33
ANNEX 3. List of persons interviewed.....	43
ANNEX 4. Data collection instruments.....	43



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report outlines the findings and recommendations of an ex-post internal evaluation of the United Kingdom’s Foreign Commonwealth Development Office’s funded project: “Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania (MiREG) project (TZ10P0503/IB.0080).” The project was implemented in Tanzania from 1 April 2019 – 31 August 2021. The evaluation shares evidence of success, lessons learned, challenges experienced during project implementation and provides recommendations for future programming. This project was funded by United Kingdom’s Foreign Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO), previously known as the Department for International Development (DFID), in the amount of GBP 1,800,000. The evaluation was conducted between April and November 2022.

Evaluative enquiry focused on impact and outcome level analysis. The evaluation covered three OECD/DAC main evaluation criteria: effectiveness, sustainability, and impact and. The evaluation was conducted for accountability to intended beneficiaries including the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, and the donor as primary users. The findings will assist IOM and the government to better implement similar interventions in the future. To support transparency, the evaluation report will be shared with IOM Tanzania and the IOM Regional Office for East and Horn of Africa and will be published on the Central Evaluation Function evaluation repository.

Evaluation methodology

Methods used for the data collection included document review, review of monitoring data and key informant interviews. IOM cross cutting principles of gender and human rights were incorporated into the analysis and findings.

Findings and conclusions

Effectiveness	In terms of project’s effectiveness, the evaluation found that the design of the project was overambitious in scope. Effectiveness could have been improved through better choices between a narrow and deep intervention, as opposed to a wide and shallow intervention to better suit the available funding and implementation timeframe. A late project revision to refocus the project in line with the government’s expectations did not unfortunately bring back the project on track and the project was prematurely terminated by the government. Despite the limitations in achieving the project objective, there is strong evidence of achievement within the project across outcome and output areas. The key success factor was the project’s alignment with the government’s priorities. Overarching challenges to achievement were primarily related to the project design and implementation: failure to seeking the government’s endorsement at the project inception stage, failure to share the detailed project description with the government stakeholders, and failure to seek explicit approval from the project’s technical working group on the detailed workplan including project locations. Finally, the project did not critically assess the government’s capacity to provide status determination despite the government’s apparent willingness to regularize irregular migrants.
----------------------	---



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Sustainability	The evaluation found indications of sustainability in the project's work, especially with regards to capacity-building of the migration authorities. However, the project's sustainability was compromised by the lack of institutional support from the government, lack of clarity over the future of migrant registration and the underfunding of the relevant activities on the government's side. The evaluation found no evidence of any sustainability plan developed by the project team to determine roles and responsibilities once the project ended.
Impact	With regards to the impact of the project, the evaluation found that the stakeholders were unanimously in agreement that the most significant change observed was the project's contribution to the improved capacity of the government to manage migration. The evidence available to the evaluator demonstrates the project achieved only positive changes, in line with the desired project goals. Unfortunately, due to the unavailability of data from indirect beneficiaries (irregular migrants, including those registered under the project), the evaluation was unable to assess whether the project achieved the desired outcome. There is little evidence at the time of the evaluation that the project achievements will continue after the project's end, especially in the context of limited public funding to continue with the migrant registration process.

Recommendations for IOM Tanzania:
1. Continue advocacy with the government on the status determination process, requesting to release the data on how many migrants of those who had undergone the registration in Tanga have had their status determined. Further advocacy and dialogue with the government is needed to confirm what impact the project had on the 5,689 irregular migrants in Tanga who were registered under this project.
2. During the project design phase, actively engage the government partners in the development of the proposal, workplan, and budget. If a project is designed without sufficient input from stakeholders, there are likely to be oversights or miscalculations, both in terms of designing activities that accurately reflect the government's priorities and in terms of budgeting.
3. Consider including a pre-project assessment of beneficiary needs at project design stage and pre-project national consultation at the beginning of implementation to ensure continued engagement with stakeholders and beneficiaries.
4. Promote community participation and ownership (in addition to the government ownership) of the project for the sustainability of outcomes and impact by ensuring buy-in and internalization of the project objectives and results. Consider including non-governmental members in the project steering committee to improve project governance.
5. Share the project documents officially at project inception stage, request letters of endorsement and design a joint workplan with the government to avoid any misunderstandings over the scope of the project and responsibilities of the project partners.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

6. Future interventions should make informed choices between wide but shallow and narrow but deep activity coverage, considering the available budget, the government's preferences and a realistic project timeframe.

7. A sustainability plan or exit strategy should be developed to support the continuation of results after a project end. The plan should include clear roles and responsibilities of the management and use of project products, information sharing, and maintenance of hardware and software. The exit strategy should be adequately designed and related to the project results, and not funding. Further, consider budgeting for the Steering Committee to continue meeting after the project has concluded to continue monitoring of the project's impact on registered migrants and the progress of the status determination process results.

8. Strengthen the engagement of key government stakeholders in programming and activities as partners, and not participants, in any future trainings and workshops with government officials, especially at the pre-project needs assessment stage.

9. For any follow-up or similar projects in Tanzania, ensure a regional or sub-regional strategy is in place to inform project design, stakeholder consultations, areas for priority interventions and donors' decisions on funds allocation to maximise on the project's impact and sustainability.

10. Apply a more coordinated regional cooperation approach by linking migrant registration with integration programming in countries of origin to support migrants who will opt for Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration. Consider regular coordination activities with neighbouring IOM missions, e.g. IOM Burundi, to ensure sufficient information exchange and coordination during the project design and project implementation.

11. Build on existing political commitment and IOM's established presence in Tanzania to continue support efforts towards status determination of irregular migrants. Since the evaluation failed to collect evidence directly from the migrant communities, it is recommended to continue to endeavor to collect impact stories, case studies to help build the evidence base for the project' impact.

Lessons learnt:

1. Ensure adequate time, planning and coordination with the government stakeholders at the project inception stage.

Actively engaging the government partners in the development of the proposal and workplan of activities is crucial to the project's effectiveness. A lack of sufficient input from stakeholders can result in assumptions, oversights or miscalculations, both in terms of designing activities that accurately reflect the government's priorities and in terms of budgeting. There is a need to follow good coordination practice at project inception stage by sharing the official project documents and requesting letters of endorsement. Designing a joint workplan with the government can help avoid misunderstandings over the scope of the project and responsibilities of the project partners.

2. Ensure sufficient engagement and involvement of the migrant populations in the project design and implementation.

Good project development practice should consider including a pre-project assessment of beneficiary needs at project design stage. The process can be further improved by pre-project national consultation at the beginning of implementation to ensure continued engagement with stakeholders and beneficiaries. Involving migrant communities can promote community



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

participation and ownership (in addition to the government ownership) of the project, which can improve the sustainability of outcomes and impact. The inclusion of non-governmental members in the project steering committee could improve project governance. Adequate budgeting and activity design should support communication and advocacy efforts by collecting impact stories, case studies to help build the evidence base for the project' impact.

3. Prevent a siloed approach to implementation by including regional coordination activities.

A more coordinated regional cooperation approach could be more beneficial to implementing migrant registration projects in East Africa. Possible strategies could include linking migrant registration with reintegration programming in countries of origin to support migrants who will opt for Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration. Closer collaboration with neighbouring IOM missions could help ensure sufficient information exchange and coordination during the project design and project implementation to improve the project's impact.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AVRR	Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration
COMMIST2	Comprehensive Migration Management Strategy
COVID-19	Coronavirus disease 2019
DFID	Department for International Development
FCDO	Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
IBM	Immigration & Border Management
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MiGOF	Migration Governance Framework
MIREG	Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania
OECD/DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
POE	Points of Entry and Exit
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TISD	Tanzania Immigration Services Department
TOC	Theory of Change
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

CHAPTER ONE: CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

1.1. Project background

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As the leading international organization for migration, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Due to the long periods of peace and stability that have prevailed in the country, the United Republic of Tanzania has a history of being a transit and destination country of migration. In fact, the United Republic of Tanzania has been a safe destination for those fleeing from conflicts in neighbouring countries such as Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and, to a lesser extent, Ethiopia, Somalia, Uganda and Zambia.

Much of this migration has been irregular, particularly in the north-western regions of the country. The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania has taken a number of measures, including operations to identify and register irregular migrants to regularize their status. Between 2014 and 2015, the government of the United Republic of Tanzania, in collaboration with IOM, successfully carried out a pilot project on the regularization of the status of irregular migrants in western United Republic of Tanzania, through support from then-DFID and other partners.

Following the implementation of that project, IOM in coordination with the government of the United Republic of Tanzania through the Ministry of Home Affairs' Immigration Services Department (Tanzania Immigration Services Department – TISD), proposed for a second phase, and the subsequent project was awarded by then-DFID, currently known as FCDO, in April 2019, titled: *Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania - MiREG*.

The project was implemented with the following objective, outcome and outputs (presented here as per the final report, after revision):

Objective:
To enhance the United Republic of Tanzania's migration management capacities with regards to irregular migration and the promotion of humane and orderly migration.
Outcome 1:
Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration.
Output 1.1:
Updated Comprehensive Migration Management Strategy (COMMIST2) is available and accessible
Output 1.2:
Immigration Government personnel have the skills and knowledge to conduct migrant registration using latest and updated peripherals and technology
Output 1.3:



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Verification fairs were conducted for HWST-registered migrants for an inclusive MiREG implementation
Output 1.4:
Improved capacity of Tanzanian Authorities to address the challenges of mixed migration
Outcome 2:
Migrant registration assistance improves the protection of migrants' rights and enables access to social services and status determination
Output 2.1:
Migrant registration is accessible to undocumented persons
Output 2.2:
Migrant Data is available and accessible by Government officials for inclusion in status determination processes
Output 2.3:
Assisted voluntary return is made available to irregular migrants not deemed eligible for regularization by the government
Outcome 3:
COVID-19 RESPONSE - MiREG Reprogramming
Output 3.1:
Strengthening Points of Entry and Exit (PoE)
Output 3.2:
Procure medical tools and equipment
Output 3.3:
Training on traveller PoE screening

1.2. Evaluation, scope and purpose

The internal ex-post evaluation covered the full “Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania (MiREG)” project implementation period of 1 April 2019 – 31 August 2021. The geographical coverage of the evaluation aligned with the implementation of the project, which took place in Tanzania. Evaluative enquiry focused on impact and outcome level analysis.

This evaluation will facilitate increased transparency and accountability, ensuring adherence to IOM evaluation requirements and demonstrating the results of the project to both beneficiaries and the donor. The evaluation also documented key lessons learned and recommendations for future programming.

The main audience and users of the evaluation will be the donor (FCDO), IOM Tanzania, and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.

Stakeholders	Evaluation purpose
FCDO	The evaluation will also be used by the donor to assess value for money for the project they funded.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

IOM Tanzania	The evaluation is being conducted for use by the management and senior management to improve implementation of projects and programmes, assess organizational effectiveness in implementing a strategy, document lessons learned and best practices from the project.
The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania	The evaluation will assist the government, in particular the Ministry of Home Affairs' Immigration Services Department, to assess the sustainability of the project's results and determine ways forward related to registration of undocumented migrants.

To support transparency, the evaluation report will be shared with IOM Tanzania, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, and will be published on the IOM evaluation repository.

1.3. Approach and methodology

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will use the following criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC) to assess the following key areas:

1. The **effectiveness** of the project in reaching its stated objective
2. Prospects for **sustainability**
3. The **impact** of the project: long term positive or negative, intended or unintended effects of the project.
4. Identify lessons learned and best practices
5. Assess existing proposed follow-up projects and make recommendations for improvements

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question
1. Effectiveness: assessing the extent to which a project achieves its intended results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the intervention achieve its objective/outcome/outputs?
2. Sustainability: assessing to what extent the project's results will be maintained for a certain period of time after the current project phased out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were suitable structures, resources and processes developed and implemented to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue? • To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?
3. Impact: positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What change(s) did the intervention bring (whether positive or negative, unintended or intended) as a result of the project?



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Data collection methods

Due to financial constraints, as well as COVID-19 travel restrictions, the evaluation was conducted remotely as follows:

- Desk review of relevant project documents, project reports, and other materials identified.
- Remote key informant interviews with the project stakeholders (project team, consultants and government officials) to document both qualitative and quantitative information; and
- Questionnaire – a short online survey (using Microsoft Office Forms) to assess perceptions on benefits and use of knowledge acquired of officials that participated in IOM trainings through the project was prepared by the evaluator and disseminated but no responses have been received

Data analysis

- Content analysis to assess the effectiveness of project activities and outputs.
- Narrative analysis of project outputs and outcomes and implementation to assess impact and sustainability.

The evaluator applied, among others, the Most Significant Change approach to assess the outcomes and impact of the project on the intended beneficiaries. The evaluation utilized most significant change stories on outcomes of interest such as United Republic of Tanzania's improved ability to manage migration and make evidence-based policies, and migrants' access to social services and status determination.

Contribution analysis approach focused on the identification and substantiation of changes (positive and negative, expected and non-expected), and also on the definition of possible project contributions to such changes, will further assess effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

Sampling

All project documents (proposal, interim and final reports, budgets) and all project outputs (training materials, training reports) were included in the evaluation.

The selection criterion for stakeholder interviews was purposeful based on their level of engagement in the project. This was a project with a relatively small project team, with relatively few individuals from each stakeholder group directly involved, allowing for nearly comprehensive coverage.

Interviews with IOM were with the individuals responsible for project design and implementation in United Republic of Tanzania. The interview with the donor was with a representative of FCDO. The interview with the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania was with the representative from the Ministry of Home Affairs' Immigration Services Department, who was the main government partner for this project.

The survey targeting officials who participated in the trainings under the project did not provide any responses.

Limitations



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

This section describes some of the limitations of the evaluation in terms of timing and data collection that affected the validity of conclusions about the project's impact. Limited ability to meet directly with members of key beneficiary groups i.e. irregular migrants also affected the evaluation findings.

- Online meetings: One of the key challenges was a challenge with access to technology for online meetings with government stakeholders. The support on the ground from IOM staff in Tanzania was required to agree with key informants on the suitable schedule and most feasible technology to use. In mitigation, the evaluation timeline has been extended to allow extra time needed to confirm the government officials' participation in the evaluation.
- Interviews with direct beneficiaries: Due to the difficulties in access to project locations and migrant communities, face-to-face interviews with direct beneficiaries were deemed too difficult to be conducted. It was expected that telephone interviews with a non-representative sample of max. 10 respondents were to be conducted during the evaluation. Unfortunately, this did not happen, and no data was collected from the irregular migrant communities by the evaluator. In mitigation, the evaluator relied on interviewed stakeholders' perceptions prior and after the project to measure the impact of the project.
- Survey with government beneficiaries: The evaluator failed to obtain any responses from the survey targeting officials who participated in the trainings. In mitigation, the evaluation relied on the interview with the government official.
- Access to project locations: Due to the current COVID-19 pandemic situation and budget unavailability, the evaluation was conducted remotely, limiting access to project sites and stakeholders to interview. In mitigation, the evaluator reviewed photographs of project sites submitted as part of project report.

1.4. Cross-cutting issues

A qualitative analysis of two cross-cutting themes, human rights approach and gender mainstreaming, was done by applying the guiding questions for incorporating cross-cutting themes into the project development, management and evaluation of the IOM Project Handbook¹ (Annex 1.4 and 1.5). In terms of gender, the alignment with IOM's policy and guidance was analyzed, along with the incorporation of gender analysis into project design (indicators, outputs, outcome levels) and implementation phases (data collection and reporting). In terms of human rights, the evaluation examined the extent to which the interventions were designed and implemented to align and contribute to rights, as defined by international and regional conventions, national policies and strategies, and the needs of rights-holders and duty-bearers, both women and men, targeted by these interventions. Aside from evaluating the result and the impact of the project, the evaluation looked for evidence on how for example, participation, non-discrimination and accountability have been considered throughout the project. For instance, the evaluation considered how the rights principle of participation was considered and applied in the consultations which informed project design.

¹ https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iom_project_handbook_6feb2012.pdf



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

CHAPTER TWO: EVALUATION FINDINGS

1.1. Effectiveness

The effectiveness criterion assesses the extent to which a project achieves its intended results.

This section describes the extent to which the project achieved its intended results. The following aspects of the project have been assessed:

- Achievement of the project objective, outcome and outputs as planned.
- Major success and failure factors influencing the achievement of the project's outcomes.
- Extent to which the project activities improved frameworks for regularized labour migration in Tanzania
- Extent to which the project activities led to improved regional coordination, cooperation and capacity in mixed migration management

Key findings:

The evaluated project built on from a pilot phase (2014-2015), which demonstrated the feasibility of implementing protection-sensitive approaches to documentation of irregular migrants. The evaluation found that the design of the project was overambitious in scope. Effectiveness could have been improved through better choices between a narrow and deep intervention, as opposed to a wide and shallow intervention to better suit the available funding and implementation timeframe. A late project revision to refocus the project in line with the government's expectations unfortunately did not bring back the project on track and the project was prematurely terminated by the government. Despite the limitations in achieving the project objective, there is strong evidence of achievement within the project across outcome and output areas. The key success factor was the project's alignment with the government's priorities. Overarching challenges to achievement were primarily related to the project design and implementation: failure to seeking the government's endorsement at the project inception stage, failure to share the detailed project description with the government stakeholders, and failure to seek explicit approval from the project's technical working group on the detailed workplan including project locations. Finally, the project did not critically assess the government's capacity to provide status determination despite the government's apparent willingness to document and regularize migrants in irregular situation.

Achievement of the project objective, outcome and outputs as planned.

Under Outcome 1 (*Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration*), the project made important strides in contributing to the strengthening of the capacity of the government officials to manage irregular migration. However, the achievement of the outcome relied on a single indicator (Impact indicator 1: A



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

substantial number of undocumented persons are biometrically registered and given temporary protection and the data are utilized to improve migration management policy), which has not been achieved, as per the final project report. The evaluation did not find evidence of the government of Tanzania's ongoing biometric registration activities, nor plans to resume these in the immediate future. Moreover, it is worth noting that the project logical framework did not specify data source or a method of verification for the objective indicator, making it more difficult to measure impact.

Under output 1.1., the Comprehensive Migration Management Strategy in Tanzania (COMMIST II) was approved by the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Tanzanian Minister of Home Affairs signed the foreword to the document. IOM Tanzania printed and distributed 642 copies of the COMMIST II document during different activities implemented under the project; copies of the document were distributed during the field scoping missions (388 copies), during steering committee meetings (20 copies), during the training of Immigration Officers at the Tanzania Regional Immigration Training Academy (219 copies), among other occasions. The COMMIST II document proved to be an important SOP that provided guidance to Immigration Officers who were directly involved in the registration exercise at field level.

Under output 1.2. (Immigration Government personnel have the skills and knowledge to conduct migrant registration using latest and updated peripherals and technology), the project procured 22 e-registration mobile kits. The project prepared TISD field staff who were to undertake the migrant registration exercise with the knowledge needed to use the e-registration kits and conduct registration in the field. The target for the second indicator under Output 1.2 (# of trainings on how to conduct the registration and verification using the equipment) was 10; however, the project team decided to combine all 10 trainings into one. The project organized one training for Immigration Officers on biometric registration at the Tanzania Regional Immigration Training Academy in Moshi, Kilimanjaro, from 11 to 25 November 2020. Unfortunately, the indicator for output 1.2 was not revised during the project revision resulting in non- achievement of the target. However, a total number of 217 immigration officers were trained.

Output 1.3 (Verification fairs were conducted for HWST-registered migrants for an inclusive MiREG implementation) was not implemented. In August 2019, TISD decided to no longer to use the e-registration software and database that was developed under HSWT. This IT decision rendered it impossible to retain the data of those migrants registered in HSWT and registration was to begin anew.

Under Output 1.4. (Improved capacity of Tanzanian Authorities to address the challenges of mixed migration), the project successfully achieved targets for both indicators: 5 trainings on mixed migration were delivered and 99 government officials (of whom 46.5% were women) participated in the trainings. It is worth noting that the indicators in the logical framework did not measure the capacity improvement of the trained officials; however pre-and post-training tests measuring the participants' knowledge with regards to the content of the trainings were conducted and showed substantial improvement.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Under Outcome 2 (*Migrant registration assistance improves the protection of migrants' rights and enables access to social services and status determination*), the project made key advances in enabling migrant registration in the region of Tanga. The overall achievement of Outcome 2 has been partial: whereas the undocumented persons who came forward to register were provided with registration numbers, the project did not register any numbers of migrants reporting easier access to social services or public facilities using as a result of their registration. The project team relied on monitoring activities to establish the number of migrants who used their registration to access social and public facilities; however, as the project was prematurely halted, the monitoring activities also stopped. It might have been more effective to establish external sources of data (e.g. relevant Ministry's reports, local health centre statistics) at the project development stage, which would provide independent source of information to verify the project's impact.

Under Output 2.1. (Migrant registration is accessible to undocumented persons), the project registered 5,689 undocumented migrants in one region against the target of 80,000 (14% of target achieved). The registration took place in the two districts of the Tanga region, selected as a pilot region. The project planned to register undocumented persons in 10 target districts but it was unable to move forward with additional migrant e-registration due to the unwillingness of TISD to continue the project as a consequence of a fundamental misunderstanding regarding the scope of and nature of the e-registration support.

Under Output 2.2. (Migrant Data is available and accessible by Government officials for inclusion in status determination processes), statistics and report on the number MiREG registrants was made available, however the target of 90 % migrants verified are provided with status determination was not achieved. The evaluation found that this indicator was overly ambitious in scope and outside the control of the project: the availability of data and statistics did not necessarily guarantee that the government would provide registered migrants with status determination. The indicator did not take into consideration the amount of bureaucracy and time needed for the status determination process (each case considered individually). The indicator relied on the status determination reports from Tanzania Immigration Services Department; however, no information has been made available by TISD as to the status determination process and thus the number of persons who have been regularized is unknown and can be assumed to be zero.

Under Output 2.3 (Assisted voluntary return is made available to irregular migrants not deemed eligible for regularization by the government), the target of 70 migrants opting for assisted voluntary return to their country of origin after their status determination was not achieved. As TISD did not render status determination for any migrants, no migrants were provided with Assisted Voluntary Return during the entire project period.

Under Outcome 3 (IOM Tanzania Rapid response to COVID-19 pandemic), IOM, in coordination with then-DFID, re-programmed part of the funding under MiREG project to respond to the COVID-19 prevention and response efforts in the United Republic of Tanzania. The evaluation found that no outcome indicator was set at the time of revision which would allow for measurement of the outcome achievement.



Under Output 3.1. (Preparedness Capacity Assessments in selected Points of Entry (PoE)), a report on the Preparedness Capacity Assessment in selected PoEs was made available, focusing on strategic points of entry and exit and health facilities in border zones.

Under Output 3.2 (Procure medical tools and equipment), targeted PoEs have received the necessary medical equipment, based on the needs from Output 3.1.

Under Output 3.3. (Training on traveller PoE screening), 160 Immigration and Port Health staff was trained on how to screen and to manage ill travelers and on infection prevention and control, according to available SOPs, achieving 226% of the initial output target.

Furthermore, the final project report includes description of Output 3.4. Water, sanitation and hygiene equipment at Points of Entry, Output 3.5. Risk Communication and Community Engagement and Output 3.6. Case management and Continuity of Essential Services. However, these three outputs seem to be missing from the logical framework (final version) and from the revision project documents.

The achievement of the project objective and outcomes was measured by the following indicators and reported in the final project report:

Indicator	Project Indicator Baseline	Project Indicator Targets	2020 evaluation Achievements	Cumulative progress (final evaluation)
Project Objective: Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration.				
Tanzania is undertaking efforts to address irregular migration through biometric registration	No	Yes	Not assessed	Achieved
Outcome 1: Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration				
A substantial number of undocumented persons are biometrically registered and given temporary protection and the data are utilized to improve migration management policy	unclear	unclear	Not determined	Not achieved
Outcome 2: Migrant registration assistance improves the protection of migrants' rights and enables access to social services and status determination				



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Undocumented persons who come forward to register are provided with registration ID cards	No	Yes	No	Achieved
# of migrants reporting easy access to social services or public facilities using provided ID cards	Not clear	3000	0 (registration not started yet)	Not achieved
Outcome 3: IOM Tanzania Rapid response to COVID-19 pandemic				
No indicator available	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Major success and failure factors influencing the achievement of the project's outcomes.

The evaluation found that project achievements and non-achievements were driven by several factors, most notably the communication with the host government. In June 2021, a decision was made between IOM, TISD and FCDO to discuss the decision to discontinue the MiREG project. The decision to terminate the project was a result of a major and overarching communication challenge which the project encountered. The project failed to reach common understanding with the main project counterpart, TISD, as to the scope and breadth of the e-registration exercise. The project was responding to a national priority and the project was officially requested by the government as phase two of a previous project implemented between 2014-15. The project team relied on the continued support from the government when the project was rolled out. However, this assumption did not hold when the differences in how the project should approach migrant registration became apparent. The evaluation confirmed that the project did not provide a copy of the project documents or an official summary of the project details, including detailed workplan specifying project locations, to the government counterparts at the inception stage of the project and did not seek the government's endorsement of the proposed activities.

As a result, the project scope was understood distinctively by the two partners: IOM set out to support the migrants' registration in selected districts in the target 11 regions of the United Republic of Tanzania, whereas TISD expected IOM to conduct a comprehensive registration covering all migrants in the 11 regions. This misunderstanding became even more noticeable after the registration in the first selected region, Tanga, commenced; the government's expectation was to complete the registration process in the whole region of Tanga before moving on to other regions. The evaluation confirmed that the project team considered that the project did not have sufficient funding to support comprehensive registration in all 11 regions.

Although in the project lifetime IOM and TISD convened eight (official) technical and/or Steering Committee meetings to discuss and plan the for different project interventions – in addition to the many informal meetings that were held on a monthly basis – this misunderstanding remained and culminated in the IOM and TISD's meeting on 25 February 2021 involving the Commissioner General of Immigration and the IOM



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Chief of Mission, plus the technical teams from both sides. The purpose of the meeting was to find a means to save the project means of agreeing on changes to the scope of the registration component of the project. Despite the project revision approved by FCDO to continue with comprehensive registration in a few regions, the Commissioner General, in a letter dated 11 May 2021, called for the suspension of the project due to a misunderstanding between the project partners.

Another overarching challenge to achievement is primarily related to the project design and the scope of the project. The achievement of project's objective and Outcome 1 relied on the government's willingness and capacity to provide registered migrants with status determination, thereby improving their access to rights and services. However, the project had little control over these aspects apart from submitting statistics and report on the number MiREG registrants to the government. The evaluation found that the project proposal contained no analysis whether the government counterparts had sufficient means and capacity to provide status determination to registered migrants within the timeline states in the proposal (two years), notwithstanding the government's willingness to regularize the irregular migrants in the country. The mid-term internal evaluation of the project also highlighted that migrants who had been registered during the pilot phase did not benefit from status determination and follow-up assistance apart from being issued with cards, recommending stronger advocacy with the government on the part of IOM to accelerate status determination and facilitate improved access to rights and services. The mid-term evaluation suggestions included advocacy on budgeting for registration and capacity-building of officials. From the management response, it appears the issue was raised with both the government and the donor, but the final evaluation did not find evidence of further actions in this area.

Extent to which the project activities improved frameworks for regularized labour migration in Tanzania

The project has contributed to strengthening the capacity of government officials to address the challenges of mixed migration, however, the evaluation did not find evidence that the project activities contributed to the government's active pursuit of biometric registration or improving access to rights and services for irregular migrants. There is no data to assess whether the regularized migrants under this project have experienced any impacts or changes to their experience. As a recommendation, IOM Tanzania should consider writing to the government to release the data on how many migrants of those who had undergone the registration in Tanga have had their status determined in the government process.

Extent to which the project activities led to improved regional coordination, cooperation and capacity in mixed migration management

During the project implementation the regional context changed, with a stronger risk of violent extremism in southern Tanzania attributed to the conflict in neighbouring Mozambique. The evaluation found that the IOM regional office was well aware of the project. However, the project did not seem to seek partnerships within Tanzania's UN Country Team (e.g. with OHCHR, UNHCR or UNDP) nor did it explicitly promote regional cooperation with neighbouring countries, i.e. Burundi. More effort could have been made to coordinate activities and information sharing with IOM Burundi during the project implementation.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

2.2. Sustainability

This section aims to assess the extent to which the project's results will be maintained for a certain period of time after the current project phased out. The following aspects of the project have been assessed:

- Extent to which suitable structures, resources and processes were developed and implemented to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue
- Extent to which the project results are likely to be sustained in the long-term

Key findings:

The evaluation found indications of sustainability in the project's work, especially with regards to capacity-building of the migration authorities. However, the project's sustainability was compromised by the lack of institutional support from the government, lack of clarity over the future of migrant registration and the underfunding of the relevant activities on the government's side. The evaluation found no evidence of any sustainability plan developed by the project team to determine roles and responsibilities once the project ended.

Extent to which suitable structures, resources and processes were developed and implemented to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue

The evaluation found that the project encouraged a durable improvement in beneficiaries' capacity to manage and address challenges of mixed migration. However, the evaluation found little evidence of this capacity being used or assessed after the training activities. In fact, the government officials interviewed as part of the evaluation admitted they had not had a chance to assess if officials trained use the new knowledge in performing their duties. Furthermore, the evaluation found reports that the government officials' participation in activities was mainly financially motivated.

Strong national support for the migrant registration process was evident during the project implementation (despite the differences in how the project should be implemented). The evaluation found that project stakeholders believed that the government of Tanzania should retain the understanding of the conceptual and practical concepts of migrant registration and might be able to continue their registration efforts with another donor's funding. However, the meetings of the Technical Working Group (the project's steering committee) discontinued after the project concluded. The evaluation found that, due to a lack of funding, the government did not seem to have any imminent or concrete plans to resume the migrant registration.

A significant component of the project was the procurement of equipment necessary to conduct the registration process. Despite the initial challenges, and changes in the government's approach and decisions over which equipment to use, the equipment was procured and retained by the government, allowing the government to resume the registration and use the same equipment, should they decide to do so.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Considering how the exit strategy was prepared in response to the misunderstanding with the government, the evaluation did not find evidence of any sustainability plan developed by the project team to determine roles and responsibilities once the project ended. Similarly, there is no evidence of IOM-related interventions that support the continuation of results, such as follow-up visits, which is due to the circumstances how the project finished and also the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Extent to which the project results are likely to be sustained in the long-term

The limited government funding for the registration activities makes it unlikely that the process will continue without external support. Because of how the project was terminated, it might be difficult for IOM Tanzania to engage the government on the issue of registration of irregular migrants. Future interventions focused on registration might need to re-evaluate officials' capacity needs to continue the process, if officials do not have opportunities to practice their knowledge in the meantime.

Since the project's main objective continues to be one of the government's priority, there might be sustained effort from the government to seek funding to continue the registration process. Further advocacy is needed to advocate with the government to mainstream migrant registration into relevant policies, including budgeting for registration and continuous capacity-building of officials.

2.3. Impact

This section assesses the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally. The evaluation focused on changes (whether positive or negative, unintended or intended) brought upon by the project.

Key findings:

The evaluation found that the stakeholders were unanimously in agreement that the most significant change observed was the project's contribution to the improved capacity of the government to manage migration. The evidence available to the evaluator demonstrates the project achieved only positive changes, in line with the desired project goals.

Unfortunately, due to the unavailability of data from indirect beneficiaries (irregular migrants, including those registered under the project), the evaluation was unable to assess whether the project achieved the desired outcome. More follow-up and advocacy work is needed with the government to assess the impact of the project on the migrant communities.

The evaluation also took consideration of limitations to determine the impact during the data collection process, such as unavailability of key data (migration statistics from TISD) and unavailability of beneficiaries (migrants in irregular situation and those registered under the project). The evaluator was not able to obtain data from beneficiaries – irregular migrants registered under the project – due to difficulties in reaching



them. The migrants live in difficult to reach communities and attempts to contact them by phone by a local Project Assistant also failed to obtain any data. These challenges affected the availability of data particularly at objective and outcome level:

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target
To enhance the United Republic of Tanzania’s migration management capacities with regards to irregular migration and the promotion of humane and orderly migration	Tanzania is undertaking efforts to address irregular migration through biometric registration (Y/N)	No	Yes
Outcome 1	Indicator	Baseline	Target
Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration	A substantial number of undocumented persons are biometrically registered and given temporary protection and the data are utilized to improve migration management policy	Tanzania Immigration Services Department annual report on Immigration, irregular migration statistics (latest report)	Latest TISD annual report reports a decline in irregular migrants and an increase in regularization (March 2021)

It is also worth noting that the formulation of the objective indicator is unclear whether the project aimed to improve Tanzania’s migration management capacities so that the government can carry out biometric registration independently from the donor supported project, or whether the indicator focused on whether the government was undertaking efforts to address irregular migration through biometric registration under the project, in which case this should be an output level indicator.

The most significant changes that can be observed in the Government’s ability to manage migration as a result of the project

The stakeholders interviewed as part of the evaluation indicated that trainings conducted under the project might have contributed to the improved capacity of the government to manage migration, though long-term impact has been difficult to measure and obtain evidence of due to the project’s early closure. Anecdotal evidence brought up during the evaluation may suggest that the government displays an approach which is more aware of protection needs to migrant populations, which is visible in its dealing with the Ethiopian migrants. Terminology used by the government seem to have also changed from calling migrants “illegal” to referring to them as irregular migrants. The government’s capacity to conduct biometric registration has been improved and since the government has retained ownership of the kits, they are in a good position to restart the registration process should they decide to. Unfortunately, the evaluation did not find evidence that the government is undertaking independent efforts to pursue migrant registration and regularization.



The most significant change in evidence-based policy making in Tanzania that can be observed as a result of the project

The stakeholders did not identify any noticeable change under this area, noting that the next national census (which will have a migration module) will be conducted in 2022. More time might be needed to assess impact under this aspect.

The most significant change in migrants’ access to social services and status determination in Tanzania that can be observed as a result of the project

The evaluation confirmed that due to the project’s early closure, not much change has been observed in this area. Migrants’ access to regularization has not been visibly improved; however, even before the project, there existed indirect pathways in place available to migrants to access social services. For example, obtaining a driving license was deemed helpful in accessing social services. The evaluation did not come across evidence that the registration improved the status of irregular migrants or improved their access to status determination. Further advocacy and dialogue with the government is needed to confirm what impact the project had on the 5,689 irregular migrants in Tanga who were registered under this project.

The long term changes the project hoped to deliver were sustained efforts of the government to continue the registration and improve irregular migrants’ access to services. The project team was aware that the registration itself was not the end of the intervention. The evaluation did not find evidence of any negative impacts of the project, aside from a short-term deterioration of the relationship with the government. The relationship between IOM and the government was restored under a new border management project in southern Tanzania. It is worth noting that some stakeholders voiced concerns over the usage of data collected during the project by the government (i.e. the risk of forced return of the registered migrants); however no reports of such procedures were found during the evaluation.

The government’s underfunding has been identified as a critical factor hindering impact of the project, affecting the likelihood of continuing the registration and the status determination process. The political commitment remains high, and even after the project’s closure, the government is regularly voicing the need to continue the migrant registration and status determination efforts.

Contribution matrix

Observed change (outcome)	Contributing factors	Type	Significance Scale 1 (low) – 4 (high)	Evidence (Signs/facts)	Reliability Triangulation of data
Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line	Immigration Government personnel have the skills and knowledge to	Primary	3	Training reports, key	Subjective opinions but documented



with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration	conduct migrant registration using latest and updated peripherals and technology			informant interviews	records → Medium
	Improved capacity of Tanzanian Authorities to address the challenges of mixed migration	Primary	3	Training reports, key informant interviews	Subjective opinions but documented records → Medium
	The COVID-19 pandemic required a shift in the government’s attention to respond to the health crisis	Opposing	2	Project reports, key informant interviews	Subjective opinions but documented records → Medium
	A misunderstanding between the project team and the government officials over the scope of the migrant registration carried out under the project	Opposing	2	Project reports, key informant interviews	Subjective opinions but documented records → Medium
	Change in the President of the United Republic of Tanzania’ office in 2021	Influencing	1	Key informant interviews	Subjective opinions → Low
<p>Contribution claim:</p> <p>The trainings delivered under the project are confirmed as being a significant factor based on reliable data. The change in the President’s office is reportedly a less significant contribution and could also not be verified to have impacted directly any immigration-related procedures or capacity building activities. The COVID-19 pandemic and the misunderstanding with the government officials did occur and impact the project but has had little influence on the behaviour of immigration officers. Overall, the contribution of the project to improved ability is assessed as of reasonable significance.</p>					

CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. Conclusions

The evaluation found evidence of progress towards achieving the project objective and outcome, as follows:

- The project partly achieved its main objective (*Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration*),
- The project has not achieved Outcome 1 (*Tanzania has improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration*)



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

- The project partly achieved Outcome 2 (*Migrant registration assistance improves the protection of migrants' rights and enables access to social services and status determination*).
- Due to the lack of indicators, the evaluation could not conclude whether Outcome 3 has been achieved (*IOM Tanzania Rapid response to COVID-19 pandemic*).

In terms of project's effectiveness, the evaluation found that the design of the project was overambitious in scope. Effectiveness could have been improved through better choices between a narrow and deep intervention, as opposed to a wide and shallow intervention to better suit the available funding and implementation timeframe. A late project revision to refocus the project in line with the government's expectations did not unfortunately bring back the project on track and the project was prematurely terminated by the government. Despite the limitations in achieving the project objective, there is strong evidence of achievement within the project across outcome and output areas. The key success factor was the project's alignment with the government's priorities. Overarching challenges to achievement were primarily related to the project design and implementation: failure to seeking the government's endorsement at the project inception stage, failure to share the detailed project description with the government stakeholders, and failure to seek explicit approval from the project's technical working group on the detailed workplan including project locations. Finally, the project did not critically assess the government's capacity to provide status determination despite the government's ostensible willingness to regularize irregular migrants.

The evaluation found indications of sustainability in the project's work, especially with regards to capacity-building of the migration authorities. However, the project's sustainability was compromised by the lack of institutional support from the government, lack of clarity over the future of migrant registration and the underfunding of the relevant activities on the government's side. The evaluation found no evidence of any sustainability plan developed by the project team to determine roles and responsibilities once the project ended.

With regards to the impact of the project, the evaluation found that the stakeholders were unanimously in agreement that the most significant change observed was the project's contribution to the improved capacity of the government to manage migration. The evidence available to the evaluator demonstrates the project achieved only positive changes, in line with the desired project goals. Unfortunately, due to the unavailability of data from indirect beneficiaries (irregular migrants, including those registered under the project), the evaluation was unable to assess whether the project achieved the desired outcome. There is little evidence at the time of the evaluation that the project achievements will continue after the project's end, especially in the context of limited public funding to continue with the migrant registration process.

There were notable strengths and challenges in the project's design and implementation. The key strength was IOM's ability to build on a successful pilot phase implemented before the evaluated project and the project's alignment to national priorities. The main challenges included the communication issues with the government stakeholders which impacted the delivery of the project.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

While the project was not without challenges, its significant achievements should be commended, and the lessons learned taken forward and integrated into future work. In particular, it is probable that the some of the project's main achievements at the capacity level of government officials will continue to bear fruit in the years ahead.

3.2. Recommendations

The following recommendations from the document review and interviews have been made for IOM Tanzania' consideration:

1. Continue advocacy with the government on the status determination process, requesting to release the data on how many migrants of those who had undergone the registration in Tanga have had their status determined. Further advocacy and dialogue with the government is needed to confirm what impact the project had on the 5,689 irregular migrants in Tanga who were registered under this project.
2. During the project design phase, actively engage the government partners in the development of the proposal, workplan, and budget. If a project is designed without sufficient input from stakeholders, there are likely to be oversights or miscalculations, both in terms of designing activities that accurately reflect the government's priorities and in terms of budgeting.
3. Consider including a pre-project assessment of beneficiary needs at project design stage and pre-project national consultation at the beginning of implementation to ensure continued engagement with stakeholders and beneficiaries.
4. Promote community participation and ownership (in addition to the government ownership) of the project for the sustainability of outcomes and impact by ensuring buy-in and internalization of the project objectives and results. Consider including non-governmental members in the project steering committee to improve project governance.
5. Share the project documents officially at project inception stage, request letters of endorsement and design a joint workplan with the government to avoid any misunderstandings over the scope of the project and responsibilities of the project partners.
6. Future interventions should make informed choices between wide but shallow and narrow but deep activity coverage, considering the available budget, the government's preferences and a realistic project timeframe.
7. A sustainability plan or exit strategy should be developed to support the continuation of results after a project end. The plan should include clear roles and responsibilities of the management and use of project products, information sharing, and maintenance of hardware and software. The exit strategy should be adequately designed and related to the project results, and not funding. Further, consider budgeting for the



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Steering Committee to continue meeting after the project has concluded to continue monitoring of the project's impact on registered migrants and the progress of the status determination process results.

8. Strengthen the engagement of key government stakeholders in programming and activities as partners, and not participants, in any future trainings and workshops with government officials, especially at the pre-project needs assessment stage.

9. For any follow-up or similar projects in Tanzania, ensure a regional or sub-regional strategy is in place to inform project design, stakeholder consultations, areas for priority interventions and donors' decisions on funds allocation to maximise on the project's impact and sustainability.

10. Apply a more coordinated regional cooperation approach by linking migrant registration with integration programming in countries of origin to support migrants who will opt for Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration. Consider regular coordination activities with neighbouring IOM missions, e.g. IOM Burundi, to ensure sufficient information exchange and coordination during the project design and project implementation.

11. Build on existing political commitment and IOM's established presence in Tanzania to continue support efforts towards status determination of irregular migrants. Since the evaluation failed to collect evidence directly from the migrant communities, it is recommended to continue to endeavor to collect impact stories, case studies to help build the evidence base for the project' impact.

3.3. Lessons learned and good practices

The three major lessons learned from the document review and interviews are:

1. Ensure adequate time, planning and coordination with the government stakeholders at the project inception stage.

Actively engaging the government partners in the development of the proposal and workplan of activities is crucial to the project's effectiveness. A lack of sufficient input from stakeholders can result in assumptions, oversights or miscalculations, both in terms of designing activities that accurately reflect the government's priorities and in terms of budgeting. There is a need to follow good coordination practice at project inception stage by sharing the official project documents and requesting letters of endorsement. Designing a joint workplan with the government can help avoid misunderstandings over the scope of the project and responsibilities of the project partners.

2. Ensure sufficient engagement and involvement of the migrant populations in the project design and implementation.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Good project development practice should consider including a pre-project assessment of beneficiary needs at project design stage. The process can be further improved by pre-project national consultation at the beginning of implementation to ensure continued engagement with stakeholders and beneficiaries. Involving migrant communities can promote community participation and ownership (in addition to the government ownership) of the project, which can improve the sustainability of outcomes and impact. The inclusion of non-governmental members in the project steering committee could improve project governance. Adequate budgeting and activity design should support communication and advocacy efforts by collecting impact stories, case studies to help build the evidence base for the project' impact.

3. Prevent a siloed approach to implementation by including regional coordination activities.

A more coordinated regional cooperation approach could be more beneficial to implementing migrant registration projects in East Africa. Possible strategies could include linking migrant registration with reintegration programming in countries of origin to support migrants who will opt for Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration. Closer collaboration with neighbouring IOM missions could help ensure sufficient information exchange and coordination during the project design and project implementation to improve the project's impact.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. Evaluation terms of reference

Terms of Reference

To be conducted by: IOM Regional Office Nairobi

Commissioned by: IOM Tanzania Country Office

Ex-Post Evaluation of the IOM project “Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania (MiREG)”

Evaluation context

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As the leading international organization for migration, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

The United Republic of Tanzania has a long history as both a transit and destination country of migration. This is mainly due to the long periods of peace and stability that have prevailed in the country. The United Republic of Tanzania has been a safe destination for those fleeing from conflicts in neighbouring countries such as Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and, to a lesser extent, Ethiopia, Somalia, Uganda and Zambia. This has subjected it to irregular migration, a phenomenon which is mostly prevalent in the north-western regions of the country.

As much of this migration has been irregular migration, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania has taken a number of measures, including operations to identify and register irregular migrants to regularize their status. Between 2014 and 2015, the government of the United Republic of Tanzania, in collaboration with the International Organization for Migration (IOM), successfully carried out a pilot project on the regularization of the status of irregular migrants in western United Republic of Tanzania, through support from Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office - FCDO) and other partners.

Following the implementation of that project, IOM in coordination with the government of the United Republic of Tanzania through the Ministry of Home Affairs’ Immigration Services Department, proposed for a second phase, and the subsequent project was awarded by (then) DFID (currently known as Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office - FCDO) in April 2019, titled: Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania - MiREG.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Evaluation Purpose

The objective of this ex-post evaluation is to assess the extent to which intended outcomes of the project have been achieved, and the likelihood of further activities taking place beyond the project activities implementation. In particular this evaluation will look at issues such as the long-term use of the registration equipment procured, and the overall impact that the project has on migration management in the United Republic of Tanzania.

The evaluation is being conducted for use by the management and senior management to improve implementation of projects and programmes, assess organizational effectiveness in implementing a strategy, document lessons learned and best practices from the project. The evaluation will be used by stakeholders to assess the relevance and accountability of a project to intended beneficiaries. The evaluation will also be used by the donor to assess value for money for the project they funded.

Evaluation scope

This ex-post evaluation is expected to assess the project: “Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania (MiREG)” performance throughout the project’s lifespan that went from 1st April 2019 to 31st August 2021, to examine its impact. This ex-post evaluation will be conducted six months after the end of the project.

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will use the following criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC) to assess the following key areas:

1. The **effectiveness** of the project in reaching its stated objective
2. The **Impact** of the project - long term positive or negative, intended or unintended effects of the project.
3. Prospects for **sustainability**
4. Identify lessons learned and best practices
5. Assess existing proposed follow-up projects and make recommendations for improvements

Evaluation questions

A complete list of evaluation questions and sub-questions will be developed by the evaluator. The below questions are indicative of the types of questions to be addressed in the evaluation:



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Effectiveness

1. To what extent did the project's activities lead to improved regional coordination, cooperation, and capacity in mixed migration management?
2. To what extent did the project's activities improve frameworks for regularized labour migration?
3. What is the quality of the project outputs and/or the project activities



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Impact

4. Which positive/negative and intended /unintended effects/changes are visible (short and long-term) as a result of the project?
5. Can those changes /impact be attributed to the project's activities? Are there any contributions from external factors?

Sustainability

6. Were suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented?
7. To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?

Evaluation methodology

The evaluator should provide a detailed proposed methodology that they intend to use to address the evaluation objectives. They will be expected to conduct: a review of existing reports and documents; in-depth interviews with key informants such as officials responsible for immigration affairs, government officials, and members of local, national, and regional coordination bodies; and questionnaires and focus group discussions with migrants if applicable.

For the document review, the following documents will be provided:

- Project document
- Project budget
- Interim reports and final reports
- Monitoring reports
- IOM strategy papers
- Other documents as requested by the evaluator

IOM Tanzania Country Office will be responsible for the identification of key stakeholders, and in organizing remote interviews.

The evaluation must follow the IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, and relevant ethical guidelines.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator will produce the following:

1. A draft evaluation inception report that clearly outlines the evaluation methodology,

refined/additional evaluation questions, data collection (including tools) and detailed work plan, inclusive of evaluation matrix (questions and sub questions, indicators and data sources)

2. A final inception report, incorporating IOM’s comments and agreed upon work plan.
3. A PowerPoint presentation debrief of emerging results at the end of on-site data collection.
4. A draft report of no more than 30 pages which includes an executive summary, background and context, methodology, findings, Lessons Learned, recommendations, conclusions.
5. A final evaluation report, incorporating IOM’s comments if applicable.
6. A 2-page evaluation brief
7. A draft management response matrix to be completed by IOM

Evaluation workplan

The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between IOM Tanzania and the evaluator. A general workplan is presented below:

Activity	Location	Months		
		1	2	3
Agreement on the final TOR (if necessary)	Home based			
Initial document review	Home based			
Draft inception report	Home based			
Final inception report	Home based			
Interviews and meetings with IOM	Microsoft Teams			
Conduct remote interviews and data collection	Microsoft Teams, phone calls			
PowerPoint presentation debrief at the end of data collection	Microsoft Teams			
Draft evaluation report	Home based			
Final evaluation report and evaluation brief	Home based			

Other requirements

The evaluator must adhere to the IOM Data Protection Principles (IN/138) and maintain confidentiality.

Budget

USD 0

ANNEX 2. Inception report



Ex-Post Evaluation of the *Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania (MiREG)* project (TZ10P0503/IB.0080)

Inception Report

Ex-post Internal Evaluation of TZ10P0503/IB.0080

Introduction

This ex-post evaluation is expected to assess the project: *Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania (MiREG)* performance throughout the project's lifespan that went from 1st April 2019 to 31st August 2021, to examine its impact.

Project code:	TZ10P0503/IB.0080
Project donor:	United Kingdom's Foreign Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO), previously known as the Department for International Development (DFID)
Project period:	29 months (01 April 2019 – 31 August 2021)
Evaluation Commissioner:	IOM Mission in Tanzania
Evaluation Manager:	Programme Coordinator, IOM Mission in Tanzania
Evaluator:	Marta Walkowiak, IOM Mission in Cambodia
Field visit dates:	N/A (remote evaluation)

During the inception phase, the evaluator reviewed the **evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)** and gathered available project documents from PRIMA, IOM's online project management system. With the help of the evaluation manager, the evaluator compiled a list of documents available and a map of all stakeholders mentioned in the proposal and donor reports.

The evaluator had also 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 key informant interviews during May 2022.

Outline:

- 1. Evaluation context** - brief description of the overall social, economic, political, or other relevant circumstances surrounding the project and the project description

2. **Evaluation purpose** – Detailing the main audience and users of the evaluation.
3. **Methodology**
 - a. Proposed data collection and data analysis methods.
 - b. Sampling
 - c. Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies
4. **Document List** – Available and requested documents. Pending documents to check for are highlighted in yellow.
5. **Workplan**
6. **Evaluation Matrix** - Data collection and analysis plans.

1. EVALUATION CONTEXT

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As the leading international organization for migration, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

The United Republic of Tanzania has a long history as both a transit and destination country of migration. This is mainly due to the long periods of peace and stability that have prevailed in the country. The United Republic of Tanzania has been a safe destination for those fleeing from conflicts in neighbouring countries such as Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and, to a lesser extent, Ethiopia, Somalia, Uganda and Zambia. This has subjected it to irregular migration, a phenomenon which is mostly prevalent in the north-western regions of the country.

As much of this migration has been irregular migration, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania has taken a number of measures, including operations to identify and register irregular migrants to regularize their status. Between 2014 and 2015, the government of the United Republic of Tanzania, in collaboration with the International Organization for Migration (IOM), successfully carried out a pilot project on the regularization of the status of irregular migrants in western United Republic of Tanzania, through support from Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office - FCDO) and other partners.

Following the implementation of that project, IOM in coordination with the government of the United Republic of Tanzania through the Ministry of Home Affairs' Immigration Services Department, proposed for a second phase, and the subsequent project was awarded by (then) DFID (currently known as Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office - FCDO) in April 2019, titled: Migrant Registration Support for Tanzania - MiREG.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The objective of this *internal ex-post evaluation* is to assess the extent to which intended outcomes of the project have been achieved, and the likelihood of further activities taking place beyond the project activities implementation. In particular this evaluation will look at issues such as the long-term use of the registration equipment procured, and the overall impact that the project has on migration management in the United Republic of Tanzania.

This *internal ex-post evaluation* will be used by stakeholders to assess the relevance and accountability of a project to intended beneficiaries and demonstrate the results of the project to both beneficiaries and to the donor. The evaluation will also document key lessons learned and recommendations for future programming.

The main audience and users of the evaluation will be the donor, IOM Tanzania, and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania:

Stakeholders	Evaluation purpose
FCDO	The evaluation will also be used by the donor to assess value for money for the project they funded.
IOM Tanzania	The evaluation is being conducted for use by the management and senior management to improve implementation of projects and programmes,

	assess organizational effectiveness in implementing a strategy, document lessons learned and best practices from the project.
The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania	The evaluation will assist the government, in particular the Ministry of Home Affairs' Immigration Services Department, to assess the sustainability of the project's results and determine ways forward related to registration of undocumented migrants.

To support transparency, the evaluation report will be shared with IOM Tanzania, The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, and will be published on the IOM evaluation repository.

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will use the following criteria of the Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC) to assess the following key areas:

1. The **effectiveness** of the project in reaching its stated objective
2. The **impact** of the project: long term positive or negative, intended or unintended effects of the project.
3. Prospects for **sustainability**
4. Identify lessons learned and best practices
5. Assess existing proposed follow-up projects and make recommendations for improvements

3. Methodology

A. Proposed data collection and data analysis methods.

Data Collection Methods:

Due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, the evaluation will be conducted remotely as follows:

- Desk review of relevant project documents, project reports, and other materials identified.
- Remote key informant interviews with the project stakeholders (project team, consultants and government officials) to document both qualitative and quantitative information; and
- Questionnaire – a short online survey (using Microsoft Office Forms) to assess perceptions on benefits and use of knowledge acquired of officials that participated in IOM trainings through the project

Data analysis:

- Content analysis to assess the effectiveness of project activities and outputs.
- Narrative analysis of project outputs and outcomes and implementation to assess impact and sustainability.

The evaluator will apply, among others, the Most Significant Change (MSC) approach to assess the outcomes and impact of the project on the intended beneficiaries. The evaluation will utilize most significant change stories on outcomes of interest such as United Republic of Tanzania's improved ability to manage migration and make evidence-based policies, and migrants' access to social services and status determination. The evaluation will further unearth other project effects from beneficiary change stories gathered.

Contribution analysis approach focused on the identification and substantiation of changes (positive and negative, expected and non-expected), and also on the definition of possible project contributions to such changes, will further assess effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

B. Sampling

All project documents (proposal, interim and final reports, budgets) and all project outputs (training materials, training reports) will be read.

The selection criterion for stakeholder interviews will be level of engagement. This was a project with a relatively small project team, with relatively few individuals from each stakeholder directly involved, allowing for nearly comprehensive coverage.

Interviews with IOM will be the individuals responsible for project design and implementation in United Republic of Tanzania. Interviews with the donor will be with a representative of FCDO. Interviews with the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania will be with representatives from the Ministry of Home Affairs' Immigration Services Department, who were the main government partner for this project.

The survey with officials will be a random sample of 30-40 respondents (the population of officials trained is 200-300), with an 80% survey return rate being anticipated.

C. Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies

This section describes some of the limitations of the evaluation in terms of timing and data collection that affects the validity of conclusions about the project's impact. Limited ability to meet directly with members of key beneficiary groups i.e. irregular migrants is also likely to affect the evaluation findings.

- Online meetings: One of the key challenges here might be challenges with access to technology for online meetings with government stakeholders. The support on the

ground from IOM staff in Tanzania will be required to agree with key informants on the most feasible technology to use.

- Interviews with direct beneficiaries: Due to the difficulties in access to project locations and migrant communities, interviews with direct beneficiaries are deemed very difficult to be conducted. It is expected that interviews with a non-representative sample of max. 10 respondents will be conducted during the evaluation.
- Access to project locations: Due to the current COVID-19 pandemic situation and budget unavailability, the evaluation will be conducted remotely, limiting access to project sites and stakeholders to interview. In mitigation, the evaluator will review photographs of project sites submitted as part of project report. Also, the online format of key informant interviews will allow the evaluator to arrange the times at informants' convenience and increase chances of interviewing all relevant stakeholders.

4. DOCUMENT LIST

The Evaluator reviewed available documents and requested various additional documents from the Evaluation Manager.

The below shows the status of documents gathered to date:

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	X		
	Budget monitoring and revision	X		
Donor reports	1 st interim narrative report	X		
	1 st interim financial report (Excel, PDF)	X		
	2 nd interim narrative report	X		
	2 nd interim financial report (Excel, PDF)	X		
	3 rd interim narrative report	X		
	3 rd interim financial report (Excel, PDF)	X		
	4 th interim narrative report			
	4 th interim financial report (Excel, PDF)			
	Final narrative report	X		
Final financial report (Excel, PDF)	X			
Project-related documents	1 st revision project documents	X		
	2 nd revision project documents	X		
	3 rd revision project documents	X		
	Basic workplan (from PRIMA)	X		
	Detailed workplan following project revision	X		
Activity monitoring	Project team meeting minutes		X	
	1 st workshop meeting notes	X		
	1 st workshop staff attendance sheet	X		
Results monitoring Component 2	1 st workshop pre-training test	X		
	1 st workshop post-training test	X		
	2 nd workshop report	X		
	2 nd workshop staff attendance report	X		

	2 nd workshop pre-training test	X		
	2 nd workshop post-training test	X		
	3 rd workshop staff attendance report (June 2019)	X		
	3 rd workshop report	X		
	4 th workshop staff attendance report	X		
	4 th workshop report	X		
	5 th visit plan (June 2019)	X		
	6 th visit plan/ meeting notes		X	
	Training curriculum	X		
	Consultant final report			
	Deed of donation	X		
	Financial tracking tools		X	
	Risk management plan		X	
Financial monitoring	IOM Migration Governance Framework	X		
Risk monitoring	IOM Country Strategy		X	
IOM and UN strategies and analyses	IOM East and Horn of Africa Regional Strategy 2020-24	X		
	IOM Institutional Strategy on Migration and Sustainable Development	X		
	IOM Strategic Vision 2019-2023	X		
	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework		X	
	UN Common Country Analysis Nov 2021	X		

5. WORKPLAN

The following tentative schedule of work is proposed:

Activity	Timeline	Location
Desk review of key project documents	April 2022	Home-based
Inception report	15 th June 2022	Home-based
Key informant interviews	1st-31 st July 2022	Online
Survey (government stakeholders)	1st-31 st July 2022	Online
Survey (beneficiaries)	1st-31 st July 2022	Online
Draft Final Evaluation Report (maximum 15 pages)	31 st August 2022	Home-based
Draft Evaluation Brief (maximum 2-3 pages)	31 st August 2022	Home-based
Final Evaluation Report (maximum 15 pages)	15 th September 2022	Home-based

6. EVALUATION MATRIX

Criterion	Key Evaluation Question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Sources of Data	Data Collection Tools
Effectiveness	To what extent did the intervention achieve its objective/outcome/outputs?	To what extent has Tanzania improved its ability to successfully manage migration in line with international human rights standards, including through biometric registration?	A substantial number of undocumented persons are biometrically registered and given temporary protection Evidence of data being utilized to improve migration management policy in line with international human rights standards	Donor reports, project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders
		What factors have facilitated achievement, or non-achievement of planned outcomes?	Perceptions of stakeholders & documented practices	Donor reports Project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders
		To what extent did the project's activities improve frameworks for regularized labour migration?	Perceptions of stakeholders	Project stakeholders	Interviews with project stakeholders
		To what extent did the project's activities lead to improved regional coordination, cooperation, and capacity in mixed migration management?	Described and documented practices, roles, reporting lines and responsibilities	Proposal, Donor reports Project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders
Sustainability	Were suitable structures, resources and processes developed and implemented to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue?	Did the project design incorporate any elements of sustainability?	Evidence of measures on sustainability in proposal and implementation	Proposal, Donor reports	Document review
		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 and/or follow-up	Donor reports, Project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders
	To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?	What is the current situation, now that the project has ended? Have any aspects been sustained without external support?	Examples of continued benefits	Donor reports, Project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders
		What would project stakeholders suggest for future projects – what appears to work, what should be done differently?	Good practices and lessons learned identified by stakeholders	Donor reports, Project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders

Criterion	Key Evaluation Question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Sources of Data	Data Collection Tools
		What were the key factors and challenges affecting sustainability of the project?	Stakeholder perceptions of key challenges and related factors	Donor reports, Project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders
Impact	What change(s) did the intervention bring (whether positive or negative, unintended or intended) as a result of the project?	What are the most significant changes that can be observed? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government’s ability to manage migration • Evidence-based policy making • Migrants’ access to social services and status determination 	Stakeholder perception of ‘most significant changes’ observed	Donor reports, Project stakeholders	Document review Interviews with project stakeholders
		Did the project’s activities lead to changes, positive or negative, intended or unintended?	Perceptions of impact of the project on individuals and communities	Project stakeholders	Interviews with project stakeholders
		Can those changes be attributed to the project’s activities? Are there any contributions from external factors?	Stakeholder perceptions	Project stakeholders Donor reports	Interviews with project stakeholders



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

ANNEX 3. List of persons interviewed

Category	Stakeholder (organization or group)	Role / involvement in the project	Individuals (titles only)
IOM staff	Senior Management in the Mission	Overall oversight of the project, liaison with the government	Programme Coordinator, IOM Tanzania
	Project Manager (PM)	Day to day management of the project, implementation, monitoring,	Project Manager, IOM Tanzania
	Other IOM staff	Support and coordination with stakeholders	Project Assistant
		Overall supervision and approval from the IOM Regional Office	Regional Thematic Specialist, IBM
Beneficiaries	Tanzania Immigration Services Department	Main government partner for all project activities	Immigration officer
Donor	Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO)	Funding provider	Humanitarian Lead, British High Commission Tanzania

ANNEX 4. Data collection instruments

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 Marta Walkowiak. I work for IOM country office in Cambodia.

I'll first explain the purpose of our meeting. I am here to evaluate a project that IOM implemented, which ended in 2021 and carried out activities in Tanzania. The project aimed to enhance the United Republic of Tanzania's migration management capacities with regards to irregular migration and the promotion of



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

humane and orderly migration; it aimed to contribute to the ongoing government efforts in managing the national immigration status determination processes for long-term irregular migrants in the country.

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 effective the project 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 if that's okay. This will make sure that I can pay attention to the conversation, without worrying about having to write everything down.

Is that OK that I record the interview?

The interview should take no more than 45 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.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

IOM Tanzania and RO RTS

Agenda

- Review who is included in the evaluation, challenges faced in including certain stakeholders.

Design

- How was the project designed?
- Is the model/approach consistent with other IBM projects?
- How was the approach adapted in Tanzania?
- Were there any assessments conducted prior to the project implementation which were taken into the consideration?

Needs

- How much of a national priority was this project when it was developed and during the implementation?
- How do projects like this align with IOM's strategy for the country? Or regional/global strategy?
- How were beneficiary needs assessed in design and implementation?
- To what extent did the project respond to the needs of all those groups?
- How does this project align with other projects? How does the Mission promote alignment?
- How were civil society stakeholders consulted?

Management and monitoring

- How did you promote internal coordination, including with other integration 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?
- What were the challenges? What would do differently next time?
- What mechanisms and approaches were used to monitor and learn?
- What other stakeholders were involved in co-leading, monitoring or evaluation of activities?
- What are the examples of usage of any global guidance on integration/ community stabilization, or lessons from other projects, during implementation?
- Gender: How well did this project mainstream gender? Did the project give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples? *Gender checklist*.

Results

- How did you monitor results?
- What challenges did you face when monitoring or reporting on results?
- To what extent did the project's activities improve frameworks for regularized labour migration?
- Training on migrants' registration:



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

- How did you identify and reach the participants? What were some of the challenges encountered during the process?
- What is your impression of the quality of methodology? To what extent was it sufficiently context-specific?
- What was the evidence that participants improved capacities as a result of the training?
- Did you measure how many participants used the newly acquired knowledge in their roles?
- Training on addressing challenges of mixed migration:
 - 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 was the evidence that participants improved capacities as a result of the training?
 - Did you measure how many participants used the newly acquired knowledge in their roles?

Impact

- In terms of longer-term results, what did you hope to see?
- What factors may be helping or hindering the impact?
- How does this fit with other projects/initiatives for a combined impact?
- Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in government's ability to manage migration in Tanzania?
- Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in evidence-based policy making in Tanzania?
- Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in migrants' access to social services and status determination in Tanzania?
- What are the negative impacts of the project?
- What actions were taken in response to the negative impact of the project? Or should be taken next time?

Sustainability

- Which changes or other benefits are likely to be sustained and have been sustained since the project closed?
- What were the key challenges regarding sustainability? - *funding, structures, will, coordination...*
- Were there plans for further external support, e.g. under other projects?
- What are the relevant developments in project sites since the project ended?
- What should be done in future projects – what works well, and what to do differently?
- What question did I not ask that you think I should have asked?



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

- What did you feel was the most important thing we talked about today, and why?



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Government officials:

- How did you hear about the project?
- How did you hear about the trainings?
- Who were the other participants?
- What is your impression of the trainings/project?
- Did the trainings/project respond well to your needs? Please elaborate What about the needs of your community?
- Who do you think the trainings/project targeted? Would it be useful for all types of people, including for men and women, and for different ages?
- Did the trainings/project give any attention to gender issues? What are some examples?
- What impact did the trainings/project have?
- Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in government's ability to manage migration in Tanzania?
- Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in evidence-based policy making in Tanzania?
- Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in migrants' access to social services and status determination in Tanzania ?
- What other factors might have contributed to those change?
- Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
- If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?
- What additional trainings/projects would be useful?
- How could have the trainings/project been 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?
- What question did I not ask that you think I should have asked?
- What did you feel was the most important thing we talked about today, and why?



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

Annex C:

Survey for government officials: <https://forms.office.com/r/Rn1mRtEVUM>

Questions:

1. Name
2. Name of the government institution you work for
3. Please describe your gender
 - Woman
 - Man
 - Prefer not to say
 -
4. Did you participate in any of the trainings organized under this project? Yes/No
5. What was your impression of the trainings?
6. How well did the trainings respond to your needs?
7. What impact did the trainings have?
8. Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in government's ability to manage migration in Tanzania?
9. Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in evidence-based policy making in Tanzania?
10. Looking back over the last year, what do you think was the most significant change in migrants' access to social services and status determination in Tanzania ?
11. Have you seen any negative impacts of the project?
 - Yes
 - No
12. If yes, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time?



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Annex D:

Survey for beneficiaries: <https://forms.office.com/r/2svMP5fQwU>

Questions:

1. Name
2. Country of origin
3. Please describe your gender
 - Woman
 - Man
 - Prefer not to say
 - Non-binary
4. When did you arrive in Tanzania?
5. Did you participate in the migrant registration process?
6. When did you receive migrant registration ID number?
7. How easy is it to access health and social services in your community?
8. Were you able to use the migrant registration ID number to access health and social services in your local community?
9. How important do you think it is to have a migrant registration ID number?