



# EVALUATION BRIEF

## BMM PHASE I: APRIL 2016 - JULY 2019

### IOM INTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

September 2019

This evaluation brief presents a summary of the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as identified by the evaluation team for use by key stakeholders, including internally by IOM BMM Team. More details can be found in the full evaluation report.

<b>Evaluation type:</b>	Internal final evaluation BMM Phase I
<b>Evaluators:</b>	Angeline WAMBANDA, Meri FUKAI and DE ANDRES Edlira
<b>Field visit dates:</b>	03 March –31 May 2019
<b>Final report date:</b>	30 September 2019
<b>Commissioned by:</b>	IOM Regional Office for East and Horn of Africa

## PROJECT SUMMARY

The BMM project's overall objective is: To improve migration Management in the Region, and particularly to address the trafficking and smuggling of migrants within and from the Horn of Africa.

BMM is a multi-partner project funded by the EU Trust Fund for Africa and managed by GIZ. The project was launched in 2016 and is implemented within the framework of the Khartoum Process. The Khartoum Process was launched at a Ministerial Conference in November 2014 in Rome. It is led by a Steering Committee comprised of five EU Member States (Italy, France, Germany, UK, and Malta), five partner countries (Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Sudan) as well as the European Commission and the African Union Commission (AUC). IOM interventions within the project therefore aimed to achieve the following results:

- **BMM R1.2: Comprehensive national migration policies / strategies are adopted in line with international and regional frameworks on migration management (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Sudan)**

**Output 1.1: Multi-stakeholder ownership of the policy/strategy development process.**

- **BMM R2.3: Governments have improved capacities in integrated border management in place, in full accordance with relevant principles of international law. Output 2.1: Improved integrated border management capacities at defined border posts**

**Evaluation purpose:** This internal evaluation has been commissioned by the Regional Office to analyze success, gaps and challenges in implementation of the Regional EUTF –BMM programme.

The findings and recommendations will guide the design and implementation of BMM phase II .

**Evaluation criteria:** Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact, as well as the extent to which the cross-cutting issues of gender were addressed by the project.

**Evaluation methodology:** The evaluation involved document review, initial reflection session with IOM project management team facilitated by the evaluator, interviews with project partners and stakeholders, Chiefs of Mission and Project staff at RO and Country office level, and

### Project information:

**Geographical coverage:** Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Somalia, South Sudan and Sudan

**Project type:** CT

**Project code:** CT.1064

**Project period:** 01 April 2016 – 30 June 2019

*Output 2.2: Enhanced interagency cooperation (at national and local level)*

**BMM (SO3) Contribute to improved identification, assistance and protection for Victims of trafficking (VOT) and Vulnerable migrants, especially women and children, in the Horn of Africa : R33.2, 3.3 and 3.5**

**Output 3.1: Mechanisms for identification and referral of victims of trafficking (VoT), refugees and vulnerable smuggled migrants are strengthened in the region. Output 3.2: The availability of appropriate facilities providing specialized services to victims of trafficking (VoT) and vulnerable migrants is increased; Output 3.2: Opportunities for voluntary return and reintegration are enhanced in the region, in full respect of applicable international standards and the non-refoulement principle. (BMM R 3.5)**

## KEY FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

Assessing **relevance**, findings indicated that the project is *widely relevant to the target groups as well as the international and partner government policies and strategies* in the domain of migration management. There is evident ownership of the project by most governments of the BMM implementing countries. Countries like Kenya and Uganda demonstrated leadership in the selection of activities implemented under BMM based on national priorities. A clearly defined division of labour between IOM and BMM partners; better articulation of TOC for IOM activities and indicators; and alignment of activities to country priorities could benefit the next face.

With regards to **effectiveness**, findings indicated that the project largely achieved Component 3 (Output 3.1 and 3.3) targets; however IOM is behind schedule for Component 1 on Development of Migration Policies (1 out of 5 countries) due to the complex political environment and migration policy formulation processes of member states. However, Migration Policy in South Sudan that was initiated by Japanese funding was finalized through BMM funding. The evaluation indicated that, overall, *the project has been implemented in a fairly efficient manner, particularly in the last year of Phase I, but could have been more efficient with improved staffing; better coordination and communication between RO and Country offices.*

*It was too early at the time of evaluation to assess the project's long-term impact.* Evaluation, however, noted that IOM secured Government interest in migration management; made a significant progress in implementation in migration areas such as through expansion of CT, Protection and MRCs support. The finalization of Migration policy in South Sudan was an unplanned positive result of BMM. In Djibouti, the Medical Referral Systems (MRS) improved the health care in the area outside of the MRC and changed the perception of communities towards migrants. .

**Sustainability:** It is premature to determine the sustainability of the project and activities implemented by IOM. In the overall project design, Component 1 on Policy Harmonization and Component 2 on Capacity Building are core to sustainability. These components are in line with regional initiatives such as IGAD migration policy programme and HOA initiatives which give governments mandate and ownership of the results. However, further efforts are needed at country level to attain planned targets for outcomes under Component 1 and 2. Good practices noted include: (i) Government ownership and commitment, such as Kenya Institute of Migration Studies, (ii) IOM BMM activities leveraged on other on-going IOM programs, likely to ensure the continuity beyond

BMM. Component 3 was mostly implemented by IOM with limited contribution from Government and other actors, such as NGOs and Civil Society.

The project incorporated gender as a cross-cutting issue. While gender was reflected in IOM reports and selection of participants during trainings, there was no clear strategy on gender mainstreaming *at the stage of its development and in the process of implementation.*

## KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Within the next six months, the IOM BMM recommended to:

1. **Theory of Change:** IOM and BMM partners could consider articulating the overall objective of BMM to be more realistic. Member states are at various levels of development with migration prioritized differently. A more realistic and achievable goal could better define the focus of the project .
2. **Strategic programming:** IOM to focus on high impact results. Whereas BMM provides flexibility in programming, IOM should focus efforts on selected results under BMM where it has a clear competitive advantage according to its mandate and relevant capacities in the field.
3. There is need to consider a different approach/scope of activities for fragile states such as Somalia, South Sudan and Sudan given the political dynamics. In addition, IOM should reconsider the extent to which it can have co-funding arrangements for human resources.
4. **Policy Harmonization:** IOM could strengthen the synergies with other IOM projects as well as other BMM partners in component 1. IOM should determine whether this could continue under BMM and/or other projects .
5. **Government ownership:** Engage government authorities at highest political authority for their buy in and subsequent support of the activities to promote ownership.
6. **Management and coordination:** Strengthen regional coordination with country offices. Improve decision making.
7. **Empower country offices:** Streamline reporting structures- Agree on a workable coordination structure at country office level, with clear accountability mechanism/leadership designed by country offices themselves;
8. **Sustainability:** Articulate sustainability strategy, such as: clear indicators and targets; tracking in annual work plans.
9. **Gender mainstreaming** to be strengthened.