



Evaluation Report

Ex-post internal evaluation of the project

“Improved Migration Management through Policy Development in Kyrgyzstan”

Implementing agency: International Organization for Migration (IOM)

IOM project code: PO.0143

Donor: IOM Development Fund (IDF)

Report date: November 2021

Internal evaluator: Jelena Ribac, Project Coordinator, IOM Office in Serbia

Commissioned by: IOM Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. INTRODUCTION	8
2. EVALUATION CONTEXT AND PURPOSE.....	8
2.1. Evaluation context	8
2.2. Evaluation purpose	9
2.3. Evaluation scope	9
3. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.....	10
3.1. Evaluation criteria	10
3.2. Data sources and data collection.....	10
3.3. Data analysis	10
3.4. Limitations and mitigation strategies	11
3.4. Evaluation norms and standards	12
4. FINDINGS.....	13
4.1 RELEVANCE:	13
4.2 COHERENCE.....	19
4.3 EFFECTIVENESS:	20
4.4 EFFICIENCY:	25
4.5 IMPACT:.....	27
4.6 SUSTAINABILITY:	30
5. Conclusions and recommendations.....	35
5.1 Summary of conclusions and recommendations.....	35
5.2 Lessons learned and good practices	37
6. Annexes.....	38
6.1 Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)	38
6.2 Evaluation matrix	44
6.3 List of stakeholders and Agenda of the scheduled interviews	51
6.4 Data collection tools	54
6.5 List of documents reviewed	57
6.6 List of persons interviewed or consulted.....	58

List of acronyms

CSO – Civil Society Organizations

EAEU – Eurasian Economic Union

EEC – Eurasian Economic Commission

GCM – Global Compact for Safe, Regular and Orderly Migration

GoK – Government of the Kyrgyz Republic

HQ – Headquarters

IDF – IOM Development Fund

ILO – International Labour Organization

IOM – International Organization for Migration

IO – International Organization

KOICA – Korea International Cooperation Agency

MLSD – Ministry of Labour and Social Development of the Kyrgyz Republic

MMPTF – Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund

MFA – Ministry of Foreign Affairs

MiGOF – Migration Governance Framework

Mol – Ministry of Interior of the Kyrgyz Republic

NDS – National Development Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic

NGO – Non-Governmental Organization

RO – Regional Office

SDGs – Sustainable Development Goals

SMS – State Migration Service of the Kyrgyz Republic

TFG – Task Force Group

ToC – Theory of Change

ToR – Terms of Reference

UNEG – United Nations Evaluation Group

UNMN – United Nations Migration Network

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an **ex-post evaluation of the project PO.0143: “Improved Migration Management through Policy Development in Kyrgyzstan”** that was managed by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic and funded by the IOM Development Fund (IDF). The evaluation was conducted as an independent, internal evaluation by an IOM staff member based in the IOM Office in Belgrade, who was not involved in the design and implementation of the project.

Project description: This 3-months project (21 October 2019 to 21 January 2020) aimed to support the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic (GoK) to improve the capacities for gender sensitive and human rights-based migration governance at the national level, in line with adopted international standards and applicable global frameworks. The project assisted the development of the Concept of the State Migration Policy of the GoK until 2030 through 1) providing adequate expert support for drafting the document, 2) technical/logistical support for the workshops and meetings of the Task Force Group (TFG) for the document development, as well as 3) organizing and facilitating trainings for the TFG members on the relevant global frameworks – the Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF), the Global Compact for Safe, Regularly and Orderly Migration (GCM) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Evaluation purpose: The evaluation was commissioned by the IOM Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic to assess the relevance, coherence with other ongoing programmes/interventions, effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation, inclusion of gender and human-rights in the project, the impact of the intended results and the sustainability of the project effects, as well as assessing attention to gender quality and human rights. The evaluation aims to also take note of any lessons learned and good practices. The intended use is to help IOM and project partners to improve the design and implementation of other/future related projects. It also aims to assist the donor (IDF) in its decision-making, to improve effectiveness where possible, and with regard to future project formulation process and funding decisions.

Evaluation scope: The evaluation covers the entire implementation period (21 October 2019 to 21 January 2020) and period until the time of the evaluation took place (August to November 2021) with reference to the main project results. The geographic scope involves the main project site in the capital city of Bishkek.

Evaluation methodology: The data collection methodologies consisted of desk review of project and other related documents, as well semi-structured in-depth interviews with key stakeholders. The evaluation was carried out remotely with the support of the CO staff for scheduling and providing interpretation for 8 key-informant interviews.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS:

The main conclusions for each of the OECD criteria are presented below, with an evaluation score assigned based on evidence from the assessment of the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the project.

Relevance: EXCELLENT (rating 5)

- The project was designed as a response to the need and decision of the GoK to develop a new Migration Policy Concept and was extremely timely and relevant as such. It facilitated the policy dialogue on a broad spectrum of migration-related issues and contributed to redefine migration management priorities based on a wider and development-oriented outlook. In line with this, the project worked to increase main stakeholders’ knowledge and understanding of migration management from a development and human rights-based perspective, based on international standards and principles.

- The project was very well aligned with GCM, the SDGs and the Agenda 2030 as well as the IOM Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF).
- Although the context is rather changed due to new political and economic developments, the ToC remained valid, and the project results remain applicable to the newly emerged challenges. There is awareness among all key stakeholders on the importance of sound migration policies for addressing some of the most important development challenges of the country, and the need to operationalize those through follow-up measures and programs.
- Comprehensive and effective engagement of all relevant actors was ensured through the project design and good quality of implementation.
- Gender and human rights considerations were incorporated as main principles in the project design and implementation, and project results reflect them accordingly.

Coherence: EXCELLENT (rating 5)

- The project has been consistent and synergetic with prior, current and follow-up initiatives and programs of IOM, the government, and other actors. And vice versa, the project contributed to improving consistency and interlinkages across policies, programmes and initiatives.

Effectiveness: EXCELLENT (rating 5)

- The project succeeded to achieve its intended results and even exceeded many of its targets. All activities, outputs and outcomes were accomplished as planned and following highest professional and quality standards. The objective was achieved accordingly, as the project contributed to improving migration management in the country by providing the necessary strategic framework and direction for creating coherent, consistent and development-oriented environment in addressing migration processes, challenges, and opportunities of the country.

Efficiency: VERY GOOD (rating 4)

- Overall, the project is an example of a short and highly efficient intervention which delivered outstanding results with minimal financial resources and stretching of staff capacities. The project was cost-effective and made the best use of available resources in the less-than-ideal circumstances, given short time frame and mitigation to cover for planned visit by RO Vienna expert. All results were achieved within the available timeframe and funding, and funds utilized in line with the project strategy and objective. The involvement and contribution of all partners worked excellent as a result of the good internal and external coordination and cooperation.

Impact: EXCELLENT (rating 5)

- The project had positive long-term effects in providing common understanding on the strategic priorities in migration which has informed the design of various programs and initiatives of different actors.
- The project contributed to strengthening advocacy, communication, and fundraising efforts of stakeholders in addressing various migration challenges at national, regional and local level in the country, as well as abroad, in a coherent and consistent manner.

- The project results, and Migration Policy Concept (MPC) in particular, are likely to contribute to gender equality in future. However, gender-specific indicators should be included in monitoring of progress towards the expected MPC results.

Sustainability: EXCELLENT (rating 5)

- The project results are fully owned by national stakeholders, including through the ongoing commitment of policy and decision makers to improve migration management in order to mitigate its negative and enforce positive effects. The technical, financial and managerial capacities for continuing the positive effects of the project are rather limited and affected by several political, institutional, economic and social factors. Still, significant efforts of all stakeholders are in place to develop joint programs and projects for the operationalization of the MPC and AP and there is evidence of ongoing harmonization of related legal acts and regulations.
- There are favorable circumstances and capacities to introduce measures that would improve the prospects of sustainability of the project's results which require all stakeholder's involvement. Such measures may include setting up an M&E system for the AP, promoting a lead institution for migration governance and clear division of roles and mandates, legislative amendments, partnerships with CSOs as well as private sector, and ongoing capacity building. IOM is recognized by all stakeholders as the key partner for supporting and facilitating the government in these processes which will require additional efforts and engagement of the organization's capacities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Notwithstanding the need for time- and cost-efficiency in delivering project results, in some cases and when circumstances allow, it would be advisable and reasonable to advocate for extended periods of project implementation and/or allocation of more human or other resources – whichever considered more beneficial for the quality of implementation and reasonable level of workload.
2. Continue the involvement in the development/implementation of the MPC AP 2021-2025 as well as appropriate M&E system, including and monitoring gender-specific indicators, and designing joint programs which would contribute to the attainment of gender-specific and other AP targets.
3. IOM would benefit from increasing the Office capacities to better respond to migration management responsibilities and commitments in relation to the government as well as the UN system. This should employ additional and optimize current technical, material, financial and human resources, including through cross-project linkages and with the support of IOM's regional/HQ departments as needed.
4. Explore further opportunities for multi-year and multi-stakeholder programmes in line with the MPC and AP priorities that would enable continuity of actions within larger-scale interventions, as well as prospects for significant impact and sustainability.
5. Continue the good cooperation and support provided to the government to further strengthen the institutional set-up and capacities based on clear roles and responsibilities of all respective actors, and in line with the whole of the government and whole of society approach.

GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED:

Several good practice examples and lessons learned permeated from the evaluation.

Good practices:

IOM's highly proactive engagement in supporting migration management through continuous advocacy, monitoring, awareness-rising and capacity building efforts is one of the key good practices observed through the evaluation of the project. This approach **generated potential which could be effectively mobilized when other conditions** were met in the wider political, economic and social context, **to achieve common development and rights-based goals in migration.**

In relation to the above, there was a good example of **how commitment of key political and state authorities could mature over time and accelerate execution of the migration agenda.** Another good practice was the demonstration of how **inclusive policy-creation process, which ensured *de facto* consideration of interests, views and contributions of all stakeholders, increased understanding and trust among stakeholders.** All this together led to and provided a **good example of creating a strong sense of ownership and accountability to a common goal, based on understanding that joint efforts in migration were meaningful and made a difference towards commonweal for the government and the society as a whole.**

Finally, looking from a wider perspective, the whole project intervention could be considered a good practice for IDF and IOM as such. As IDF **provides resources** to Missions and Offices worldwide to support Member States to strengthen migration management capacities, the project demonstrated the importance and potential long-term impact of this 'seed funding' **in situations where timely response to emerging policy-windows was needed.**

Lessons learned:

Overall, a lesson learned was the importance of planning for sufficient human resources and/or time for projects implementation to avoid overstressing the organization's capacities, while maintaining the good quality of the work and results. In this regard Missions/Offices could advocate for, and IDF could consider flexible approaches towards the ratio between staff and office costs, operational costs, and project implementation timeframes tailored to specific needs/situations.

1. INTRODUCTION

IOM has conducted an internal independent ex-post evaluation of the project “Improved Migration Management through Policy Development in Kyrgyzstan” funded by the IOM Development Fund (IDF).

The project aimed to support the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic (GoK) to improve migration management through the development of comprehensive migration policy in line with international standards, especially considering gender and human rights. This objective was to be achieved through a combination of advocacy and capacity building activities targeting and involving relevant stakeholders in the Kyrgyz Republic.

The evaluation was commissioned by the IOM Mission in the Kyrgyz Republic and conducted by an independent internal evaluator, Jelena Ribac, Project Manager in the IOM’s Office in Belgrade, Serbia. It was conducted approximately 18 months after the end of the project.

The evaluation report provides an overview of the context and purpose of the evaluation, the evaluation framework and methodology, the findings, as well as the main conclusions and recommendations.

2. EVALUATION CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

2.1. Evaluation context

The **project ‘Improved Migration Management through Policy Development in Kyrgyzstan’** was **implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM)** during three months (21 October 2019 to 21 January 2020)

As part of the United Nations (UN), **IOM is the leading intergovernmental organization in the field of migration** and works closely with governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental partners. IOM is dedicated to promoting humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all. It does so by providing services and advice to governments and migrants. IOM recognizes the link between migration and economic, social and cultural development, as well as to the right of freedom of movement. From this perspective, IOM works in the four broad areas of migration management: migration and development, facilitating migration, regulating migration, and in forced migration. IOM activities that cut across these areas include the promotion of international migration law, policy debate and guidance, protection of migrants' human rights, migration health and the gender dimension of migration.

The **overall project’s objective** was to support the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic (GoK) to improve migration management at the national level based on migration policies that are in line with international standards and mainstream gender and human rights. In line with this, the project worked to strengthen the capacities of the GoK to address migration-related processes, challenges and migrants’ needs. This outcome was achieved through the development of the draft of the state Migration Policy Concept (MPC) and improving knowledge of state agencies representatives on the global frameworks and international frameworks and standards relevant for migration governance (SDGs, MiGOF). IOM activities included technical and expert support for the achievement of the stated outputs by organizing workshops and meetings for state counterparts with CSO’s, IO’s, academia representatives and independent specialists.

The **migration-related context** in the Kyrgyz Republic during the project evaluation is characterized by external and mainly labour-induced migration which accounts for approx. 15% of the country's population (6.5 million). The vast majority of estimated 1 million labour migrants are working in the Russian Federation, out of which around 40% are women, according to available national statistics. The external migration takes a significant portion of the labour force due to lack of employment opportunities in the country. At the same time, remittances equal to 30% of the GDP of this lower middle-income country which are spent largely in consumption/primarily needs, and real estate. Due to ongoing population and migration trends, elderly population increases in the country, as well as children left behind without parental care (making 80% of street children according to data available from UNICEF).

Although characterized by frequent political fluctuations which are affecting the political system and institutional set-up, there is a continuity of interest and attention given to migration by the main political actors in the recent years. This seems to be deriving from increased awareness and understanding of the high importance of the effects that the migration situation and trends have for the political, economic and social developments in the country, especially in the longer-term.

Key IOM's and project stakeholders were the GoK and relevant line ministries/state agencies (primarily the State Migration Service, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Labour and Social Development, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Health, State Agency on Youth issues, Prime-Minister's Administration and other state institutions), as well as UN agencies and civil society organizations, the academia and independent experts.

2.2. Evaluation purpose

The evaluation was commissioned by the IOM Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic to assess the relevance of the project for the stakeholders and beneficiaries, coherence with other ongoing programmes/interventions, the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation, the inclusion of gender and human-rights in the project, the impact of the intended results and the sustainability of the project effects. The evaluation aims to also take note of any lessons learned and good practices which can help IOM and project partners, namely government entities, experts, and civil society partners, to improve the design and implementation of other/future related projects.

The evaluation also aims to promote transparency and accountability which will, in turn, assist the donor (IDF) in its decision-making and to better equip staff to make judgments about the project and to improve effectiveness where possible and with regard to future project funding. Concerning the expected use of findings, the ex-post evaluation aims to also identify lessons learned, good practices, and provide a learning opportunity for IDF and its implementing partners regarding the project formulation process. The findings will also help make evidence-based strategic decisions in relation to specific projects, while also demonstrating the Fund's on-going commitment to results-based management.

2.3. Evaluation scope

The evaluation covers the entire project implementation period (21 October 2019 to 21 January 2020) and period until the time of the evaluation took place (August to November 2021) with reference to the main project results. The geographic scope involves the main project site, the capital city of Bishkek, where all the main stakeholders were located (consulted remotely).

3. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation focused on all six OECD-DAC criteria: relevance, coherences, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the project. The evaluation also assessed how effectively gender equality and human rights protection were mainstreamed in the process of project design and during project implementation.

3.2. Data sources and data collection

At the beginning of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Manager (IOM Project Assistant) provided wide-ranging and very well-organized country specific information, relevant documents, and information on the achievements of the project to date. The evaluator carried out a desk review (See Annex 5 for list of documents consulted).

The data collection for the evaluation was guided by the Evaluation Matrix (see Annex 2), which laid out the plan for collecting and analyzing data for each of the questions posted in the Evaluation ToR (see Annex 1). The data collection methods involved the following:

- Document review (see list of documents reviewed in section 6.5);
- Initial reflection session with IOM staff facilitated by the evaluator;
- Semi-structured key informant interviews with partners and stakeholders (see list in section 6.6)

The Evaluation Matrix and the data collection methods ensured consideration of cross-cutting themes, in particular gender and human-rights, which were covered through targeted questions and to which a particular attention was given in the data analysis.

Due to travel restrictions related to the coronavirus pandemic the field visit to the Kyrgyz Republic was not feasible and instead all meetings and interviews with the stakeholders were organized online using MS Teams and Zoom (see agenda of scheduled interviews in Annex 3).

The evaluator encouraged participation of all stakeholders to the extent possible. Representatives of the relevant partner institutions, UN agencies, civil society organizations and independent experts took part in the key informant interviews (see list of consulted stakeholders in Annex 6). The purpose and the scope of the evaluation was explained at the beginning of each interview, and participants were asked for their opinions, observations, proposed actions and general feedback related to the project based on guiding questions of the interview guide (See Annex 4). The donor's perspective in relation to the main evaluation questions, findings, conclusions and recommendations has been considered and incorporated subsequently, based on feedback inquired before the finalization of the report.

3.3. Data analysis

The evaluation was implemented using qualitative analysis, cross-referencing and triangulating information from the desk review of project-related documents and from the notes/recordings of the semi-structured interviews.

For each evaluation criteria a rating was determined based on the following scale:

Table 4: Evaluation criteria and scaling

Evaluation Criteria Scaling		Explanation	Supporting evidence
5	Excellent (Always)	There is evidence of a strong contribution and/or contributions exceeding the level expected by the intervention.	<i>Supporting evidence will be detailed for each rating given.</i>
4	Very good (Almost always)	There is evidence of a good contribution but with some areas for improvement remaining.	
3	Good (Mostly, with some exceptions)	There is evidence of a satisfactory contribution, but continued improvement is required.	
2	Adequate (Sometimes, with many exceptions)	There is evidence of some contribution, but significant improvement is required.	
1	Poor (Never or occasionally with clear weaknesses)	There is low or no observable contribution.	

3.4. Limitations and mitigation strategies

The main limitation of the evaluation was the **unavailability of some representatives** of the state agencies and CSO's that were involved in the project activities. One of the reasons was the fact that the interviews were conducted during August 2021 which is a period of summer holidays. Another reason was the fact that some representatives left service or were not employed in the same state institutions anymore. In addition, **the implementation and finalization of the evaluation was postponed** due to periods of leave of the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluator, as well as other unforeseen developments in both Bishkek and Belgrade Offices demanding prioritization of other urgent tasks.

Another constraint came from the **online modality of conducting the interviews**, organized with the excellent support of IOM Belgrade ICT Officer, and a highly qualified professional interpreter engaged by IOM Office in Bishkek. Therefore, efforts had to be made by all parties to ensure effective communication and avoid misunderstandings despite inevitable technical issues and challenges of double-mediated communication.

In terms of data analysis, the risk of bias in the application of causality analysis was mitigated based on the general consensus among stakeholders on almost all findings presented in the report.

3.4. Evaluation norms and standards

The evaluator strived to ensure the assessment was as objective as possible, conclusions were accurate and verifiable, and recommendations were realistic, as well as to follow IOM Data Protection Principles, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and relevant ethical guidelines.

4. FINDINGS

Overall, the project was a highly relevant, timely and quality intervention in line with the national migration policy priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic. It supported and streamlined the process of development of a new draft of the Migration Policy Concept (MPC) of the GoK, in line with international frameworks and standards, including gender and human rights considerations.

The objective and main outcomes of the project were achieved and exceeded as the project delivered the draft of the MPC that was later submitted and adopted by the GoK. The MPC was endorsed by the government and all other stakeholders as the guiding policy document that provided strategic direction and evidence-based grounds to steer migration governance and migration management in the country. Both short and long-term positive changes had been identified, involving further efforts towards improving policy, legal and operational frameworks and their implementation. Therefore, the sustainability of the project results could be enhanced by introducing new interventions that would contribute to a coherent and consistent capacity building for implementation of migration management programmes and policies.

Detailed findings on each of these points, along with related conclusions and recommendations, can be found below. A summary of the conclusions and recommendations is provided afterwards in section 5.

4.1 RELEVANCE:

The relevance criteria refers to the extent in which the project's objective and intended results remained valid and pertinent (as originally planned or as subsequently modified).

All stakeholders repeatedly cited the project was extremely relevant, very well-designed and came right on time to respond to the identified capacity-building needs for strengthening migration governance in the Kyrgyz Republic.

R1. To what extent is the project design relevant to needs and priorities at the national and regional levels?

- *Did the project approach respond well to the identified needs? Were there any identifiable gaps that can be observed now?*
- *Is the project aligned to a larger strategy on the national or regional level?*

The project supported the development of a new MPC and training of the relevant government institutions to enhance government capacities for a gender-sensitive and human-rights based migration management. The previous MPC developed back in 2010 was never adopted and had a narrowed focus to labour migration only, leaving out many important issues and needs deriving from complex migration processes in the country and the region. Despite discrepancies found in different data sources, based on the project and other analyzed documents, there are indications that more than 1,000,000 Kyrgyz migrants are abroad, being mostly labour migrants in the Russian Federation. This would constitute approx. 15% of the total population of the Kyrgyz Republic (6.5 million) and significant 40% of the country's labour force. While lack employment opportunities in the country continue to increase external migration (especially youth), remittances equal to 30% of the GDP. Population and migration trends see elderly population remaining in the country as well as children left behind without parental care, creating pressing needs for the social system and services.

In this context, **there was a need to address the complexity of migration-related issues and negative consequences for the country in a new strategic approach that would align, consolidate, and significantly increase efforts toward medium- and long-term changes in migration processes and outcomes.** The evaluation respondents especially highlighted the necessity to stabilize and streamline migration processes in sectoral policies that were considered with the project. Therefore, the development of the new draft of the MPC addressed the necessity to consider migration and migrant’s contribution as potential driver of the country’s political, social, and economic development, as well as protection of human rights for all (not only labour) migrants and migrant families. As a result, a number of problematic issues were included in the draft document such as: adversities faced by migrant’s children, women and migrant families, migrant access to healthcare, return and effective reintegration, employment and validation of skills, social welfare and consequences to social systems, aspects of demography, economic effects and many other migration-related challenges and opportunities.

The links to the stated documents have been recognized by stakeholders in the light for the country’s own development vision and have been also reflected in prior important strategic and operational frameworks on the national level, such as the National Development Plan (NDP) of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2040. In addition, the MPC is seen as beneficial for other **regional cooperation frameworks and commitments**, such as those related to the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) and the Eurasian Economic Commission (EEC), the Almaty process on refugee protection and international migration to, from and within Central Asia, and the Beijing+20 Declaration and platform for Action on gender equality and the empowerment of women.

Conclusion 1: *The project was designed as a response to the need and decision of the GoK to develop a new Migration Policy Concept and was extremely timely and relevant as such. It facilitated the policy dialogue on a broad spectrum of migration-related issues and contributed to redefine migration management priorities based on a wider and development-oriented outlook. In line with this, the project worked to increase main stakeholders’ knowledge and understanding of migration management from a development and human rights-based perspective, based on international standards and principles.*

R2. To what extent is the project aligned to the Global Compact on Migration (GCM) and the Agenda 2030, as well as to IOM’s global Strategic Vision?

The project was designed and implemented to have the main project results delivered in line with the goals and priorities of the main global development and migration frameworks. In particular, the Migration Policy Concept was aligned to those as presented in the table below:

Migration Policy Concept 2020-2030 alignment with global development and migration frameworks		
Global framework	Alignment with goals, objectives, priorities	Reference
Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the Agenda 2030	Goals and related targets (10 out of 17): 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere (Target 1.3); 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages (Target 3.3) 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all (Target 4.4; 4.5); 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (Target 5.2; 5.5); 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all (Targets: 8.1; 8.5; 8.6; 8.7; 8.9; 8.b);	Project documents and reports, Migration Policy Concept, interviews with stakeholders confirming alignment.

	<p>9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation (Target: 9.2)</p> <p>10. Reduce inequality within and among countries (Targets: 10.3; 10.7, 10.C)</p> <p>13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (Target: 13.1)</p> <p>16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (Target: 16.2;)</p> <p>17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development (Targets: 17.3; 17.5; 17.13; 17.16; 17.17; 17.18)</p>	
<p>Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Legal Migration (GCM)</p>	<p>Objectives (16 out of 23):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect and utilize accurate and disaggregated data as a basis for evidence-based policies. 2. Minimize the adverse drivers and structural factors that compel people to leave their country of origin. 3. Provide accurate and timely information at all stages of migration. 4. Ensure that all migrants have proof of legal identity and adequate documentation. 5. Enhance availability and flexibility of pathways for regular migration. 6. Facilitate fair and ethical recruitment and safeguard conditions that ensure decent work. 7. Address and reduce vulnerabilities in migration. 12. Strengthen certainty and predictability in migration procedures for appropriate screening, assessment and referral. 14. Enhance consular protection, assistance and cooperation throughout the migration cycle. 15. Provide access to basic services for migrants. 16. Empower migrants and societies to realize full inclusion and social cohesion. 17. Eliminate all forms of discrimination and promote evidence-based public discourse to shape perceptions of migration. 18. Invest in skills development and facilitate mutual recognition of skills, qualifications and competences. 19. Create conditions for migrants and diasporas to fully contribute to sustainable development in all countries. 20. Promote faster, safer and cheaper transfer of remittances and foster financial inclusion of migrants. 	<p>Project documents and reports, Migration Policy Concept, interviews with stakeholders confirming alignment.</p>

	23. Strengthen international cooperation and global partnerships for safe, orderly and regular migration.	
MIGOF principles and objectives	<p>Principles (3 out of 3):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adherence to international standards and fulfillment of migrants’ rights. 2. Formulating policy using evidence and a “whole-of government” approach. 3. Engagement with partners to address migration and related issues. <p>Objectives (2 out of 3):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advance the socioeconomic well-being of migrants and society. 3. Ensure that migration takes place in a safe, orderly and dignified manner. 	Project documents and reports, Migration Policy Concept, interviews with stakeholders confirming alignment.

It was a general observation in the interviews that the Kyrgyz Republic is well advanced in linking national policies to international and global frameworks as well as cross-cutting issues such as gender or environmental issues. These is ensured through regulatory assessments, including on compliance with these frameworks as part of the mandatory procedure for adoption of any policy or legislative document.

Conclusion 2: *The project was very well aligned with GCM, the SDGs and the Agenda 2030 as well as the IOM Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF).*

R3. Is the Theory of Change suited for the context, responsive to the identified challenge(s), and logically linked?

- *What were the hypotheses and assumptions within the ToC and to what degree did they remain valid?*
- *Did the context shift during and has it changed since the project implementation? How?*
- *What was the results chain linking project input to project outcomes?*

Theory of Change:

As observed in the project documentation, there was a logical connection of the project Outcome with the related Output and Activities, as well as their contribution to the overall project Objective. Although there are segments of the results framework which could have been improved, the logic was fairly good and valid.

The intended outcome was improved capacities of the GoK to address challenges in migration management and to align national migration policies to global frameworks, which is in line with the context (as described further below), assuming in particular the willingness of the GoK to develop a State Migration Policy. This links logically with the intended output, to draft a gender-sensitive and human rights-based Concept of the State Migration Policy, relying on the assumption that the TFG co-chairs and members will actively contribute to the process of the policy development.

Still, while overall logical, there are identified ways that the logic may have been improved. On the output level, a separate, second output could have been introduced to capture the intended result on improved knowledge of the government representatives on relevant global frameworks for migration governance and management. This would highlight two complementary and synergetic lines of simultaneous work – on strengthening policy frameworks, and improving knowledge and competences for policy making and implementation – both contributing to achieving the main project outcome.

On the outcome level, in line with the above statement, the indicators could have also included the application of development-oriented approach in the policy-making process in line with the relevant global frameworks (i.e. SDGs, GCM).

On the Objective level, the objective statement could have been more general in nature, presenting the project as part of wider processes and efforts of the government (and other actors) to contribute to improving of migration management in the country, including through policy development. Likewise, the indicator could have referred to the existing/ongoing processes of consideration or adoption of such policies, as it was expected for the MPC.

Contextual factors:

The interviewees agreed that the context in the time of the project implementation was very much favorable both on the political and institutional level. Two main factors affecting the project achievements as cited were the highest-level political support pushing for the migration policy to become a priority of the Government's work as well as the enabling institutional setting, namely the State Migration Service that was well capacitated to lead this process with the support of IOM. This led to both inclusive and expedient development of the draft Migration Policy Concept that was submitted for adoption in early 2020. However, the MPC was finally adopted in early May 2021, following a period of vacuum due to some significant developments changing the context in the country.

On the political level, following presidential elections in early 2021, a new president has been appointed and the Constitution has been changed. New parliamentary elections are expected at the end of November 2021 which might further affect the political organization and system. The developments have caused institutional representatives who were at the time closely involved in the project leave or dislocate to other positions/institutions. In addition, the situation in the country and in the region has been affected by the border tensions between the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan culminating between April and July 2021. The Covid-19 pandemic caused many migrants to return in the country in a short period of time leading to additional pressure for the health system, as well as double loss - for Kyrgyz citizens losing employment abroad, and for the country facing sharp decrease of remittances. In a situation where labour migration, mainly in Russia and Kazakhstan, contributes to the equivalent of more than 30 percent of GDP, this has created significant additional pressure to the economic and social system.

On the institutional level, the State Migration Service, being the central government institution for coordination of migration policies and measures has been disbanded. Its mandate has been dispersed mainly towards the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (department for External Migration), Ministry of Labour and Social Development of the Kyrgyz Republic, and, to a lesser extent, to the Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and other line ministries covering specific migration-related issues.

However, it seems that stated developments have provided even more arguments in favor of the operationalization of the MPC given that they brought many migration-related challenges high on the political agenda. There is consensus among the stakeholders on the ongoing commitment to address challenges and work towards the MPC objectives which has not be affected despite the changes in the government, keeping the momentum for further migration policy development and improving migration management in the country.

Conclusion 3: *Although the context is rather changed due to new political and economic developments, the ToC remained valid, and the project results remain applicable to the newly emerged challenges. There is awareness among all key stakeholders on the importance of sound migration policies for addressing some of the most important development challenges of the country, and the need to operationalize those through follow-up measures and programmes.*

As one respondent stated, “The Migration Policy Concept is a testimony of commitment, but it requires additional measures to come to life”.

R4. To what extent did IOM engage national stakeholders in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?

- *Was the involvement of stakeholders well-balanced, sufficiently inclusive and representative of all key actors and interests?*

IOM was a co-chair of the inter-ministerial Task Force Group (TFG) established by the Government with the aim of developing the MPC. As documented by the project and elaborated by stakeholders, the TFG consisted of all relevant state institutions, international organizations, and included relevant independent experts and representatives of academia and civil society organizations. The project design, and later implementation were therefore based on this broad engagement of all relevant national stakeholders, enabling comprehensive dialogue and ensuring meaningful participation in line with the project objectives. Despite the changes of individual representatives of the institutions involved during the MPC development, the respondents cited active involvement of all actors in the project activities. They tend to agree that all relevant actors were included, and that needs, and interests of all beneficiaries were represented and considered during the implementation. IOM’s facilitation of the process has been highlighted in this regard, as it ensured timely coordination of meetings, delivery of necessary materials, dissemination of meeting minutes, facilitating discussions, and organizing follow-up actions and collection of feedback from all participants. There is a shared opinion that this approach ensured consideration of all issues, inputs, and proposals during the development process and that all of them were later addressed and/or incorporated in the draft MPC.

Conclusion 4: *Comprehensive and effective engagement of all relevant actors was ensured through the project design and good quality of implementation.*

R5. To what extent was gender and human rights considered in the design of this project?

- *Was the design of the project appropriate for ensuring that gender and human rights issues are properly and consistently integrated?*

Considerations of gender and human right issues has been incorporated at all levels of the project design – from activities to the main outcome and project objective which is: ‘to contribute to improving migration management in the Kyrgyz Republic while ensuring that gender and human rights considerations are mainstreamed in the State Migration Policy’.

In line with this, IOM hired two public policy and gender experts, experienced in drafting strategic policy documents, to work on the preparation of the MPC while ensuring the inclusion of gender and human-rights considerations. The project activities – workshops, meetings, trainings – included relevant institutions and organizations dealing with protection of human and women’s rights, such as UN agencies (UN Women, UNICEF), independent experts, CSO’s and associations involving migrant women and diaspora representatives.

In this framework, issues and needs of various vulnerable groups in migration, including women, children, victims of trafficking (VOT), people with disabilities and families of migrants could be considered. Their arguments and expert’s advocacy efforts helped to increase understanding of the need for specific protection and assistance mechanisms among policy and decision makers, and to inform the design of the new migration policy accordingly. For instance, the trend of ‘feminization of migration’ (women participating in both external and internal migration significantly exceeding the number of men) and needs

deriving from this process have been recognized in the assessments and objectives of the MPC in relation to their social, economic, legal and security dimension.

In this regard, the priorities stated in the MPC reflect the need for mechanisms and programmes that support economic empowerment of women, equal opportunities and access to information and services, protection from gender-based discrimination and violence. Human rights of migrants, including women have been considered from various perspectives, such as protection of labour rights of migrant workers, access to health and social services (inclusion of migrants in the pension system, protection of children left behind without parental care), political participation and representation, right to education, children rights of migrant children and other important aspects.

Conclusion 5: *Gender and human rights considerations were incorporated as main principles in the project design and implementation, and project results reflect them accordingly.*

4.2 COHERENCE

The coherence criteria examines if any synergies can be observed between this project and other similar projects implemented by IOM or other similar initiatives by government or other actors which is addressed through the following questions.

Co1. To what extent can synergies be observed between this project and other similar projects implemented by IOM or other similar initiatives by government or other actors?

- *Did the project consider and align with other IOM programmes/projects/initiatives and efforts of government and other actors?*
- *How did other actors and initiatives contribute to the project implementation and results?*

The project was coherent with development policies and initiatives implemented by IOM, the government, and other actors. In relation to the government's development priorities and actions, the project was consistent with the objectives of the National Development Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic for 2018-2040 (NDS) which underlines the importance of addressing migration issues by the government (i.e. diversification of countries of destination for Kyrgyz migrants, increase of competitiveness of migrant workforce for the global market, legal and economic protection in countries of destination, creating investment and entrepreneurship opportunities for Kyrgyz nationals living and working abroad, etc.). The project has also considered and aligned with the National Action Plan on Gender Equality 2018-2020.

IOM was appointed as the leading agency to coordinate all UN initiatives on migration issues in the Kyrgyz Republic through the UN Migration Technical Group (UNMTG) in April 2019. The UNMTG conducted a Policy Development Dialogue on migration issues to draw attention of state authorities, civil society organizations and experts to this topic and the importance of updating the State Migration Policy based on the migrants' needs. The project built upon this initiative, enabling continuation of the policy dialogue, now with the purpose of the MPC development in late 2019 and early 2020. In early 2021, the establishment of the UN Migration Network (UNMN) for the implementation of the GCM was finalized. The UNMN is coordinated by IOM and gathers all relevant UN and state agencies as well as other stakeholders. The UNMN Action Plan for 2021 encompasses different initiatives and programmes in line with the MPC, leveraging the project's results. Following the adoption of the MPC, support to the development of the National Action Plan for the implementation of the Migration Policy under the project "the Kyrgyz Republic: Leveraging Diaspora funding for Climate Action 2020-2022", while various other projects aim to address socio-economic, gender and environmental aspects of migration.

The evaluation’s respondents were aware of only few initiatives and programmes of other actors at the time of the project implementation. One of the examples was a study supported by the Hans Seidel Foundation on issues related to internal migration. Although specific migration issues were discussed or addressed through different project in recent years, the respondents agree that the most important conclusion and recommendation deriving from all of them was the need to reflect all migration-related issues in a single state policy document.

Conclusion 6: *The project has been consistent and synergetic with prior, current and follow-up initiatives and programmes of IOM, the government, and other actors. And vice versa, the project contributed to improving consistency and interlinkages across policies, programmes and initiatives.*

4.3 EFFECTIVENESS:

Effectiveness is the criteria measuring the extent to which the project succeeded to achieve its intended results, which will be described in the section below.

In terms of design, the project was developed in accordance with the IOM Project Handbook, using standard IOM templates for the project proposal and consequently, reporting. As described above under Relevance, the project has a strong and logical Theory of Change.

Et1. To what extent did the project produce the desired outputs and outcomes?

Based on cross-analysis of activities and project reports, and data gathered from online interviews during the evaluation, the following table and section provide overview of the level of achievement of the project output, outcome and objective. Overall and looking from a perspective of time when this ex-post evaluation is being implemented, all project results have been achieved or even exceeded since the time the project has been implemented.

Table 1.

Activity/result:	Evidence of achievement/indicators:	Achievement:
Activities:	Activity 1.1.1 Two (2) national experts to coordinate meetings, communicate with members of TFG, facilitate discussions throughout the whole process of Policy Development hired	Completed
	Activity 1.1.2 One training for members of TFG and State Migration Service representatives on global policies and frameworks such as SDGs and MiGOF organized	Completed
	Activity 1.1.3 1 One internal meeting with UN Women and women led-organizations/experts on mainstreaming gender considerations in migration policies organized	Completed
	Activity 1.1.4 Two 2-day workshops for members of TFG to develop draft concept of State Migration Policy organized	Completed
	Activity 1.1.5 Two internal meetings for members of TFG and other experts organized for the development of MPC	Completed
	Activity 1.1.6 One meeting with members of TFG, experts and representatives from other relevant government entities organized to	Completed

	<p>present/discuss the draft MPC and collect recommendations</p> <p>Activity 1.1.7 One follow-up internal TFG meeting to address the recommendations and revise the draft MPC organized prior to sending the document to the Prime Minister for further adoption</p>	Completed	
<p>Output 1.1 – A gender-sensitive and human rights-based Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2030 is drafted</p>	<p><u>Indicators/targets:</u></p> <p>35 TFG members participated in the workshops, disaggregated by sex and institutions</p> <p>1 training for members of TFG organized</p> <p>4 internal TFG meetings organized</p> <p>2 workshops (incl.online) with TFG members, different experts and beneficiaries organized</p> <p>70% of participants' increase knowledge on global framework related to migration such as MiGOF</p>	<p><u>Cumulative progress:</u></p> <p>Achieved and exceeded: LoPs, meeting minutes and reports demonstrate 59 participants (TFG members, experts, UN Agencies, and CSO's representatives) in the project workshops. (31 men and 28 women)</p> <p>Achieved: LoP, training report and interviewees confirm 1 training on MiGOF and SDG's organized for 32 representatives of the TFG members and State Migration Service (9 men and 23 women).</p> <p>Achieved: LoPs and meeting reports demonstrate 4 meetings on developing the Concept were organized.</p> <p>Achieved: LoPs and meeting reports demonstrate 2 two-day workshops for the MPC development were organized.</p> <p>Achieved: Post-tests surveys of 70% of participants recorded increased knowledge</p>	Achieved
<p>Outcome 1 – Improved capacities of the Kyrgyz Government to address the challenges in migration management and to align national migration policies to global frameworks</p>	<p><u>Indicators/targets:</u></p> <p>National authorities are applying gender-sensitive principles and human rights-based approach in the Migration Policy development</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Progress:</u></p> <p>Yes; the national authorities committed and applied a gender-sensitive and human rights-based approach in the developing of the Migration Policy Concept with the IOM's assistance</p>	Achieved
<p>Objective: Contribute to improving migration</p>	<p><u>Indicators/targets:</u></p> <p>1 document/policy regulating/coordinating</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Progress:</u></p> <p>Achieved: the draft Migration Policy Concept was successfully developed, submitted and</p>	Achieved and exceeded

management in the Kyrgyz Republic while ensuring that gender and human rights considerations are mainstreamed in the State Migration Policy	state efforts on migration management in line with country priorities on migration and other cross-cutting issues such as gender	published for consultations (after the project termination it was also adopted by the GoK)	with the official adoption of the MPC and follow-up AP preparation (after the project termination)
---	--	--	--

Activities – Project activities were implemented in a timely and very well-coordinated manner, both internally and externally. The project provided necessary expert, technical and material resources for the development of the migration policy concept and effectively facilitated the process of collection, exchange and dissemination of information, materials and inputs among all actors participating in the workshops and meetings. Data collected from interviews with TFG members show high level of satisfaction with the way the process of development of the MPC was organized, the quality and relevance of the content which was presented and discussed, and finally incorporated or used to inform the MPC document.

All meetings, workshops and trainings were organized as planned and agreed among project partners. The quality of representation of state agencies representatives at the meetings and workshops for the development of the MPC has been evaluated as satisfactory by most respondents, although there were examples of less qualified or insufficiently informed or prepared participants who were than not able to contribute to some of the discussions. However, changes of representatives of the actors involved were rather expected due to the intensity of activities in a short period of time, while this still provided institutional continuity in following the overall process of the MPC development.

Output – The main project output being the draft text of the MPC has been commended by the respondents who participated in the meeting and workshops. They repeatedly cited that the competence of the experts who managed to take into account and embrace all inputs, recommendations and feedback that derived from the numerous meetings and workshops in the final document.

This approach has been both **protection-centered** and **development-oriented** when considering human rights and gender perspectives which have been reflected in the project outputs. This has been noted by stakeholders which perceive MPC as a strategic document providing the necessary directions and vision ‘that was missing’ in order to have common understanding and clarity on migration issues and priorities, and mainstream migration through sectoral policies from the development angle.

The main pillars (priority areas and objectives) of the policy are listed below, with attention to the ways that gender and human rights were integrated:

1. Improvement of the conditions for the realization by the country's citizens, compatriots, immigrants and stateless persons of the educational, labour, professional and cultural potential and opportunities in the Kyrgyz Republic.

In particular, the priority refers to: creating balanced and qualified domestic labour market in accordance with the labour market demand, increasing training opportunities and employment, while decreasing **gender** segregation on the labour market, creating new jobs to be offered to the global market from the country of residence, increase accessibility of information on domestic employment **especially for women and youth**, introducing entrepreneur opportunities, minimizing adverse effects of environmental factors and related aspects.

2. Use of the migration potential of the population, compatriots, immigrants and stateless persons for the development of the Kyrgyz Republic.

Among others, the objective envisages: increasing financial literacy of migrants, employ skills and competences of diaspora in the country and include them in the pension system, attract diaspora inclusion in multi-sectoral development projects of local communities and regions, create programmes for reintegration for returning migrants with negative migration experience (**especially women**), conditions for decent work and legal recruitment for foreign citizens, etc.

3. Creation of a system for protecting the rights of citizens of the Kyrgyz Republic staying outside the country, as well as immigrants, compatriots, and stateless persons staying on the territory of the Kyrgyz Republic.

This priority encompasses issues such as: expansion of coverage of Kyrgyz citizens through organized and safe interstate programmes, improve efficiency of consular protection, improve legal literacy and information provision in all stages of the migration cycle, **especially for women and youth**, improve the documentation system for all migrants, promote interstate and non-discriminatory access to social, medical and education services, **protection of rights** and interests of children and families in difficult situation and ensuring electoral rights of Kyrgyz citizens abroad.

As summarized above, specific vulnerabilities, risks and needs of women in migration are highlighted in the MPC: risks of forced labour and human trafficking due to legal illiteracy or irregular migration, lack of programmes for decent return and sustainable reintegration for those with negative migration experience, intolerance and stigmatization, violence against women and girls, and need for protection and respect of their human rights in migration processes in general.

Based on this, 3 out of 4 MPC priorities and objectives explicitly address the need for gender-specific actions, including: create accessible information system on domestic employment, improve access to financial resources for entrepreneurial initiatives, enable training, employment and decent wages and adoption of measures on reducing existing gender segregation on the labour market, implementation of adequate rehabilitation and reintegration programmes, and improvement of the legal literacy of women

4. Creation of a safe migration environment

The last objective of the MPC covers various aspects related both to risks and drivers of forced migration including: countering human trafficking and smuggling of migrants (the latter missing the basic recognition in any existing legislative), prevention of violent extremism among migrants, comprehensive resettlement assistance, strengthening resilience and mitigating consequences of climate changes and natural disasters, and strengthening international cooperation in general as to ensure safe, orderly and regulated migration.

Outcome – The project improved the capacities of the GoK to address migration management challenges based on a comprehensive approach in migration policy planning, policy making and implementation which is aligned with global migration frameworks and standards. In this regard, there is an agreement among respondents of the evaluation that the project improved the GoK capacities to comply with and foster the implementation of the GCM and the SDGs. For example, the concept reflected the challenges identified in the Voluntary National Review (VNR) on the attainment of SDGs (especially 8 and 10), and considered many important issues in light of the GCM implementation for example collection and use of disaggregated migration data, or the proper documentation of migrants in the wider context of the digitalization of public services.

However, there is shared observation that despite the good quality of the document itself, the political nature of the MPC requires follow-up support and monitoring mechanisms that will ensure the messages

and guidelines of the concept are well understood, interpreted and as such transposed through legislative and regulatory acts.

In relation to the feasibility of all of the above, the document recognizes the necessity of amending the relevant legislative framework, and decentralization of responsibilities to the regional and local authorities. This should ensure harmonization and consistency *vis à vis* the realization of socio-economic potential in line with the MPC, as well as alignment with international law. It also highlights the necessity of improving the national statistics system as to enable integrated and disaggregated migration data to support evidence-based policy making.

Objective – The project contributed to improving migration management in the country: the Migration Policy Concept was successfully developed, submitted and published for consultations, and after the project termination it was also adopted by the GoK. It provided the necessary strategic framework and direction for further alignment of policy, programme and legal framework that should enable consistency in addressing migration-related challenges across sectoral policies. The overall contribution of the project is also seen by national authorities and experts in regard to increasing understanding of the huge impact that migration has in the country, and the urgent need to address the root causes and different drivers of migration in order to stabilize and regulate migration flows, as well as shift the paradigm from consumption to local economic development. This includes the understanding of the importance of reliable data on migration processes and migrant needs in order to follow-up with effective, evidence-based programmes and mechanisms.

Conclusion 7: *The project succeeded to achieve its intended results and even exceeded many of its targets. All activities, outputs and outcomes were accomplished as planned, following highest professional and quality standards. The objective was achieved accordingly, as the project contributed to improving migration management in the country by providing the necessary strategic framework and direction for creating coherent, consistent and development-oriented environment in addressing migration processes, challenges, and opportunities of the country.*

Et2. What were the major factors influencing achievement of the expected outputs and outcomes?

The achievements of the project results can be related to various enabling factors related to both context and structural conditions (level of understanding and commitment of the key stakeholders), as well as to the IOM's role and approach used within the project.

The main preconditions can relate to the political will, institutional set-up, and understanding on behalf of Government and leadership of the country of the need to address migration challenges and to provide an adequate strategic and policy framework in this regard. As observed from the respondents' perceptions, the project itself came in a period when the awareness as well and the institutional setting on migration had sufficiently matured to generate momentum for addressing migration as one of the country's most important priorities. This was mirrored in the highest-level political commitment, as well as competent and committed representatives of the key partner-institutions working on migration (and the project), especially the SMS.

IOM's position, in particular the organization's reputation as a reliable and competent partner in dealing with migration has been highlighted by most of the respondents as one of the factors leading to good results. IOM has been continuously supporting capacity-building activities in the last 20 years, providing trainings for the relevant state agencies on different migration topics. Cooperation frameworks and networks established through previous IOM programmes (for example, the project "Technical Assistance

to the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic to Strengthen the Legal and Operational Framework on Combating Trafficking in Persons”) provided a good starting point that was inherited by this project. In addition, some respondents noticed IOM’s increased advocacy efforts in the past few years to include migration in relevant national and local level plans and promote specific legislative acts and regulations.

On the other hand, a factor negatively affecting the implementation was the very short time available for the project to be implemented as to use the momentum and meet the deadline for the draft concept development. Based on the interviews, as well as observations of the evaluator, buffering of those effects is the result of very good internal coordination, excellent communication with government counterparts, very close cooperation with other UN entities (especially UNDP), and the overall full commitment of the IOM’s high-level management (HoO) and project/programme staff.

4.4 EFFICIENCY:

The efficiency criterion evaluates how well human, physical and financial resources were used to undertake activities, and how well were these resources converted into results. The following questions were considered accordingly.

Ey1. To what extent was the project cost-effective?

- *To what extent was the funding allocated in line with the strategy of the project and helped to achieve what the project set out to achieve?*

Ey2. Were the funds and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?

- *To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled and in line with budget allocated?*

Ey3. How well were other resources (expertise, time) being converted into results, including consideration of practices and mechanisms for coordination, M&E, and reporting?

- *To what extent did the project make the best use of all available resources?*

Ey4. How well did the partner contribution/involvement work?

- *To what extent was the coordination with the government authorities, agencies and other national key actors effective?*

The project was implemented in line with the activity plan and within the available budget. According to the financial report, 71% of the total budget was used (Staff and Office were used 80%, and 71% of the operational costs, excluding the costs for the ex-post evaluation). The savings arose mainly from the lower costs for refreshments, venues, and other technical costs, as well as unspent travel which was envisaged for RO Vienna expert who couldn’t attend the training. One of the obstacles to employ all funds was the very short period of implementation. At the same time, all intended results were achieved within the project duration, and there was no need for extension and reallocation of savings for other purposes.

The meetings, workshops and trainings were efficiently implemented within very tight deadlines. In total, seven (7) different events were organized in less than 3 months (1 training, 2 two-day workshops and 4 working meetings) gathering more than 160 participants. This translates to one event organized in every two weeks, on average, and highly intensive consultation process that required substantial technical, logistical and expert skills. Significant engagement was also needed to ensure timely information sharing and coordination of inputs and feedback among all agencies and organizations engaged in the MPC development.

The human resources included part-time engagement of the HoO (20%) and full-time engagement of one assistant, with modest (10%) support of RM and other support units. This ratio seems reasonable overall and fits the 30% limit for Staff and Office costs. However, the IOM role of being the co-chair of the TFG for the MPC development, the **intensity of activities** and challenges encountered (e.g. training facilitation) created significant pressure, **significantly stretching the capacities of the project staff** in terms of workload. This **might have been avoided with more staff and/or time for implementation of the activities** which should be considered in future project planning and designs.

Despite these challenges, the activities were implemented timely, efficiently, and effectively. Internally, **the project assistant had very good communication and coordination with the HoO, and both worked to optimize available resources and maximize results.** As an example, the above-mentioned training on SDGs was both organized and led by the HoO and the project assistant who stepped up with expertise on the topic, in addition to the one offered through regular meetings, workshops, and ongoing advocacy efforts. This was also an opportunity for promotion of competences of junior staff, and a good mitigation measure in situation where an expert from the Regional Office could not join to deliver the training as it was initially planned. Luckily the assistant was able to leverage existing knowledge and competences, as these could not have been developed in the short project timeframe.

In terms of M&E and reporting, the project envisaged one internal ex-post evaluation, and one final report which are appropriate for the scope/nature (policy-level) and duration (3 months) of the intervention. The cooperation with the donor (IDF) has been evaluated as very good by IOM representatives, highlighting straightforward procedures and good support from the Fund focal points.

Externally, the experts hired by IOM were well-known and highly competent for the task, who, as it was cited in interviews with most respondents, managed to conceptualize and formulate a good quality policy document. All meetings, workshops and trainings were organized smoothly, following agreed timelines, and ensured participation and contribution from all stakeholders.

Based on the statements from the interviews, **the participants were very satisfied with the methodology of work during these activities, as it enabled productive and proactive approach, with quality and relevant content, as well as knowledge to be obtained** (from the training). Representation was broad, coordination established at good level, meeting minutes were distributed regularly, raised problems regarding the MPC content were addressed and reflected, and revisions of the document sent to all members and representatives for approval. In this way even the participants not able to attend for any reason could learn what were the ongoing comments and suggestions. The experts and IOM representatives were capable of understanding and reconciling different opinions and ideas rising through the consultations and discussions, navigating based on the common goals and interests in relation to the desired outcomes of the migration and larger development agenda of the country. Finally, the document was drafted and finalized as planned and submitted for adoption.

Conclusion 8: *Overall, the project is an example of a short and highly efficient intervention which delivered outstanding results with minimal financial resources and stretching of staff capacities. The project was cost-effective and made the best use of available resources in less-than-ideal circumstances, given the short timeframe and mitigation to cover for planned visit by RO Vienna expert. All results were achieved within the available timeframe and funding, and funds utilized in line with the project strategy and objective. The involvement and contribution of all partners worked excellent as a result of the good internal and external coordination and cooperation.*

Recommendation 1: *Notwithstanding the need for time and cost efficiency in delivering project results, in some cases and when circumstances allow, it would be advisable and reasonable to advocate for extended*

periods of project implementation and/or allocation of more resources – whichever considered more beneficial for the quality of implementation and reasonable level of workload.

4.5 IMPACT:

The impact criterion explores the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally.

11. To what extent can long-term changes be observed (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative), particularly in relation to building capacities of relevant State actors?

- *Has the project served to design or inform discussion of follow-up projects/programmes (actual or planned)?*

The most important long-term positive effect of the project as observed by state, non-governmental and representatives of international organizations, is the **consensus on the long-term vision, and desired development outcomes of the migration governance in the country**. As highlighted during the interviews with UN agencies, this positive effect is reflected through **mainstreaming migration in sectoral policies**, especially from the development angle (e.g., creating favorable business and investment climate for the diaspora and shifting paradigm from consumption of remittances to investment of the diaspora's financial, professional, and expert resources).

Despite the overall awareness on the importance that migration has for the country, this approach was surprisingly missing before. In this regard, the project and MPC contributed to focus on migration processes and migrants as key target groups when considering development or protection measures to be implemented through, for example, economic, social, security or health policies. At the same time, it contributed to the understanding of multiplicity of factors and drivers of migration, and the need to address its root causes which, besides the traditional political or socio-economic aspects, now includes challenges such as climate-induced migration.

Secondly, the representatives of international and civil society organization state that the MPC became the **necessary strategic and policy framework that will help ensure consistency across migration-relevant laws and regulations**, but also a **key advocacy and communication tool** that was missing in explaining and justifying why it is important to push for migration- and migrant-centered approach among all stakeholders and donors which are ready to support this agenda. In this regard, the project also generated awareness of **the importance of quality and reliable migration data** for proper design of any intervention, and increased discussions on the need for effective information systems able to record, integrate and disaggregate such data.

Another positive effect of the project as perceived by the respondents is that it **helped everyone involved 'to speak the same language'**, i.e. to have a common understanding and awareness on the multifaceted aspects and consequences of migration that demand immediate attention and prioritization in the best interest of the country and its citizens.

One of the project's dialogue platform effects was for **different stakeholders to better hear each other's voice, listen and share ideas and concerns, and see it is possible to jointly address them**. CSOs especially highlighted the project's dialogue platform as an opportunity to better understand government's positions on some sensitive issues. And vice versa, state authorities highlighted better understanding of CSOs as 'the eyes and ears' at the forefront that know people's and migrants' needs and problems, including those in

most vulnerable situations. In addition, many TFG members had an opportunity for in-depth work and study on migration processes, which contributed to better understand its importance.

Several initiatives of the government, UN partners and CSOs followed in line with the MPC (as well as the pending AP for its implementation). One of the programmes designed was the “*Mekenim*” (English: ‘My Hometown’), a pilot programme for the period 2020-2022 that should have been executed by the government’s ‘Center for Project Funding of Regional Development’ as an executive agency. The programme should support migrant workers and members of their families to invest their capital in a new or existing business. However, the funds for its implementation are apparently still not available.

IOM has started a **3-year IDF-funded programme on Migration and Climate** (“Kyrgyzstan: Leveraging Diaspora funding for Climate Action 2020-2022”). It works on preparing several project proposals for the KOICA (sustainable rural development through financial inclusion and digital remittances), MPTF and other potential donors in the framework of the UNMN. As reported in the interviews with their representatives, besides several projects on reintegration at the local level, a joint IOM and UNDP project has been prepared on **migration and local development**, in particular harnessing diaspora contribution in local development (establishing hometown associations, and supporting diaspora’s investment of money, knowledge and skills in developing basic local services in local communities. Another joint project is considered based on the whole-of-government approach which will have several components, including a **strong capacity building component for representatives of the relevant state authorities** and support to the **reviewing of in the inventory of relevant legislative acts which shall be subject to revision**. IOM and UN Women implement a joint project on integrating migration and gender in local policies, strategies, and plans, while UN Women and ILO work on exploring investment opportunities for migrant women. FAO is exploring implementing good practices from projects implemented in the region, such as the pilot on matching grants implemented in Tajikistan which tried to create income-generating activities shifting the investments from infrastructure to agriculture/agribusiness. CSOs representatives mentioned various initiatives at the grass-root level working on educational activities that promote smart migration.

Many ongoing/planned projects and available funds had to be redesigned to include activities addressing Covid-19 challenges. For instance, funds were used from the Global Joint Programme on Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Strategies (SDC, IOM and UNDP) to conduct an assessment on the perceptions of local communities towards returned migrants (attitudes, acceptance and support). Nevertheless, these activities were highly beneficial to collect fresh first-hand information not only on the attitudes towards migrants coming back after losing jobs in communities where situation is already difficult, but also gave other extremely valuable information. It showed that migrants brought back money, skills, medicines, and equipment – and understanding of the key role they can have in development of their own country. It showed their strong interest to engage in communities through business initiatives, but that they need a framework and support from the local self-governments. On the other hand, local authorities said they are willing to work in engaging returning migrants and diaspora in such activities but lack the knowledge and capacities to do so. Therefore, Covid-19 could be used as an opportunity to collect information that justify further actions in line with the MPC priorities.

Conclusion 9: *The project had positive long-term effects in providing common understanding on the strategic priorities in migration which has informed the design of various programmes and initiatives of different actors.*

Conclusion 10: *The project contributed to strengthening advocacy, communication, and fundraising efforts of stakeholders in addressing various migration challenges at national, regional and local level in the country, as well as abroad, in a coherent and consistent manner.*

12. What contribution did this project make towards the intended outcomes and any observed long-term changes, considering also other relevant external factors?

- *To what extent has the project instigated further alignment and regulation of the migration governance policies and migration management legal framework in the country?*
- *Has the project helped to advance government-led initiatives and/or and regional commitments?*
- *What is the likeliness of increased gender equality as a result of the project?*

Almost 2 years after the project was completed (January 2020), at the time of the evaluation, **the draft MPC developed in early 2020 was adopted by the new Government in May 2021**. This has followed turbulent political changes, changes in the institutional setting, and changes and consequences deriving from the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. As this report is being written, **the Government is expecting the finalization of the five-year Action Plan (AP) on the implementation of the MPC for the period 2021-2025**, delegated to Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Ministry of Health and Social Development of the Kyrgyz Republic (MHSD), based on the Prime Minister's Resolution "On approval of the Concept of migration policy of the Kyrgyz Republic for 2020-2030". The AP will define timeframes, responsible implementing agencies and outcomes for the implementation of measures as envisaged by the MPC.

Although respondents think it is still early to see more significant alignments in policy and legal frameworks with the MPC (3 months after the adoption), there are some related developments which can be observed. Namely, there are ongoing discussions and/or changes of some relevant legislation which are not deriving only from the need to align with the MPC, while the AP itself envisages specific legislative reviews as part of creating supportive legal framework to implement its measures. All respondents mention they are currently looking into creating an inventory of migration-relevant legislative and regulatory acts, and several are already identified for revision based on the provisions of MPC. One of those is the **Law on Changes of the Law on External Labour Migration**. The parliament returned the proposal and decided to develop a new draft law on external migration that will incorporate all provisions outlined in the Migration Policy.

Respondents from IOM and other UN agencies described the project as an **accelerator towards the GCM and MiGOF** (in the case of IOM), especially the **whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach** in addressing migration processes. The MPC was one of the strategic documents used for the Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA) – one of the main tools used to identify the level of alignment between national priorities and SDG implementation and attainment on the subnational level, as well as areas that can benefit from actions to accelerate SDG progress. It has also provided impetus toward acceleration of regional commitments within the Almaty process, as well as the EAEU and the EEC on ensuring equal working conditions (recognition of education documents/academic degrees) and social guarantees (pension provision for migrant workers from the member countries). The latter is also applicable for bilateral agreements in the region, such as with Republic of Korea and Turkey.

Although gender considerations are not explicitly visible in the expected results of the MPC, these can be derived from the stated priorities and objectives. Therefore, **gender issues are likely to continue to be addressed towards increasing gender equality**, but in order to ensure this, gender-specific indicators should be included in monitoring of progress towards the expected MPC results.

Conclusion 11: *The project results, and MPC in particular, are likely to contribute to gender equality in future. However, gender-specific indicators should be included in monitoring of progress towards the expected MPC results.*

Recommendation 2: Continue the involvement in the development/implementation of the MPC AP 2021-2025 as well as appropriate M&E system, including and monitoring gender-specific indicators, and designing joint programmes which would contribute to the attainment of gender-specific and other AP targets.

4.6 SUSTAINABILITY:

The sustainability criteria is used to evaluate if the project's results or its benefits will continue once external support ceases.

S1. What does the project have as an element(s) of sustainability?

- *To what extent have the stakeholders and beneficiaries taken ownership of the outputs?*
- *What were the measures taken to have the effects of the project be maintained after the project completion?*

The **project results are fully owned by national stakeholders** as the project has been initiated and designed as a response to the government needs and official decision to develop a new migration policy in late 2019/beginning of 2020. As a result, the draft MPC was developed and submitted for public consultations and approval of the government. Although political disturbances and institutional changes led to a period of vacuum preventing any policy developments, **improving migration management to mitigate its negative and enforce positive effects** has continued and **remains a priority policy and decision makers** in the period of the ex-post evaluation.

As highlighted during the interviews, the wider ownership of project results in the political system can be observed in the fact that **one of the first five decrees of the newly elected president in January 2021 was on migration**, and that the MPC 2020-2030 was finally approved and adopted in May 2021. Basically, the work done before and through the project allowed to move quickly once the conditions were there. This has been followed by the **resolution to develop and adopt the first 5-year Action Plan (2021-2025) for the MPC implementation**, which has added to the favorable condition to boost initiatives for its implementation.

'The MPC is the key document for looking into migration management and governance that brought clarity to what is happening and why and how migration should be mainstreamed through other sectors and from a development angle' – UN agency representative.

IOM continues to be in the forefront of these processes, co-leading and co-facilitating the preparation of the AP together with the mandated institutions and other states and UN agencies, CSOs, and other stakeholders most of which also participated in the MPC development. There is a good sense of continuity and achievement among the key actors in the process which could be observed from the interviews, and **significant efforts are in place to develop joint programmes and projects for the operationalization of the MPC and AP.**

'This project has enriched me, professionally and personally, and enabled me to share my ideas through a dialogue platform where they could be heard and realized' – independent expert.

Although a short period has passed since the MPC adoption, there is **some evidence of ongoing harmonization of relevant legal acts and regulations which can be attributed to the MPC.** Moreover, the fact that the MPC document itself envisages 'conducting an inventory and harmonization of current normative legal acts in the field of migration and related fields, including in accordance with international

law, these processes are highly likely to continue with more intensity after the adoption of the AP (2021-2025).

S2 Were the activities appropriately designed to ensure sustainability of project benefits?

- *How was sustainability included in the initial design (proposal and planning documents)?*

The project design and methodology of work enabled meaningful involvement, namely, commitment, contribution and ownership by all actors included. As cited in interviews, the fact that *'everyone related to migration was there'* – state agencies, UN and other international organizations, the civil society, the academic and expert community, and migrants themselves – created a sense of joint cause and goal that is for the benefit of whole of the government and whole of the society and can only be achieved if everyone works together.

S3 Do the stakeholders have necessary structures, resources and processes in place, and have those been used since the end of the project to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support? If not, why not?

- *Are project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits?*
- *Have you seen improved sustainability based on the combined efforts of several projects that IOM runs in migration management?*
- *Were there any additional measures that could have been taken to make this project more sustainable?*

Stakeholders' Capacities

The technical, financial and managerial **capacities to pursue the positive effects of the project are rather limited and affected by several political, institutional, economic and social factors.**

According to observations of independent experts and UN and CSOs representatives, the political developments in the country in the last two years have led to **losses in institutional memory and related competences within the state institutions.** In this regard, they expect that the planned cuts of staff in public administration will additionally limit already overburdened capacities of the state agencies. Low wages and absence of other incentives for professional development additionally affect the public servants' motivation and commitment. This can significantly decrease the level of engagement in any policy processes, including those affiliated to this project, increasing the demand for external support and questioning sustainability. Finally, the potential changes of the political system and institutional set-up after the parliamentary elections could also generate challenges to maintain the right level of coordination and cooperation.

In order to mitigate downfalls of such developments to some extent, UN and experts state that the envisaged programmes and projects which are currently being designed should include strong capacity building components for representatives of the relevant state authorities, as well as support for proper coordination structures and mechanisms.

Feasibility of the MPC has been debated based on lack of financial constrains before, and some respondents pointed to the fact that **securing financial support for many of the envisaged actions will be difficult.** This issue has apparently already been raised for some of the pending programmes (e.g. *'Mekenim'*). The ongoing economic situation is unfavorable in general, given that the detrimental effects of the pandemic in the last two years increased the poverty rate to more than 5% compared to 2019.

In this regard, it has been highlighted by government representatives that the AP will look into implementing measures within existing institutional budgets, in order to ensure feasibility and avoid uncertain new/additional budget allocations. As explained, based on the MPC, the implementation plans of existing policy and legal frameworks will mainstream and incorporate migration issues and migrants as beneficiaries in existing financial frameworks and resources that are already allocated to be redistributed in a way that contribute to achieving the policy objectives. As the AP should identify the existing resources, one of key discussion points was how to formulate clear objectives that rely on existing policies and do not require additional budget, and in a way that is doable and achievable in the timeframe set. Taking this into account, the funding available through the international development assistance would have to be prioritized and optimized to complement any gaps identified in the medium and long-term.

The UNMN is considered an important coordination and advocacy mechanism for action upon ongoing developments and needs, as well as the civil society that seems to have the strength, expertise and commitment to influence policy and decision making in the country.

IOM's capacities

While IOM is seen as the key actor and partner in supporting all governmental efforts toward the implementation of the migration agenda, the increasing number of responsibilities entrusted by state agencies as well as within the UN system are overstressing the organization's existing capacities. Exclusively projectized funding and limited funding opportunities to employ and retain new staff put huge pressure and tremendous workload on the current employees and resources, especially alongside IOM's ongoing internal institutional and operational changes globally.

Therefore, possible actions should be explored to increase the human and technical capacities of the Office and mitigate implications on the IOM's competitiveness. This could include more staff being employed, while retaining existing, highly competent and experienced staff who have been overstretched to take on the increasing responsibilities on various levels. In addition, introducing core funding for at least some staff and office costs would be a significant relief. This would help IOM to remain in capacity to deliver high-level and high-quality results, but also to follow-up on the results of previous projects in question as well as other projects.

Conclusion 12: *The project results are fully owned by national stakeholders, including through the ongoing commitment of policy and decision makers to improve migration management in order to mitigate its negative and enforce positive effects. The technical, financial and managerial capacities for continuing the positive effects of the project are rather limited and affected by several political, institutional, economic and social factors. Still, significant efforts of all stakeholders are in place to develop joint programmes and projects for the operationalization of the MPC and AP and there is evidence of ongoing harmonization of related legal acts and regulations.*

Additional measures that could make the project results more sustainable

In the view of the respondents, various additional measures could be taken to make the project results more sustainable.

The most important feature recognized by the experts is the **establishment of effective and independent Monitoring and Evaluation mechanisms** to track progress of the implementation of the MPC and accompanying the first 5-year Action Plan. Such activities are already envisaged by the AP through the inclusion of a results matrix with quantitative indicators and with **progress reports which are to be**

prepared every six months. In order for this process to be effective, these reports should be **considered by all relevant stakeholders in the Parliament** (including expert/academia and CSOs), while the **recommendations on improving the implementation should be addressed at the highest political level of the executive power** (e.g., the level of the Prime Minister). This level of involvement would also state the true commitment of the government to address issues associated with migration.

Experts and CSOs representatives highlighted the need to **re-establish a single authorized institution in charge of migration governance issues in the country.** Notwithstanding the cross-cutting nature of migration which falls under the mandate of various Ministries and State authorities, one central authority is needed for the coordination and monitoring of migration policy development and implementation. There is a Coordination Council on Migration headed by the Vice Prime Minister established to address issues associated with migration processes. However, this structure is not a permanent authorized state agency, while tremendous efforts will be needed for the MPC implementation, including rising issues in the parliament and with the Government while including all other relevant stakeholders.

In this regard, the need for **clear division of roles/mandate, responsibilities and accountability** is highlighted by one of the UN representatives in order to ensure **horizontal (inter-and intra-institutional) and vertical (central, regional and local level) coherence of actions.** This could be operationalized through a government decree on the whole-of-government approach, and designation of permanent positions/focal points on migration at the national and local levels.

CSO representatives underlined that in order for the concept to become operational it must be reflected in all related legislative acts, laws, bylaws, regulations. One of the modalities could be the establishment of parallel/thematic working groups of interested parties, to **work on proposals for amendments of current legislation** that regulates issues of migration from the point of view of MPC. The activities should also include monitoring of new laws being developed, to ensure their provisions reflect MPC objectives. It could also be favorable to make ready-made legislative acts with engagement of expert community and offer them as an ownership of the Government.

CSOs are seen (by themselves and other respondents) as **key implementation partners** in ensuring community-based responses to the genuine needs of their constituencies, as well as local ownership and sustainability of follow-up actions. Additional attention should be given to the **potential interest and possibility of partnerships with the private sector.** In parallel, the MPC objectives should be properly communicated and advocated for with migrants and migrants and their associations abroad.

Even though a certain amount of knowledge on migration is generated and sustained over time, there is also a recognized and constant need for **capacity building activities increasing understanding, knowledge and competences for migration management of the relevant policy and decision makers, civil servants and service providers** of all relevant institutions and organizations, to mitigate the effects of high fluctuation of staff.

Overall, there are favorable circumstances that can be leveraged from the project results and opportunity to implement measures which contribute to their sustainability. However, some respondents underlined that migration remains a very appealing political topic to juggle with in terms of political benefits. Therefore, true political will and commitment also remains to be seen through proper interpretation and implementation of the MPC provisions.

Conclusion 13: *There are favorable circumstances and capacities to introduce measures that would improve the prospects of sustainability of the project's results which require all stakeholder's involvement. Such measures may include setting up an M&E system for the AP, promoting a lead institution for migration*

governance and clear division of roles and mandates, legislative amendments, partnerships with CSOs as well as private sector, and ongoing capacity building. IOM is recognized by all stakeholders as the key partner for supporting and facilitating the government in these processes which will require additional efforts and engagement of the organization's capacities.

Recommendation 3: *IOM would benefit from increasing the Office capacities to better respond to migration management responsibilities and commitments in relation to the government as well as the UN system. This should employ additional and optimize current technical, material, financial and human resources, including through cross-project linkages and with the support of IOM's regional/HQ departments as needed.*

Recommendation 4: *Explore further opportunities for multi-year and multi-stakeholder programmes in line with the MPC and AP priorities that would enable continuity of actions within larger-scale interventions, as well as prospects for significant impact and sustainability.*

Recommendation 5: *Continue the good cooperation and support provided to the government to further strengthen the institutional set-up and capacities based on clear roles and responsibilities of all respective actors, and in line with the whole of the government and whole of society approach.*

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Summary of conclusions and recommendations

RELEVANCE:

Conclusion 1: The project was designed as a response to the need and decision of the GoK to develop a new Migration Policy Concept and was extremely timely and relevant as such. It facilitated the policy dialogue on a broad spectrum of migration-related issues and contributed to redefine migration management priorities based on a wider and development-oriented outlook. In line with this, the project worked to increase main stakeholders' knowledge and understanding of migration management from a development and human rights-based perspective, based on international standards and principles.

Conclusion 2: The project was very well aligned with GCM, the SDGs and the Agenda 2030 as well as the IOM Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF).

Conclusion 3: Although the context is rather changed due to new political and economic developments, the ToC remained valid, and the project results remain applicable to the newly emerged challenges. There is awareness among all key stakeholders on the importance of sound migration policies for addressing some of the most important development challenges of the country, and the need to operationalize those through follow-up measures and programmes.

Conclusion 4: Comprehensive and effective engagement of all relevant actors was ensured through the project design and good quality of implementation.

Conclusion 5: Gender and human rights considerations were incorporated as main principles in the project design and implementation, and project results reflect them accordingly.

COHERENCE:

Conclusion 6: The project has been consistent and synergetic with prior, current and follow-up initiatives and programmes of IOM, the government, and other actors. And vice versa, the project contributed to improving consistency and interlinkages across policies, programmes and initiatives.

EFFECTIVENESS:

Conclusion 7: The project succeeded to achieve its intended results and even exceeded many of its targets. All activities, outputs and outcomes were accomplished as planned and following highest professional and quality standards. The objective was achieved accordingly, as the project contributed to improving migration management in the country by providing the necessary strategic framework and direction for creating coherent, consistent and development-oriented environment in addressing migration processes, challenges, and opportunities of the country.

EFFICIENCY:

Conclusion 8: Overall, the project is an example of a short and highly efficient intervention which delivered outstanding results with minimal financial resources and stretching of staff capacities. The project was cost-effective and made the best use of available resources in the less-than-ideal circumstances, given short time frame and mitigation to cover for planned visit by RO Vienna expert. All results were achieved within the available timeframe and funding, and funds utilized in line with the project strategy and objective. The

involvement and contribution of all partners worked excellent as a result of the good internal and external coordination and cooperation.

Recommendation 1: *Notwithstanding the need for time- and cost-efficiency in delivering project results, in some cases and when circumstances allow, it would be advisable and reasonable to advocate for extended periods of project implementation and/or allocation of more human or other resources – whichever considered more beneficial for the quality of implementation and reasonable level of workload.*

IMPACT:

Conclusion 9: The project had positive long-term effects in providing common understanding on the strategic priorities in migration which has informed the design of various programmes and initiatives of different actors.

Conclusion 10: The project contributed to strengthening advocacy, communication, and fundraising efforts of stakeholders in addressing various migration challenges at the national, regional and local level in the country, as well as abroad, in a coherent and consistent manner.

Conclusion 11: The project results, and MPC in particular, are likely to contribute to gender equality in future. However, gender-specific indicators should be included in monitoring of progress towards the expected MPC results.

Recommendation 2: *Continue the involvement in the development/implementation of the MPC AP 2021-2025 as well as appropriate M&E system, including and monitoring gender-specific indicators, and designing joint programs which would contribute to the attainment of gender-specific and other AP targets.*

SUSTAINABILITY:

Conclusion 12: The project results are fully owned by national stakeholders, including through the ongoing commitment of policy and decision makers to improve migration management in order to mitigate its negative and enforce positive effects. The technical, financial and managerial capacities for continuing the positive effects of the project are rather limited and affected by several political, institutional, economic and social factors. Still, significant efforts of all stakeholders are in place to develop joint programmes and projects for the operationalization of the MPC and AP and there is evidence of ongoing harmonization of related legal acts and regulations.

Conclusion 13: There are favorable circumstances and capacities to introduce measures that would improve the prospects of sustainability of the project's results which require all stakeholder's involvement. Such measures may include setting up an M&E system for the AP, promoting a lead institution for migration governance and clear division of roles and mandates, legislative amendments, partnerships with CSOs as well as private sector, and ongoing capacity building. IOM is recognized by all stakeholders as the key partner for supporting and facilitating the government in these processes which will require additional efforts and engagement of the organization's capacities.

Recommendation 3: *IOM would benefit from increasing the Office capacities to better respond to migration management responsibilities and commitments in relation to the government as well as the UN system. This should employ additional and optimize current technical, material, financial and human resources, including through cross-project linkages and with the support of IOM's regional/central departments as needed.*

Recommendation 4: Explore further opportunities for multi-year and multi-stakeholder programmes in line with the MPC and AP priorities that would enable continuity of actions within larger-scale interventions, as well as prospects for significant impact and sustainability.

Recommendation 5: Continue the good cooperation and support provided to the government to further strengthen the institutional set-up and capacities based on clear roles and responsibilities of all respective actors, and in line with the whole of the government and whole of society approach.

5.2 Lessons learned and good practices

Several good practice examples and lessons learned permeate from the evaluation.

Good practices:

IOM's highly proactive engagement in supporting migration management through continuous advocacy, monitoring, awareness-rising and capacity building efforts is one of the key good practices observed through the evaluation of the project. This approach **generated potential which could be effectively mobilized when other conditions** were met in the wider political, economic and social context, **to achieve common development and rights-based goals in migration.**

In relation to the above, there was a good example of **how commitment of key political and state authorities could mature over time and accelerate execution of the migration agenda.** Another good practice was the demonstration of how **inclusive policy-creation process which *de facto* ensured interests, views and contributions of all stakeholders to be considered, increased understanding and trust among stakeholders.** All this together led to and provided a **good example of creating a strong sense of ownership and accountability to a common goal, based** on understanding that **joint efforts in migration were meaningful and made a difference towards commonweal for the government and the society as a whole.**

Finally, looking from a wider perspective, the whole project intervention can be considered a good practice for IDF and IOM as such. As IDF **provides resources** to Missions and Offices worldwide to support Member States to strengthen migration management capacities, the project demonstrates the importance and potential long-term impact of this 'seed funding' **in situations where timely response to emerging policy-windows is needed.**

Lessons learned:

Overall, a lesson learned is the importance of planning for sufficient human resources and/or time for projects implementation to avoid overstretching the organization's capacities, while maintaining the good quality of the work and results. In this regard **Missions/Offices could advocate for, and IDF could consider flexible approaches towards the ratio between staff and office costs, operational costs, and project implementation timeframes** tailored to specific needs/situations.

6. Annexes

6.1 Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Internal Ex-post Evaluation of the project PO.0143: “Improved Migration Management through Policy Development in Kyrgyzstan”

Commissioned by: IOM Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic

Project Identification:	
Executing Organization:	International Organization for Migration (IOM), Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic
Project Management Site	Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
Relevant Regional Office	RO Vienna
Donor	IOM Development Fund (IDF)
Project Period and Overall Duration:	3 months October 21, 2019 to January 21, 2020
Geographical Coverage:	Kyrgyzstan
Project Beneficiaries:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Direct Beneficiaries: Government of Kyrgyz Republic including State Migration Service• Indirect Beneficiaries: migrants and their families
Project Partner(s):	The Task Force Group of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, which consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Various state agencies (such as State Migration Service; Ministry of Economy; Ministry of Labour and Social Development; Ministry of Culture, Information and Tourism; Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Internal Affairs; Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA); State Agency on Youth issues; State Border Service; State Registration Agency; Prime-Minister’s Administration,• Independent experts and academia,• UN Agencies (UN Women, ILO),• Women-led organizations.
Total Funding Received:	USD 37,887
Total Funding spent (before evaluation):	USD 26,881

1. Evaluation context

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is a longstanding partner to the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic and for more than two decades has been providing comprehensive expertise and technical assistance on various areas of migration governance, including migration related policies, counter-trafficking, migration activities and others.

The 2018-2040 National Development Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic notes the importance of addressing migration issues. In April 2019, IOM Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic was appointed by the United Nations Resident Coordinator (UNRC) to be a leading agency to coordinate all UN initiatives on migration issues in Kyrgyzstan and the UN Migration Technical Group (UNMTG) was established at the country level. As its first initiative, the UNMTG conducted Policy Development Dialogue on migration issues to draw attention to the state authorities, civil society organizations and experts of the importance of developing the State Migration Policy with a migrant centered and human rights based approach. In this context, the Kyrgyz Government has requested for IOM's assistance to draft and develop a comprehensive State Migration Policy. Therefore, the inter-ministerial Task Force Group (TFG) was established by the Government's Resolution with IOM as a co-chair. The Task Force Group consisted of various state agencies (ministries), independent experts and academia's, UN Agencies (UN Women, ILO, UNICEF, UNODC, FAO and others), diaspora association representatives, women-led non-governmental organizations and migrants themselves.

Within the framework of assistance on drafting and developing a comprehensive State Migration Policy with TFG members expertise, during the period of October 21, 2019 – January 21, 2020, IOM Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic implemented the project **“Improved Migration Management through Policy Development in Kyrgyzstan”** (PO.0143), funded by the IOM Development Fund. The overall objective of this project was to assist the Government of Kyrgyzstan to improve migration management at the national level while ensuring that gender and human rights considerations are mainstreamed in the State Migration Policy. The project was also aimed to contribute to the implementation of the 2018-2040 National Development Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic, mentioning migration regulation as one of the key priorities in the country's development. During the project implementation period IOM provided support to the Government of Kyrgyzstan by organizing workshops to increase the knowledge of government counterparts on global migration frameworks including Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and its Agenda 2030. Further, IOM assisted in the drafting of the State Migration Policy Concept in collaboration with different government entities, non-governmental organizations, UN agencies, women-led organizations, women-migrants and diaspora representatives.

The intended output of this project was the draft of a gender-sensitive and human rights-based Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2030, contributing to the intended outcome of improved capacities of the Kyrgyz Government to address the challenges in migration management and to align national migration policies to global frameworks. To those ends, national experts were hired to support communication, coordination of meetings, and facilitation of discussions. Activities included meetings, a training on global policies and frameworks (e.g. SDGs and MiGOF), and workshops for drafting the concept of State Migration Policy.

Evidence of achievements to date include the successful development of the Migration Policy Concept, and its publishing on a government website for public discussion (<https://www.gov.kg/ru/npa/s/2278>). The Concept was already circulated for comments among ministries and made available for comments from the public for a 30-day period until the end of March 2020 with all attachments and supporting documentation in Russian and Kyrgyz languages. A public hearing was planned to include civil society and the public in general to discuss the content of the Concept, but it was postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic and related lockdowns. Despite the changes in government structure due to Presidential elections, the Migration Policy Concept is still under revision for the approval in President's office. Additionally, it was observed during meetings of state stakeholders on the Voluntary National Review (VNR) that some of the TFG members were actively mainstreaming migration issues. It is the first VNR that Kyrgyzstan has submitted.

2. Evaluation purpose

The evaluation intends to assess the relevance, coherence of the interventions vis a vis other interventions, the effectiveness and performance of the project, the efficiency of project management and implementation, and the impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will also document lessons learned and make recommendations that IOM and project partners, namely government entities, experts, and civil society partners, might use to improve the design and implementation of other and future related projects and programmes.

The evaluation aims to promote transparency and accountability which will, in turn, assist the Fund in its decision-making and to better equip staff to make judgments about the project and to improve effectiveness where possible and with regard to future project funding. Concerning the expected use of findings, the ex-post evaluation aims to also identify lessons learned, good practices, and provide a learning opportunity for the Fund and its implementing partners with regard to the project formulation process. The findings will also help make evidence-based strategic decisions in relation to specific projects, while also demonstrating the Fund's on-going commitment to results based management.

3. Evaluation scope

The intervention period being evaluated shall cover the entire project period from October 21, 2019 to January 21, 2020. The evaluation geographical scope will cover Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan where all the major stakeholders and partners who engaged in the project activities are located. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, online meetings and phone calls with project participants will be considered for evaluation as well.

4. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria will be guided by all six OECD-DAC criteria: relevance, coherences, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will also assess how effectively issues of gender equality and human rights protection were mainstreamed in the process of project design and during project implementation.

5. Evaluation questions

This evaluation should aim to answer the following questions:

Relevance:

- To what extent is the project design relevant to needs and priorities at the national and regional levels?
- To what extent is the project aligned to the Global Compact on Migration (GCM) and the Agenda 2030, as well as to IOM's global Strategic Vision?
- Is the Theory of Change suited for the context, responsive to the identified challenge(s), and logically linked?
- To what extent did IOM engage national stakeholders in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?
- To what extent was gender and human rights considered in the design of this project?

Coherence

- To what extent can synergies be observed between this project and other similar projects implemented by IOM or other similar initiatives by government or other actors?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent did the project produce the desired outputs and outcomes?
- What were the major factors influencing achievement of the expected outputs and outcomes?

Efficiency:

- To what extent was the project cost-effective?
- Were the funds and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
- How well were other resources (expertise, time) being converted into results, including consideration of practices and mechanisms for coordination, M&E, and reporting?
- How well did the partner contribution/involvement work?

Impact:

- To what extent can long-term changes be observed (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative), particularly in relation to building capacities of relevant State actors?
- What contribution did this project make towards the intended outcomes and any observed long-term changes, considering also other relevant external factors?

Sustainability:

- What does the project have as an element(s) of sustainability?
- Were the activities appropriately designed to ensure sustainability of project benefits?
- Do the stakeholders have necessary structures, resources and processes in place, and have those been used since the end of the project to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support? If not, why not?

IOM is interested in all conclusions that can be reached on the above questions, but the evaluator should give particular focus to good practices or drawbacks in the implementation and provide recommendations to IOM and project stakeholders, namely government entities, experts and civil society partners for follow-up activities.

6. Evaluation methodology

An evaluation framework will be developed and focus on all of the six standard DAC criteria and cross-cutting themes criteria (gender, human rights), supported by standard tools (evaluation matrix) and will take place over a period of three months.

The evaluation will be conducted remotely, in line with COVID 19 restrictions and take a participatory approach involving and consulting with the relevant stakeholders (IDF, IOM regional office staff) in the different steps of the evaluation and integrating this approach into the methodology as far as is feasible.

The following data collection methods will be used in the evaluation:

1. Desk review of the existing project documents, including project reports and other relevant documentation (agendas, minutes of meetings and workshops), reports of experts/consultants hired for assisting with data collection and development of the Concept of Migration Policy.
2. Semi-structured interviews with the project management and staff, relevant project partners

and other stakeholders as needed (to be further determined during the preparation phase, see section 7 below).

3. A survey may also be considered, to be confirmed in the inception phase.

Stakeholders to be consulted in the interviews and/or survey should include members of the TFG and UNMTG. The full list of stakeholders will be confirmed during the inception phase.

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

7. Evaluation workplan

Role of Parties

The evaluator will be responsible for preparing for and carrying out data collection and analysis and delivering the products outlined below. The evaluator should provide periodic feedback as needed to the Evaluation Manager (the Project Manager) on progress and any challenges faced.

IOM Mission in the Kyrgyz Republic will provide logistical support (transportation, interpretation, translation, provision of project documents, etc.) and arrange interviews with project stakeholders as required by the evaluator. The Project Manager will be responsible for managing the evaluation process including feedback and comments to the inception report and draft evaluation report and helping to address any issues or challenges flagged by the evaluator.

Deliverables

An **inception report** will be prepared by the evaluator and shared with the project management. The report should include at minimum an evaluation matrix.

Following the data collection, the evaluator will debrief the Project Manager. Building on the debrief and initial feedback received, the evaluator will produce a draft report that will be shared with the Project Manager for review. The Project Manager will consolidate feedback and present it to the Evaluator. Feedback should focus on technical aspects and not on the conclusions or findings, unless those are based on inaccurate or incomplete information, in which case corrected or supplemental information should be provided.

The final outputs of the evaluation will be an **Evaluation Report** and a two-page **evaluation brief** following the IDF template.

The evaluation report will follow the template in the IOM Project Handbook: executive summary, list of acronyms, introduction, evaluation context and purpose, evaluation framework and methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Annexes should include the TOR, inception report, list of documents reviewed, list of persons interviewed or consulted and data collection instruments. The length of the Report should not exceed 30 pages in total (excluding the annexes). The Report should be analytical in nature, and be structured around issues and related findings/lessons learned, and include actionable recommendations.

The **evaluation brief** should be no more than two pages and should follow the IOM template, which includes: identification of audience of the learning brief; project information (project title, countries covered, project type and code, project duration, project period, donor(s), and budget); evaluation background (evaluation purpose, evaluation team, evaluation timeframe, type of evaluation,

methodology); and evaluation results: Key findings and/or conclusions, best practices and lessons learned (optional), and key recommendations.

Finally, the evaluator will provide a draft Management Response Matrix with proposed timeline and actions related to the recommendations posed in the evaluation report. This will be drafted in close coordination with the Project Manager, who will then finalize afterwards the matrix in coordination with other relevant colleagues and partners.

Timing and duration

The total duration of the evaluation will be three months within the period of **May to July 2021** according to the following tentative plan, with precise dates to be agreed upon with the selected evaluator:

Preparation (two weeks) – Evaluator:

- Collection of and acquaintance with project documents, project progress reports and other relevant project-related materials;
- Designing the inception report with detailed evaluation scope and methodology;
- Setting up the mission dates and preparation of the detailed mission programme in cooperation with the Project Manager;
- Communication with the Project Manager to clarify any other matters.

Preparation (two weeks) – Project Manager:

- Timely provide all necessary project documentation and information;
- Organize the schedule of the mission, arrange transportation for the evaluator and organize translation/interpretation, when necessary.

Data collection (one to two weeks) – Evaluator:

- Briefing with IOM, meetings and interviews;
- Meetings and interviews with project stakeholders and partners;
- Debrief of initial findings and tentative conclusions and recommendations.

Elaboration of the draft report (six weeks) – Evaluator:

- Additional desk review and analysis of data;
- Completion of the draft report;
- Presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions.

Review of the draft report (one week) – Project Manager:

- Compilation of feedback from project management team and Chief of Mission.

Elaboration of the final report (one week):

- Incorporation of comments and revision of the draft report;
- Finalization of the report, the evaluation brief, and draft management response.

8. Budget

The total available budget for the evaluation is 1,894 USD. It will cover expenses related to the evaluator's travel, accommodation and DSA. If travel is not possible, the budget could be used for interpretation.

6.2 Evaluation matrix

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

IMPROVED MIGRATION MANAGEMENT THROUGH POLICY DEVELOPMENT IN KYRGYZSTAN

Evaluation Matrix

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION (AS PER THE TOR)

The overall objectives of the evaluation are: *‘to assess the relevance, coherence of the interventions vis à vis other interventions, the effectiveness and performance of the project, the efficiency of project management and implementation, and the impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will also document lessons learned and make recommendations that IOM and project partners, namely government entities, experts, and civil society partners, might use to improve the design and implementation of other and future related projects and programmes’.*

The evaluation also aims to promote transparency and accountability which will, in turn, assist the Fund in its decision-making and to better equip staff to make judgments about the project and to improve effectiveness where possible and with regard to future project funding. Concerning the expected use of findings, the ex-post evaluation aims to also identify lessons learned, good practices, and provide a learning opportunity for the Fund and its implementing partners with regard to the project formulation process. The findings will also help make evidence-based strategic decisions in relation to specific projects, while also demonstrating the Fund’s on-going commitment to results based management.

2. EVALUATION MATRIX

Using the questions formulated in the TOR, the Evaluator has identified the type of questions that would need to be answered during the interviews with main stakeholders. Furthermore, the sources of the information were identified¹.

For each group of interviewees, the questions may be slightly modified in the semi-structured interview forms:

1. IOM – this includes the project manager, the Chief of Mission, the RMO and other staff who have been working on the project or other related projects. Depending on the person interviewed, some questions may be skipped if the interviewee is not in a position to answer them. Interviews will preferably be done separately.
2. Donor – these are questions that will be asked to an IDF interviewee (if/where relevant).
3. Government – this is a larger group of interviewees that include: the Government counterpart representatives of the institutions and line ministries involved in the project; questions will be adjusted based on the concrete representative being interviewed.
4. Beneficiaries, in particular officials who have been trained and hence can provide their personal

¹ This is based solely on the review of the proposal and may be adjusted as the other documents are provided.

experience and potential impact that the project has had on their work.

Data collection method:

1. Document review: relevant documents will be reviewed in line with the questions below to determine if information is available. Documents will be received from the project staff but may also be found by the evaluator.
2. Semi-structured interviews: this will be used for most of the interviewees during the on-line stakeholder interviewing process. Questions will be based on the evaluation matrix below but adjusted according to the interviewee. Preferably these will take place in one-to-one interviews but this can be modified based on the timing and availability of some of the interviewees.

Survey (to be determined): A survey could be done with government representatives through available on-line tools on their experience of participating in project workshops and capacity building activities (training) in order to identify how they benefited them, as well as the project and the quality of results. This will could be further discussed with IOM Kyrgyz Republic to explore the feasibility and possible effectiveness of such an exercise in relation to the identified interviewees and information expected to be collected through the interviews.

IDF FUNDED PROJECT: IMPROVED MIGRATION MANAGEMENT THROUGH POLICY DEVELOPMENT IN KYRGYZSTAN (PO.0143)

EVALUATION MATRIX

CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)		SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS		DATA SOURCES AND DATA COLLECTION TOOLS			
	Evaluation questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Documents (desk review)	Stakeholders (semi-structured interviews)		
					IOM	Govt	Donor
Relevance	R1. To what extent is the project design relevant to needs and priorities at the national and regional levels?	Did the project approach respond well to the identified needs? Were there any identifiable gaps that can be observed now?	Perceptions of stakeholders of the relevance of the project approach, and identification of current or likely future gaps. Documented assessments and stakeholder perceptions.	Project documents	X	X	X
		Is the project aligned to a larger strategy on the national or regional level?	Identify/receive relevant documentation to identify links between the project and existing policies.	Project documents, relevant government and regional policy reports/documents.	X	X	X
	R2. To what extent is the project aligned to the Global Compact on Migration (GCM) and the Agenda 2030, as well as to IOM's global Strategic Vision?	To what extent was the project in alignment with the GCM, the Agenda 2030 and the IOM global Strategic vision?	Alignment with IOM global strategies. Alignment with other international migration governance standards and principles, as well as consultation and coordination efforts to ensure alignment.	IOM Strategy, MiGOF, GCM, relevant global strategies Project documents	X	X	X
	R3. Is the Theory of Change suited for the context, responsive to the identified challenge(s), and logically linked?	What were the hypotheses and assumptions within the ToC and to what degree did they remain valid?	Definitions and assumptions regarding migration governance and migration management, including regular and irregular migration, return processes, vulnerability, capacity, and protection.	Project documents, project and research reports, policy documents.	X	X	
		Did the context shift during and has it changed since the project implementation? How?	Changes in the social, political, security and economic context. Perceptions of stakeholders of changes in the social, political, security and economic context.	Project documents, project and research reports, policy documents.	X	X	X

		What was the results chain linking project input to project outcomes?	Inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and objective. Extent to which there are logical cause-effect linkages among inputs, outputs and outcomes.	Project documents, project and research reports, policy documents.	X	X	
	R4. To what extent did IOM engage national stakeholders in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?	Was the involvement of stakeholders well-balanced, sufficiently inclusive and representative of all key actors and interests?	Documented assessments and stakeholder perceptions on the degree of the involvement of all actors.	Project documents, project reports (meeting minutes and lists of participants).	X	X	
	R5. To what extent was gender and human rights considered in the design of this project?	Was the project design appropriate for ensuring that gender and human rights issues are properly and consistently integrated in project activities and results?	Project Proposal and other planning/reporting/monitoring documents determine if gender was included in the strategy, results matrix, etc. Evidence of integration of gender mainstreaming using IOM checklist from project handbook, and human rights using the IOM Results-Based Approach manual. Documented assessments and stakeholder perceptions.	Project documents, project reports (meeting minutes and lists of participants).	X	X	X
Coherence	Co1. To what extent can synergies be observed between this project and other similar projects implemented by IOM or other similar initiatives by government or other actors?	Did the project consider and align with other IOM programs/projects/initiatives and efforts of government and other actors?	Documented assessments and stakeholder perceptions.	Project documents, project and research reports, policy documents.	X	X	
		How did other actors and initiatives contribute to the project implementation and results?	Documentation and reports of various related programs/projects/initiatives of IOM and other stakeholders showcase cross-reference and mutual contribution to the project implementation and results. Documented assessments and stakeholder perceptions.	Project documents, project and research reports, policy documents.	X X	X X	

Effectiveness	Et1. To what extent did the project produce the desired outputs and outcomes?	<u>Output 1.1</u> A gender-sensitive and human rights-based Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2030 is drafted	Availability of a gender-sensitive and human rights-based Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2030. Perceptions on the quality of inputs and results enabled by the project design.	Project documents and reports, policy documents.	X	X	
		<u>Outcome 1</u> Improved capacities of the Kyrgyz Government address the challenges in migration management and align national migration policies to global frameworks	Documented assessments and stakeholder perceptions on the improvement of capacities (i.e. policies, organizational, expert/human and technical resources/capacities) of the Kyrgyz Government to address the challenges in migration management and to align national migration policies to global frameworks.	Project documents, project and research reports, policy documents.	X	X	
	Et2. What were the major factors influencing achievement of the expected outputs and outcomes?	<u>Output 1.1</u> A gender-sensitive and human rights-based Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2030 is drafted	Explanations of the major factors influencing achievement, as observed by project stakeholders. Perceptions on the quality of the implemented activities in relation to achieved results.	Project documents and reports, policy documents.	X	X	X
		<u>Outcome 1</u> Improved capacities of the Kyrgyz Government address the challenges in migration management and align national migration policies to global frameworks	Explanations of the major factors influencing achievement, as observed by project stakeholders.	Project documents, project and research reports, policy documents.	X	X	

Efficiency	Ey1. To what extent was the project cost-effective?	To what extent was the funding allocated in line with the strategy of the project and helped to achieve what the project set out to achieve?	Documented assessments of the effectiveness of human financial, and technical resources allocated in relation to the activities and results. Stakeholder perceptions.	Project proposal and budget, narrative and financial reports.	X	X	X
	Ey2. Were the funds and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?	To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled and in line with budget allocated?	Documented assessments of project Workplan and financial reports showcase resources provided are at planned costs.	Work plan and project financial reports.	X	X	
	Ey3. How well were other resources (expertise, time) being converted into results, including consideration of practices and mechanisms for coordination, M&E, and reporting?	To what extent did the project make the best use of all available resources?	Documentation of regular coordination with project partners and stakeholders including on monitoring, mapping and employing of other available/existing resources; Partner's and stakeholder's explanation of their involvement in steering the project implementation.	Minutes and reports of coordination meetings and workshops, project financial and monitoring data.	X	X	
	Ey4. How well did the partner contribution/involvement work?	To what extent was the coordination with the government authorities, agencies and other national key actors effective?	Documentation of regular coordination with project partners, and explanation of their involvement in steering the project implementation. Stakeholder perceptions of the extent to which additional partner's resources were leveraged during project implementation.	Financial and monitoring data, including on monitoring, mapping and employing of other available/existing resources.	X	X	X
Impact	I1. To what extent can long-term changes be observed (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative), particularly in relation to building capacities of relevant State actors?	Has the project served to design or inform discussion of follow-up projects/programs (actual or planned)?	Explanations of measures taken, including specific examples and explanations of follow-up projects and programs in relation to this project.	Documentation and reports of other related projects, policy documents and other stakeholder's reports.	X	X	

	I2. What contribution did this project make towards the intended outcomes and any observed long-term changes, considering also other relevant external factors?	To what extent has the project instigated further alignment and regulation of the migration governance policies and migration management legal framework in the country? Has the helped to advance government-led initiatives and/or and regional commitments?	Explanations of measures taken, including specific examples and explanations of follow-up policy processes, documents or regulations initiated/drafted in line with the Concept of the State Migration Policy.	Documentation and reports of other related projects, policy documents and other stakeholder's reports.	X	X	
		What is the likeliness of increased gender equality as a result of the project?	Documented assessments and stakeholder perceptions.	Project documents, project reports (meeting minutes and lists of participants).	X	X	X
Sustainability	S1. What does the project have as an element(s) of sustainability?	To what extent have the stakeholders and beneficiaries taken ownership of the outputs?	Assessments of the project and planning documentation and stakeholder perceptions on the commitment of relevant actors to take ownership of the outputs.	Project documents and reports, stakeholder reports.	X	X	
		What were the measures taken to have the effects of the project be maintained after the project completion?	Assessments of the project and planning documentation and stakeholder perceptions.	Project documents and reports (training documentation), stakeholder reports on available capacities.	X	X	
	S2 Were the activities appropriately designed to ensure sustainability of project benefits?	How was sustainability included in the initial design (proposal and planning documents)?	Stakeholder perceptions of likely future use of project main results. Stakeholder perceptions of local support and ownership. Examples of institutionalization.	Project and stakeholder's relevant reports and documents.	X	X	
S3 Do the stakeholders have necessary structures, resources and processes in place, and have those been used since the end of the project to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support? If not, why not?	Are project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits?	Stakeholder information on specific measures ensuring resources, processes and structures for the Migration Policy implementation.	Stakeholder's relevant reports and documents.	X	X		
	Have you seen improved sustainability based on the combined efforts of several projects that IOM runs in migration management?	Stakeholder information and perceptions on complementarities and synergies with other projects.	Stakeholder's relevant reports and documents	X	X		
	Were there any additional measures that could have been taken to make this project more sustainable?	Description of any follow-up monitoring activities to track the progress in implementing strategic migration management. Stakeholder perceptions.	Policy monitoring reports, policy documents.	X	X		

6.3 List of stakeholders and Agenda of the scheduled interviews

List of key stakeholders prioritized for the interviews:

Category	Stakeholder (organization or group)	Role / involvement in the project	Individuals (names and titles)	Contacts	Priority to meet with?
IOM	Senior Management in the Mission	Senior management and oversight; high-level liaison with government and donors	Bermet MOLDOBAEVA , Head of Office of IOM Mission in Kyrgyzstan	bmoldobaeva@iom.int	Not organized
	Project Manager (PM)	Day to day management of the project	Almaz ATAMBIEV , Project Manager	aatambiev@iom.int	Not organized
	Other members of the project team	Project team member involved to the project	Salavat BAKTYBEK kyzy , Programme Assistant	bsalavat@iom.int	TBC (on AL)
	Resource management Officer (RMO)	Financial oversight	Marina TERESCHENKO , RMO	mtereschenko@iom.int	August 11, 2021 at 14:00 (Bishkek time)
	Relevant IOM staff at RO Vienna	Technical guidance and support	Michael Newson , Senior Regional Labour Mobility and Human Development Specialist Amr Taha , Senior Regional Policy and Liaison Officer	mnewson@iom.int ; ataha@iom.int	Not organized
Indirect beneficiaries	Association of legal entities of the Association "International Congress of Kyrgyzstanis and Compatriots" Zamandash "		Lola OGONBAEVA (Needs translation)	lola-2103@mail.ru +996 555 424 256	Cancelled
Other government partners working closely on project	Information-Consultation Centre of the Department of External Migration of MFA		Almaz ALYBAEV , ICC Deputy director (Needs translation)	+996 554 463737 almazkg@mail.ru	August 10, 2021 at 14:00 (Bishkek time)
	Social Fund		Torobek PRATOV	+995 555 884705 torobek.pratov@gmail.com	Not confirmed

	Ministry of Internal Affairs		Timur ZHANAKEEV	+996 558 604009 tima.zhanakeev@mail.ru	Not confirmed
UN agencies and NGOs working on similar projects	FAO		Marlen TYNALIEV	Marlen.Tynaliev@fao.org	August 6, 2021 at 15:30 (Bishkek time)
	UNPD		Oxana MACIUCA	oxana.maciuca@undp.org	August 10, 2021 at 11:00 (Bishkek time).
	Public fund "Center for Assistance to International Protection"		Akylbek TASHBULATOV (Needs translation)	+996 772 394400 akylbek.csip@gmail.com	August 6, 2021 at 17:00 (Bishkek time)
Other stakeholders	Independent Expert		Zamira AZHIGULOVA (Needs translation)	+996 555 432838 ajigulovaz@mail.ru	August 9, 2021 at 13:00 (Bishkek time)
	Independent Expert		Nurbubu KERIMOVA (Needs translation)	+996 550 911 221 kernura.1961@mail.ru	August 10, 2021 15:00 (Bishkek time)

Agenda of the scheduled interviews:

Stakeholder Interviews – Timetable				
Friday, 6 August 2021	Monday, 9 August 2021	Tuesday, 10 August 2021	Wednesday, 11 August 2021	Thursday, 12 August 2021
Time: 15:30 (Bishkek) / 11.30 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Participants: <u>Interviewee:</u> Marlen TYNALIEV, FAO, Marlen.Tynaliev@fao.org <u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int	CANCELLED (no show) Time: 11:00 (Bishkek) / 07:00 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Interpretation provided Participants: <u>Interviewee:</u> Lola OGONBAEVA, Association of legal entities of the Association "International Congress of Kyrgyzstanis and Compatriots" Zamandash", lola-2103@mail.ru <u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int		Time: 14:00 (Bishkek) / 10:00 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Participants: <u>Interviewee:</u> Marina TERESCHENKO, IOM RMO, mtereschenko@iom.int <u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int	Time: 11:30 (Bishkek) / 07:30 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Participants: <u>Interviewee:</u> Oxana MACIUCA, UNDP oxana.maciuca@undp.org <u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int

<p>Time: 17:00 (Bishkek) / 13:00 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Interpretation provided</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p><u>Interviewee:</u> Akylbek TASHBULATOV, Public fund "Center for Assistance to International Protection", email: akylbek.csip@gmail.com</p> <p><u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int</p>	<p>Time: 13:00 (Bishkek) / 09:00 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Interpretation provided</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p><u>Interviewee:</u> Zamira AZHIGULOVA, Independent Expert, ajigulovaz@mail.ru</p> <p><u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int</p> <p><u>Interpreter:</u> Evgeny Sinelschikov, translations.uae@gmail.com</p>	<p>Time: 14:00 (Bishkek) / 10:00 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Interpretation provided</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p><u>Interviewee:</u> Almaz ALYBAEV, Information-Consultation Centre of the Department of External Migration of MFA, almazkg@mail.ru</p> <p><u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int</p>	<p>Time: 16:00 (Bishkek) / 12:00 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Interpretation provided</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p><u>Interviewee:</u> Nurbubu KERIMOVA, Independent Expert, kernura.1961@mail.ru</p> <p><u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int</p>	
			<p>Time: 18:00 (Bishkek) / 14:00 (Belgrade) Duration: 60-90 minutes Meeting link</p> <p>Participants:</p> <p><u>Interviewee:</u> Salavat Baktybek Kyzy, IOM Project Assistant, bsalavat@iom.int</p> <p><u>Interviewer:</u> Jelena Ribac, IOM, jribac@iom.int</p>	

6.4 Data collection tools

Interview Guide

The below Interview Guide was used as a guide in the semi-structured interviews with IOM staff, government and CSO representatives and experts. During the interviews, depending on the course of the conversation, information provided and the profile of the interviewee, the evaluator asked follow-up questions or combined/skipped questions already covered. The questions are divided into categories following the main evaluation criteria, with specific questions targeting specific stakeholders if/where needed:

Introduction: My name is Jelena Ribac, from IOM's Office in Belgrade, Serbia. I'm an internal IOM evaluator appointed to conduct an independent ex-post evaluation of the project "Improved Migration Management through Policy Development in Kyrgyzstan" funded by the International Development Fund (IDF).

The overall objective of this project was to assist the Government of Kyrgyzstan to improve migration management at the national level by developing a gender-sensitive and human rights-based draft Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic until 2030.

The purpose the evaluation is to assess the relevance and coherence of the intervention *vis-a-vis* other interventions, the effectiveness and performance of the project, the efficiency of project management and implementation, and the impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation will also document lessons learned and make recommendations that IOM and project partners might use to improve the design and implementation of other and future related projects and programmes.

Through a series of questions prepared, the purpose of the interviews is to learn from you and other stakeholders about how the project's implementation and results in relation to each of the abovementioned criteria. I invite you to be open in your responses as everything that you share is confidential. I will list the people that I meet with, but I won't cite specific people or agencies. If you agree, I will record our conversation. The recordings are only for my personal use in the process of the report preparation. They will not be shared with anyone and will be deleted as soon as the evaluation is completed. Do you agree and are there any questions before we begin?

Relevance: To what extent did project's objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified?

Guiding questions:

- How were you involved in the project? Can you briefly describe your role in the activities? (design, implementation/concrete activities)?
- Do you think the project and its approach responded well to the identified needs at the time? Are there any identifiable gaps that can be observed now?
- Would you say that the context shifted during, or has it changed since the project implementation? How?
- Is the project linked/aligned to any larger strategy on the national or regional level (e.g. A2030, SDG's, GCM)?

- Was the design of the project appropriate for ensuring that gender and human rights issues are properly and consistently integrated?
- Do you think the project enabled inclusive and meaningful participation of key actors and their respective needs/interests?

Coherence: To what extent can synergies be observed between this project and other similar projects implemented by IOM or other similar initiatives by government or other actors?

- Were there any other programs/projects/initiatives and efforts of other actors that the project considered and aligned with?
- How did these other actors and initiatives contribute to the project implementation and results?

IOM project staff:

- Did the project consider and align with other IOM programs/projects/initiatives? How?

Effectiveness: To what extent did the project achieve its intended results?

Guiding questions:

- Did the project design enable good quality of inputs and results?
- Do you think the project contributed to the improvement of capacities of the Kyrgyz Government to address the challenges in migration management, and to align national migration policies to global frameworks (i.e. policies, organizational, expert/human and technical resources/capacities)?
- What were, in your opinion, the major factors influencing project achievements, in terms of: 1) the gender-sensitive and human rights-based Concept of the State Migration Policy and 2) improved capacities of the government to address the migration management challenges?

IOM project staff:

- To what extent was the project successfully implemented, from a project and resource management perspective? What were the major factors influencing this?

Efficiency: How well were human, physical and financial resources used to undertake activities, and how well were these resources converted into results?

Guiding questions:

- Do you think that the coordination with the government authorities, UN, civil society and other organizations and relevant actors was effective?

IOM project staff:

- To what extent was the funding allocated as outlined in the project document and budget?
- Were activities implemented as scheduled, and in line with budget allocated?
- In your opinion, did the project make the best use of all available resources?

Impact: What are the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally?

Guiding questions:

- Do you know if the project served further to design or inform discussion of follow-up projects/programs (actual or planned)?
- Has the project instigated any further alignment and regulation of migration governance policies and migration management legal framework in the country?
- Has the project helped to advance government-led initiatives and/or and regional commitments?

IOM project staff:

- Managerially and financially speaking, did the project provide any relevant experience and lessons learned, or served to inform the budget design of any follow-up projects/programs?

Sustainability: Will the project's results or its benefits continue once external support ceases?

Guiding questions:

- Are project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing and building upon the project's benefits?
- Were there any additional measures that are or could have been taken to make the project results more sustainable?

IOM project staff:

- Would you say that IOM is adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) for follow-up on this project's results?
- Have you seen improved sustainability for IOM's activities based on the combined efforts of different projects that IOM runs in migration management, including the one in question?

6.5 List of documents reviewed

- Final proposal (IOM format)
- Donor reports including financial reports, and annexes:
 - ANNEX I. Kyrgyz Government's bylaw on TFG on MP Concept development №46 from May 6, 2019
 - ANNEX II. LoP_TFG meeting June 20, 2019
 - ANNEX III. Activity 1.1.3_Protocol, LoP_Internal Meeting with UN Women and woman led organizations December 10, 2019
 - ANNEX IV. Activity 1.1.4_Agenda, LoPs_TFG Workshop_November 14-15, 2019
 - ANNEX IX. Activity 1.1.2_LoPs_Training for TFG and SMS on SDGs & MIGOF_January 15-16, 2020
 - ANNEX V. Activity 1.1.5_LoPs, Agenda, Protocol_TFG meeting October 31, 2019 and November 22, 2019
 - ANNEX VI. Activity 1.1.6_Agenda, Protocol, LoP_TFG meeting December 13, 2019
 - ANNEX VII. Activity 1.1.7_LoPs, Agenda, Protocol_TFG meeting December 06, 2019
 - ANNEX VIII. Activity 1.1.4_Agenda, LoP, Protocol_TFG workshop January 13-14, 2020
 - ANNEX X. Pre-tests
 - ANNEX XI. Post-tests
 - ANNEX XII. Photos
 - ANNEX XIII. List of supporting policy papers by the Government of KR
 - ANNEX XIV. Migration Policy Concept 2020-2030 of the Kyrgyz Republic in Eng
 - ANNEX XV. SDGs and GCM links to the Goals of the Migration Policy

Other related documents:

- [Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals in the Kyrgyz Republic 2020](#)
- [IOM Migration Governance Framework](#)
- [Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration](#)
- Concept of the "Mekenim" (My hometown) pilot program for the period 2020-2022: MEKENIM - ENG. – FINAL
- IOM project proposal: 'Kyrgyzstan: Enhancing Migrants' Awareness on Air Pollution and Moving Towards a "Healthy City Vision" In Bishkek'
- IOM project proposal: Promoting inclusive and sustainable rural development through financial inclusion and digital remittances (2023-2027)
- UNMN Kyrgyzstan ToR
- UNMN Work plan 2021 in Kyrgyzstan

6.6 List of persons interviewed or consulted

- Marlen Tynaliev, FAO Officer
- Akylbek Tashbulatov, Public Fund "Center for Assistance to International Protection"
- Zamira Azhigulova, Independent Expert
- Almaz Alybaev, Head of the Information-Consultation Centre of the Department of External Migration of MFA
- Marina Tereschenko, RMO, IOM Kyrgystan
- Nurbubu KERIMOVA, Independent Expert
- Salavat Baktybek Kyzy, IOM Project Assistant
- Oxana MACIUCA, UNDP consultant