



**Migration
Multi-Partner
Trust Fund**

**External Final Evaluation of the project ‘EVIDENCE-BASED
MIGRATION POLICY PLANNING AND DISCOURSE IN
NORTH MACEDONIA’**

28 October 2020 – 31 October 2023

EVALUATION REPORT

Authors:

Thomas Vasseur

Vlado Rikalovski

October 2023

MAP OF NORTH MACEDONIA



ACRONYMS

CHRCR	Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution
DESA	United Nations Department of Social and Economic Affairs
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
EASO	European Asylum Support Office
EPI	European Policy Institute
ESARNM	Employment Service Agency of the Republic of North Macedonia
EU	European Union
FRONTEX	European Border and Coast Guard Agency
ICMPD	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JRC	European Commission – Joint Research Centre
CSO	Civil Society Organization
MAPP	Macedonian Anti- Poverty Platform
MARRI	Migration, Asylum, Refugees Regional Initiative
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MGI	Migration Governance Index
MIGOF	IOM's Migration Governance Framework
MISA	Ministry of Information Society and Administration
MLSP	Ministry of Labor and Social Policy
MMPTF	Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund
MOI	Ministry of Interior
MYLA	Macedonian Young Lawyers' Association
MLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
NDI	National Democratic Institute for Internal Affairs
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PSD	United Nations Partnership for Sustainable Development
SSO	State Statistical Office of the Republic of North Macedonia
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNSDF	UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
WHO	World Health Organization

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team would like to thank the joint IOM/UNFPA/UNHCR Project Team for its overall outstanding support throughout the evaluation process, from sharing an exhaustive list of documents, to making time for multiple briefings and arranging evaluation interviews meetings in Skopje.

The team also wishes to express its gratitude to all implementing partners and stakeholders to the project, who have kindly made themselves available to share their open views on the project.

Table of Contents

MAP OF NORTH MACEDONIA	1
ACRONYMS	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
Background	6
Evaluation objective and methodology	6
Key Findings	7
Best practices	8
Conclusions	9
Recommendations	10
Introduction	12
CHAPTER 1. COUNTRY BACKGROUND, PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND KEY STAKEHOLDERS	13
1.1. Country Background	13
1.2. Project Description	14
1.3. Key Project Stakeholders	15
CHAPTER 2. EVALUATION CONTEXT AND PURPOSE	16
2.1. Evaluation Context	16
2.2. Evaluation Purpose	16
2.3. Evaluation scope	16
CHAPTER 3. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY	16
3.1. Evaluation Framework and Criteria	16
3.2. Evaluation Framework and Methodology	17
3.2.1. Data sources and collection	17
3.2.2. Data analysis	18
3.2.3. Evaluation Limitations	18
3.3. Stakeholder participation and Ethical issues	18
CHAPTER 4. EVALUATION FINDINGS	19
4.1. Relevance	19
4.2. Coherence	22
4.3. Effectiveness	23
4.4. Efficiency	32
4.5. Impact	33
4.6. Sustainability	34
4.7. Cross Cutting Themes	35
CHAPTER 5. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES	36
5.1. Lessons Learned	36
5.2. Best Practices	37
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37
6.1. Conclusions	37
6.2. Recommendations	40

Annexes 42

- Annex 1: List of Documents Reviewed..... 42**
- Annex 2: List of Interviewed Stakeholders 46**
- Annex 3: Evaluation Framework 48**
- Annex 4: Data Collection Tools 59**
- Annex 5: Terms of Reference 63**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

North Macedonia is characterized by a mix of both permanent emigration of citizens living and working abroad, as well as seasonal and temporary labour migration, in addition to the recent phenomenon of transitory migration. While immigration is usually low in volume, apart from situations of transit migration, emigration has been massive for decades and on a steady increase in the past years. The phenomenon is such that it represents a significant loss, not only in economic terms but also to the overall development of the country. Thus, migration has become a prominent threat to the socio-economic development of the country, which has become a priority. The lack of data for evidenced-based policy making, a fragmented institutional response, the absence of a harmonized, coordinated and well-informed response is among the key challenges identified by the project. In response, the project has pursued the **objective** of contributing to good migration governance in North Macedonia through **enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development**, through the (1) the Development of evidence-based migration policies based on: a. Improved systemic data collection and analysis of migration dynamics; b. Enhanced institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration and (2) the collective engagement of broad range of partners aimed to increase the positive perception of the general public for effective management of immigrants and refugees. These objectives were intended to be reached through three outcomes: 1. Institutional stakeholders design and implement evidence-based and coordinated migration policies, 2. Inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management are enhanced and 3. The general public and the policy makers view migrants and refugees as development actors.

Evaluation objective and methodology

Evaluation objective: This is an end-of-project evaluation which purpose has been to provide an impartial assessment of the progress and performance of the project, specifically, its relevance; effectiveness in achieving the intended results; efficiency; the sustainability of its results, as well as the observable impact of the intervention towards the end of its implementation cycle. The evaluation has reviewed the entire project implementation period, i.e., from 28 October 2020 until 31 October 2023 and has taken place from June to October 2023, with a field interview phase in Skopje during the first half of September. The Final Evaluation Report includes lessons learned and best practices and provides actionable recommendations based on findings for evaluation questions.

Evaluation Methodology: This final evaluation aimed at reviewing the project performance in the frame of the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and likely impact. The project's complementarity and coordination with other relevant interventions has been assessed under the criterion of coherence.

Key Findings

Relevance: Overall, the evaluation has found the project to be of high relevance as rationale guiding the long-term goal, the approach, the stakeholder engagement, and activities show that its formulation is the result of a thorough needs assessment, long-standing relations with institutions and analytical capacity of fundamental drivers of migration management. The project is a combined answer to the key gaps identified in the area of migration management: lack of evidence, insufficient data collection and analysis capacity, lack of a functional institutional mechanism for migration data produced and fragmented implementation of the coordination of migration policy. The policy making – the Resolution on migration – is well aligned to the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, but also to the migration-related national sectoral strategies. Equally importantly, this intervention supports EU’s reported priorities in the field of migration governance. The relevance also extends the approach taken by the project, proceeding in phases of awareness raising, wide policy-making consultation and innovating both in the use of tools enhancing migration evidence as well as the necessary forward-looking perspective on migration governance.

Coherence: There are not many comparable projects in the field of migration governance. However, the strong consultative orientation of the project has ensured it is coherent with state programmes as well as initiatives from civil society. This project is an example of coherence of efforts among UN agencies as it has been assessed, designed, and implemented in a true collaborative spirit as a joint project.

Effectiveness: The project is assessed as highly effective since all of the numerous planned activities have been implemented timely, even during the COVID context, and this is once again, explained, by the collaborative spirit of IOM, UNFPA, UNHCR and RCO. The multi-agency project team dedication has also been supported with a strong distribution of roles, responsibilities and (flexible) process (e.g., organization of procurement).

Efficiency: The efficiency is rated as strong, in regard of the complexity of the project, the substantial awareness raising, mind-shifting activities in the initial phase of the project, the number of activities and the quality of the outputs, also considering the strong innovation orientation of the project and its technicality in term of data collection and analysis. The project has also interacted with a vast and large number of institutions and organizations; national and international, which has added to the demand in terms of efficiency. Since the project is primarily of qualitative nature and commits to transform practices (in terms of migration policy formulation, governance, and implementation), the use of financial resources has been very efficient, when considering it achieving the change the paradigm of addressing migration among institutions, even though, the effort needs to be pursued. One crucial factor to efficiency is embodied by the very individuals who have been managing. The individual energy from the project team brought to the project has been key to getting stakeholder involvement. Experience, professionalism, personal dedication, and attitude have been instrumental to the success of the implementation.

Impact: The sense of impact of the project the evaluation was able to gather is strong, though its lasting effect requires continued attention. One first major impact of the project is that all relevant institutions, and representatives of the civil society have come together to take a new stance on migration and jointly

developed a new policy orientation and formulation, tackling the root causes of a system, inefficient in managing the diverse and increasing challenges related to migration. While this change has materialized in the new resolution on migration in the first phase of the project, the impact has gone beyond, with institutions getting into the practice of working in a synchronized manner and using tools increasing the evidence on migration data. All State institutions are now focused on the operationalization of a more systematic data exchange, while they are supporting the model of anticipatory governance. However, this is only at an early stage, and with limited human and financial resources, as well as external support, the lasting effect of the impact is not guaranteed. The impact on public opinion shows that a different perspective on migration can spark discussions and positively influence perceptions. However, a lasting impact requires a continuation of regular campaigns.

Sustainability: The project has a strong sustainability with regards to the tangible results it has been able to institutionalize in a relatively short time, considering this has involved substantial consultation, awareness raising and training. The resolution on Migration is sustainable for a five-year period and beyond, to the extent as a similar forward-looking approach will be applied, and sufficient resources secured. The innovative tools introduced, such as the Country Migration Profile, are now part of the practice and sustainable.

The inter-institutional coordination has gone a level higher under the auspices of the project while inter-institutional migration exchange has become a routine practice. However, political will, more resources, ideally under the impetus of an external project are important conditions to maintain a coherent commitment across institutions.

Cross cutting themes: The gender and human rights dimension as well as the Global Compact for Migration (GCM) Principles have been fully considered as it has been fully reflected in the resolution on migration. The project design and proposal also clearly refer to the GCM (Global Compact for Migration) principles as well as the gender dimension and human rights. The whole-of-government approach has stood at the core of the various project activities, from the involvement in the resolution formulation process, to the supported inter-institutional mechanisms. The project has systematically collected gender-disaggregated data and has overall recorded a higher female participation rate in project training events.

Best practices

The project is rich in best practices, in terms of participatory policy formulation, bringing institutions work in greater coherence and putting innovation into practices. There is potential value in sharing these practices with other institutions in the Western Balkans, in the field of migration management, given the strong similarity of challenges.

Conclusions

Conclusion #1 The project has reached its intended results, institutional stakeholders are supportive of and committed to evidence-based and data-driven policy development. Non-governmental actors involved in the policy making and positive communication on migration.

Conclusion #2 Migration-related evidence and data has effectively been enhanced through the introduction and application of innovative tools and approaches. Institutions have overall welcomed the innovation brought by the project. The technical assistance component of the project has produced concreted advancements in building the evidence and enhancing the data collection, while it has also contributed to underline some of the technical and resource capacity limitations of some institutions.

Conclusion #3 The level of inter-institutional collaboration and coordination has increased thanks to the support of the project in facilitating regular exchanges at policy and operational levels. As a result, there is now greater exchange and harmonization of migration-related data.

However, from the feedback of institution's representatives interviewed, a concern was expressed that, without continued external support to stimulate institution's involvement, the collaborative effort may decline over time. Such a mechanism is effective and produces results as long it is being facilitated by a project and supported with resources thus raising the question of the relevance of a coordination mechanism as a sustainable answer the demanding tasks of inter-institutional coordination and harmonization of efforts.

Conclusion #4 The attention paid and supported provided by the project in building the understanding, increasing the awareness, and getting the buy-in and commitment of stakeholders understanding of a new and systematic Migration Policy has proven crucial to the development of the forward-looking Resolution on Migration. Based on interview feedback, the quality of the next Resolution on Migration will, once again, depend on the attention dedicated to its development.

Conclusion # 5 The short-term impact from Communication for Social Change's approach which have guided most of the communication campaign, events, trainings have confirmed it is efficient in turning public perceptions and discourse towards positive attitude and feedback. The evaluation draws the conclusion that the communication effort needs to be continued in order to progressively build a culture of tolerance.

Conclusion #6 The above conclusions, from 1 to 4, underline that the results obtained so far have been effectives and impactful, though these recognize that building a systematic and effective migration policy requires a longer-term support while institutions lack the financial (and to some extent the human) resources to pursue the institutional commitment and necessary capacity building. A clear conclusion from this is that resources are currently lacking and are expected to require mobilization.

Conclusion #7 There are several country-level and Western Balkans publications describing these (transit, immigration, emigration, intra-regional) share common migration characteristics, challenges, stakes, institutional development, and an EU accession perspective.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Support the continuation of the intervention as the project approach remains necessary to continue the stakeholder mobilization and technical support, in order to reach a sustainable, institutional model of migration management in North Macedonia.

1.1- Continue supporting the further development of innovative approaches and tools (at minimum until financial resources are mobilized: e.g., assess technical capacity needs), which require consolidation or support to develop further its potential.

1.2. Continue supporting the inter and intra-institutional data exchange and collaboration mechanisms (at minimum until financial resources are mobilized: e.g. facilitating, attending inter-institutional coordination meetings).

Recommendation #2: Actively fundraise for the continuation of the project, prioritising targeting IPA III funds under chapter 24 (justice, freedom, and security). The project has a very high relevance in supporting the priorities and recommendations formulated in the latest EU Screening Report for North Macedonia. The report, among other findings, recognised the value of the Migration Resolution, provides a strong justification to tap into IPA III funding. It is recommended that IOM/UNHCR/UNFPA consult and support the relevant institutions in the formulation of a project to continue the efforts from the initial phase, by highlighting how it has supported the various priorities highlighted in the latest (20 July 2023) *EU Screening report for North Macedonia*.

Recommendation #3: Relates to conclusion #4 Engage a consultative process to develop an institutional vision and model for the management of the Migration Policy and the implementation of its action plan. This process could take place at the earliest convenience so it can be introduced during the preparation phase of the next Resolution on Migration, where relevant actors could provide their input.

Recommendation #4: Allocate sufficient time for the elaboration of the next Migration Resolution, in order to grant sufficient time for a thorough and wide consultation process (with a greater space for civil society, the private sector and the diaspora). It is also recommended for consultations about the future institutional model (see recommendation 3) during the preparation period of the next Migration Resolution.

Recommendation #5: Organize a Western Balkans regional consultation on migration management support initiatives and experiences among the UN agencies involved in the project (IOM/UNFPA/UNHCR). Based on the understanding that similar or related initiatives have been implemented in the region, the evaluation believes any exchange of technical knowledge and experience can be beneficial to future interventions in support of migration management. Aware of the fact that time, human and financial

resources may not be available to support regional consultation activities, the evaluation suggests remote regional exchanges are organized. Whenever possible, it is also suggested to include a regional dimension (and related activities) in future project design.



Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund

Introduction

This report presents the findings, conclusions, lessons learned, best practices and recommendations from the final, external evaluation of the jointly implemented project entitled “Evidence-based migration policy planning and discourse in North Macedonia”. The project’s review has been conducted by an independent evaluation team, composed of one national and one international consultant. This evaluation assignment has been commissioned by IOM and has taken place from June to October 2023.

CHAPTER 1. COUNTRY BACKGROUND, PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND KEY STAKEHOLDERS

1.1. Country Background

North Macedonia is characterized by a mix of traditional and more recent migration patterns, combining permanent emigration of citizens living and working abroad with seasonal and temporary labour migration. In recent years, the country has been affected by increased mixed migration movements with the transitory migration flows still continuing.

The lack of data for evidenced-based policy making is one of the main challenges in maximizing the development effect of migration and ensuring an effective migration policy. Other challenges include lack of reliable data on the exact extent of the aforementioned migration movements, in part due to absence of regular census data, limited and outdated inter- and intra- institutional information exchange and insufficient collection of data on emigration and returnees, lack of sufficiently disaggregated data on migration and of relevant data on remittances to determine the particularities of these migratory movements. In this regard, the country lacked a country-specific migration profile, which would include the collection of disaggregated data on all migration-relevant aspects in a national context.

Population trends and dynamics must be factored into migration planning and policy decisions. Since 2000 onwards, North Macedonia follows Eastern European population trends - shrinking workforce, low birth rates and high emigration with remittances. This relates to the projected global demographic change up to 2030, with serious implications for the development and the progress towards achievement of the SDGs. In order to develop evidence-based migration and other relevant policies, decision makers need timely, reliable, accessible, and comparable data on the demographic flows that will help prevent misperceptions about the scale of emigration and its effects and devise appropriate policies.

The country's candidacy and path to EU accession enforce the need of alignment with relevant EU standards related to migration and international protection ensuring exchange of migration statistics among the relevant institutional stakeholders on migration management. Therefore, the country's need to have a migration module integrated in the labor force survey conducted by the State Statistical Office (SSO) since 1996, has been answered by the project under evaluation. The information about economically active population, employment and unemployment is the basic statistical data that are indispensable for monitoring the changes on the labour market.

The country needs support in the development of a **systematic Migration Policy** that defines the country's strategic approach on migration. The previous migration policy – the Resolution on Migration Policy 2015-2020 - expired at the end of 2020, warranting a process of development of a new five-year strategy and policy dialogue on the countries' migration approaches and perspectives.

The Joint project (JP) “Evidence-based migration policy planning and discourse in North Macedonia” started with implementation on 28th October 2020 and will end on 31st of October 2023¹. It aims to support policymakers in North Macedonia to effectively manage demographic and migration dynamics by developing evidence-based migration policies based on improved systemic data collection and analysis, enhanced inter-institutional data exchange, and improving the general public's and policymakers' perception of immigrants and refugees.

The country has implemented limited actions on **public perceptions on migration** and on awareness raising and educational activities for the policy makers to ensure fact-based perception on migrants and refugees and combat false narratives. It is important to provide the public with accurate and truthful information on the challenges faced by the refugees and migrants, their struggles, and fears as well as the positive development potential of migration in an effort to address the false perceptions on migration in the country at large.

1.2. Project Description

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) was established in 1951 and is the leading inter-governmental organization in the field of migration working closely with governmental, intergovernmental, and non-governmental partners. IOM is dedicated to promoting humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all. UNHCR, the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was created in 1950, during the aftermath of the Second World War, to help millions of Europeans who had fled or lost their homes. UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund works with governments and partners on population dynamics, human capital, and sustainable development, and creating population policies.

The **overall objective** of the project is to contribute to good migration governance in North Macedonia through **enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development**. This is to be achieved through the following set of actions:

1. Development of evidence-based migration policies based on:
 - a. Improved systemic data collection and analysis of migration dynamics; b. Enhanced institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration.
2. Collective engagement of a broad range of partners aimed to increase the positive perception of the general public for effective management of immigrants and refugees.

These actions have been grouped around the following expected results:

Outcome 1: Policy makers and institutional stakeholders design and implement evidence-based and coordinated migration policies. Under this outcome, the project has been supporting the development of the new Migration Policy, the improvement of systemic data collection and analysis of migration dynamics and enhancement of institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration.

¹ Initial end date set at 27th of April 2023; with the donor approved no-cost extension the project end date is 31st of October 2023

Outcome 2: Inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management are enhanced.

Under this outcome, the UN Agencies have been working towards the **operationalization of the recommendations** from the country migration management’ strategic and policy documents. Also, **inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms have been strengthened**, in line with the newly **developed migration policy**, the integrated action plan, and EU and international standards. For this, an **assessment of data exchange gaps and shortfalls has been** undertaken with the key institutions with competences on migration management. Based on the assessment’s recommendations, **advisory, capacity building activities and technical support (i.e., software upgrades, equipment, and standard operating procedures - SoPs) have been** provided for key institutional stakeholders.

Outcome 3: The general public and the policy makers view migrants and refugees as development actors. The UN Agencies has implemented four distinct sets of activities under this outcome – 1) a national information campaign aimed at the general public’s awareness raising on positive effects of migration, 2) targeted capacity building of key national-level stakeholders on positive approaches to migrants and refugees, 3) targeted sensitization, awareness raising and capacity building of key local-level stakeholders on positive and proactive approaches to migrants and refugees, and 4) targeted capacity building and sensitizing of journalists on refugees and migration issues. All activities have been guided by the innovative approaches for targeting and engagement of stakeholders within the **Communication Strategy for Social Change**, with the last three representing part of its implementation. The **beneficiary** of these activities is the whole society/the country including refugees and migrants, due to the positive effects on the country’s development and on social cohesion.

1.3. Key Project Stakeholders

The key stakeholders to the project have also been the final direct beneficiaries of the intervention and appear in the list below.

Table 1: The target groups and final beneficiaries

Key stakeholders	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Ministry of Interior 2) The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy 3) Ministry of Information Society and Public Administration 4) Ministry of Foreign Affairs 5) The Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio (Minister for Diaspora)² 6) The State Statistical Office 7) The National Bank of the Republic of North Macedonia;
Final direct beneficiaries	Relevant national stakeholders from the targeted institutions

² Note: Since February 2023 the diaspora issues are covered by the Ministry of Interior as the position of Minister without Portfolio for Diaspora matters was canceled by the Government.

Final indirect beneficiaries	Migrants, North Macedonian citizens, and citizens from the diaspora
-------------------------------------	---

CHAPTER 2. EVALUATION CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

2.1. Evaluation Context

This is an end-of-project evaluation conducted in the final weeks of the project cycle, from 01 June to 31 October 2023. Given this has been the first joint UN agency project, highly innovative in nature, driven by a long-term transformative perspective, the concluding implementation phase can be considered as an initial venture, which results, observed changes and lessons learned require an external assessment to formulate recommendations for the future.

2.2. Evaluation Purpose

The main purpose of this final evaluation has been to assess the progress and performance of the project, specifically, the *relevance* of its objectives, strategy, and approach; the *coherence* of its synergies and coordination with other initiatives; its *effectiveness* in achieving the intended results; its *efficiency* in selecting the right stakeholders and the use of coordination mechanisms; the *sustainability* of its results, as well as the observable *impact* of the intervention towards the end of its implementation cycle.

The intention of this evaluation was also to look at its gender dimension and how and understand how the joint project has been successful in addressing the needs of all genders, as well as integrate attention to the GCM guiding principles on rights-based, gender-responsive, and child-sensitive programming and whole-of-government, whole-of-society, and people-centred approaches. The evaluation has sought to identify implementation challenges and constraints as well as gather important lessons learned and formulate recommendations for possible future implementation.

2.3. Evaluation scope

The evaluation has reviewed the entire project implementation period, i.e., from 28 October 2020 until 31 October 2023. While the evaluation field visit in Skopje has taken place in September, all activities had been completed by the time of stakeholder interviews.

CHAPTER 3. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Evaluation Framework and Criteria

This is a final evaluation aimed at reviewing the project performance in the frame of the OECD-DAC³ evaluation criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability** and likely **impact**. The project's complementarity and coordination with other relevant interventions has been assessed under the criterion of **coherence**.

This external review has also encompassed the cross-cutting themes of children's rights⁴ and disabilities⁵, and the GCM seven guiding principles of **Human rights** (effective respect for and protection and fulfilment of the human rights of all migrants, regardless of their migration status; commitment to eliminate all forms of discrimination against migrants and their families). **Gender responsiveness** (Mainstream a gender perspective and promotes gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls) and **Child sensitiveness** (Uphold the principle of the best interests of the child at all times, in the context of international migration) have also been analysed.

The principles of **Whole of Government** (working with more than one government line entity, and/or with local government(s) and/or related entities) and **Whole of Society** (multi-stakeholder partnerships approach throughout the design and implementation have been taken into consideration by the evaluation.

Finally, the values supporting **People-centred** (consultation of migrants and/or migration affected communities during the design of the project) and **Leave no one behind (LNOB)** (focus on discrimination and inequalities that undermine the agency of people as holders of rights) have also been factored in the approach of this assignment.

3.2. Evaluation Framework and Methodology

3.2.1. Data sources and collection

The evaluation has used mixed methods to collect qualitative and quantitative data, with an emphasis on the qualitative aspect given the importance of a qualitative analysis to grasp the extent to which and how the project has achieved its intended change process, especially the increased awareness and change of approaches of key stakeholders towards addressing and managing the challenges of migration. The data collection exercise has tapped information from three mainly types of sources:

- a. Project documentation and relevant publications shared by the project team to the evaluation team.

³ OECD-DAC criteria: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

⁴ For more information, refer to the Fund's [operations manual](#), including indicators on pages 45-46 and annexed guidance on Engagement with Civil Society, Migrants and Communities and markers for rights-based, gender responsive and child sensitive programming.

⁵ Disabilities: interventions and activities should address barriers that prevent persons with disabilities in all their diversity from participating in, or having access to, services and/or protection, in line with the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

b. other publications on relevant thematic and geographic topics identified by the evaluators through web-based research.

3. Stakeholder interviews: All the key stakeholders to the project have been interviewed during the month of September, involving face-to-face individual and focus group discussions (groups of up to 3 persons) for the vast majority and remote interviewing with stakeholders located outside of North Macedonia or not available for presential interviewing.

Stakeholder selection and interview approach: Key stakeholders ranging from State Institutions, the national civil society, independent experts, UN agencies, universities and think tanks had been identified with the support of the project team. Semi-closed and open questions have been used and tailored to each specific stakeholder, in relation to the specific role, commitment and stake to the project. The evaluation has also sought to systematically gather the personal perspective and analysis of interviewees on the project results, impact as well as their views on the future prospects of managing migration in North Macedonia. Among the key actors, the evaluation has interviewed representatives from the Technical Working Group and the Steering Committee, as well as the members of the Intra-governmental body for development of the new Resolution on Migration Policy.

3.2.2. Data analysis

In order to identify robust findings, as a foundation for drawing conclusions and formulating recommendations, the evaluation has gathered, compared, and crossed from the three main sources described in section 3.2.1. (i.e., project documentation and publications, complementary reports identified through research and stakeholder interviews). In addition to the triangulation of this information, the evaluation has also asked interviewees for their feedback and analysis, when more clarity or confirmation on the findings was deemed necessary.

3.2.3. Evaluation Limitations

The evaluation has not experienced any substantial limitations as the evaluation team has had access to all identified key informants during the field interview phase in Skopje. This has been facilitated thanks to the support of the project team in arranging meetings with identified individuals involved in the project. The complexity of the transformative, innovative nature and activity-rich content of the project, identified as a potential limitation in the inception report of the evaluation has been made more accessible to the evaluation team, thanks to several briefings held with the project team in the early stage of the evaluation process. The interviews have also provided an opportunity to unpack some of the complexity through the explanation and analytical views expressed by interviewees.

3.3. Stakeholder participation and Ethical issues

The ethical considerations of independence, confidentiality, cultural, belief, social and political sensitivity have formed an integral part of this evaluation, and the evaluation team has applied those ethical principles in each of the evaluation activity, especially in the collection and management of information. Ethical measures have been aligned to the stipulated in UNEG Norms and Standards, including “be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all

stakeholders”, “ensure that their contacts with individuals are characterized by respect” and “protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual information”. The IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluation and other relevant ethical guidelines have also been used in conducting this evaluation.

CHAPTER 4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

The findings from the evaluation are gathered in this chapter around the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, and coherence**.

4.1. Relevance

EQ1. To what extent were stakeholders consulted and involved in designing the project?

The evaluation has found the stakeholders have been consulted and involved in designing the project to a substantial extent. As indicated under the answer to the EQ 3; it is important to have in mind that the continuous relations between IOM/UNFPA/UNHCR are giving the space for a regular dialogue on the challenges State Institutions face when it comes to addressing migration.

The consultations have involved a wide range of stakeholders ranging from governmental to universities, think-tanks and non-governmental institutions.⁶ The Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Information Society and Administration, the National Bank, the State Statistical Office were among the key stakeholders consulted and those had clearly expressed their needs to find ways to gather and analyze migration-related data. This has led to the project to engage in multiple partnerships with the academia, telecom companies, think-tanks and own resources to develop tailor-made products, methods and technological solutions. Thus, addressing the data gap using big data, has been offered by the project and has opened creative partnerships with national but also international universities, such as the Southampton university. Thorough consultations with the National Bank have been particularly beneficial in outlining the intervention strategy and providing a detailed analysis description for the work related to Remittances. The contributions from stakeholders have made the work on the Remittances high relevant to the project objective as it helped establish major linkage between migrations and development.

To some extent, the views of refugees and migrants were taken into consideration during project design and development through the IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) surveys. In a couple of instances, interviewees have considered a wider consultation of civil society, and the private sector.

⁶ the Secretariat for European Affairs, the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Ministry of Information Society and Public Administration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio (Minister for Diaspora), the State Statistical Office, the National Bank of the Republic of North Macedonia and the Migration, Asylum, Refugees Regional Initiative (MARRI) and civil society organizations working with refugees, migrants and media i.e. EPI, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution (CHRRCR), Subversive Front, Multus, Y-PEER, Macedonian Anti-Poverty Platform (MAPP), Association of Journalists of Macedonia, ADRA Macedonia, CED, and NDI).

EQ2. Is the project aligned with and supportive of national strategies?

The project enjoys a strong alignment to and provides direct support to the strategic objectives and activities of key policy documents and its related action plans in the field of migration. This includes: the National Strategy for Integrated Border Management 2021-2025 with the Action Plan for Implementation (2022- 2025), the Resolution of the Migration Policy 2021-2025, the Migration Profile (2021) and the National Strategy for Cooperation with the Diaspora (2019-2023). But it also indirectly contributes to the National Strategy for Combatting Trafficking in Human Beings 2021-2025 and well as the country's efforts in aligning its statistical production to EUSTAT standards.

EQ3. Does the project respond to the needs of the target group?

The project is a well targeted response to the needs of the stakeholders directly targeted, i.e., the State Institutions with a responsibility in the migration management. It also addresses the core challenges related to immigration, transit migration and emigration.

The needs of key actors have been thoroughly assessed in multiple ways: a. Through the consultative and advisory nature of the long-term relationships entertained between the implementing UN agencies, b. through the learning of previous project implementation in the area of migration, c. through the consultations which were held to inform the drafting of the resolution, d. through the assessments conducted prior to the various technical components of the intervention, e. through the regular monthly reports as the main project monitoring instrument provided by the project monitoring and the regular Steering Committee and other coordination meetings.

The increased understanding and growing interest expressed by stakeholders resulting from the awareness raising activities and the introduction of innovative approaches, confirmed the intervention has responded to the needs of the ministries and State Institutions in terms of recognizing a more coherent inter-institutional response was necessary to address migration at large. The need for harmonised data collection tools and analysis has also been clearly expressed by interviewees of the evaluation.

EQ4. To what extent does the project align to the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework?

Though this project is an initial venture, it really is driven by and stimulating institutions into defining a vision and the institutional solution to managing migration in the long term. Thus, the project is fully aligned to UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2021-2025 and more specifically, the Outcome 4 "By 2025, people in North Macedonia benefit from improved rule of law; evidence-based, anticipatory and gender-responsive policies; greater social cohesion; and effective service delivery by transparent, accountable and responsive institutions ". The project is also supportive of a number of UN SDG and specific targets. It more specifically contributes to UNSDG 10.7 which calls on countries to facilitate orderly, safe, regular, and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies. The list of domains and sub-criteria the project is relevant to is too long to quote it all in this section; but the evaluation has retained the following. The project is specifically relevant to several domains under the indicator 10.72., including the Domain 1 on migrant rights (and access to essential services), the domain 2, on the whole-of-

government/evidence-based policies, including (though the project has not yet led to this conclusion, but supports this objective) a dedicated government agency to implementation national migration policy. It also is fully aligned to the domain 3 sub-criteria of “a mechanism to ensure that migration policy is informed by data. Further, the project has also been relevant to the domain 3 “Cooperation and Partnerships” and especially on the sub-criteria “an inter-ministerial coordination mechanism”. The intervention is also particularly supportive of the sub-criteria “Align, through periodic assessments, labour migration policies with actual and project labour market needs”. The inclusion of a module on migration in the LFS of the SSO has both contributed to understanding of the employment situation of emigrants and is also a step forward in connecting labour market policies with migration management.

EQ5. In regard to capacity development, were the most suitable stakeholder representatives selected?

Representatives were carefully selected from key stakeholders, i.e., in order to raise interest and get institutional engagement, the appropriate top decision-making but also technical levels were invited to participate in the training. Apart from the SSO and the NBRNM, institutions have indicated that, even though the appropriate department and staff had been involved, they underlined that the lack of equipment and analytical capacity as a recurrent issue within their institutions. It was suggested that capacity development at the technical level was also in need of higher “political level” support to ensure the data processing and analysis was getting continued support. In fact, not only stakeholders have had their needs assessed in order to identify their data gaps challenges, so appropriate solutions could be developed, but the staff entrusted with managing the technical solutions have been identified and selected, so that they could apply the training content directly when implementing the various innovation solutions introduced. This has encompassed, among others, staff from the National Bank on using Big Data for Remittance data analysis and reporting, or the training of staff with the Intragovernmental Body for the Development and Implementation of the Migration Policy on anticipatory governance.

Focal points from the various ministries, the National Bank and the SSO were identified so the technical experts hired by the project could collaborate with the appropriate staff.

EQ6. Was a proper analysis of the readiness of the stakeholders to undertake this initiative undertaken?

As mentioned under the Evaluation Question n°. 3, stakeholders had been consulted about their need and interest to undertake the project. All interviewees have confirmed this intervention was relevant and answering the long-standing need of improving harmonized data collection and analysis, an innovative approach to addressing migration as well as addressing the issue of fragmented efforts in the State response to the challenges of migration.

Few voices however, expressed that, while recognizing the project was highly necessary, their institutions were overloaded with a busy working agenda and that more time could have been dedicated to the consultation process; especially in relation to drafting the Resolution on Migration Policy.

4.2 Coherence

EQ7. To what extent has the project been complementary to other relevant migration management projects undertaken by the participating entities, as well as other UN and non-UN actors?

Even if there is a limited number of comparable projects in its design the reviewed intervention has been designed in complementarity with other relevant interventions, such as the Central European initiative (CEI)-funded project “Advisory support for strengthening the capacities for diaspora engagement and evidence-based migration policy planning”, and in consideration of the Regional support to protection sensitive migration management in the Western Balkans and Turkey, Phase 2 (component 2) t, the issue of complementarity has been a major issue for the project. Its innovative nature has conferred the project a unique position, filling very specific gaps when it comes to how institutions jointly handle the various forms of migration. Among other forms, it has, for instance, tackled emigration by exploring new sources of data from remittances from the diaspora. The project has supported the development of methodologies for researching and estimating data from a wider range of sources, with an aim to increase the evidence level to better inform migration policy development. The fact that the project is a first-time and truly joint UN interagency venture has ensured that all of its activities in support of migration were closely complementary. For instance, the UNHCR’s allocation of own funds to the Communication for Social Change component of the project is an illustrative example of complementarity. The project has also been highly complementary of Government priorities as State Institutions have been deeply involved in the policy design and formulation effort (of the Resolution on Migration).

The project is also complementary to the various initiatives from civil society, in the field of migration, asylum seekers and youth in general. It has been complementary to the work of the Youth Educational Forum in mobilizing and raising awareness of youth around the issue of migration, while it has also been coherent with national NGO MYLA on irregular and forced migration, especially on the issue of human trafficking and Smuggling of Migrants. Last but not least, the project is closely harmonized with the EU accession support to North Macedonia in acquiring the technical capacity and applying standards in the management of migration.

EQ8. To what extent was the project coordinated with other relevant migration management projects?

As mentioned in the answer to the previous question (EQ 7), while there are not many projects dealing with the management of migration, the project has been complementary in building the technical capacities of the State Institutions in several areas crucial to the EU accession process, especially under the Chapter 24. In fact, the project has been strongly complementary to priorities and recommendations formulated by the EU for North Macedonia to progress and align its policies and standards to EU standard. In this respect the project has been highly complementary to a number of fundamental priorities for the country in its EU accession process and EU Screening Report for North Macedonia. The evaluation has listed below the corresponding priorities and recommendations identified in the EU to the project areas of interventions:

- ✓ Migrations statistics: “Regarding statistics on migration and asylum substantial work is required to improve alignment. “
- ✓ Migration module in the Labour Force Survey:” Labour market statistics are partly aligned, and further improvements are needed, including solving some IT issues.”
- ✓ Inter-institutional coordination and migration data exchange: « The Ministry of Interior is the main actor in the field of migration. North Macedonia needs to strengthen its institutional and administrative capacities across the sector by increasing the number of employees and providing additional material and technical resources.”
- ✓ IT equipment and technical statistical capacity assistance: « North Macedonia needs to increase financial, human and technical resources across the board with regard to migration”.
- ✓ Inter-institutional coordination: « The fragmentation of tasks between the various institutions dealing with migration makes management less effective. »
- ✓ Migration Resolution: « North Macedonia indicated that its legal framework is partially aligned with the EU *acquis* as regards Migration. »
- ✓ *All above quotes are extracted from the Screening report.*
- ✓ North Macedonia, Cluster 1 – Fundamentals, dated 20/07/2023 (https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-07/MK%20Cluster_1%20Draft%20screening%20report_external%20version.pdf)

The screening is based on the enhanced enlargement methodology, adopted in 2020 and aims at injecting dynamism into the negotiating process for the EU accession of North Macedonia. The fact that the priorities identified, and recommendations made in the report directly relate to the project targeted areas underlines the fact that the project is also strongly relevant to the EU Accession process of the country.

4.3. Effectiveness

EQ9. To what extent were target groups consulted and involved in the implementation of activities, thereby improving ownership, accountability, and effectiveness?

The evaluation has found that relevant stakeholders were systematically consulted and involved in the implementation of activities, and this has contributed to improving the project’s ownership.

The project ownership has been built over several phases and approach. Firstly, the draft of the Migration Resolution has involved a large number of consultative and awareness raising events, allowing the various stakeholders to understand and support the need address existing institutional gaps and change their perspective on managing migration overall. Ownership has also been consolidated with the introduction of innovative tools and approaches. On the one hand, innovative tools such as the Migration Profile and the inclusion of a migration module in the SSO LFS have been introduced and elaborated in consultation with the relevant institutions. On the other hand, innovative approaches, such as the anticipatory governance on migration have also been introduced in a consultative and participatory manner so that the project actors could express their feedback. Even though the innovative dimension of the project has been a pilot rather than the adoption of a model, it has raised a strong interest from the various ministries and

institutions involved. It has also provided a strategic direction to guide the future efforts of those institutions. As an example, most ministries and institutions involved have become aware and in demand of their needs to increase their data analysis capacity and to establish a harmonized data exchange system. The MoI for instance, has become strongly aware that there have been readily available data they are collecting but not really using to feed the migration data set. As an example, the MoI is systematically collecting data of citizens at the various land border cross points, including citizens from North Macedonia from the diaspora. This data is recorded in spreadsheet files, which format, is unfortunately not readily compatible for exchange of inter-institutional migration-related data, as it is necessary that all data are made available in the same format. However, the project has started to solve the situation of data inter-operationality with the procurement of computers with software compatible to national databases to the Border Police regional units, which has supported the timely data collection. This has also allowed for the registration of migrants travelling in mixed movements as well as the registration of asylum-seekers. Another contribution of the project in support of the MoI has involved the provision of IT equipment with updated hardware and software capabilities that are compatible to national databases, also offering the expected compatibility with EU requirements.

EQ10. Have the project outputs been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?

The project has performed very well in terms of output delivery. Both quantitatively and qualitatively, as all planned activities have been implemented, allowing to reach all initial targets, and exceeding a good number of it. While various aspects of the qualitative dimension of activities is tackled through the various sections of the report, the one general comment that came up from interviews is that the project is often described as one of high quality, because of the quality of expertise provide and the level of consultativeness that accompanied it. In the context of this project evaluation, quality has been defined according to multiple criteria. This is includes: a. Quality of experts (high level of expertise in their domains, knowledge and understanding of the context and challenges), b. quality of technical assistance training (defined by trainee satisfaction rate – consistently above 75%, satisfaction rate of attendees), c; quality of innovation (tools and approaches introduced are relevant to migration challenges e.g. addressing data gaps, tools such as the Labour Force Survey module have been effectively used and contribute to improve data and data analysis), d. quality of outputs (e.g. visibility and high participation to public events such as a Jazz Festival, ability to grasp interest through feedback on social media forums on migration, and to spark constructive debates, improve practices such as alternative journalistic approaches to reporting on migration, amongst others), d. Quality of support (ability of the project team to consult, listen, react and adjust to stakeholder inputs during implementation).



Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND TARGET ACHIEVEMENT

Most results are as of December 2022, thus it is likely that some further progress has been made for on-going activities after December 2022.

INDICATOR	TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT	DEGREE OF ACHIEVEMENT	COMMENTS
Indicator 1a - Extent to which stakeholders use the produced data, migration tools and methodologies in the policy development and implementation	Maximum possible on a scale of 1 to 5	4- Great extent	Objective exceeded (by 200%)	Achievement: 4 - Great extent. Data produced for the first ever country MGI report. New Migration Profile 2021 used in the development of the new Migration Resolution and Action Plan for 2021-2025
Indicator 1b - Level of alignment of the policies with the international and EU data management standards	Full alignment international and EU standards	Fully aligned with EU and international standards	Objective reached	Achievement: Migration resolution, migration profile, MGI Report, the migration module in LFS and EU standards Guidelines. Final three (3) data management tools/mechanisms developed and applied by the State Statistical Office.
Indicator 1.1.a – Comprehensive and systematic migration policy available	Migration Policy 2016-2020	Migration Policy 2021-2025	Achieved	Achievement: Migration Policy 2021-2025 endorsed and adopted in December 2021.
Indicator 1.2a - Number of data management tools and/or mechanisms applied by the institutions	5	7	Exceeded (by 140%)	Achievement: 7 data management tools and/or mechanisms applied by the institutions (Migration Profile, Migration module in LFS, Guidelines for implementation of the Migration Module questionnaire, Migration Governance Index Report - 3 data collection tools

Indicator 1.2b - Complementary data source of migration stocks and flows available	2	2	Achieved (100%)	Achievements: 2 complementary data sources (Bayesian hierarchical approach and Comparative Analysis of the Remittances) - Social media (FB) data - Report on Big Data analytics - Data Analysis of 2 000 remittances receiving HH. South – South Cooperation: study visit of the NBRNM team to the Central Bank of Albania.
Indicator 1.3a - Number of individuals trained on data management	325	357	Exceeded 357 (110%)	Achievement: Overall total 357 trained/80% average correct responds in the post-training questionnaires:
Indicator 1.3b – Number of training sessions/meetings/conferences	10	29 (as of September 2023)	Exceeded (290%)	Achievement: 29 working sessions/meetings/interviews/training sessions organized. - working sessions for the intragovernmental body. - interviews /meetings with national stakeholders about the anticipatory migration governance.
Indicator 2a - The frequency of inter and intra institutional data exchange.	Middle to high frequency of data exchange.	Middle to High frequency of data exchange	Achieved	Achievement: Middle to High frequency of data exchange (a) 4 mechanisms established b) 2 protocols developed.
Indicator 2.1a – Number of needs assessments on inter and intra institutional data collection and exchange mechanisms	1	1	Achieved	Achievement: 1 need assessment completed on 27 th of May 2021
Indicator 2.1b – Number of individuals trained, disaggregated by sex and	150 (with at least 70% with correct	169 (94%)	Exceeded (115% of target).	Achievement: Total 169 participants (64% women) with 94% correct responds in the post-training questionnaire trained on Remittances and Big Data by of 2022.

institutions / number of trainees whose knowledge/skills improved	responses in the post-training questionnaires)		Correct response target exceeded (135%)	
Indicator 2.1c – Number of developed/updated SOPs/procedures	2	2	Achieved	Achievement: 2 developed SoPs/procedures
Indicator 2.1d – Number of developed or upgraded data management/ exchange systems	3	5	Exceeded (125% of target)	Achievement: 5 systems developed/upgraded
Indicator 3a - % of increase in policy and opinion makers' perception towards migrants and refugees as development actors.	30% with increase in positive perceptions		/	Achievement: Awaiting results of Study of perceptions conducted in 2023.
Indicator 3.1a – Number of persons reached with the country wide and local level campaigns	at least 10,000 persons to be reached with the social and other media.	449,492 persons reached/ 740,000 views	Exceeded (7000% of target)	Achievement: 449,492 persons reached with the information campaign videos / 45 times more than targeted in the JP.
Indicator 3.1b – Availability of an informative campaign, developed and disseminated in traditional and social media	Yes (availability of the informative campaign)	informative campaign	Exceeded	Achievement: Informative campaign available on 3 national TV stations, 3 local TV stations, 3 radio stations, 10 web portals and paid ads on FB and Instagram.

Indicator 3.2a - Number of journalists trained, Number of trainees whose knowledge/skills improved	50 (at least 70% with correct responds in the post-training questionnaire.)	40 (87% with correct responses)	31 (86%)	Achievement: 40 journalists trained by the JP in 2021 -2023 ⁷ / 87% with correct responds in the post training questionnaire:
Indicator 3.2b - Number of articles/broadcasts from journalists with positive narratives and perceptions;	22 articles/broadcasts	31	Exceeded (140% of target)	Achievement: 31 articles/broadcasts with positive narratives and perceptions:
Indicator 3.2c - Number of individuals trained on the Communication Strategy for Social Change	120	161	Exceeded (134)	161 officials (61% women) from the governmental bodies and relevant ministries, as well as from civil society organizations and UN entities. 89% was the average rating by the participants of the overall experience of the training.
Indicator 3.2d – Number of public events organized or supported in order for the public to adopt positive narratives and perceptions of migrants and refugees	5 public events	10	Exceeded (200%) of target	Achievement: Total 10 events organized with MPTF support. - 555,173 persons were reached with the informative campaign “Not hate – build an attitude” in 2021.

Complementary Migration Data Sources Available:

A statistical model of migration flows to and from North Macedonia, developed using the Bayesian hierarchical approach (Mirror Statistics) by experts from Southampton University, was presented to relevant national stakeholders.

A "Comparative Analysis of Remittances in North Macedonia and Opportunities for Survey-Based Measurement Improvements" was made available.

A report on the analysis of data collected during a specialized survey of a sample of 2,000 remittance-receiving households.

⁷ Note: The target of 50 journalists trained by the end of JP includes the baseline of 20 journalists were trained by UNHCR in 2020 outside JP.

A follow-up analysis titled "Leveraging Migration and Remittances for Promoting Sustainable Growth: Global Experiences and Policy Options for North Macedonia."

- Pilot activities involving South-South Cooperation and a study visit by a team from the National Bank of North Macedonia to the Central Bank of Albania, focusing on exchanging experiences related to conducting remittance surveys at border crossings and data distribution within Balance of Payments statistics, along with the sustainability of the estimation model.

- A report on Big Data analytics, mapping, describing, and analyzing potential data sources for migration big data analysis, utilizing state-of-the-art techniques.

- A report on the analysis of Big Data as an alternative source for understanding internal migration patterns, specifically "Big Data Analysis in North Macedonia."

In Statistics:

The development of population projections spanning 50 years, representing the first such projections in a quarter of a century.

A recalculation of total population estimates between the last two census rounds (2002-2021).



Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund

EQ11. To what extent can changes be observed in terms of the intended outcomes?

a. Design and implementation of evidence-based and coordinated migration policies by policy makers and institutional stakeholders, including anticipatory governance (Outcome 1);

b. Enhanced inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management (Outcome 2); and

c. Improved perceptions of migrants and refugees as development actors among the general public and policy makers (Outcome 3)?

The evaluation has recorded a number of changes that can be observed when it comes to the design and implementation of evidence-based and coordinated migration policies. First, the policy preparation context leading to the formulation of Resolution on Migration Policy of The Republic of North Macedonia (2021 - 2025) has been much more consultative than in previous iterations and has encompassed a wider range of actors, including civil society. The feedback from interviews shows a strong appreciation of the participatory approach, in that the process has opened time and space for roundtable consultations, enabled to gather inputs, which allowed to produce a policy document, value for its relevance, clarity and level of details.

The interaction of stakeholders also now reached a higher level, owing to regular exchanges and with institutions having, for the first time often, identified and collaborated directly with the right person on a technical level within each institution (considering the statistical capacity of each institution can greatly vary, from the SSO and the National Bank equipped with full-fledged statistical units, to other institutions with lesser equipment, less sophisticated software and less staff, such as the Ministry of Interior for instance).

A major change has also occurred in the overall systematic and organized inter-institutional cooperation and coordination. The coordination and collaboration systems introduced by the project given an impetus of institutions to not only actively exchange data but also identify ways to fill data gaps, with the support of the innovative tools and approaches introduced by the project. Among other, the project has introduced the Migration Profile (a compact fiche based on statistical data, bringing together key indicators on migration and development), the Migration Governance Index Report (MGI, a tool based on policy inputs, which offers insights on policy levers that countries can use to develop their migration governance), a Migration Module (developed and included in the LFS, to help obtain accurate data on labor migration in the country.), Statistical Model of Migration Flow (applying the so-called “Bayesian Approach”) and using big data to estimate migration stocks and flows, Remittances household survey and remittance work analysis (using data on the foreign currency remittances from emigrants and workers residing abroad as an alternative and complementary data source for migration estimates).

The innovative and forward-looking dimension of the project, focusing on raising awareness and training institutions on a series of news to inform migration policy, has resulted in institutions, moving from a merely a data collection exercise, often conducted in disconnection from peer institutions to efforts driven by an awareness that each institution brings its piece of the wider migration data “puzzle”.

The various public events and the use of social media in the campaigns aiming at building a positive perception of migration have also brought change which could be observed in the degree of (positive) reactivity on electronic media and attendance to events. It is hard to measure the depth of change, especially in the long term. The feedback back from interviewees is that improving the positive public perception on migration requires a continuum of activity, through regular events and community mobilization, especially with the youth.

EQ12. To what extent can changes be observed in the institutional capacity development programmes of the beneficiaries in the area of migration management?

Institutions have been making progress in their data collection and data analysis capacity, as a result of the project support; both in IT equipment, introduction of and training on new software. This combined with the introduction of new conceptual models and tools, has contributed to building a better picture on migration. However, there are important variations among institutions in terms of capacity in collecting and analysing data. The SSO is obviously the most capable and advance institution (even if it chronically lacks financial resources), SSO, as collecting and publishing data is part of its legal mandate (including the management of the register-based statistical system - MakStat Database, which collects and disseminates data related to both internal and international migration of Macedonian nationals and foreigners). From the rest of institutions, there remains significant gaps, between, from instance, the NBRM, a capable institution in terms of statistical analysis and the Ministry of Interior, which, even if it does collect a substantial amount of data (for instance on migration at border crossing points), is still recording a lot of data on spreadsheets, and only enjoys a limited capacity to cross and analyze data on migration. Even if institutions have overall enhanced their capacity, owing the equipment, the software and trainings provided by the project, there is need for each institution to have a unit dedicated to data collection, analysis and sharing so that the level of migration evidence for policy and programming purposes, increases.

EQ13. To what extent has the project contributed to good migration governance in North Macedonia through enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development? (Objective)

The guiding process to the latest resolution on migration, the changed, constructive, and forward-looking perception of migration and the way of managing it, the advancement on building data evidence, the increased and more systematic coherence of the “whole-of-institutions” represent a major contribution of the project to a better migration governance. However, better does not yet mean good governance as it would be unrealistic to expect a fully functional and institutionalized model that is able to strongly manage emigration, after a three-year project cycle. However, the project has set institutions on track to building an efficient institutional response in the mid to long-term.

EQ14. What were the factors that facilitated or hindered the achievement of intended results of the project?

Stakeholder consultation and participation have played a key role in progressively raising awareness, shifting minds, and changing perception to get a strong commitment of stakeholders. The complementary of mandates and experience among IOM, UNFPA and UNHCR, to mobilize the expertise in various fields

has contributed to development the substantial technical component of the project. The smoothness of the collaboration among the project team from the three different agencies has proven essential to maintain the dynamic of stakeholder mobilization and manage to deliver numerous activities within the project cycle. Besides the COVID crisis to which the project has rapidly and effectively adjusted, adjusting to the tempo of institutions with their own priorities (e.g.: postponing the LFS Household survey on migration so that it coincides with the SSO planning) has been a time constraint the project has had to deal with. Otherwise, the project has not suffered from significantly hindering factor.

4.4. Efficiency

EQ15. To what extent has the project made good use of its human, financial and technical resources?

Overall, there has been very positive feedback of interviewees on human resources (UN staff: opened, flexible, engaged, and responsive. External consultants showed sharp expertise, offering mind-shifting knowledge content and perspective on migration management and governance), Quality of project collaborative events and capacity-building training,

EQ16. To what extent has the project used an appropriate combination of tools, approaches and partnerships to pursue the achievement of its results?

The evaluation has assessed the project activities as characterized with elevated cost-efficiency with the qualitative (defined based on the feedback of trainees, interviewees, and concrete application of knowledge) aspect which has been ensured owing to the following:

- True joint UN project in nature: The project design, operational modalities, and respective roles (based on the specific mandates, expertise and experience of each UN agency with RC coordination support) designed in detail, thus leaving no space for misunderstanding during implementation.
- An appropriate attitude of the project team members: The evaluation felt there was an individual and collective willingness to work together, moved by pro-active attitude and flexibility in adjusting the challenges (for instance, proceeding a budget reallocation and requesting a no-cost extension or postponing the implementation module of the LFS).

Other aspect explaining the quality have been assessed as including the following:

- Highly inclusive and participatory project approach has enabled interest, commitment to innovative migration management and ownership of the migration.
- Deep and long-term (strong inclusion of national stakeholder in previous Migration Resolutions) history of stakeholder engagement, strong institutional commitment stimulated has created a context with actors supportive of and highly receptive of innovation tools as they have capture that, in essence, addressing the challenge of migration requires not only the use of innovative tools but also of a new form of governance.
- Quality and relevance and content and training delivery assessed as high consistently across interviewed stakeholders.

It is also worth mentioning that beyond its high cost-efficiency, the innovative activities introduced by the project have raised interest beyond the scope of the project. As an example, the tools and approaches introduced by DEMOS have gained strong interest and are planned to be used by several training

participants. e.g. A teacher from the American University in Skopje will develop curricula based on the DEMOS tools for his students.

4.5. Impact

EQ17. What is the likely long-term impact of the project in the area of migration management?

It is difficult to estimate the long-term impact of the project in the area of migration management in case the efforts and results achieved by the project are no longer supported by the force of a project; especially since the sustainability of results is typically and partly affected by political situation. The level and quality of data collection will likely continue to increase, as long as institutions continue to use the introduced tools, though the rhythm of progress will depend on the level of financial and human resources invested in this area.

EQ18. Was the intended impact communicated efficiently with the stakeholders in terms of promoting understanding of the value of forward-looking approaches for good migration governance?

The introduction of the various innovative tools and approaches has contributed not only to changing minds and perspective on migration, both on the consideration of the phenomenon as bringing opportunities but also on ways to manage migration. There is an awareness among UN agencies and involved stakeholders that the introduction of new concepts relating to migration management is a starting point and that it will take more than a single project phase to not only absorb but also institutionalize the migration policy, its action plan and the innovative tool and approaches introduced to boost implementation.

The awareness on the fundamental importance of managing migration raised by the project, combined with the innovative spin injected and absorbed by stakeholders has led to stakeholders taking stock that addressing the migration challenge will take more than just inter-institutional mechanisms to be up to the stake, it such arrangement add to the burden of institution workload and lack the institutional authority required for effective implementation.

It has also opened the space to anticipate the future, “next level” institutional response to migration (a migration agency the vision and mandate needs to be hosted and nested in a single, dedicated institutional home. Related conclusion that the (transformative) achievements of this project’s first phase needs to be driven by a model, a vision, and an institutional place for its effective implementation.

The impact can be seen in multiple aspects, and it has been observed through the following:

- A commitment and pro-active role of many stakeholders in the policy formulation effort. Institutions and non-governmental stakeholders who would traditionally not be greatly involved in the formulation of the Resolution of Migration Policy have been providing inputs to the policy. The deeper commitment of stakeholders to contributing to the policy is understood as the result on the awareness raising initiative of the project, presenting evidence-based policymaking as more effective and powerful than a reactive policy, tackling the phenomenon rather than its root causes.

- A changed attitude of stakeholders characterized with a willingness to collaborate with other institutions more systematically, involving regular exchanges (while institutions would rarely meet on the topic of migration) with the intention to share data, driven by a single and common vision of contributing to improving the evidence.

- On a general level, the opinions and interest of institutions but also the general public has also positively changed, thanks to a more informed understanding of migration, the diversity of its situation, the stakes linking migration and development and the positive contribution of migrants to the society. This is seen as the results of a stronger data-based evidence, allowing to replace prejudices with data and facts, but also through the topic of migration entering through the public debate through constructive journalism reporting on migration-related situation a wider debate stimulated through cultural events and social media communication.

EQ19. If any, which unintended effects can be observed, whether positive or negative?

The evaluation understands the anticipatory governance methodology introduced through the project by DEMOS has raised interest for Northern Macedonia for the development of its National Development Strategy. This interest is a powerful indicator that innovation and forward-looking policymaking is valued and potentially further adopted by Northern Macedonia. This can contribute to strengthening the overall development policy coherence of the country, as stronger data-collection mechanisms and evidence-based policy is needed across all sectors and are expected to be more efficient if conducted in synergy. The interest of the Government to consider the anticipatory governance not only to its migration policy management but to its overall development strategy is a powerful unintended effect of project, indicating that when innovation is not a superficial layer to “sell” innovation for the sake of innovation, it has the potential to be a game-changer in policy formulation. It is also indicating that there is ownership of the innovation introduced by the project, implying not only a acknowledgement that evidence-based policies are needed across sectors but also that the government has grasped the link between improving the data collection and overall system and the ability to use this data as a condition to be able to include anticipation in the governance of development issues.

4.6. Sustainability

Q20. Are benefits generated by the project likely to continue once the external support ceases?

Several of the benefits resulting from the project will remain without further project support, such as, for instance, the tools introduced by the project (Migration Profile, MGI, Migration Module in LFS...). However, part of the advancements achieved by the project may be affected if no further external support and resources are mobilized. At the policy level, the current Resolution, supported by the project expires in 2025 and it is planned for a new one to be formulated. Based on the feedback from interviews, the overall effort required to deliver a meaningful policy, that should reflect the furthering of evidence-based, forward-looking, inclusive, and cross-institutional Resolution, will require strong external support. The mobilization of an even wider spectrum of stakeholders (with more of the civil society and more of the private sector), the consultation and coordination effort required is such that the evaluation grasped that the same level of project support to the current Resolution will be highly needed. When it comes to the collective inter-institutional commitment to implement the Resolution Action Plan, and the participation

of each institution to the inter-institutional mechanisms, enhanced by the project, interviewees have also expressed concern that without the boost from an external support, the overall commitment of institutions may not be maintained at the level during the project implementation. The various innovative tools introduced have now been integrated in the practices and processes of institutions while those repeatedly mentioned they need more human and technical resources to continue improving the data collection effort.

EQ21. Do the project partners have the technical and financial capacity and are they committed to maintaining the benefits of the project in the long run?

The project partners have the willingness to commit further towards the longer-term goal of the project; and they have clearly expressed their commitment to maintaining the benefits of the project. However, some institutions still lack the technical capacity in relation to data analysis, harmonized formatting, and exchange. All interviews have also mentioned the lack of financial resources, as well as human resources, as a recurrent problem, limiting their ability to move further without external support. All stakeholders are aware of the situation and have transmitted the message that further support should continue, and that the three implementing UN agencies should also have a continued involvement in managing the technical assistance.

EQ22. Are stakeholders capacitated to utilize the knowledge in other areas, not just migration management?

The data collection tools, and innovative approaches introduced by the project are definitely also relevant and useful to institutions as it increases the ability to exploit, cross data with other institutions and use it to feed analyses in the various areas of responsibilities of the various ministries.

4.7. Cross Cutting Themes

EQ23. To what extent were the principles of leave no one behind and disabilities as well as GCM guiding principles on human rights, gender responsive, and child sensitive programming incorporated into the project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting)?

The gender and human rights dimension as well as the GCM Principles have been fully considered as it has been fully reflected in the resolution on migration. The project design and proposal also clearly refer to the GCM principles as well as the gender dimension and human rights. The whole-of-government approach has stood at the core of the various project activities, from the involvement in the resolution formulation process, to the supported inter-institutional mechanisms. The project has systematically collected gender-disaggregated data and has overall recorded a higher female participation to project training and other events.

EQ24. What was the impact of the joint project on the enjoyment of human rights by impacted rights-holders, the advancement of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, and the advancement of children's rights and meeting their needs?

It is impossible to measure the direct and indirect impact of the project on the enjoyment of the rights of affected right-holders. First, some of the changes observed, such as a more constructive approach in

journalism towards migration or the public perception expressed through social media and polled by the project are the direct result of activities while the long-term changes will require a continuation of similar social change activities. Second, the project's efforts leading to a changed attitude, perspective of institutions in the way they manage migration may not produce significantly visible effects on the rights of migrants at this stage. However, this change in the institution's approach lay the essential foundation to create a strong institutional environment where more protective of migrants' rights, in a context of a public opinion more sensitized and understanding of challenges faced by migrants and their potential contribution to the society.

EQ25. To what extent did the joint project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting) and management structure reflect and align with the GCM guiding principles on whole-of-government, whole-of-society, and people-centred approaches to programming?

The project design has included monitoring and reporting format allowing for the systematic collection of gender-disaggregated data, while the resolution, its action plan and the monitoring of its implementation do include disaggregation of data that can inform on the implementation of human rights. In parallel, the project has built various levels of inter-institutional mechanisms, at the technical, operational and policy level that encompass all institutions, thus applying the whole government principle. Civil society has been involved in the preparation of the Migration Resolution, though its degree of involvement could be increased for the next resolution.

CHAPTER 5. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

5.1. Lessons Learned

Lesson learned #1

The project has raised awareness and improved the understanding of the factors that are encouraging emigration through the data collection and analysis tools as well as approaches. This has contributed to the institutional awareness that emigration is crucial to the development of the country and that institutions can strengthen policies in the prevention of emigration.

Lesson learned #2

Given that the project can be considered as pilot phase, instilling change of minds, practices and system which can only realistically be implemented over a long period of time, it is important to acknowledge that the project has introduced several truly innovative (such as Mirror Statistics, a groundbreaking method for estimating migration stocks and flows to and from the country, recently introduced to the professional community or Big Data, methodically mapped and analyzed as a promising alternative and experimental data source for migration, supplementary to the administrative data sources. Or which are the work on remittances and its potential contributions to the country's development and assumed benefits from migration, also represents an initial effort of another valuable, yet untapped, data source worth exploring practices which (depending on the type of innovation involved) cannot be expected to have been fully institutionalized as it requires further time, capacity, and resources.

Additionally, inter-institutional coordination mechanisms cannot be considered as sustainable after a single project cycle, but that is more relevant to consider the project results as laying the foundation for sustainable mechanism. In this respect, this has been achieved by the project. In parallel, being aware that continuous funding cannot be guaranteed in the beginning, it is useful to engage with institutions to identify possible sources of funding the institutions themselves are able to access too.

5.2. Best Practices

Best Practice #1

Western Balkan countries experience similar challenges both in the areas of immigration, migration, and emigration. The regional-level initiatives (e.g. Study visit of NBRM to the Bank of Albania) supported more efficiently regional collaboration.

Best Practice #2

The degree of innovation introduced by the project is a best practice in that it has been careful enough and preparing the readiness of institutions through awareness raising and consultation taken very seriously. When unpacking innovation in technical terms, this translates in as many best practices as there has been innovative ways introduced. Repeating the examples mentioned under Lesson Learned 2, best practices have been identified through the following methods: Mirror Statistics, for being a spearheading method for estimating migration stocks. methodically mapped and analyzed additional sources from the Big Data, for its promising potential as alternative and experimental data source for migration. The exploration of information on remittances and its related analysis to better estimate and understand its potential contributions to the country's development).

Best Practice #3

The proposed Anticipatory Policy model formulated in DEMOS's final project publication⁸ is a best practice in terms of proposing a relevant conceptual model for the future. The model is tailor-designed to the migration challenges of North Macedonia, as the publication is the output of the consultations, interactions and workshops conducted during the project implementation.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Conclusions

Conclusion #1 *The project has reached its intended results, institutional stakeholders are supportive of and committed to evidence-based and data-driven policy development. Non-governmental actors involved in the policy making and positive communication on migration.*

Based on the findings described under the effectiveness ap and impacts sections, the evaluation confirms the expected changes in the change of public discourse and views, commitments, and practices of institutions towards evidence-based migration policy formulation and implementation have occurred.

⁸ "From Fortress to Foresight, A new of Governing Migration", DEMOS Helsinki

The project has confirmed not only interest but strong commitment from all stakeholders. An important step towards implementation, evidenced by mind-shifting effect, established inter-institutional mechanisms, and use of innovative is an encouraging first phase effort. While the findings also indicate that results and early impacts require further support to be sustained, the success of this project provides a validation of the theory of change and justifies the rationale for external project support to continue.

Conclusion #2 *Migration-related evidence and data has effectively been enhanced through the introduction and application of innovative tools and approaches.*

Institutions have overall welcomed the innovation brought by the project. The technical assistance component of the project has produced concreate advancements in building the evidence and enhancing the data collection, while it has also contributed to underline some of the technical and resource capacity limitations of some institutions.

Several tools and products, such as the migration module from the LFS or the Country Migration Profile have now fully become part of the regular institutional practices. Some other tools and approaches such as the work on remittances has shown its potential through the contribution to the data production and analysis effort.

The observed situation at end of the project leads to conclude that, on the one hand, support is still needed to build further the technical capacities of institutions in the development and implementation of innovative tools. On the other hand, those institutions (such as the Ministry of Interior) with weaker data collection, processing and analytical capacity need continued support so they increase their contribution to the inter-institutional data exchange mechanism.

Some tools and approaches have already been adopted and put into practice while some others have only recently been introduced and will require further support to unlock their potential. State Institutions have also indicated their data collection and analysis capacity should be further built to increase the availability of migration-related data (e.g. for the Ministry of Interior to convert Excel-based data collect to a harmonized, exchangeable format). A conclusion from this observation is that it is important to recognize that attaining an effective data-driven, evidence-based migration management is a long-term objective and requires a long-term investment. In this regard, this project should be considered as a first phase of this investment.

Conclusion #3 The level of inter-institutional collaboration and coordination has increased thanks to the support of the project in facilitating regular exchanges at policy and operational levels. As a results, there is now greater exchange and harmonisation of migration-related data.

However, from the feedback of institution's representatives interviewed, a concern was expressed that, without continued external support to stimulate institution's involvement, the collaborative effort may decline over time. Such a mechanism is effective and produces results as long it is being facilitated by a project and supported with resources thus raising the question of the relevance of a coordination

mechanism as a sustainable answer the demanding tasks of inter-institutional coordination and harmonisation of efforts.

A conclusion from this finding is that an institutional mechanism may not be sufficient to ensure the steady and continued commitment of institutions in their contributions to provide migration-related data and evidence. Indeed, the institutional response to the challenge and high stakes of migration is assessed as in need of an ambition vision, which should be conveyed through the creation of a formal body which would have both the mandate, authority, and resources to manage the implementation of the Resolution of Migration and its action plan, including the inter-institutional coordination.

Conclusion #4 The attention paid and supported provided by the project in building the understanding, increasing the awareness, and getting the buy-in and commitment of stakeholders understanding of a new and systematic Migration Policy has proven crucial to the development of the forward-looking Resolution on Migration. Based on interview feedback, the quality of the next Resolution on Migration will, once again, depend on the attention dedicated to its development.

The development phase of the Resolution of Migration is both crucial to the quality of Resolution and a substantial effort, for the process to be inclusive and participatory. Considering the interview feedback that the process should include even more of the civil society and private sector, this means sufficient time will be required to conduct an extensive consultative process.

Conclusion # 5 The short-term impact from Communication for Social Change's approach which have guided most of the communication campaign, events, trainings have confirmed it is efficient in turning public perceptions and discourse towards positive attitude and feedback.

However, the consultations with the project actors indicate that perceptions and opinions remain largely influenced by the context are a variable. Thus, the evaluation draws the conclusion that the communication effort needs to be continued in order to progressively build a culture of tolerance and increasingly (evidence-based) informed and objective appreciation of the benefits from migration (preventing emigration, managing migration flows).

Conclusion #6 The above conclusions, from 1 to 4, underline that the results obtained so far have been effective and impactful, though these recognize that building a systematic and effective migration policy requires a longer-term support while institutions lack the financial (and to some extent the human) resources to pursue the institutional commitment and necessary capacity building. A clear conclusion from this is that resources are currently lacking and are expected to require mobilization.

This needs to be pursued as establishing a forward-looking migration management governance is a long-term process that requires continuity, i.e the project effort with a follow up phase. The following efforts require a strategic driver with an institutional response that is commensurate to the importance of the influence of migration phenomenon to the development of North Macedonia.

Conclusion #57

There are several country-level and Western Balkans publications describing these (transit, immigration, emigration, intra-regional) share common migration characteristics, challenges, stakes, institutional development, and an EU accession perspective.

The evaluation further understands the various countries of the region are engaged in comparable – though at different stages – to EU-aligned effective migration policies. Even though, this was not a specific expectation from the evaluation, there is a relevant conclusion to observe for the region. As a matter of cost-effectiveness (in the exchange of and learning from experiences), coherence and synergy, exploring the possibilities of sharing experiences in the field of migration policies would be of benefit for each country and the region as a whole. The benefit of the study visit of the National Bank of North Macedonia to Albania, is a good indicator of the value of exchanging practices from the Western Balkans.

6.2. Recommendations

Recommendation #1 (short-term)

(Relates to Conclusion #1, 2, 3 and 4) Support the continuation of the intervention as the project approach remains necessary to continue the stakeholder mobilization and technical support, in order to reach a sustainable, institutional model of migration management in North Macedonia.

This project is to be considered as the first phase of a longer-term commitment to achieving the objective of establishing an effective model of migration governance, able to manage the diversity of migration, from transit migration to emigration. The project has raised an awareness that the stakes are high for the country's development and that the task ahead is sizeable and will require time and resources. The results yielded by the project are both encouraging and promising but remain fragile without the external support and driving force of a project. The evaluation strongly recommends further support is mobilized to enable the implementation a successive project phase.

More specifically, this recommendation entails the following:

1.1- Continue supporting the further development of innovative approaches and tools (at minimum until financial resources are mobilized: e.g. assess technical capacity needs), which require consolidation or support to develop further its potential.

1.2. Continue supporting the inter and intra-institutional data exchange and collaboration mechanisms (at minimum until financial resources are mobilized: e.g. facilitating, attending inter-institutional coordination meetings).

Recommendation #.2 (Priority, short-term)

(Relates to Conclusion #6 Actively fundraise for the continuation of the project, prioritising targeting IPA III funds under chapter 24 (justice, freedom, and security). The project has a very high relevance in supporting the priorities and recommendations formulated in the latest EU Screening Report for North Macedonia. The report, among other findings, recognised the value of the Migration Resolution, provides

a strong justification to tap into IPA III funding. It is recommended that IOM/UNHCR/UNFPA consult and support the relevant institutions in the formulation of a project to continue the efforts from the initial phase, by highlighting how it has supported the various priorities highlighted in the latest (20 July 2023) *EU Screening report for North Macedonia*.

Recommendation #3 (mid-term)

(Relates to conclusion #4) Engage a consultative process to develop an institutional vision and model for the management of the Migration Policy and the implementation of its action plan. This process could take place at the earliest convenience so it can be introduced during the preparation phase of the next Resolution on Migration, where relevant actors could provide their input.

Recommendation #4 (longer-term)

(Relates to conclusion#4) Allocate sufficient time for the elaboration of the next Migration Resolution, in order to grant sufficient time for a thorough and wide consultation process (with a greater space for civil society, the private sector and the diaspora). It is also recommended for consultations about the future institutional model (see recommendation 3) during the preparation period of the next Migration Resolution.

Recommendation #57 (mid-term)

Organize a Western Balkans regional consultation on migration management support initiatives and experiences among the UN agencies involved in the project (IOM/UNFPA/UNHCR). Based on the understanding that similar or related initiatives have been implemented in the region, the evaluation believes any exchange of technical knowledge and experience can be beneficial to future interventions in support of migration management. Aware of the fact that time, human and financial resources may not be available to support regional consultation activities, the evaluation suggests remote regional exchanges are organized. Whenever possible, it is also suggested to include a regional dimension (and related activities) in future project design.

Annexes

Annex 1: List of Documents Reviewed

DESK REVIEW – LIST OF DOCUMENTS		
1.	JOINT Project Document « Evidence-based migration policy planning and discourse in North Macedonia”	28/08/2020 ; MPTF, IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA
2.	Migration in North Macedonia, A Country Profile 2021	IOM, Government of North Macedonia, 2021
3.	Mid-term Migration MPTF joint programme update 2021	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2021
4.	Mid-term Migration MPTF joint programme update 2022	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2022
5.	Mid-term Migration MPTF joint programme update 2023	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2023
6.	Annual Progress Report 2020 - 28.10.2020-27.04.2023	IOM North Macedonia
7.	Annual Progress Report 2021 – 01.01.2021 – 31.12.2021	IOM North Macedonia
8.	Annual Progress Report 2022 – 01.01.2022 – 31.12.2022	IOM North Macedonia
9.	Compilation of Monthly progress reports January – June 2023	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2023
10.	Annex 1 - Communication and visibility plan	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2020
11.	Annex 2 - Communication and visibility guidelines	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2020
12.	Annex 3 - Project factsheet	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2020
13.	Annex 4 - PRESS RELEASE Joint UN support to the development of an evidence-based migration policy in North Macedonia	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2020
14.	Annex 5 - PRESS CLIPPING (Compilation of media coverage)	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2020
15.	Annex 6 - MEETING MINUTES #1 Technical Working Group (TWG)	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, 2020
16.	Resolution on the migration policy of the Republic of North Macedonia 2021-2025	Government of the republic of North Macedonia, June 2021
17.	Migration profile of the Republic of North Macedonia 2021	Government of the republic of North Macedonia, June 2021
18.	Ad Hoc Migration Module (questionnaire)	Republic of North Macedonia State Statistical Office, 2021

19.	The Guide for implementation of the questionnaire for a standard migration module incorporated in the regular Labor Force Survey in the Republic of North Macedonia	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, 2021
20.	Rules of procedure of the intra-governmental group for development of migration policy	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, 2021
21.	INTRA-GOVERNMENTAL BODY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF MIGRATION POLICY Description of the tasks and duties of the head, deputy head, members, and deputy members	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, 2021
22.	Communication Strategy and Communication Tools of the Intra- governmental Body for Development of the Migration Policy	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, November 2021
23.	Instruments for Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluating the Resolution on Migration Policy and the Action Plan	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, October 2021
24.	Alignment of the Macedonian Migration Policy with the EU Standards	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, November 2021
25.	TRAINING REPORT team building for the Members of the Intragovernmental Coordination Body for Migration in North Macedonia, through the IOM office in Skopje	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, 20- 21.12 2021
26.	Technical Offer Services to support the institutionalization of forward-looking planning and policy development in North Macedonia	Demos Helsinki, 2021
27.	Communication strategy for Social Change	UNHCR, December 2021, Kimberly A. Parker, PhD Bobi Ivanov, PhD Erin B. Hester, MA
28.	Social Media Plan	UNHCR, December 2021, Kimberly A. Parker, PhD Bobi Ivanov, PhD Erin B. Hester, MA
29.	Communications Strategy for Social Change Capacity Building Workshops - Narrative Report	UNHCR, January 2021
30.	Youth Engagement and Education for Improving the Narrative relating to Refugees, Asylum Seekers, and Stateless Persons	Grey group, UNHCR, Youth Education Forum, February 2022
31.	Migrants and Refugees campaign, final report	IOM North Macedonia, December 2022
32.	Joint Project "Evidence-based migration policy planning and discourse in North Macedonia" Steering Committee (SC) #1	IOM North Macedonia, 10 February 2021

	MEETING MINUTES	
33.	Research on the perceptions and attitudes of young people in North Macedonia regarding refugees, asylum-seekers, migrants and persons without citizenship	MPTF, December 2021
34.	MEETING MINUTES Steering Committee (SC) #3	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, 31 March 2022
35.	Distribution of the Resolution of Migration Policy 2021-2025	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, 2021
36.	Capacity building training report on improving inter- and intra-institutional data collection and exchange mechanisms and practices	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, February 2022
37.	Implementation of the New Framework Regulation for the Production of European Statistics on Persons and Households (Integrated European Social Statistics - IESS) in the Labour Force Domain (LFS): The Case of Slovenia – Part I Guidelines on the preparation of the LFS methodology and questionnaire, LFS data transmission and validation and preparation of the Quality Report	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, Ana Božič Verbič, November 2022
38.	Implementation of the New Framework Regulation for the Production of European Statistics on Persons and Households (Integrated European Social Statistics - IESS) in the Labour Force Domain (LFS): The Case of Slovenia – Part II Guidelines on the sample design, break in time series, dissemination of LFS data at a lower level than the national level and calculation of the monthly unemployment rate and new indicators	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, Ana Božič Verbič, November 2022
39.	Development of data collection tool/exchange mechanisms and sharing of practices that will be applied by the State Statistical Office Final methodological and organizational guidelines	IOM, UNHCR, UNCFPA North Macedonia, Danilo Dolenc, 12 December 2022
40.	Migration estimates for North Macedonia by using mirror statistics (stage 1): Final project report	Department of Social Statistics and Demography, University of Southampton, Georgios Aristotelous, Peter W.F. Smith and Jakub Bijak
41.	Mapping, description, and analysis of potential data sources for migration big data analysis and state-of-the-art recommendations	Assist. prof. d-r Petre Lameski, 2022
42.	Remittances in North Macedonia: comparative analysis and measurement improvements	MPTF, UNFPA, Bojan Shimbov, 2021
43.	Survey of household personal remittances in the republic of North Macedonia from abroad	UNFPA North Macedonia, 2021

44.	Anticipatory Migration Governance and Policymaking in North Macedonia First Progress Report	MPTF, Demos Helsinki, February 2022
45.	Anticipatory Migration Governance and Policymaking in North Macedonia Second Progress Report	MPTF, Demos Helsinki, February 2022
46.	Anticipatory Migration Governance and Policymaking in North Macedonia Third Progress Report	MPTF, Demos Helsinki, August 2022
47.	Anticipatory Migration Governance and Policymaking in North Macedonia Fourth Progress Report	MPTF, Demos Helsinki, December 2022
48.	Proposal for amendments and additions to the Rulebook on the standards for the reception of asylum seekers	Minister of Labour and Social Policy, Mila Carovska, 30 August 2019
49.	Handbook on how to implement the integration program for persons granted asylum	Ministry of Labor and Social Policy Republic of North Macedonia, December 2022
50.	Joint project “evidence-based migration policy and discourse in North Macedonia” final report of the training on “remittances in North Macedonia - comparative analysis and measurement improvements through a design and implementation of a new methodology for surveying remittances”	UNFPA North Macedonia, November 2022
51.	Final training report on “big data as an alternative source of data for migration policy in North Macedonia - mapping, description and analysis of potential data sources for migration big data analysis and state-of-the-art recommendations”	IOM, UNHCR, UNFPA North Macedonia, December 2022

Annex 2: List of Interviewed Stakeholders

Name and Surname	Organization	E-mail
Jelena Krasic	IOM	jkasic@iom.int
Eneida Alimanova	IOM	Ealimanova@iom.int
Petar Dimitrov	UNHCR	dimitrop@unhcr.org
Ljubinka Brashnarska	UNHCR	brashnar@unhcr.org
Marija Dimitrovska	UNFPA	dimitrovska@unfpa.org
Rajna Cemerska Krtov	UNFPA	rcemerska1@gmail.com
Biljana Taneska	UNFPA	taneska@unfpa.org

Name and Surname	Institution/Organization	E-mail
Dejan Gerasimovski	Cabinet of the Prime Minister	dejan.gerasimovski@primeminister.gov.mk
Ivanna Hadzievska		ivanna.hadzievska@primeminister.gov.mk
Apostol Simovski	State Statistical Office (SSO)	apostol.simovski@stat.gov.mk
Jovanco Sapundzioski		jovanco.sapundzioski@stat.gov.mk
Bojkica Markovska		bojkica.markovska@stat.gov.mk
Ajrija Causoska		ajrija.causoska@stat.gov.mk
Maja Cvetkovska	Ministry of Interior (Moi)	maja_cvetkovska@moi.gov.mk
Julija Popovska		JULIJA_POPOVSKA@moi.gov.mk
Aleksandrovska		
Nikola Nikolov	Ministry of Information Society and Public Administration (MISA)	nikola.nikolov@mioa.gov.mk
Emilija Gjoshevski		emilija.gjoshevski@mioa.gov.mk
Rezarta Zulfiu		rezerta.zulfiu@mioa.gov.mk
Jeton Dauti		jeton.dauti@mioa.gov.mk
Elena Grozdanova	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy	egrozdanova@mtsp.gov.mk

Flutura Lazami Selvet Baruti Dana Petreska	Secretariat for European affairs	Flutura.lazami@sep.gov.mk selvet.baruti@sep.gov.mk Dana.petreska@sep.gov.mk
Sultanija Bojceva Terzijan Jasminka Dodeva Kovacheva	National Bank of the Republic of North Macedonia (NBRNM)	bojcevas@nbrm.mk dodevaj@nbrm.mk
Zoran Drangovski Irena Zdravkova Teodora Kjoseva	Macedonian Young Lawyers Association – MYLA	zdrangovski@myla.org.mk izdravkova@myla.org.mk tkjoseva@myla.org.mk
Petar Baralakovski Pande Eftimov	Youth Educational Forum (YEF)	petar_baralakovski@mof.org.mk pande_eftimov@mof.org.mk
Joao Sigora Mikael Sokero	Demos Helsinki (Partner in implementation of the anticipatory governance)	joao.sigora@demoshelsinki.fi mikael.sokero@demoshelsinki.fi
Kimberly Parker Bobi Ivanov	University of Kentucky	kimberly.a.parker@uky.edu bobi.ivanov@uky.edu
Peter Smith Jakub Bijak	Southampton University	P.W.Smith@soton.ac.uk J.Bijak@soton.ac.uk
Bojan Shimbov Gjorgji Nacevski	Local consultants on Remittance (activity 2.1.2)	simbovbojan@yahoo.com goganacevski@gmail.com
Ivan Chorbev Petre Lameski	Local consultants on Big data (activity 1.2.5 and 2.1.2)	ivan.chorbev@finki.ukim.mk petre.lameski@finki.ukim.mk

Annex 3: Evaluation Framework

Evaluation Question number	Question	Indicators	Description (Judgment indicators)	Data collecting methods	Data sources
RELEVANCE					
EQ1	To what extent were stakeholders consulted and involved in designing the project?	1.1. A formal stakeholder consultation process has taken place and the project design is reflecting the outcome of the consultation.	1.1.1. Documented stakeholder consultation on needs in the field of intervention. 1.1.2 Evidence of the project addressing priorities at the policy (national strategies...) 1.1.3 Evidence of the project design taking into account the needs, priorities and challenges expressed by consulted stakeholders. 1.1.4 Evidence of relevance and complementary of expertise among IOM, UNFPA, UNCHR and key partners' strategies 1.1.4 Evidence of key partners national strategic documents are coherent and not overlap.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ2	Is the project aligned with and supportive of national strategies?	2.1 Project goals, outcome and approach have been in line with and supportive of national strategies (and related action plans). 2.2 The project contributes to measurable progress towards the achievement of national	2.1.1. Documented evidence of the alignment of the project with the national strategies (and related action plans) 2.1.2. Evidence/testimonies from project staff and national stakeholders of the project remaining relevant and supportive to the potential changes of the related policies and strategies or the context affecting the sector of intervention. 2.2.1. Evidence of measurable (quantitative or qualitative) contribution of the project towards the achievement of national strategies (and related	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team

		strategies (and related action plans)	action plans) (e.g. strengthened capacities of supported stakeholders).		Key National partners
EQ3	Does the project respond to the needs of the target group?	<p>3.1. Evidence of the project approach, objectives, rationale, and activities responding to target group needs.</p> <p>3.2. Adequacy of the capacity building activities so needs of target group, so institutions are able to address needs over time.</p>	<p>3.1.1. Evidence of target group needs clearly expressed, identified, and confirmed by relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>3.1.2. Evidence of the project needs analysis, theory of change, rationale clearly respond to needs and the root-causes of needs.</p> <p>3.1.3. Documented elements of alignment between the capacity building activities developed by the project and training needs of the target group.</p> <p>3.2.1. Needs related to capacity gaps of stakeholders to address target group needs have been identified.</p> <p>3.2.2. Degree of project beneficiaries' satisfaction on the delivery of services (from service provider and user perspectives) using the capacity building activities brought by the project.</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p> <p>Key National partners</p>
EQ4	To what extent does the project align to the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework?	4.1. The project document refers to and supports the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework specific objectives and outcomes	<p>4.1.1. Evidence of clear references of the project document to the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework specific objectives and outcomes.</p> <p>4.1.2. Evidence of how the project intends to align and contribute to the UNSDCF.</p> <p>4.1.3. Evidence of how the project has effectively contributed to the UNSDCF (see effectiveness).</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p>

					Key National partners
EQ5	In regard to capacity development, were the most suitable stakeholder representatives selected?	5.1. Selected stakeholder representatives are effectively those in function to delivery services/make decisions for which capacity has been identified as a need to serve the objective of the project.	5.1.1. Evidence of a project assessment and indication of those stakeholder and their specific representatives are those who are expected to deliver services/contribute to implementation of strategy. 5.1.2. Evidence of a mechanism/rational on the selection process the most suitable stakeholder representatives, using clear indicators. 5.1.3. Degree of consensus or recognition by the project stakeholders on the selection process, selected representatives, and their performance.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ6	Was a proper analysis of the readiness of the stakeholders to undertake this initiative undertaken?	6.1. A proper analysis of the readiness of the stakeholders to undertake this initiative was conducted. 6.2. The conclusions and recommendations from the analysis were implemented. 6.3. The recommendations from the analysis proved correct or required adjustment.	6.1.1. Documented evidence that such an analysis was conducted, with clear conclusions and recommendations. Consensus or validation by the project team and key stakeholders of the conclusions and recommendations 6.1.2. Documented evidence that the conclusions and recommendations from the analysis were implemented. 6.1.3. Elements of evidence that the recommendations from the analysis proved correct or required adjustment.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
COHERENCE					
EQ7	To what extent has the project been complementary to other relevant migration management projects undertaken by the	7.1. An assessment of other relevant migration management projects has been conducted and	7.1.1. Evidence that an assessment of/and consultations with other relevant migration management projects has been conducted and led to project adjustment complementarity initiatives.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents

	participating entities, as well as other UN and non-UN actors?	led to project adjustment complementarity initiatives. 7.2. Overlaps, duplication have been identified or synergies have taken place.	7.1.2. Evidence, if any, Overlaps, duplication have been identified or synergies have taken place.	Project team briefings	Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ8	To what extent was the project coordinated with other relevant migration management projects?	8.1. Coordination initiatives or mechanisms have been defined and agreed upon during project design or inception phase. 8.2. Coordination has been effective and has contributed to effective results, synergies, added value.	8.1.1. Evidence of coordination mechanisms have defined and agreed upon during project design or inception phase. 8.2.1. Evidence of coordination mechanisms effectively implemented. 8.2.1. Identification of cases of effective/ineffective coordination, its outcomes or drawbacks and lessons learned.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EFFECTIVENESS					
EQ9	To what extent were target groups consulted and involved in the implementation of activities, thereby improving ownership, accountability and effectiveness?	9.1. Target groups were effectively consulted and involved in the implementation of activities. 9.2. Ownership, accountability, and effectiveness have improved as result of project activities.	9.1.1. Evidence that target groups were effectively consulted and involved in the implementation of activities. 9.1.2. Feedback sought and collected, concerns considered and addressed). 9.2.1. Evidence of elements/indicators of improved ownership, accountability, and effectiveness (progress towards objectives, decision-making, concrete stakeholders' commitment, actions, initiatives, statements...)	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners

EQ10	Have the project outputs been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?	<p>10.1. Degree of delivery of planned outputs.</p> <p>10.2. Identified under-delivery, challenges, changed outputs.</p>	<p>10.1.1 Degree to which outputs have been delivered (quantitatively, but especially qualitatively) as per the plans. Explanation in case of change of plan.</p> <p>10.2.1 Evidence of elements explaining effectiveness or lack of effectiveness in outputs delivery.</p> <p>10.2.2. Correctives actions taken in case of under-delivery or change of plans and related lessons learned.</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p> <p>Key National partners</p>
EQ11	<p>11.To what extent can changes be observed in terms of the intended outcomes?</p> <p>a. Design and implementation of evidence-based and coordinated migration policies by policy makers and institutional stakeholders, including anticipatory governance (Outcome 1);</p> <p>b. Enhanced inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management (Outcome 2); and</p> <p>c. Improved perceptions of migrants and refugees as development actors among the general public and policy makers (Outcome 3)?</p>	<p>11.1. a. Identified (by the project or the evaluation) observed changes related to design and implementation of evidence-based and coordinated migration policies by policy makers and institutional stakeholders, including anticipatory governance (Outcome 1).</p> <p>11.1.b Identified (by the project or the evaluation) observed changes related to enhanced inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management (Outcome 2).</p>	<p>11.1.a. Evidence of identified and observed changes. Extent to which changes correspond or differ from those initially expected. Evidence of (internal, external to the project) factors/indicators explaining why observed outcome-level changes match or differ from those expected. Extent to which changes are institutionalised.</p> <p>11.1.b. Evidence on the extent to which inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management is enhanced, systemized and effective. (indicators included: regular and systematic collection, exchange and use of data for public discourse, evidence-based policymaking...).</p> <p>11.1.c. Evidence on improved perceptions of migrants and refugees as development actors among the general public and policy makers.</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Public surveys</p> <p>Independent reviews</p> <p>Public institutions and other stakeholder statements, campaign, public initiatives.</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p> <p>Key National partners</p>

		11.1.c Identified (by the project or the evaluation) observed changes related to improved perceptions of migrants and refugees as development actors among the general public and policy makers (Outcome 3).			
EQ12	To what extent can changes be observed in the institutional capacity development programmes of the beneficiaries in the area of migration management?	<p>12.1. Observable changes in the institutional capacity development programmes of the beneficiaries in the area of migration management.</p> <p>12.2. Observed changes match or differ from initial project expectations.</p>	<p>12.1.1. Evidence of observed or identified institutional capacity development programmes changes of the beneficiaries (using the project results and other performance indicators: e.g. through data-driven evidence-based decisions, public campaigns, change in public perception...).</p> <p>12.2.1. Identified reasons or factors explaining why observed changes, differ (if such is the case) from initially envisaged.</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p> <p>Key National partners</p>
EQ13	To what extent has the project contributed to good migration governance in North Macedonia through enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development? (Objective)	<p>13.1. The project has contributed to good migration governance in North Macedonia through enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development as per expected results.</p> <p>13.2. Shortcomings good migration governance identified and reported, if any.</p>	<p>13.1.1. Evidence (using project results-indicators and also evaluation criteria and analysis) of the attribution to good migration governance in North Macedonia to the project (verifiable direct, indirect effect of project on good migration governance (e.g. effective mechanisms...).</p> <p>13.2.1. Evidence of shortcomings identified. Reasons for those shortcomings and corrective actions taken if necessary. (internal factors: e.g. lack of stakeholder ownership, external factors: institution staff turnover, political instability, poor inter-institutional coordination...).</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p> <p>Key National partners</p>

EQ14	What were the factors that facilitated or hindered the achievement of intended results of the project?	<p>14.1. Factors that facilitated the achievement of intended results of the project.</p> <p>14.2. factors that hindered the achievement of intended results of the project.</p>	<p>14.1.1 Evidence of identified (internal or external) factors that facilitated the achievement of intended results of the project. (quality of project design, consultative relations with stakeholders during implementation, flexible and reactive management...).</p> <p>14.2.1 Evidence of identified (internal or external) factors that hindered the achievement of intended results of the project.</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p> <p>Key National partners</p> <p>Key national partners</p>
EFFICIENCY					
EQ15	To what extent has the project made good use of its human, financial and technical resources?	<p>15.1. Quality/efficient of use of human resources.</p> <p>15.2. Quality/efficient of use of financial resources.</p> <p>15.3. Quality/efficient of use of technical resources.</p>	<p>15.1. Required skills properly identified in project design? Clarity of roles and responsibilities within project teams and relations with stakeholders. Communication mechanisms clearly defined.</p> <p>15.2. Administrative/financial procedures clearly defined, flexible, and adjusted to project needs. Project budget appropriately estimated. Needs for reallocation of resources?</p> <p>15.3. Technical resources appropriately and clearly defined at design stage. Availability and access to technical resources (internal, external expertise). Feedback on quality of technical resources.</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p> <p>IOM Project Manager & Project team</p> <p>Key National partners</p>
EQ16	To what extent has the project used an appropriate combination of tools, approaches, and partnerships to pursue the achievement of its results?	16.1 The project has used an appropriate combination of tools, approaches, and partnerships to pursue the achievement of its results	<p>16.1.1. The project has developed or used tools, approaches, and partnerships appropriate to ensure efficient implementation.</p> <p>16.1.2. Tools, approaches, and partnerships used by the project have been found appropriate by stakeholders and proven efficient. (stakeholder feedback).</p>	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Project team briefings</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Complementary web-based research</p>

			16.1.3. Clarity of rationale demonstrating causal links between tools, approaches and partnerships and achievement of results. 16.1.4. Efficient interagency (IOM, UNFPA, UNCHR) cooperation and coordination).		IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
IMPACT					
EQ17	What is the likely long-term impact of the project in the area of migration management?	17.1. Availability and clarity on the description of the expected impact of the project in the area of migration management. 17.2. Observed short-term impact to date and prospective for the mid and long term as perceived by stakeholders. 17.3. Identified or other (negative or positive) impact identified.	17.1.1. Availability of description of short-, mid- and long-term impact perspectives in the project document or during implementation (roundtables....). 17.2.1. The degree to which short-term impact observation matches initial perspectives and reasons for possible divergences. 17.3.1. Availability of other (negative or positive) impact observed and related explanations.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ18	Was the intended impact communicated efficiently with the stakeholders in terms of promoting understanding of the value of forward-looking approaches for good migration governance?	18.1. The intended impact in terms of promoting understanding of the value of forward-looking approaches for good migration governance has been clearly formulated in the project design and later on during implementation. 18.2. Stakeholders have developed a strong understanding of the impact from the value and approaches allowing to develop	18.1.1. Communication has been clear and accessible. Feedback on stakeholders' effective understanding of intended impact is available and positive. 18.2.1. There are elements (actions, decisions, statements, commitments...) demonstrating stakeholders have not only understood the intended impact but have and will continue to commit to it.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews Project team briefings	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners

		ownership and capacity to contribute to achieving good migration governance.			
EQ19	If any, which unintended effects can be observed, whether positive or negative?	19.1 Observed positive unintended effects. 19.1 Observed negative unintended effects.	19.1.1. Evidence of positive unintended effects and reasons why it was unintended (missed in the design or unpredictable). 19.2.1. Evidence of negative unintended effects and reasons why it was unintended (missed in the design or unpredictable).	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
SUSTAINABILITY					
EQ20	Are benefits generated by the project likely to continue once the external support ceases?	20.1. Any element (formal or informal) indicating project benefits are likely to continue once the external support ceases.	20.1.1. The project document or decision made during implementation has described arrangements, mechanisms, and commitments to support the continuation of benefits once the external support ceases. This includes (transfer of responsibilities to institutions, agreements, mechanisms ensuring the financial take over from government institutions, institutionalization/formalisation of all mechanisms (coordination, data management...) introduced by the project.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ21	Do the project partners have the technical and financial capacity and are they committed to maintaining	21.1. Extent to which project partners have the technical and financial capacity and are they committed to maintaining the	21.1.1. Indication or recent (or regular through M&E and this evaluation) assessment indicating technical capacity is up to requirements and financial capacity	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents

	the benefits of the project in the long run?	benefits of the project in the long run. 21.2. Identified remaining gaps or threats related to institutional technical and financial capacity and commitment necessary for sustainability of benefits.	is backed by firm commitments/institutional arrangements. 21.2.1. Identified gaps or situations indicating technical and financial capacity and/or commitment is insufficient to maintaining the benefits of the project in the long run.		Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ22	Are stakeholders capacitated to utilize the knowledge in other areas, not just migration management?	22.1. Evidence that stakeholders are capacitated to utilize the knowledge in other areas, not just migration management. 22.2. Evidence that stakeholders are insufficiently capacitated to utilize the knowledge in other areas, not just migration management.	22.1.2. Evidence indicating stakeholder possess adequate capacity to utilize the knowledge in other areas, not just migration management is available. This includes indicators that necessary knowledge is mastered and used in the professional practice of good migration management and other relevant sectors. 22.2.1. Evidence indicating stakeholder possess insufficient (or poorly managed) capacity to utilize the knowledge in other areas, not just migration management is available. This includes indicators that necessary knowledge is mastered and used in the professional practice of good migration management and other relevant sectors. Identification of concrete situations and of causes.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
CROSS CUTTING THEMES					
EQ23	To what extent were the principles of leave no one behind and disabilities as well as GCM guiding principles on human rights, gender responsive, and child sensitive programming incorporated into the	23.1. principles of leave no one behind and disabilities as well as GCM guiding principles on human rights, gender responsive, and child sensitive programming have been incorporated into the	23.1. Extent to which afore-mentioned principles are referred in the project document, objectives, and outcomes (specific description of expected result for each cross-cutting theme), in its overall approach, data collection (disaggregated per principle), and concretely translated through	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents Complementary web-based research

	project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting)?	project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting).	activities. Availability of specific reporting on results and achievements in relation to each principle and related cross cutting issue. 23.1. Identified cases of shortcoming in applying principles and reasons for it.		IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ24	What was the impact of the joint project on the enjoyment of human rights by impacted rights-holders, the advancement of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, and the advancement of children’s rights and meeting their needs?	24.1. The (short-term, projected) impact of the joint project (on the enjoyment of human rights by impacted rights-holders, the advancement of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, and the advancement of children’s rights and meeting their needs) is effective, tangible, and measurable.	24.1.1. Extent to which the afore-mentioned impact is effective, tangible, and measurable, as per the project intention and reported. Identification of indicators of impact and availability of description of concrete cases of (positive or negative, intended, or unintended impact).	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners
EQ25	To what extent did the joint project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting) and management structure reflect and align with the GCM guiding principles on whole-of-government, whole-of-society, and people-centred approaches to programming?	25.1. The joint project cycle has effectively been designed as per GCM guiding principles. 25.2. The joint project cycle has effectively been implemented as per GCM guiding principles.	25.1.1. Extent to which GCM guiding principles are effectively referred to and concretely applied in the design of the joint project cycle design, implementation approach (communication...), monitoring (M&E tools), and reporting). 25.1.2. Extent to which there is evidence that applied GCM guiding principles as described above arrangements have effectively contributed to be whole-of-government-inclusive, whole-of-society-inclusive, and people-centred through programming.	Desk review Stakeholder Interviews	Project documents Complementary web-based research IOM Project Manager & Project team Key National partners

Annex 4: Data Collection Tools

INTERVIEW GUIDE

IOM Project Manager; Key National Partners.

Relevance

IOM

When thinking on the project objectives, how were priorities of the respective institutions (MoLSP, SWC) considered when developing the project? What steps have been undertaken to include National strategy (and other policy documents on a national level) into the project?

In what way was MoLSP/SWC involved in developing the project? How would you describe the cooperation?

Were there any gaps in the cooperation with the Ministry/SWC? What would be the practical improvements you would suggest in this respect?

Did IOM/IDF have any contribution to these changes? Did IOM/IDF support efforts for improvements in this domain? To what extent was IOM/IDF support complementary with strategic partners (i.e., donors and international organizations?)

How relevant were the capacity building activities for the stakeholders with regard to services for the potential victims of trafficking and victims of trafficking?

Key national partners

What changes in the legislation (laws, policies, by-laws, secondary legislation) were made with support of the project? How would you characterize the overall capacities of the institutions to address trafficking of human beings? Were there any changes in this area in the past couple of years? Who triggered these changes? Were all measures adopted coherent along time in order to produce durable changes in the area of THB? Were there any measures that contradicted previous changes?

How do you perceive IOM's contribution to the changes in this area (THB), previously discussed? What changes would not happen without IOM intervention? What interventions relevant for the process would have taken place without IOM/IDF intervention?

Does the training program correspond to the practical needs of final beneficiaries? In what way were the needs of the staff being identified and by whom? How did this training contribute to capacity of the final beneficiaries by increasing their knowledge on THB, smuggling of immigrants, protecting of the vulnerable migrants, and identifying and referring cases of VoT and PoVoT?

Has the training program been aligned with the existing curricula (ISA, SWC)? What kind of changes was involved in the revision of the curricula and with support of IOM?

Efficiency

IOM

How did you allocate the resources for the interventions? Based on what criteria decisions were made to approve the budgets? Were these allocations driven by the prices on the national market, or they were driven by constraints in terms of the limited resources you had available/leveraged from other international donors? If it would be the case to do again the same project, would you make the same allocations? If not, why? Were there any market studies which guided your decision in the budget allocation?

Were there any measures which did not support the project goals? What about the timing, would you prioritize changes differently?

How well the implementation of the activities been managed by the IOM in consultation with national partners? What tools were developed in order to monitor the effectiveness of program activities? What tools for monitoring and evaluation of training activities were developed? Did the institutions responsible for trainings implemented these tools and reported regularly on the quality of trainings conducted? What were the main obstacles in implementation of the activities? What would be the improvements you would suggest in this respect?

Key National Partners

How much time, human resources, and financial resources did your institutions/organisation invest in developing and implementing projects that contributed to capacity building of your staff with regard to combating trafficking in human beings and irregular migration? Did your institution/organisation implement any common activities/any form of collaboration with other institutions/organisation with IOM support? Were there any changes in your institution's budget allocation, which were initiated by some of the activities under the project? If yes, please describe in more detail. What else can be done in order to involve the Government's resources on a larger scale?

Effectiveness

IOM

Have the planned results been achieved (quantitative and qualitative)?

- In creating/improving national migration related legislation and at the higher-level policy documents addressing THB?
- In building capacities of local stakeholders (final beneficiaries)

How successful was the program in establishing and developing national level mechanism for continuous professional development of governmental staff that work in the area of migration, THB, and asylum?

Were there any unexpected results? What were the key factors of success? What were the main constraints/challenges from inside the organization, as well as the external factors that have influenced the attainment of the results?

What strategies/core roles have been most efficient in influencing improvements in capacities of the stakeholders to efficiently implement the new legislation and relevant operational documents related to THB and irregular migration?

Key national partners

Has the project supported by IOM achieved their planned outcomes under the capacity building programs? How satisfied are you with the quality of policy documents, studies, technical tools, technical advice, capacity building and other activities delivered by the IOM/IDF supported activities? To what extent the IOM supported project contribute to building capacities of final beneficiaries/social workers? Did those interventions provided any additional (not directly planned) significant contribution in the area of THB and irregular migration? If yes, which are those? What were the most successful practices adopted and the main problems encountered?

Sustainability

IOM

To what extent are the results achieved sustainable? What makes them sustainable? What are the risks that the achievements would not be sustainable and what are the measures needed to improve prospects for the sustainability of results? What has been missing in the area of combatting THB and irregular migration among vulnerable migrants and is needed in order to fully implement the desired changes?

Key national partners

How stable is progress achieved so far in the area of combatting THB and irregular migration among vulnerable migrants? What more should be done to make it more stable? Are you willing and committed with achieving priorities in the National Strategy for combatting THB and IM? Do you have the capacities to continue with achieving Strategy priorities? Is there local ownership of Strategy outcomes? Which are your major concerns regarding the success of the reforms in combatting THB and irregular migration in the country? How can these vulnerabilities be mitigated?

Impact

IOM

How did the IOM's work build the capacity of governmental staff to counter human trafficking and protecting victims of human trafficking? How did the IOM work in the country influence coordination among the IOM and its strategic partners?

If any, which unintended effects can be observed (positive or negative)?

National partners

Did the IOM support influence the capacity of your institution/organisation? In what sense? Do you think that now you have the capacity to continue implementation of the adopted strategies and initiatives to deliver on the national efforts to effectively counter human trafficking? What else does your institution/organization need to have the capacity to deliver on these national efforts? Was there any cooperation with other donors/organizations in achieving these goals? If yes, how did IOM influence coordination with those strategic partners?

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Final beneficiaries

Relevance

Does the training program correspond to your practical needs? In what way were the needs of the final beneficiaries being identified and by whom? How did this training contribute to your capacity to counter THB and irregular migration/protect trafficked persons, vulnerable migrants and groups vulnerable to migration related risks?

Effectiveness

How satisfied are you with the quality of policy documents, studies, technical tools, technical advice, capacity building and other activities delivered by the IOM supported activities? To what extent the IOM supported program contribute to building your capacities? Did those interventions provided any additional (not directly planned) significant contribution to effectively combat the trafficking and irregular migration? If yes, which are those? What were the most successful practices adopted and the main problems encountered?

Sustainability

How stable is progress achieved so far in the area of combatting THB, irregular migration, protection of victims and potential victims of trafficking? What more should be done to make it more stable? Are you willing and committed with achieving priorities in the strategy for combatting THB? Do you have the capacities to continue with achieving these priorities? Which are your major concerns regarding the success of combatting THB and irregular migration in the country? How can these vulnerabilities be mitigated?

Impact

Did the IOM support influence your capacity as professional in the field? In what sense? Do you think that now you have the capacity to continue implementation of the adopted strategies and initiatives to deliver on priorities in combatting THB and irregular migration? What else do you need in order to have the capacity to deliver on these priorities?

Annex 5: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for International Expert

External Final Evaluation of the Joint IOM / UNHCR / UNFPA project 'Evidence-based migration policy planning and discourse in North Macedonia'

Commissioned by: IOM Country Office in North Macedonia in cooperation with UNFPA and UNHCR under the supervision of the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO)

Managed by: IOM Joint Project Manager, Jelena Krasic

1. Evaluation Context:

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) as lead agency, in partnership with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and under the supervision of the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), are jointly implementing the project "Evidence-based migration policy planning and discourse in North Macedonia" funded by the Migration Multi-Partner Trust Fund (the Fund)⁹ during a 30-month implementation period (28 October 2020 to 27 April 2023).

Launched in 2019, **the Fund** is a pooled funding instrument to contribute to robust, coordinated, inclusive and coherent UN systemwide support to Member States in their implementation, follow-up, and review of the of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM).¹⁰ The UN established a Network on Migration to ensure effective, timely and coordinated system-wide support to Member States in implementation of the GCM. The joint programmes of the Fund are the product of collaborative work by members of the United Nations Network on Migration working with national partners in order to strengthen the coherence and increase the impact of UN-system programming, reduce fragmentation, and fill critical gaps. The Fund is aligned with the ten cross-cutting, interdependent guiding principles of the GCM: (a) People-centred; (b) International cooperation; (c) National sovereignty; (d) Rule of law and due process; (e) Sustainable development / 2030 Agenda; (f) Human rights; (g) Gender-responsive; (h) Child-sensitive; (i) Whole-of-government approach; and (j) Whole-of-society approach. Guiding principles (a), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) should be assessed as part of this evaluation.¹¹

IOM, the UN Migration Agency, was established in 1951 and is the leading inter-governmental organization in the field of migration working closely with governmental, intergovernmental, and non-governmental partners. With 173 Member States, 8 states holding observer status and offices in over 100

⁹ Information on the Fund: <https://migrationnetwork.un.org/mptf>

¹⁰ Information on the GCM: <https://migrationnetwork.un.org/global-compact-migration-follow-and-review>

¹¹ For more information, refer to the Fund's [operations manual](#), including indicators on pages 45-46 and annexed guidance on Engagement with Civil Society, Migrants and Communities and markers for rights-based, gender responsive and child sensitive programming.

countries, IOM is dedicated to promoting humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all. IOM has been implementing a variety of projects in North Macedonia since 1999, in line with its mission to assist the Government of North Macedonia to meet the operational challenges of migration, advance understanding of migration issues, encourage social and economic development, and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants. In the field of mainstreaming migration and development policies as well as knowledge management and data, IOM in North Macedonia has been implementing projects in support of the Government, related to collection, analysis and dissemination of accurate, reliable and comparable data, guiding coherent and evidence-based policymaking and well-informed public discourse. IOM provides support through several projects, with actions ranging from supporting development of the Resolution on Migration Policy 2015-2020 and its Action Plan, and the National Strategy for Cooperation with the Diaspora and corresponding Action Plan; organizing raising awareness through informative campaigns and educational activities for the policy makers to ensure fact-based perceptions on migrants and refugees to combat false narratives; and developing specialized training curriculums to support capacity building of relevant government institutions and civil society organizations.

UNHCR, the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was created in 1950, during the aftermath of the Second World War, to help millions of Europeans who had fled or lost their homes. UNHCR has continuously supported the efforts of institutions in North Macedonia in creating modern regulations concerning refugees. The support also includes providing technical and IT assistance in advancing the methodology for more efficient management of statistics related to asylum seekers and the right of access to asylum.

UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund works with governments and partners to promote universal access to quality, integrated sexual and reproductive health services, to strengthen health systems, train health workers, educate midwives and improve access to the full range of reproductive health and works to prevent and respond to gender-based violence through its work with policymakers, justice systems, health systems and humanitarian partners. UNFPA also works on population dynamics, human capital, and sustainable development, and creating population policies. Since its establishment in the country in 2007, UNFPA has supported the Government in the fields of reproductive health, population and development and gender-based violence.

Additionally, the work of the UN system in North Macedonia is guided by the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2021-2025¹², a key strategic document developed in close partnership with Government and other stakeholders. The SDCF is aligned with national development priorities, its international human rights and gender equality commitments, and the Agenda 2030. Recognising that EU membership is a key national priority, SDCF also strives to ensure full alignment with the EU accession process. UN engagement in the country also is guided by the overarching principle of leaving no one behind (LNOB); by human rights-based approach; gender equality and women's empowerment; resilience; sustainability and accountability.

¹² UNSDCF for North Macedonia: <https://northmacedonia.un.org/en/100160-republic-north-macedonia-and-united-nations-sustainable-development-cooperation-framework>

Project background:

The **overall objective** of the project is to contribute to good migration governance in North Macedonia through enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development. intended **outcomes**: (1) policy makers and institutional stakeholders design and implement evidence-based and coordinated migration policies; (2) Inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management are enhanced; and (3) The general public and the policy makers view migrants and refugees as development actors. To that end, the project includes the following intended **outputs**:

- New comprehensive Migration Policy is developed and adopted.
- By 2022, data collection mechanisms are strengthened as a key precondition for evidence-based policy making.
- The national stakeholders have the capacity to develop and support the implementation of migration policies that meet EU and international standards.
- The national institutions have the capacities to exchange migration related data in line with EU and international standards.
- The General public has positive narratives and perceptions towards migrants and refugees; and
- The policy and opinion makers have the capacities to develop and support the implementation of policies based on positive and proactive views on migrants and refugees, and number of project activities.

The **target groups** and **final beneficiaries** were the following entities and individuals:

Target groups	8) The Ministry of Interior 9) The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy 10) Ministry of Information Society and Public Administration 11) Ministry of Foreign Affairs 12) The Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio (Minister for Diaspora) 13) The State Statistical Office 14) The National Bank of the Republic of North Macedonia;
Final beneficiaries	Relevant national stakeholders from the targeted institutions

The **theory of change** is built based on the identified contextual challenges hampering the development of comprehensive evidence-based migration policy, which are insufficient availability of comprehensive, reliable and disaggregated population and migration data and statistics, limiter inter- and intra-institutional coordination, relatively weak institutional infrastructure for integrated digital information systems and information technology, as well as limited awareness about the positive development effects on migration.

The theory of change is as follows: i) if data collection mechanisms are strengthened and national stakeholders' capacities on policy making and data analysis and collection are strengthened, ii) if the national institutions have adequate technical resources and protocols in place to exchange migration related data in line with EU and international standards, iii) if the general public has access to positive narratives and perceptions towards migrants and refugees and the policy and opinion makers have the capacities to develop and support the implementation policies based on positive effects of migration on

development, then the Government will be able to create and implement evidence-based policies on migration that meet EU and international standards and open space for migrants and refugees to contribute as development actors. The theory of change assumes continuous strengthening of institutional capacities and human resources of the institutions with mandates in migration policy and close collaboration and coordination among the government, academia, CSOs, etc. and with clearly pronounced specification of their inter-institutional roles and responsibilities.

Complementary initiatives:

The Joint UN project was designed as complementary to the Central European initiative (CEI)-funded project “*Advisory support for strengthening the capacities for diaspora engagement and evidence-based migration policy planning*”, which had similar objective in terms of evidence-based policy making, specifically in maximizing the development effect of migration, and ensuring an effective and comprehensive migration policy. Therefore, while the evaluation is focused on the MPTF project, consideration should also be given to alignment and synergy between the MPTF and CEI project “*Advisory support for strengthening the capacities for diaspora engagement and evidence-based migration policy planning*”, in particular related to the questions under the coordination criteria.

Other complementary projects that should be considered are:

- “*Regional support to protection sensitive migration management in the Western Balkans and Turkey, Phase 2 (component 2)*” implemented since 2016 with funding from the European Union. The overall objective of this initiative is to support the country to develop and operationalize a comprehensive migration management system. Synergies and coordination are established with this initiative regarding the design of the national roadmap indicating a timeline on the availability of migration statistics in line with EU standards in the Western Balkans.

2. Evaluation purpose and objective:

The main purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the programmatic progress and performance of the above described intervention, including from the point of view of *relevance* of the programme objectives, strategy and approach; *coherence* in terms of synergies and coordination with other initiatives; *effectiveness* in achieving the intended results; *efficiency* in terms of stakeholder selection and coordination mechanisms; and *sustainability* of the results, as well as the *impact* of the intervention to the extent possible.

The evaluation must also be gender-sensitive and shall seek to understand the extent the joint project has been successful in addressing the needs of all genders, as well as integrate attention to the GCM guiding principles on rights-based, gender-responsive, and child-sensitive programming and whole-of-government, whole-of-society, and people-centred approaches. Specifically, the evaluation should identify the challenges and constraints that have been encountered during the implementation process and identify important lessons learned and make recommendations for the implementation of future projects.

This evaluation is conducted in line with the Fund’s requirement to conduct a joint final independent evaluation within six months of operational completion. The main targeted users of the evaluation are the donor, the staff of participating UN agencies, and the targeted beneficiaries (government and CSOs).

Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover the entire implementation period from 28 October 2020 until 31 October 2023. The evaluation field visit will be carried out in Skopje.

3. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project, and to the possible extent, will address the likely impact. It will also examine the project's complementarity and coordination with other relevant interventions under the criterion of coherence. The evaluation will be guided by the OECD-DAC definitions¹³:

- *Relevance*: The extent to which the intervention's objectives and design respond to beneficiaries' global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.
- *Coherence*: The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector, or institution.
- *Effectiveness*: The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.
- *Efficiency*: The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.
- *Impact*: The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended, higher-level effects.
- *Sustainability*: The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

The evaluation should also assess the incorporation of GCM guiding principles into the project cycle (human rights, gender-responsive, child sensitive, whole-of-government, whole-of-society and people-centred), and impacts related to human rights, gender equality and empowerment, and children's rights.¹⁴ The evaluation will also assess leave no one behind (LNOB) and disabilities as cross-cutting themes.

- *Human rights*: Ensure effective respect for and protection and fulfilment of the human rights of all migrants, regardless of their migration status, across all stages of the migration cycle. In addition, commit to eliminate all forms of discrimination, including racism, xenophobia, and intolerance, against migrants and their families.
- *Gender responsive*: Mainstream a gender perspective and promotes gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls, recognizing their independence, agency, and leadership in order to move away from addressing migrant women primarily through a lens of victimhood.
- *Child sensitive*: Uphold the principle of the best interests of the child at all times, as a primary consideration in all situations concerning children in the context of international migration, including unaccompanied and separated children.

¹³ OECD-DAC criteria: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

¹⁴ For more information, refer to the Fund's [operations manual](#), including indicators on pages 45-46 and annexed guidance on Engagement with Civil Society, Migrants and Communities and markers for rights-based, gender responsive and child sensitive programming.

- *Whole of Government*: working with more than one government line entity, and/or with local government(s) and/or related entities
- *Whole of Society*: multi-stakeholder partnerships approach throughout the design and implementation
- *People-centred*: consultation of migrants and/or migration affected communities during the design of this proposal and explicitly reflecting the needs and concerns of migrants and/or migration affected communities.
- *Leave no one behind (LNOB)*: focus on discrimination and inequalities (often multiple and intersecting) that undermine the agency of people as holders of rights, such as the barriers people face in accessing services, resources, and equal opportunities as the result of discriminatory laws, policies, and social practices.
- *Disabilities*: interventions and activities should address barriers that prevent persons with disabilities in all their diversity from participating in, or having access to, services and/or protection, in line with the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

4. Evaluation questions

More specifically, the evaluation shall focus on the following questions:

Relevance

1. To what extent were stakeholders consulted and involved in designing the project?
2. Is the project aligned with and supportive of national strategies?
3. Does the project respond to the needs of the target group?
4. To what extent does the project align to the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework?
5. In regard to capacity development, were the most suitable stakeholder representatives selected?
6. Was a proper analysis of the readiness of the stakeholders to undertake this initiative undertaken?

Coherence

7. To what extent has the project been complementary to other relevant migration management projects undertaken by the participating entities, as well as other UN and non-UN actors?
8. To what extent was the project coordinated with other relevant migration management projects?

Effectiveness

9. To what extent were target groups consulted and involved in the implementation of activities, thereby improving ownership, accountability, and effectiveness?
10. Have the project outputs been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?
11. To what extent can changes be observed in terms of the intended outcomes?
 - a. Design and implementation of evidence-based and coordinated migration policies by policy makers and institutional stakeholders, including anticipatory governance (Outcome 1);

- b. Enhanced inter and intra institutional data exchange mechanisms and collaboration among key institutions with competences on migration management (Outcome 2); and
 - c. Improved perceptions of migrants and refugees as development actors among the general public and policy makers (Outcome 3)?
12. To what extent can changes be observed in the institutional capacity development programmes of the beneficiaries in the area of migration management?
 13. To what extent has the project contributed to good migration governance in North Macedonia through enhanced evidence-based and data-driven migration discourse and policy development? (Objective)
 14. What were the factors that facilitated or hindered the achievement of intended results of the project?

Efficiency

15. To what extent has the project made good use of its human, financial and technical resources?
16. To what extent has the project used an appropriate combination of tools, approaches and partnerships to pursue the achievement of its results?

Impact

17. What is the likely long-term impact of the project in the area of migration management?
18. Was the intended impact communicated efficiently with the stakeholders in terms of promoting understanding of the value of forward-looking approaches for good migration governance?
19. If any, which unintended effects can be observed, whether positive or negative?

Sustainability

20. Are benefits generated by the project likely to continue once the external support ceases?
21. Do the project partners have the technical and financial capacity and are they committed to maintaining the benefits of the project in the long run?
22. Are stakeholders capacitated to utilize the knowledge in other areas, not just migration management?

Cross-cutting themes

23. To what extent were the principles of leave no one behind and disabilities as well as GCM guiding principles on human rights, gender responsive, and child sensitive programming incorporated into the project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting)?
24. What was the impact of the joint project on the enjoyment of human rights by impacted rights-holders, the advancement of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, and the advancement of children's rights and meeting their needs?
25. To what extent did the joint project cycle (design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting) and management structure reflect and align with the GCM guiding principles on whole-of-government, whole-of-society, and people-centred approaches to programming?

The focus should be on summative assessment of the performance and results to date, in particular effectiveness in relation to outcome level changes, contribution to impact, and sustainability. The evaluation should also document any lessons learned and good practices to be used by IOM, UNFPA, UNHCR and UN RCO to inform design and implementation of similar projects, whether in the country or

globally. Finally, recommendations should highlight in particular any actions that could be taken to strengthen performance and achievement of results in ongoing or future similar projects.

5. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation should involve theory-based, participative, and mixed method approaches that combine a variety of data collection methods and data sources, including consultation and inclusion of all relevant stakeholders. The following combination of data collection methods are proposed be used in the evaluation, pending discussion with and the inception report of the selected evaluators:

- A desk review of all relevant documents including, but not limited to: project documents, progress reports, workshop reports, evaluation, questionnaires, etc.
- Semi-structured interviews with IOM, UNFPA, UNHCR and UN RCO staff responsible for the project implementation
- Interviews and/or focus groups with government institutions and other relevant stakeholders (based on the status with the COVID-19 a telecommuting can be used to replace face-to-face meetings)

6. Evaluation ethics, norms, and standards

IOM, UNHCR and UNFPA abide by the [norms and standards](#) of the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) and expects all evaluation stakeholders to be familiar with the [ethical conduct guidelines](#) of UNEG and the consultant(s) with the [UNEG codes of conduct](#) as well.

This evaluation will be guided by IOM's [Evaluation Policy](#), [M&E Guidelines](#), and [Guidance on Quality Management of IOM Evaluations](#) including the quality checking tool for inception reports and final reports. Due regard will be incorporated to evaluation policies and guidelines of UNHCR and UNFPA. Each UN agency will raise pertinent considerations in line with their respective institutional policies during the evaluation process.

The evaluation must also be conducted in respect of IOM Data Protection Principles, as laid out in the [IOM Data Protection Manual](#).

7. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluators should develop an **inception report**¹⁵ including an evaluation matrix and related data collection tools to describe their understanding of the TOR and how they will conduct the evaluation including any revisions to the methodology as required. This should be submitted to the Evaluation Manager following the document review phase, for comments and discussion with the evaluator to finalize plans prior to the interview phase.

Following the interview phase, the evaluators should prepare a short **presentation** of the initial findings and tentative conclusions and recommendations. This will be used by the evaluators to debrief the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Management Group (EMG), to identify and address any misinterpretations or gaps.

Building on the debrief and initial feedback received, the evaluators should prepare a **draft report**¹⁶ to be shared with the Evaluation Manager. The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for compiling

¹⁵ See for reference the IOM [inception report template](#) and IOM [sample example evaluation matrices](#).

¹⁶ Though IOM does not oblige evaluators to use the same reporting format, evaluators are expected to address all components outlined in the IOM [components template](#) and [template for evaluation final report](#) as per the [IOM M&E Guidelines](#) (see p. 237).

comments/feedback, including the comments and feedback from other EMG members. The evaluators will then finalize the report based on the comments/feedback received.

The **final report** shall be written in English and meet good language standards, being grammatically correct, proofread and laid out well, consisting of between 20 and 25 pages of the main text (without annexes). The report will follow the same presentation logic and include, at a minimum, the information described in the IOM Project Handbook template for evaluation reports: 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 or evaluation matrix, list of documents reviewed, list of persons interviewed or consulted, data collection instruments, as well as any other relevant information.

A **two-page evaluation brief**¹⁷ will also be developed by the evaluators to summarize key findings, conclusions, and recommendations. IOM will provide a template as guidance, which can be adapted by the evaluators, but which should be no longer than two pages. Page one should include Identification of audience; Project information (project title, countries covered, project type and code, project duration, project period, donor(s), and budget); Evaluation background (purpose, team, timeframe, type of evaluation, and methodology); Brief description of the project. Page two should summarize the most important evaluation results: Key findings and/or conclusions, best practices and lessons learned (optional), and key recommendations.

Once the evaluation report and brief are finalized and accepted by the Evaluation Manager, the evaluators should prepare a **draft Management Response Matrix** using IOM template¹⁸ by inserting the recommendations as well as an indicative timeframe or deadline for implementation. The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for finalizing the matrix in coordination with the EMG.

Finally, an **online presentation** of the final key evaluation findings and recommendations will be delivered for key stakeholders including the Evaluation Manager and EMG, other relevant staff from the participating UN agencies, and national partners in North Macedonia. A draft presentation should be shared with the Evaluation Manager, and comments from EMG on the draft presentation should be incorporated into final version.

8. Specifications of roles:

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of external evaluators (lead international and national). The respective roles and responsibilities are outlined below:

External lead international evaluator

- Lead the preparation, carrying out data collection and analysis, and drafting all of the products outlined above with the contribution and support of the national evaluator.
- Directing and supervising the national evaluator in carrying out collection, research and analysis of relevant documentation and other data, and reporting.

¹⁷ An [IOM template](#) for the brief will be provided by IOM developed on Microsoft Publisher. The brief should provide a short (two pages) overview of the evaluation including key project information, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

¹⁸ Using the [IOM template](#) for Management Response and Follow-up.

- Overseeing and assuring quality of data collection and leading the analysis of the evaluation evidence.
- Provide periodic feedback as needed to the Joint Project Manager on progress and any challenges.
- Provide debrief at the end of the data collection phase to present initial findings and tentative conclusions. This will allow for any obvious oversights, misinterpretations, or information gaps to be identified and addressed before the external evaluator begins drafting the full report.
- Finalizing all evaluation documents by ensuring all feedback is integrated.
- Conducting online presentation of the final key evaluation findings and recommendations for key stakeholders.

External national evaluator

- Support the preparation, carrying out data collection and analysis, and drafting all of the products outlined above.
- Together with the lead evaluator provide periodic feedback as needed to the Joint Project Manager on progress and any challenges.
- Together with the lead evaluator provide debrief at the end of the data collection phase to present initial findings and tentative conclusions. This will allow for any obvious oversights, misinterpretations, or information gaps to be identified and addressed before the external evaluator begins drafting the full report.
- Together with the lead evaluator conduct online presentation of the final key evaluation findings and recommendations for key stakeholders.

The **Evaluation Manager** (Joint Project Manager) will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the evaluation. The evaluation process will be supported by representatives from each participating agency (IOM, UNFPA and UNHCR) and the UN RCO as members of an **Evaluation Management Group (EMG)**. The EMG will oversee the evaluation process, make key decisions, quality assure in accordance with evaluation ethics, norms, and standards, and jointly approve the deliverables. In addition, an **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)** will be established to promote participation of relevant stakeholders and partners, including civil society, migrants, and communities as feasible. The membership of the EMG and ERG will be finalized during the inception phase. The expected responsibilities for the EM, EMG, and ERG are outlined below:

Evaluation Manager (EM)

- Arrange interview logistics including meetings (or e-mail addresses of the stakeholders needed for the telecommuting) in coordination with the team members from UNFPA and UNHCR and UN RCO.
- Manage evaluation process including feedback and quality control to the inception phase, debrief, and provide comments to the draft evaluation report in coordination with the EMG.
- Assist in addressing issues or challenges flagged by the evaluators in coordination with the EMG.

- Final quality control including use of IOM quality control tools for inception and evaluation reports.¹⁹

Evaluation Management Group (EMG)

- Review and quality assurance of evaluation deliverables in accordance with UNEG ethics, norms and standards and the evaluation policies and guidance of each respective agency.
- Support the Evaluation Manager with addressing emergent challenges or barriers raised by evaluators and finding appropriate solutions to facilitate the evaluation process.

Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

- Attend a preliminary inception meeting with the evaluation team concerning the evaluation plans.
- Provide information to the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process, as needed.
- Participate in the validation meeting (the online presentation of the final key evaluation findings and recommendations) of the final evaluation report and provide feedback as relevant.
- Promote the use of the evaluation findings and recommendations.

A quality assurance process shall be integrated into the evaluation, as follows:

- a) Final terms of reference (ToR) shall be agreed between EM, EMG, and evaluator.
- b) The inception report shall be reviewed by the EMG, revised by the evaluator, and finalized upon the EM's acceptance.
- c) The evaluator will timely raise any emergent challenges or barriers with the EM, who will support with finding appropriate solutions to facilitate the evaluation process in coordination with the EMG.
- d) The final report and brief shall be reviewed by the EM and EMG, revised by the evaluator, and finalized upon the EM's acceptance.

9. Time schedule:

The evaluation process will include an initial preparation phase on the part of the participating UN agencies, involving conceptualizing the evaluation approach, internal consultations among UN agencies on the approach, drafting the TOR, establishment of the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), gathering programme data, stakeholders mapping and selection of the evaluation team.

The selected evaluators will be expected to complete the following tasks. **The foreseen period for conducting this evaluation is 20 August – 20 October 2023.** The precise dates will be confirmed with the selected evaluators. The final report must be completed by 20 October 2023.

The number of working days is **30 days** for the international consultant and **20 days** for the national consultant.

¹⁹ IOM Guidance on Quality Management of Evaluations available [here](#).

TASKS	TIMEFRAME (Working days)	
	International consultant	National Consultant
<p><i>Inception phase:</i> Consultations with national evaluator, Evaluation Manager and EMG on the final ToR. Conduct initial desk research and stakeholder mapping: gather and analyse reliable, relevant, and up-to-date information from all available sources (including project reports and information from non-governmental agencies and international organizations). The lead evaluator shall prepare an inception report to summarize the findings of the desk review and provide further details on methodologies to be used and/or any revisions to the methodology as required. Submit inception report to the Evaluation Manager for comments from the EMG and hold an inception meeting with the ERG. Finalization of the evaluation methodology based on feedback from EMG and ERG. The inception report must be approved by the EMG prior to the start of data collection.</p>	10	6
<p><i>Data collection:</i> Conduct in-depth research and desk review of documents and monitoring data, and collection of primary data from relevant stakeholders, including interviews with IOM, UNFPA, UNHCR, UN RCO staff and relevant stakeholders. Debrief the EMG on the initial findings and tentative conclusions.</p>	10	6
<p><i>Analysis and synthesis:</i> Analysis of data and interpretation of findings and drafting and validation of an evaluation report and other final deliverables. Submit the draft report, brief and Management Response Matrix to the Evaluation Manager for feedback and further inputs from the EMG. Presentation for EMG and ERG with the results of the evaluation. A draft presentation should be shared with the EMG for comments prior to the online presentation.</p>	5	4
<p>Finalize the report and the brief and submit to IOM</p>	5	4

Once the evaluation is completed, IOM, UNHCR and UNFPA will finalize the Management Response, publish the evaluation report on respective agency websites, and further disseminate the evaluation findings.

10. Evaluation requirements for the Lead International Expert

Qualifications and experience

The **external lead international evaluator** should meet the following requirements:

- **Master's or higher degree in a relevant discipline** (social sciences, e.g., political science, economics, sociology, international relations, public policy, international development), or a **first level university degree in combination with two additional years of qualifying experience**.
- Minimum of **five years** of experience conducting or managing evaluations is required.
- **Experience in the country or region and experience working in the migration management** area is preferred.
- **Skills in evaluation design, qualitative data collection and analysis, drafting and editing in English, communication, time management and cultural sensitivity** are required.
- **Knowledge of evaluation norms, standards, and ethical principles**.

Performance indicators for evaluation of results:

- The quality of the evaluation products, including assessment according to the IOM quality control tools for inception reports and evaluation reports.
- Timely completion of the evaluation materials.
- Balance of theory and practical information in developing materials.
- Quality, user friendly and topic oriented, comprehensive presentations.
- Compliance with IOM House Style Guidelines.
- Compliance with IOM Data Protection Principles.

Languages

Fluency in oral and written **English** is required.

11. Submission of application

Interested international evaluators are invited to submit the below as part of the application. Please note that a separate selection process will be carried out for the national evaluator.

- **CV of the evaluator.**
- **Technical Proposal** outlining the proposed methodology, data analysis techniques, quality control measures, timelines, and budget, including consideration of tasks and coordination mechanisms for working with the national evaluation consultant.
- **Two samples of previous work.**

Applications are to be submitted to the following e-mail address: recruitmentskopje@iom.int indicating the position title in your email subject line and quoting the reference code – **CFA-IOM-SKP-07-2023**.

The deadline for applications is 15th of May 2023.

Late submissions will not be accepted.