

[EXPOST EVALUATION OF THE MIGRATION, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE: EVIDENCE FOR POLICY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA AND THE INDIAN OCEAN PROJECT [NC.0005]

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

Evaluation type: Internal Independent Ex post Evaluation

Evaluator(s): Rogers MUTIE, Regional M&E Officer,
IOM Regional Office in Pretoria

Field visit dates: 10-15 March; 31 March –4 April

Final report date: 3 July 2019

Commissioned by: IOM Development Fund and
RO Pretoria

Managed by: Daniel Silva, Chief of Mission.
IOM Madagascar & Comoros

Evaluation purpose: [To determine whether the project achieved its intended objective and generate lessons/recommendations for future similar projects.]

Evaluation criteria: [Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.]

Evaluation methodology: [Document review, semi structured Key Informant interviews, and Direct Observations.]

Project information:

Geographical coverage: [Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia]

Project type: [MECC]

Project code: [NC.0005]

Gender marker: [Not Rated at the time]

Project period: [Sept. 2016 to June 2018]

Donor: [IOM Development Fund]

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project was an 18-month initiative aimed at increasing the evidence base, knowledge and dialogue on the nexus between climate change, environment and migration in four Southern Africa countries namely Madagascar (as the management site), Mauritius, Mozambique and Namibia. Though the initial project lifetime was planned to be 18 months, delays resulted to a request for an extension to finalize the project.

Identification of the four focus countries was based on evidence that they were some of the most affected or more vulnerable to climate change and environmental degradation in the region. The MECC project was therefore designed with the overall objective to increase knowledge and awareness about the relationship between migration, the environment and climate change, with a view to generate evidence and knowledge for informed formulation of related national and regional policies and programmes. The project sought to deliver within the following two outcome areas:

- ◆ National stakeholders from participating countries demonstrate an increased capacity to streamline environmental change, including climate change into migration management policies and/or migration into environment and development policies;

- ◆ Regional stakeholders demonstrate an increased willingness and capacity to streamline environmental change, including climate change into regional policy-guiding documents.

The project generated country assessment reports on the MECC situation in each country and used these to convene national dialogue meetings with stakeholders to reflect on the findings and come up with a national action plan (blueprints) to address key MECC policy and programme priorities. A regional forum bringing together all the participating countries for a regional exchange was also held and came up with some regional policy and programme recommendations.

Following an agreed criteria Madagascar and Namibia were selected for primary data collection, with the other two countries to be studied through secondary data collection. A country visit though planned for Mozambique could not take place due to the Cyclones Idai and Kenneth that hit the country in the course of this evaluation. The mission staff was overwhelmed with emergency response operations. As for Mauritius having been part of the EU funded-IOM implemented MECLEP Project which had already been evaluated, it was decided that the MECLEP evaluation report would inform the current expost. Identification of key informants was independently done by the evaluator initially in view of the data that needed to be collected.

KEY FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

The project was found to have performed well in:

- ◆ Increasing understanding and sensitivity on the migration-environment-climate change nexus.
- ◆ Bringing on board non-traditional partners into the migration governance landscape.
- ◆ Use of local research institutions and capacities.
- ◆ Sound methodology leading to credible evidence though from a small geographical scale.
- ◆ Translating assessment findings into policy and programme recommendations (Blueprints).
- ◆ Facilitating national and regional MECC stakeholders' mobilization.

Based on the OECD-DAC Criteria:

- ◆ **Relevance:** The project was relevant to the Member States involved in the wake of real impacts of climate induced migration that has been witnessed in recent years including Cyclones Idai and Kenneth that made landfall in the evaluation months.
- ◆ **Efficiency:** Good internal project management efficiency was reported. Budget burn rate was satisfactory, slight delays affected timely project delivery. Good efficiency relative to the number of staff members available to implement the project.
- ◆ **Effectiveness:** The project delivered all the outputs it had envisaged in its results framework, indicating good progress and contribution to outcome level results.
- ◆ **Sustainability:** Anchoring its work on research evidence, developing and publishing key blueprint documents and use of local TWGs and research experts to roll out the project laid a good foundation for sustainability. Post project action implementation is however low and some revitalization is needed.
- ◆ **Impact:** Too early to judge, but aspects of empowerment and improved coordination between agencies was noted.

However the project could have done better in:

- ◆ **Dissemination of the assessment reports, blue print document and the regional policy guide:** There is room to improve the reach of the different products that the project finalized. Several stakeholders reported not to have received the final copies of the assessment reports, or blueprint documents or the regional policy guide-even though they were part of the TWG. For the regional forum outcome document, those TWG members who did not participate were completely unaware of its existence.
- ◆ **Post project follow up and continuity mechanisms:** The level of implementation of the different blueprint documents was found to be relatively low in addition to practical use of the assessment data. The different technical working groups that had been established during the project were also no longer meeting.
- ◆ **Greater gender mainstreaming:** There is room to improve on explicit integration and analysis of gender in key documents especially where "vulnerable" or "migrant" populations are being discussed. Actively ensure women representatives attend key events.

GOOD PRACTICES & LESSONS LEARNT

- ◆ **Signing of a Declaration of Commitment:** In Madagascar such a document was signed with the minister of Environment and IOM and CO staff reported that it was useful in facilitating greater cooperation from involved stakeholders.
- ◆ **Boosting transition from evidence to action.** The national dialogues held and the blueprint documents outlining priority actions were key steps to transition from evidence to action.
- ◆ **On sustaining TWG activities, have the end in mind at the beginning:** For TWGs to remain active after IOM projects, the issue of tenure should best be addressed at the beginning – during development of TOR and identification of members.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- ⇒ **For IOM missions and Regional Office:** Follow-up model projects are required. From the interviews it was clear that the IOM project was pioneering, and it spurred greater interest in MECC. While many of the countries were already looking into climate change and environmental issues, the migration nexus was fairly new. The project successfully heightened attention to this nexus but failed to model a practical response largely due to limitation in resources and project design which did not include some initial practical responses. For the gains made not to be lost, the biggest priority for now remains to undertake intensive resource mobilization to especially implement actions in the various blueprints but more especially with the purpose of modelling what and how MECC programming looks like in real life.
- ⇒ **For IOM Missions:** Greater dissemination of assessments reports and blueprints to increase their utility. There is still a section of stakeholders who were actively involved in the project but who claimed not to have received the final versions of the different documents produced. There was also no substantial evidence produced indicating that the data and/or blueprints had been used indicating a low level of utility this far. There is need for an intentional promotion/dissemination of these products to different audiences.
- ⇒ **For IOM missions:** Encourage the functioning of Technical Working Groups. If TWGs or respective multi-stakeholder forums such as the National Coordinating Committee on climate change in Namibia are supported to remain functional and integrate a greater MECC focus, it will go a long way to sustaining what IOM started. From observations made during evaluation process and in other IDF mandated evaluations done in recent past, it is clear that continuity of TWGs is not necessarily dependent on availability of financial resources as much as it is with availability of **proactive leadership**. What seems to diminish after IOM projects is the leadership or championing role that focuses on reviewing progress made and/or on continuing and scaling up IOM's seed programming.