



EX-POST EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PROJECT

“REGIONAL CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR THE PRODUCTION AND ANALYSIS OF REGIONAL MIGRATION INFORMATION IN MESOAMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN”





Acknowledgements

First of all, I want to thank the interview partners from Costa Rica, Mexico, Jamaica and Saint Lucia as well as Jorge Pizarro Martinez and Leandro Reboiras Finardi from UN ECLAC for their valuable input throughout the interviews and informative talks. Furthermore, thanks to all those that participated in the quantitative survey. I am also very thankful to Gabriela Rodriguez as PRIMI's then Project Manager and Sofía Arce as Evaluation Manager as well as the numerous staff from IOM's Regional Office, the Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) and IOM El Salvador who stood ready for providing information through interviews or provided valuable input through other channels.

I also want to thank our Regional Director Michele Klein-Solomon, my supervisors Natalia Pérez Andersen and Vanesa Vaca without whose constant support this evaluation would not have been possible. Special thanks also to Theogene Nshimiyimana for his valuable advice, proof-reading and mentoring.

I also want to extend my thanks to the IOM Development Fund for their review and comments.

Martin Schmitt
Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
Regional Office for Central America, North America and the Caribbean

Email: mschmitt@iom.int

Tel: +506 2212-5300

©IOM

September 2021

Content

Executive summary

List of acronyms

1. Introduction	1
2. Context and purpose of the evaluation	1
Context.....	1
Evaluation purpose	3
Evaluation scope	3
Evaluation criteria	3
3. Evaluation methodology	3
Data sources, data collection and analysis	3
Sampling.....	4
Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies	5
4. Findings	7
Relevance	7
Effectiveness	15
Efficiency	20
Impact	22
Coherence	25
Sustainability	26
Gender Mainstreaming	28
5. Conclusions and recommendations	29
Relevance	29
Effectiveness	30
Efficiency	33
Impact	34
Coherence	35
Sustainability	37



Gender Mainstreaming.....	38
Literature	39
Annexes.....	41
Evaluation terms of reference	41
Evaluation matrix.....	47
List of documents reviewed.....	55
List of persons interviewed or consulted.....	55
Data collection instruments.....	56

Figures

Figure 1: Screenshot of pop-up window for survey in Spanish	4
Figure 2: Screenshot of pop-up window for survey in English	4

Tables

Table 1: Results Matrix.....	11
Table 2: Usage of Platform over Time	19



Executive summary

The Project

The following report is an ex-post evaluation of the project CR99P0002/PR.0221: Regional Capacity-building for the Production and Analysis of Regional Migration Information in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean managed by the Regional Office for Central America, North America, and the Caribbean of the International Organization of Migration (IOM) and funded by the IOM Development Fund (IDF) with a total budget of USD 300,000. The project was implemented from 01 February 2018 until the 31 January 2020 and covered 12 countries from Mesoamerica and the Caribbean, namely Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, St. Lucia and Surinam.

The objective was to contribute to strengthening of Governments' capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean. The project planned to achieve this overarching goal first through the improvement of the capacities of the National Directorates of Migration, which allows them to generate migration information through the cooperation mechanisms established for the production of this information. This should be achieved by establishing a regional cooperation network on migration data, organizing workshops and individual country support enabling them to produce and share migration data with the Regional Platform for Migration Information (PRIMI).

The overall objective of this ex-post evaluation is to measure how well the project was performing in terms of the following evaluation criteria established by OECD-DAC: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability. The integration of overall priorities and gender equality into the program design and implementation has also been examined.

Evaluation Methodology

This evaluation builds its analysis upon a non-experimental mixed-methods design. Besides a thorough review of available data and project documents, this evaluation includes a qualitative approach using remote in-depth key informant interviews (KII) based on semi-structured questionnaires with relevant stakeholders from IOM and government counterparts. Additionally, a quantitative close-ended questionnaire in English and Spanish was developed and sent to the respective government counterparts and other stakeholders.

Key Findings and Recommendations

Relevance

The project was highly relevant. All interviewed stakeholders and basically all frameworks and strategies, be it on national, regional or global level emphasize the importance of having access to timely, high-quality and comparable data in the field of migration to improved evidence-based decision making. The project logic showed some weaknesses, in the horizontal as well as the vertical logic. While the data on the platform was considered very useful in general terms, e.g. to identify regional trends, lack of comparability and timeliness of the data presented on the platform compromised the utility for political decision makers. However, as many of the examined countries currently do not have the capacity to produce this kind of data, a very close, individualized support mechanism should be established to support countries in their efforts to produce the requested data. Further coordination efforts to assimilate definitions and forms of measurement would additionally increase relevance of the data.

- **Recommendation:** For future similar exercises, allow sufficient time for a needs assessment, including stakeholder consultations to identify the most important issues and the development of the respective strategies for addressing them before starting with project activities. An updated mapping of which data is available per country is recommended before starting any further interventions to reflect countries that were working on their data collection and processing abilities.
- **Recommendation:** For similar activities in the future, organize separate or additional workshops with a separate focus, e.g. how to improve data collection without strong border management systems.
- **Recommendation:** In case of a continuation or similar projects in the future, optimize platform accessibility for smartphones and tablets to keep pace with the development of increasing use of mobile devices.
- **Recommendation:** Include an explicit theory of change into the project proposal of upcoming activities in this regard to have a stronger base for predicting the effects of project interventions and under which circumstances the desired change will happen. Additionally, set-up a risk assessment plan into the project proposal, as required per IOM's Project Handbook.

Effectiveness

The project was partially effective. The project achieved all outputs, namely the 1) The establishment of a regional cooperation network on migration data, 2) The establishment of a Regional Platform on Migration Information, 3) The availability of migration statistics on the platform and the knowledge of government entities, regional organisms, civil society and academia, 4) The availability of a study on tools to systematize migration information, and 5) Migration officials know of best practices on how to manage migration information. Not all countries reported an increase in their capacity to produce the required information. Also, in the final report only six out of twelve countries were reporting to use the platform,

one could be confirmed during this evaluation. None of the Caribbean countries delivered the requested data during the project. The major challenge there remains the lack of capacities to produce this data. Ways to increase the usage of the data once produced, it is furthermore paramount to promote the platform with knowledge products such as factsheets or thematic briefs. This increases accessibility, publicity and can furthermore help to prevent misinterpretation of results. As a first step, however, focus should be put on supporting countries to be able to produce the data.

- **Recommendation:** Keep on working with Caribbean countries by supporting them setting up a solid data collection and management system. As many of them do not have yet a well-established system or very entrenched opinions on definitions of certain phenomena, there is a big opportunity to build on the progress made and to jointly set it up the “right” way in order increase comparability of data across the region.
- **Recommendation:** Increase frequency of data uploads. Of course, this can only work if countries are able to deliver the requested data in the given period. Investing resources in increased automatization in the data cleaning process can help to reduce the time after data comes in. Uploads should also include a revision / comparison of existing data as governments continuously amend their registers based on new data from local authorities.
- **Recommendation:** Invest further time and resources to find least common denominators and try to work with the countries on ways how to either adapt their definitions or having the ability to produce data according to their national interest as well as for international comparison. Until this has been achieved at least to a great extent, focus on the strength of providing access to quality data on national level. Do not sell it as a tool for comparison of data between countries.
- **Recommendation:** Promote the publicity of the platform by actively engaging with universities, private and public sector. For this, strong liaison and advocacy work is needed. Other options could include to further join forces and create interlinkages with already known platforms like the Migration Data Portal or NTMI. Increase the presence on social media via targeted campaigns and provide political decision makers with regular updates in form of targeted, reader-friendly knowledge products and/or inviting them to (virtual) workshops. This will help facilitating correct and timely information retrieval and may convince them of the added value of the platform for their daily decision making and by this increase their ownership and buy-in to invest more resources into the platform.
- **Recommendation:** Further strengthen data collection and processing capacities by investing in new data collection tools, licenses, programs for countries in the region and accompany them with intensive capacity building measures (in form of longer workshops) to facilitate change management and reduce resistance to change.
- **Recommendation:** Take the time to discuss with every country individually, also on new ways how to collect the data needed. For this invite various stakeholder groups like statisticians, border managers, policy makers, migration department directors, planning ministry, and private sector representatives.

- **Recommendation:** In future projects, designate a focal person in the respective IOM country offices to help facilitate communication and benefit from their contextual knowledge and relationship with the government counterparts. Make sure that this focal person (or a replacement) is able to take care of questions even after the project ends.
- **Recommendation:** Help countries establish well-defined working modalities through meeting minutes and workflow documents in order to facilitate and maintain data and information exchange. This is particularly relevant for countries with not so well established interagency information flows.

Efficiency

The project was efficient. The project remained within its budgetary boundaries and could even leverage some additional funds for consultants after project end. Through enabling networking it also contributed to intraorganizational cooperation. There were various smaller delays in the implementation. An earlier involvement of the consultant completing the needs assessment/baseline study as well as a solid risk assessment plan could have helped to prevent delays and use the funds in a more efficient way. One important critique mentioned in this evaluation is the variety of data platforms which also leads to the establishment of parallel structures e.g. in the hosting, design and maintenance of platforms. A better integration into already existing platforms, while maintaining the data collection and processing at the regional level out of an expert perspective, could help to increase the efficiency.

- **Recommendation:** Recommendations for efficiency are covered in the other criteria.

Impact

The project had a moderate impact. Despite the fact that the project's objective could only partly be achieved (see effectiveness section), the changes brought about by the project at the outcome level contributed to a longer-term impact of the project. Especially countries with limited capacities in terms of migration data collection and processing improved their capacity in various aspects:

- 1) Higher awareness of which data exists in other countries and what it can be used for
- 2) Improved interagency communication and thus higher awareness of which data exists in their own country
- 3) Higher awareness of which data still needs to be collected and a better idea of areas in which to improve to be able to collect this type of data

Also, and maybe even more important, in some countries the project produced a higher *willingness* to work on their data capacities by e.g. revising their border management systems. This increased government buy-in is a crucial part of being able to cooperate in these kind of projects. In order to not lose the achieved progress, it is important to keep on promoting the benefits of having this kind of data gathered in one place through targeted knowledge products e.g. This requires strong liaison and advocacy work, and, after all, also additional resources to be invested.



- **Recommendation:** Keep on promoting frequent exchange within a regional network of stakeholders working with migration data through events, workshops and capacity building measures as this resulted in an important vehicle to increase coordination and coherence among involved stakeholders across the region and builds the base for further interventions in this field.

Coherence

The project was partially coherent. The project connected well with similar initiatives in the field and built on the experience with former, similar projects like the SIEMMES while project staff also relied on external expertise from e.g. UN ECLAC and UNHCR as organizations producing migration data in the region. Also, the availability of administrative data to a broader public was innovative in this field. Despite some collaboration with IOM GMDAC's Migration Data Portal there is currently multitude of migration data platforms that at times are not compatible. To avoid parallel structures, further coordination between the platforms should be considered (see efficiency criterion).

- **Recommendation:** Instead of creating more platforms with specific focuses which all require resources for set-up, maintenance and publicity, incorporate potential future versions of PRIMI into the Migration Data Portal as IOM's flagship for migration data under the respective regional tab. Data gathering, processing and management should still be under the responsibility of the Regional Office.
- **Recommendation:** Promote the introduction of a global guidance on which programs should be used across the organization. Until this exists, promote the transition to data collection and management tools that are compatible to the main data platforms like the Migration Data Portal and DTM to facilitate data transfer.
- **Recommendation:** Assure the availability of funds for a dedicated person (locally or in MAC) to react fast on IT related requests until the platform is set-up and request access rights for decentralized IT personnel at the Regional Office San Jose to be able to quickly respond to potential issues with high urgency.
- **Recommendation:** Promote the creation of alliances for data gathering and cleaning with other actors in the field. While doing this, assure access and compatibility of the data for a potential later integration into IOM's Migration Data Portal.

Sustainability

The sustainability was found to be limited. At the time of the evaluation, the platform did not include up-to-date information, some even with errors. Only two countries were still contributing to the platform, but data is not, or only very delayed, uploaded to PRIMI. One of the main challenges for sustainability is the high workload that is caused by the labor-intensive data cleaning and maintenance work to keep the data accurate and up to date. Improving the quality and coherence of incoming data is key for enabling a



sustainable existence of the platform. As highlighted in other sections in this report, to guarantee a well-working, efficient and thus sustainable data management, it is crucial to

1. Harmonize the data collection processes on the side of the participating countries (see effectiveness section).
2. Help countries establish systems to compile the necessary data with the lowest effort possible, even if this means investments in hardware, licenses and/or capacity building measures (see effectiveness section).
3. Automate data cleaning processes (including data quality checks) to the maximum on the side of IOM using macros or scripts in statistics programs (see effectiveness section).
4. Increase synergies with other actors in the field through shared platforms and/or cooperation in the field of data collection (see coherence section).
5. Strive for long-term funding commitments to promote stability, predictability and sustainable planning.

Despite the challenges for sustainability, the platform managed to spark interest in administrative data in the region and builds the base for potential further activities in this area.

- **Recommendation:** For future activities, strive for long-term funding commitment to promote stability, predictability and sustainable planning. This long-term commitment can also help to facilitate change management within the participating countries making sure that change efforts are not abandoned half-way.
- **Recommendation:** Work on formalizing data exchange with governments by setting up bi- or multilateral Memoranda of Understanding or data exchange agreements with governments.

Gender Mainstreaming

The project team encouraged equal participation of men and women in workshops to guarantee that both perspectives are reflected. Most of the produced data is disaggregated by sex and age, not by gender. However, as at this point, the aim of the platform is to generate basic migration related data for evidence-based policy making and considering that for some countries delivering the requested data in a high quality results challenging due to several reasons laid out in this report, a disaggregation by sex and age is considered sufficient. At a later stage, and once the platform is more consolidated, a needs assessment in terms of gender specific data demands should be considered to facilitate gender sensitive political decision making based on evidence. Countries should be encouraged to extend their level of disaggregation and include information on gender and persons with diverse SOGIESC.

- **Recommendation:** Encourage countries to extend the level of disaggregation, so that, apart from sex and age, data can also be disaggregated by gender and related data like information on persons with diverse SOGIESC.

List of acronyms

CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CMC	Caribbean Migration Consultations
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
GCM	Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration
IDF	IOM Development Fund
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MIDAS	Migration Information and Data Analysis System
MIRAC	Migration Resource Allocation Committee
NDM	National Directorate of Migration
NTMI	Northern Triangle Migration Information Management Initiative
OAS	Organization of American States
OCAM	The Central American Commission of Migration Directors
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee
PRIMI	Regional Platform for Migration Information (“Plataforma Regional de Información sobre Migración” by its Spanish name)
PVIGMA	Virtual Information Platform for Migration Governance in the Americas
RCM	Regional Conference on Migration
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SICA	Central American Integration System / Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana
SICREMI	Continuous Reporting System on International Migration in the Americas / Sistema Continuo de Reportes sobre Migración Internacional en las Américas
SIEMMES	Migration Information and Statistics System for Mesoamerica
SI-Estad	Integrated System for Information on Statistics of the SICA / Sistema Integrado de Información Estadística del SICA



SOGIESC	Sexual Orientations, Gender Identities and Expressions, and Sex Characteristics
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

1. Introduction

The following report is an ex-post evaluation of the project CR99P0002/PR.0221: Regional Capacity-building for the Production and Analysis of Regional Migration Information in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean managed by the Regional Office for Central America, North America, and the Caribbean of the International Organization of Migration (IOM) and funded by the IOM Development Fund (IDF) with a total budget of USD 300,000. The project was implemented from 01 February 2018 until the 31 January 2020 and covered 12 countries from Mesoamerica and the Caribbean¹.

The objective was to contribute to strengthening of Governments' capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean. The project planned to achieve this overarching goal first through the improvement of the capacities of the National Directorates of Migration (NDM), which allows them to generate migration information through the cooperation mechanisms established for the production of this information. This should be achieved by establishing a regional cooperation network on migration data, organizing workshops and individual country support enabling them to produce and share migration data with the Regional Platform for Migration Information (PRIMI).

This ex-post evaluation was commissioned by the IDF and carried out by Martin Schmitt from April 2021 to September 2021. The evaluation focuses on all six OECD-DAC (OECD-DAC, 2019) evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability. Apart from that, the integration of overall priorities like gender mainstreaming into the program design and implementation will be evaluated.

2. Context and purpose of the evaluation

Context

Migration management is a process that requires coordination and consensus between countries. The generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration serves as the basis to guide the efforts of national governments in the development of migration policies based on evidence. In turn, evidence-based migration policies are an inherent part of good migration governance. Information and data as well as policies that are based on them, are essential elements for the fulfillment of goals 10.7² and 17.18³ of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

¹ The countries covered in the project are: Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, St. Lucia and Surinam.

² SDG goal 10.7: "Facilitate orderly, safe, and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies" (United Nations, 2015).

³ SDG goal 17.18: "Enhance availability of reliable data: By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing states, to increase significantly the

However, there are multiple challenges to ensure the availability of up-to-date and real-time information and data on migration. As will be described throughout this evaluation, some of these challenges are limited capacities to collect, process and analyze migration data on the side of the national governments, lack of coherent definitions across countries and the general challenge of high mobility of migrants and thus the difficulty to collect information from hard-to-reach populations, especially if it comes to measuring irregular migration movements. In addition, there are obvious limitations in the coordination between countries for the exchange of them.

The IDF provides a unique global resource aimed at supporting developing Member States in their efforts to strengthen their migration management capacity through “seed funding” for innovative projects.

The project “Regional Capacity-Building for the Production and Analysis of Regional Migration Information in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean” aims to contribute to the strengthening of capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean through the development of a migration information system, namely the Regional Platform for Migration Information (PRIMI by its Spanish acronym).

Specifically, the objective, outcome and outputs are structured as follows:

Objective: Contribute to the strengthening of capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean.

Outcome: The National Migration Directorates have improved their capacities which allows them to generate migration related information through the cooperation mechanisms established for the production of this information.

Output 1.1: The Regional Cooperation Network "Virtual Information Platform for Migration Governance in the Americas (PVI-GMA)⁴" on migration data has been established.

Output 1.2: The "Virtual Information Platform for Migration Governance in the Americas" is established.

Output 1.3: Statistical information on migration is available and known to governments, regional bodies, civil society and academia.

Output 1.4: Governments have an assessment of migration data systematisation tools used in Mesoamerican and Caribbean countries.

Output 1.5: NDM national officers gain knowledge on best practices in migration information management.

availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts” (United Nations, 2015).

⁴ During the project implementation, the name PVI-GMA was changed to PRIMI.

Evaluation purpose

The overall purpose of this internal ex-post evaluation is to assess the relevance of project design, coherence of the interventions in relation to other interventions, the effectiveness and performance of the project, the efficiency of project management and implementation, as well as the impact and sustainability of the project. The evaluation was designed as an ex-post evaluation, as this allows for identifying the impact and sustainability of the project and helps to develop lessons learned and good practices which are crucial to further improve the development of future projects in the field of using and producing migration data. The donor will use the findings of the evaluation in its decision-making on the use of the IDF as seed funding, and on regional project management, while IOM staff and the Regional Thematic Specialists will profit from the results in order to inform and improve future programming. Parallel to this evaluation, the Regional Office in San Jose is working on future steps of how to connect to PRIMM and the idea of having a regional platform providing migration data over the long run.

As per the IDF, all projects must undergo an ex-post evaluation commissioned by the Fund.

Evaluation scope

This evaluation covers the period of the project implementation from February 1st 2018 to January 31st 2020, and analyses all activities delivered including all capacity-building trainings, sensitization activities, coordination efforts as well as the content available on the platform. Even if the platform is globally accessible, the evaluation focuses on the countries covered by the project, Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Suriname and Saint Lucia. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all data was collected remotely.

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation focuses on all six OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability. Apart from that, the integration of overall priorities like gender equality into the program design and implementation will be evaluated.

3. Evaluation methodology

Data sources, data collection and analysis

This evaluation builds its analysis upon a non-experimental mixed-methods design. Besides a thorough review of available data and project documents, this evaluation includes a qualitative approach using remote in-depth key informant interviews (KII) with relevant stakeholders from IOM and government counterparts. The KII are built upon semi-structured questionnaires for the specific stakeholder groups.

Additionally, a quantitative close-ended questionnaire in English and Spanish using KoboToolbox⁵ has been developed and sent to government counterparts working in the field of migration. Additionally, with the help of the Regional Web Developing Assistant a pop-up window in both languages was created, encouraging visitors to complete the survey (see figure 1 & 2). Due to the low response rate, however, no quantitative analysis will be conducted.



Figure 1: Screenshot of pop-up window for survey in Spanish



Figure 2: Screenshot of pop-up window for survey in English

Sampling

The evaluator selected the participants for the KII based on a purposive sampling method which means that participants were selected according to their ability “to elucidate a specific theme, concept, or phenomenon” (Robinson, 2014). The sample consists of a broad variety of stakeholders in order to examine the respective research question from various angles.

In total 12 KII were conducted with the following persons:

- 4 government focal points from participating countries (Mexico, Costa Rica, Jamaica, St. Lucia)
- 2 IOM RO San José staff involved in the project (Project manager, Project staff)
- 2 staff from IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC)
- 1 consultant involved in the project (now IOM staff)
- 1 IOM staff acting as Secretary for the Central American Commission of Migration Directors – OCAM
- 2 Staff from United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)

⁵ For more info, see: <https://www.kobotoolbox.org/>

For the quantitative data collection, a total of 120⁶ officials of different government agencies working in the field of migration from the participating countries were contacted via email and asked to complete the survey. It is also not clear, how many persons visited the questionnaire or abandoned it half-way, as due to updated data protection regulations of KoboToolbox, only data of completed surveys will be sent. Unfortunately, despite several reminders to government officials, only twelve persons replied to the survey. Only two out of these indicated having visited the platform and had thus the opportunity to answer the questions from the survey while for the others the survey ended based on conditional filtering of survey questions.

Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies

Limited availability of stakeholders

One of the biggest challenges to this evaluation was the limited availability of stakeholders. The project ended in January 2020 and some of the project staff had left the mission, or in case of the project manager, had even left IOM at the time the evaluation started. Also, during project implementation, various focal points from the national Governments rotated or were replaced which additionally complicates data collection.

While, despite the various re-assignments after the project end, former IOM project staff could be reached without major problems, this was only the case for very few of government stakeholders. In some cases, initial contact could be established, however, no interview was possible as government focal points stopped answering and/or did simply not show up to the agreed (video-)calls. Triangulation of data through extensive document review as well as the intent to complement the KII with a quantitative instrument were measures taken to mitigate the challenge of reaching only few interview partners which in turn can produce selection bias. In order to include also the broader public into the data collection, the pop-up survey on the PRIMI homepage has been created.

Difficulty to collect primary data on site due to contact and travel restrictions during COVID-19

The enduring COVID-19 pandemic impeded the evaluator from having direct contact with project stakeholders. Due to this reason the data collection was conducted entirely remotely via video conference tools like Microsoft Teams, WhatsApp calls and the quantitative online survey.

⁶ As some of the email addresses are distribution lists and other had already been deactivated, it is not clear how many participants could be reached.



Potential self-selection biases

As the sample is based on a purposive convenience sampling certain biases caused by self-selection processes could not be entirely prevented. These self-selection biases could be caused by the fact that persons that are generally more interested in migration data or the project itself might be more willing to participate in an interview or a survey. This could result in a bias towards a positive judgement.

Although self-selection biases are rather difficult to address without a sound data base to control for systematic unit non-response⁷, potential biases were intended to be addressed via the triangulation of data using primary and secondary data sources.

⁷ Unit nonresponse in a survey occurs when an eligible sample member fails to respond at all or does not provide enough information for the response to be deemed usable (not even as a "partial completion"). (Lavrakas, 2008)

4. Findings

The evaluation findings are presented below per evaluation criteria.

Relevance

The criterion relevance describes “the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change” (OECD-DAC, 2019).

To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders considered during project design and development?

Was there a formal needs assessment?

Even though no formal needs assessment has been conducted before the actual start of the activities, various project documents refer to the need of a platform comprising accessible migration data from the region, expressed by several stakeholders. According to the project proposal, in 2016, the Caribbean Migration Consultation (CMC) stressed the importance of information systems presenting accessible migration data. Similar statements have been voiced by the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) and OCAM beforehand. A report issued by IOM and McKinsey (2018, p. 24) stressed the need for more, comparable, and timely migration data in order “to enable improved migration governance and to drive economic, humanitarian, social development and political benefits”, so did a report by the Global Migration Group (2013). Besides that, the project report acknowledges the respective targets/objectives in global frameworks like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (United Nations, 2015) or the Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) (United Nations, 2018), in which the need for more and better migration data is explicitly mentioned. Experiences from similar platforms like the Migration Information and Statistics System for Mesoamerica (SIEMMES by its Spanish acronym) have also confirmed the need of the project.

After having finished the project development phase a consultant was hired to conduct an extensive baseline study on the availability of information systems of the participating countries. The report disclosed important gaps regarding the countries’ capacity to produce timely and high-quality migration data while also providing best-practices and lessons learned. As the project development phase at this time had already been finished, there was only limited ability to incorporate the lessons learned into the project design.

To what extent were stakeholder consulted during project development?

During the project design phase, exchange with relevant stakeholders has proven to be limited. The great majority of the interviewed partners mentioned to have been consulted for the first time after the project had been developed. However, as many government counterparts had been assigned by their respective supervisors, participants could not provide much information about potential consultations between

IOM's Project Staff and government counterparts at the senior management level. At the intra-organizational level, representatives from IOM's GMDAC mentioned to have been consulted after main parts of the project development had already been done and the implementation phase had started. Due to GMDAC's experience with the management of data portals and their role as key stakeholder due to potential intersections between the Migration Data Portal⁸ and PRIMI, an earlier involvement in the conceptualization phase would have been desired. Also, IOM's representatives at OCAM were included in the project at a time when the project proposal had already been approved.

After the project design phase, however, there was very close exchange with the stakeholders. There were two kick-off events, one in Panama for the Spanish-speaking countries and one in Jamaica for the English-speaking countries, in which the project proposal, data collection templates and methodology as well as the implementation plan were discussed and validated. Also, in the course of the implementation there was a very close follow-up with the country focal points by the project manager which was highly appreciated and highlighted various times in the interviews.

"It was very good. in the beginning there was a lot of feedback gathered from us and, actually, I would receive calls. We would receive calls from their consultant at different points to find out, you know, how the the project was serving us. So, there could be feedback at every point and different concerns taken into consideration at any point. So I think, uhm...,their communication was a very good mechanism, very effective."

To what extent do stakeholders feel that their needs were addressed?

One key aspect for generating comprehensive and reliable migration data is the incorporation of various data sources like census data, survey data as well as administrative data. This finding was also one of the key messages of the second International Forum on Migration Statistics in January 2020 in Cairo, Egypt (IOM, DESA, & OECD, 2020). The relevance of these kinds of data has been confirmed by all interviewees throughout this evaluation. One of the benefits of the platform highlighted by one participant was that PRIMI contains also administrative data of some Central American States that are not publicly accessible and which they use regularly for comparison and internal reporting.

"As a source of information it is invaluable because it is the only source, at least for the time being, that allows you to have data from all the countries that are integrated. So that is something plus that you cannot find even in our own data, meaning, we just have what we generate on our own [...], but we don't have what Central America, Honduras, what El Salvador generates. So, this seems to me that in terms of promotion and generation of statistical information, it is a good reference." [translated from Spanish]

⁸ See: <https://www.migrationdataportal.org/>

Some countries even had advancements in data and communication on migration as one of the key aspects of their national strategies.

“It was aligned with the outcomes that we wanted out of our policies, so Jamaica had a policy and one of the areas, the thematic areas, was that of data and communication.”

What has not been addressed?

There was general consensus among the study participants that IOM project staff was very concerned of accommodating the needs and demands of the participating countries. Still, throughout the interviews, participants mentioned shortcomings in the relevance of the results discussed in the workshops, particularly the one on best-practices.

For some of the Caribbean states, best practices or lessons learned that were discussed in the workshops did not apply very well to their needs and realities as they did not have integrated border management systems like Central American States or Mexico that are using IOM’s Migration Information and Data Analysis System (MIDAS). Thus, collecting the necessary data to populate PRIMI resulted much more challenging for them.

“So, the experiences were based on the realities within the Spanish-speaking countries, [...] were not the same realities that we faced in the English-speaking Caribbean, and as such, even although they were shared as best practices, they were a little bit lofty to the four countries, some to greater extents than others. Because I remember even at the table we were saying “OK, this can happen, but this can't happen within the time frame that we're really targeting.”

This is also reflected in the statement of another participant who mentioned the lack of capacity their country still has in terms of being able to produce the requested data.

“And what we thought this process would do, is that it would also help to mainstream that data collection and also it would help us in terms of an ongoing effort that we have, and we have not necessarily been successful at thus far, is to establish a national migration database.”

One participant mentioned the lack of qualitative data complementing the quantitative data in order to have a more comprehensive picture which would be necessary for developing their respective country profiles and mapping of migration data. Another participant further stated that for her work, the regional focus is helpful for purposes of comparison between countries, but that she missed data from South America as persons migrating from the southern part of the continent play a strong role in terms of asylum requests, among others.

Did the project include all relevant stakeholders?

The project included a broad set of stakeholders including the Regional Office's Senior Management and project staff, representatives of GMDAC for consultation and facilitation of workshops, representatives of OCAM and other relevant organizations in the region like the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) or CMC. Governments of all twelve participating countries were contacted so that they assign focal points for organizing data compilation, project related correspondence and attending workshops. Most of these focal points are working in their respective Migration Directorate (7), some others in the area of Home Affairs and Border Management (3) while the rest (2) were coming from the Planning Institute or Ministry of Citizenship of their government. Due to changes in the participating countries' administrations, stakeholders reported critically of a relatively high fluctuation of assigned focal points which reportedly caused a loss of knowledge as handovers were not always working smoothly. Another point of criticism that was raised in the interviews is that not always the right persons were involved and that because of that, at times technical knowledge was lacking. Exemplary, in some cases participants found it insufficient to only have persons with IT background involved who know how to generate the data bank, but do not have sufficient expertise in the meaning of the data.

"The IT colleagues know about databases or how to obtain the information, etc., how to arrange the information, but they don't know the meaning, what is being asked for or what is meant by the terms that are being asked for, because they are just told: "Generate this information", but they don't know where it comes from, what it is called, what it is referring to and many times they say, "yes, we have it", and that's not true." [Translated from Spanish]

Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcome and objective?

The results matrix (see table 1) shows weaknesses in the horizontal as well as the vertical logic, especially at outcome/objective level. But also at the output level some indicators show weaknesses. Many indicators are not or only partially apt to prove that the respective objective, outcome or output had been achieved. At the objective level, e.g., there is a discrepancy between the *use* of migration data (what the indicator is measuring) and the *access* to data (what the objective is stating). This discrepancies also lead to the fact that it is not reflected in matrix that e.g. the project *did* contribute to a strengthening of capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration, even in countries that *are not using PRIMI* but increased their capacities by trying to deliver the requested data (see Impact criterion).

The narrative part in the project proposal could have been more elaborated, strengthening the project logic and making it more robust. The project proposal does not include an explicit Theory of Change (ToC) that connects the different project outcomes, outputs and activities based on certain assumptions. Also, similar exercises like a Problem-Tree Analysis have not been applied.

Table 1: Results Matrix

<p>Objective:</p> <p>The project will contribute to strengthening of capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean</p>	<p>Indicator:</p> <p># of countries reporting having used PVI-GMA migration information for the design and development of policies, programmes and actions</p>	<p>Analysis:</p> <p>The objective is not clearly stated. Deriving from the interviews and the narrative in the project proposal, what the project really wanted to achieve was contributing to improved evidence-based decision making based on data. This is also what the indicator is trying to measure. Improved generation of migration data is included in both, the objective and the outcome level, which indicates weaknesses in the vertical logic.</p>
<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>The NDM have improved their capacities, which allows them to generate migration information through the cooperation mechanisms established for the production of this information.</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <p>The Regional Network of the Virtual Information Platform for Migration Governance in the Americas (PVI-GMA) on gender-sensitive migration data is established and coordinating</p> <p>% of countries that have their capacities enhanced through the use of a migration information system</p>	<p>Analysis:</p> <p>The Outcome is well stated and is showing an increase in capacity or skills, even though it could have been more ambitious and refer to the generation of migration data as a result of cooperation mechanisms and improved capacities. The first indicator (establishment of PVI-GMA) is rather an output level indicator and is not apt to prove that the establishment and coordination is leading to an increase in capacities. The second indicator is apt.</p>
<p>Output 1.1:</p>	<p>Indicators:</p>	<p>Analysis:</p>

<p>The Regional Cooperation Network "Virtual Information Platform for Migration Governance in the Americas (PVI-GMA)" on migration data has been established.</p>	<p># of participants in the network, disaggregated by sex and age</p> <p># of project launch event reports</p> <p># of reports on the networking events</p>	<p>The indicators are generally fine, even though the first indicator from the outcome level would be rather apt for this output.</p>
<p>Output 1.2:</p> <p>The "Virtual Information Platform for Migration Governance in the Americas (PVI-GMA)" is established.</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <p>Platform is operational</p> <p># of focal points by country designated to provide information on the platform, disaggregated by sex and age</p> <p>Mechanism established to collect migration data of the established DGM</p>	<p>Analysis:</p> <p>Output is clearly formulated and indicators are well chosen to measure it.</p>
<p>Output 1.3:</p> <p>Statistical information on migration is available and known to governments, regional bodies, civil society and academia.</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <p>Press briefing note of the kick-off event of the platform is created and disseminated</p> <p># of government officials, civil society and governments of the region who are receiving material produced by the Network</p> <p># of joint gender-sensitive documents produced by the network</p> <p># of registered new visitors to the platform</p>	<p>Analysis:</p> <p>Output is clearly formulated and indicators are well chosen to measure it.</p>

<p>Output 1.4:</p> <p>Governments have an assessment of migration data systematisation tools used in Mesoamerican and Caribbean countries.</p>	<p>Indicator:</p> <p>Regional gender-sensitive assessment identifying best-practices is created and disseminated</p>	<p>Analysis:</p> <p>Output is clearly formulated and indicators are well chosen to measure it.</p>
<p>Output 1.5:</p> <p>NDM officers gain knowledge on best practices in migration information management</p>	<p>Indicator:</p> <p># of regional knowledge exchange workshops</p> <p># of NDM officials trained in the use of information systems, disaggregated by sex and age</p>	<p>Analysis:</p> <p>The indicators do rather prove that trainings or workshops have been conducted. They are not able to prove that NDM officers actually gained knowledge. For this, e.g. pre-post test would have been needed.</p>



Is the project aligned with and supportive of IOM national, regional, and/or global strategies and the Migration Governance Framework?

The strengthening of migration data and by this promote evidence-based policies is at the heart of almost every migration related strategic document or framework IOM has committed itself or is using as guidance for its work over the last years. On the global interagency level, most explicitly it is established in the GCM with its first objective, namely “Collect and utilize accurate and disaggregated data as a basis for evidence-based policies” (United Nations, 2018). The objective of the project is also strongly aligned with other strategic documents like the Agenda 2030 with its SDGs, here to mention objective 10.7 and 17.18 (United Nations, 2015).

“Greater quality, consistency and comparability of data sets” as well as policy capacity and knowledge management are explicitly mentioned as key drivers for success in IOM’s Strategic Vision (IOM, 2019). This is also reflected in the Strategic Results Framework that is currently in the roll-out process across the organization. The Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF) stresses the importance of promoting evidence-based and data-driven policy making in principle two (IOM, 2015).

The project is further in line with the three strategic objectives of IOM’s Migration Data Strategy which are (1) strengthen the global evidence base on migration; (2) develop capacity of States and other relevant partners to enhance the national, regional and global migration evidence base; and (3) ensure more evidence-based IOM- and United Nations systemwide programming, operations, policy advice and communications (IOM, 2021a).

The Regional Strategy for Central America, North America and the Caribbean 2020–2024 explicitly mentions PRIMI in one of its strategic priorities (“Improve IOM’s capacity to collect and analyse migration and internal displacement”) and underlines the importance of capacity development of governments to “collect, analyse and use migration and internal displacement data for evidence-based policymaking” (IOM, 2020a).

At the time of the evaluation the respective country strategies in the region were still under development. As they will be oriented towards IOM’s Strategic Vision and the Strategic Results Framework, the project’s objective will remain highly relevant also on the national level.

Are the data collected via the data collection tools and posted in PRIMI relevant to the initial intent and for use by the targeted beneficiaries?

The intent to build the platform PRIMI was to give governments the necessary tools and data to build their migration related decisions on evidence. The administrative data collected on the platform is very relevant for this purpose and gives a good overview of migratory developments in the region. One interviewee mentioned in this regard to be regularly using the platform looking for data from other countries for comparison or forecasting purposes, especially as some of the data was not publicly available before PRIMI.

In order to make the platform as needs oriented as possible, the consultant working in the project conducted three field visits including focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews with public and private actors inquiring their demand for data and to collect information on their migration data management systems. Additionally, a workshop with relevant stakeholders from GMDAC, CMC, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and country focal points has been conducted to discuss further steps.

Nevertheless, there are some aspects mentioned by the participants that are hindering a stronger consideration by the intended target group. One aspect here is the strong demand for very recent data by political decision makers. Data that is considered outdated due to certain political changes or major environmental events will probably not be considered. In the case of PRIMI, the time span between the collection of the data which happens every six months and the publication on the platform was considered too long to be relevant for political decision making, especially as this does not yet include the time needed for data cleaning which at times sums up to nine months. For academic purposes this might be sufficient. However, when it comes to political decision-making data might be already too old to be considered relevant for political decision makers.

Another important factor to consider is that migration data is not static. Most countries are not able to deliver final data. As countries are only delivering the data at one point in time and there is no established revision after certain time has passed, data might differ from administrative data 6 months later. This is because migration departments are constantly working on the precision of the data, meaning eliminating or adding observations to a data set according to new data they receive from local authorities. The data in PRIMI is static which might cause confusion if the data in PRIMI does not correspond to the data that they are requesting directly from the statistics or migration office six months later which might lead to confusion.

Almost all interview participants expressed their concerns about comparability of data across countries due to different concepts and definitions.

Effectiveness

The criterion effectiveness describes “the extent to which the intervention achieves or is expected to achieve its objectives and its results” (OECD-DAC, 2019).

Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans and results matrix?

Objective level

The overall objective of the project was to contribute to a strengthening of capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration in Mexico, Central America and

the Caribbean through the development of a migration information system, the Regional Platform for Migration Information. Once established, it shall allow Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Suriname to have relevant data for the development of migration policies based on information and data.

The information gathered in the course of this evaluation indicate that the overall objective has partly been achieved. While in Central America and Mexico the platform provides data on a set of migration related topics, this is not the case for a single country in the Caribbean. According to the final narrative report, six countries (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Belize) are making use of the platform, none of the Caribbean countries. In the evaluation, due to a limited availability of government stakeholders, this could only be verified in Mexico, where the platform was used to visualize regional migration flows.

"[...] What we do use the platform for is just to look for these regional trends, because at some point you don't have enough statistics for your own country. So, for example, for the issue of last year, with all this question of the health contingency, you needed to visualise flows and trends at the regional level, and the platform, with the information it had available up to that point, helped us to visualise that. So, if there is a use for the platform, in a way that, let's say, not as a provider, but as a user, at least in the case of Mexico, it is quite exploitable." [Translated from Spanish]

IOM staff reported having used the platform to prepare an overview of developments in the area of trafficking in persons for the government of Guatemala and to extract data for reporting on inter- and intraregional migration flows in general. Data extracted from PRIMI built the base for an update of an action plan developed together with the Central American Integration System (SICA), the Comprehensive Action Plan for Addressing Migration in the SICA region (PAIM-SICA)⁹.

Even though the objective has only partly been achieved in the closer sense considering the indicators established in the results matrix, especially in the Caribbean important progress was reported in terms of capacity to produce data (see outcome level) which, in turn, enables governments to use the data for evidence-based decision making (see section on Impact criterion). As an example, one interview participant mentioned the importance of the data from the platform for identifying regional trends.

Outcome level

The envisaged outcome of the project was that the NDM have improved their capacities, which allows them to generate migration information through the cooperation mechanisms established for the production of this information. Eight out of twelve participating migration institutions reported an improvement in their capacity to collect, process and/or analyse migration data in the course of the project. Although this number does not meet the targeted 80 percent of participating countries that was envisaged

⁹ For more information see: <https://programamesoamerica.iom.int/en/news/iom-presents-new-regional-migration-report-covering-8-sica-countries>

in the results matrix, it has to be acknowledged that in some countries the project initiated important processes that have the potential to sustainably improve data collection capacities. This was particularly the case in countries that did not have very sophisticated data collection systems in place like some island states in the Caribbean.

“But I would just like to say that basically we were strengthened in the area of collection and processing and Management of our migratory data. [...] And we were in a good place because we are in a transition. So, in a transition it helps you to incorporate your desired outcome/goals, better than if you have an established system which you're going to have to fight in order to get, you know, some progress there. So, it came to us at the right time.”

“Well, definitely, [...], we are creating some new and improved systems. So, as I indicated, a lot, a lot of guidance came from the project for us to do that.”

– Interviewee on the question if the project had significantly improved the way they are collecting and analyzing data.

Output and activity level

All outputs and activities have been completed as pre-defined in the results matrix. There is a slight divergence between the target output 1.5 and the achieved progress. According to the final narrative report, this, however, is a result of activities that have been combined out of efficiency reasons: After stakeholder consultations, the funds of two events were combined which enabled the participation of more countries for which a separate workshop was initially planned.

Was the collaboration and coordination with partners and stakeholders effective?

In overall terms, the coordination between the different actors worked well. There were various events in order to exchange knowledge and coordinate further actions. These events consisted among others of two kick-off events (one for Central America and Mexico, one for the Caribbean countries), one coordination and knowledge exchange event with OCAM, ECLAC, CMC and the country focal persons as well as two lessons learnt/best-practices workshops at the end of the project. In total, ten meetings were held over the project period in order to strengthen alliances between the actors. During the implementation period regular exchange was secured by establishing two WhatsApp groups, one for the Spanish-speaking countries and one for the English-speaking ones. All interviewees agreed that the coordination from side of the IOM project team was very good and effective. Numerous participants highlighted the close follow-up and the good reachability of the project manager. Also, the coordination with IOM staff from other programs in the region like the Western Hemisphere Program was considered fruitful.

“I mean Gabriela was great to coordinate with. She always followed up and, uh, yeah. So, and that was really useful and she also, you know, then followed up on other things with the Regional Office for us. So that was really helpful to have her as our focal point.”

“Yes, I would actually like to add that the team that facilitated, it was very... They did take on a very participatory approach, they did give us... We never got the feeling that, although it was an IOM initiative, that it was being spearheaded, that we were forced. I think there was lots of reasoning and lots of patience. I think the project leads were excellent.”

One interviewee mentioned that they felt insufficient communication between IOM’s Regional Office and the respective Country Office and that they as government entity were actually the ones informing the local IOM Mission about any new development in the project instead of having them informed by the IOM colleagues at the Regional Office. After the end of the project study participants were somewhat surprised by the sudden lack of communication from the side of IOM and had wished a substituting focal person doing the follow-up with them.

Working modalities were partly formalized. The workshops came with a clear agenda and participant lists are available. However, apart from bigger events like the RCM, no meeting minutes were archived among the project documents. The excel templates that had to be populated by the participating countries were clear and straight-forward even though definitions had to be clarified along the process as they varied strongly between countries.

Some countries reported intra-agency communication issues, especially when there was a handover of responsibilities. In some cases, this led to loss of knowledge and additional efforts to maintain previously established communication channels. But not only within a respective agency or ministry but also between different government agencies within the same country, at times well-defined structures on how to effectively effect knowledge and data exchange were missing. Particularly in countries with limited data collection and processing capacities, the project disclosed said weaknesses. Exemplary, in one country the agency responsible for migration related issues revealed just during the project that the Ministry of Tourism was collecting relevant data but had not shared this information with other agencies until this point. In another example, within the same government different agencies are using incompatible data collection systems or collect data based on distinct definitions which caused significant challenges when trying to merge the data.

To what extent were the target beneficiaries reached?

The project proposal identifies political decision makers and the general public as main target groups. Data from the Key-Informant Interviews reveal that the project indeed reached political decision makers, however, rather in an indirect way through their respective migration or statistics departments. All of the participants said that the political decision makers are still referring to them for any migration related information.

In the period from August 2019 until September 2021, in total 12,186 users visited the platform at least once, showing a steep increase in new users over the years. In 2021, however, the number of visitors

remained relatively stable over the months. Unfortunately, due to the low response rate in the quantitative survey, no further information can be provided on the frequency of usage by the different users. Over the years, the share of persons entering the platform via mobile devices almost doubled from initially 24 percent in 2019 to 44 percent in 2021.

Table 2: Usage of Platform over Time

Time period	Total number of new users	Share of users accessing via mobile device
August 2019 – December 2019	748	23.59%
January 2020 – December 2020	3601	27.87%
January 2021 – September 2021	7837	43.59%

Are the target beneficiaries finding the content and information they are looking for on the platform?

This aspect is covered in the following paragraph.

Are there any factors preventing beneficiaries and project partners from accessing the results/services/products?

Interviewed stakeholders described the platform as very user-friendly and appealing in the design. The short tutorial video was considered very useful in order to understand the functionalities of the platform but could be even more detailed about where to find specific data, according to one interviewee. A more general critique pointed towards the quality of data, as one country focal point criticized the lack of comparability between the countries as not all countries have the same information available which makes intra- as well as cross-regional comparison difficult. This is reinforced by the aforementioned fact that definitions of similar phenomena vary. Another interview partner, however, reported that even though definitions are varying, the platform helped to understand data and definitions of other countries and by this improves comparability between countries enormously.

Additionally, one interviewee mentioned that the coordination from time to time was a bit difficult due to differing realities in terms of data availability between Central American countries and Mexico and those of Caribbean countries. This made the transferability of results and best-practices difficult for countries with less sophisticated data collection and processing systems.

Another factor mentioned was a lack of promotion and publicity of the platform. According to one interviewee there are only few peers that know about the platform which naturally prevents them from accessing the information directly from the platform.

Unfortunately, due to the low response to the quantitative survey, there are no information available on the use of different functionalities of the websites by the users. The information extracted from Google Analytics shows that both information pages (e.g. “What is IOM”) and pages containing migration data are visited by users.

Efficiency

The criterion efficiency describes the “extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way” (OECD-DAC, 2019).

Were the activities implemented according to the schedule of the project work plan? If not, what were the reasons and the steps taken to complete them?

In the beginning of the project, most of the activities were conducted as stated in the workplan. Some activities were postponed due to strategic reasons, e.g. in order to wait for a new government to take over. However, various smaller delays in the implementation led to a delayed global launch of the platform in August 2019 instead of October 2018, like it was stated in the workplan included in the project proposal. Among the delayed activities were the terms of reference for the consultancy compiling the study on migration data management systems and capacities which were published with a one month delay. This in turn caused a delayed start of the consultant which resulted in a total delay in the dissemination of the results of about 4 months compared to the workplan. Activities regarding the compilation of reports and information sheets were also delayed by around three months.

For some of the delays, the final reports offer justification like the late hiring of the project manager which delayed some activities or the postponing of the kick-off event to be able to present something more solid or other strategic reasons. For others, the reports lack a clear justification. Despite some delays in the workplan, at the time of the final report, all activities were duly completed.

Looking at the timeliness of reporting duties, all four project reports were endorsed after the submission deadline. While in the case of the interim reports there was between one and two months of delay between the due date and the final endorsement by Regional Accounting Services, the final report was endorsed more than 3 months after the actual due date.

Were challenges in project implementation identified and addressed quickly and appropriately?

The project proposal did not include a risk assessment plan. In the narrative reports in the course of the implementation, the project team identified various challenges, among them:

- 1) Difficulties in the implementation due to resistance of introducing another platform
- 2) Difficulties in the implementation due to the political landscape and/or upcoming elections
- 3) Difficulties in the implementation due to different capacities and thus dynamics between Central American and Caribbean countries.

There are various examples where the project manager decided to amend the project's work plan to react to emerging opportunities or to face identified challenges. One example is the realization of two kick-off events instead of one to incorporate additional partners like the CMC. Other examples are the postponing of the nomination of focal points as in various of the countries elections were coming up which could mean changes in the government focal points.

In the majority of cases, the measures taken to the identified challenges were appropriate and timely. During the implementation period there was always close contact between the project manager and the government focal points. Some of the challenges, like e.g. the resistance of introducing another platform, could have been identified earlier if the needs assessment and relevant consultations would have been conducted at an earlier stage of the project or an adequate risk assessment plan would have set up. As the project development and planning phase was already finished when the consultant took up the study, there was only limited ability to react to the identified challenges and to incorporate the lessons learned into the project design.

Were the project expenses incurred in line with the agreed budget?

Of the available USD 300,000 at the time of final financial report USD 253,102 were spent over the project life cycle. This corresponds to an overall burn rate of approximately 86 percent¹⁰. On the operational side, all outputs remained within their respective budgetary limits and reached burn rates from 72 percent (Output 1.3) up to 92 percent (Output 1.2). Almost all activities for those overspending was reported were related to travel costs and respective allowances. No single budget line in the operations section surpassed a 20 percent overspending.

The budget for staff costs was slightly overstretched by 12 percent while spending on office costs remained significantly under the budgeted amount with a burn rate of only 34 percent. The underspending in the office costs were mainly due to a very low spending in the area of communication (3 percent of budgeted amount) and underspending of office rent (58 percent) and office supplies (15 percent). For licenses 34 percent more funds were needed than initially planned.

Even though no project support was hired as it was planned, staff costs exceeded the budgeted amount due to a 30 percent overspending for the position of the project coordinator. Staff and office costs thus

¹⁰ Of the total amount, USD 5,000 were budgeted for this evaluation report. As this amount was not planned to be spent during the project implementation period, it is excluded from the calculation for the burn rate.

summed up to approximately USD 90,000 which is equal to 36 percent of overall spending. This is slightly over the recommended threshold of 30 percent. No unexpected costs were reported.

Did the funds spent give the possibility of achieving the expected results?

The project team managed to achieve all outputs. Interviewed project staff and government focal points indicated that there were enough funds to achieve the results. One of the interview partners from the Caribbean mentioned that rather than investing more funds, first government structures and institutional processes need to change in order to achieve better results.

“I don't think IOM putting any more resources in would have yield in any different results. I think much of what happened in the project was solely dependent on agency governance and institutional understandings and agreements that needed to be done”

To what extent were resources efficiently used to achieve results?

The project team made changes in the hiring processes as they identified IOM staff in the Regional Office San Jose who could take over programming responsibilities while the funds for the planned consultant were used at a later stage to improve useability.

As will be described later in this report (see coherence criterion) the project builds the base for the Migration Resource Allocation Committee (MIRAC)-funded Regional Migration Data Hub. Project activities furthermore helped to interlink IOM staff from country and the regional office with colleagues from GMDAC which resulted in other initiatives, e.g. the joint revision of a course on migration data in the Caribbean on e-campus¹¹. Additionally, the project leveraged additional efforts by governments (e.g. Saint Lucia) to continue working on a revised border management system and by this strengthen their capacities.

Impact

The criterion “impact” describes the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects (OECD-DAC, 2019).

Which were the unplanned positive or negative effects and in which way they contributed to the results produced/services/products provided?

Interviewed stakeholders mentioned positive effects the project produced beyond the project’s overall objective. For the one hand, there was an increased cooperation between IOM’s GMDAC and the Regional

¹¹ See <https://www.ecampus.iom.int/enrol/index.php?id=556>

Office in San Jose. This resulted in a longer-term cooperation on migration data and improved intraorganizational coordination. For the other hand, colleagues reported of important network events that brought together colleagues from IOM's GMDAC with project staff of other programs in the region which also facilitated the work on a data module that was designed for IOM's e-campus. The project furthermore built the base for the recently established Regional Migration Data Unit that is operating out of IOM's Regional Office in San Jose and which is continuing working on improving availability of migration data in the region. These unintended effects will contribute to higher capacities in terms of working with migration data as well as improve availability of migration data in the region and by this further enable evidence-based decision making in the field of migration management.

No unplanned negative effects were reported by the participants.

Does the impact come from the project activities, from external factors or from both?

Findings obtained from the interviews indicate that one of the main impacts brought about by the program happened in countries of the Caribbean that do not have very strong data collection capacities. Interview participants referred to the project as some kind of "eye-opener" in terms of what data other countries with higher data collection and processing capacities in the field of migration are producing and what they can use it for. Knowing the existence of these standards in neighboring countries functions as an important motivation and provided guidance for countries with limited migration data processing capacities in order to review their processes and renovate their data systems.

Beforehand, some countries were referring to migration data almost exclusively out of a lens of security and border control. This perception reportedly has changed due to the project and those governments are having a more comprehensive view on this phenomenon.

The intent to deliver the requested data required a strong collaboration within these countries, as data was often either not collected at all or not shared by the responsible agency or ministry as it was not considered relevant. Due to the project, interagency coordination and communication was reported to have improved considerably in those countries. Their enhanced capacity and thus the increased availability of data are not only providing a better base for introducing or revising migration related policies but was also reported to have served for analyzing project proposals developed by IOM.

"So that was a great eye-opener for us and we realized immediately that this was an issue to be addressed because the immigration sector needed the information for itself as well, and it never saw the value in that. [...] [T]hese unusual procedures will be changed. It will be addressed. There will be more emphasis on statistics. The gathering of the statistics, not for another sector of the economy only, but also to share it and to use it right where it's originated, which is in the migration sector, not just migration but anything to do with the borders, immigration issues, activities, it will be registered and used also and analyzed

disaggregated by the department where it just got it and hand it over. So that was useful to us and we would have never realized this was happening if it were not for the project.”

“Processes have improved, and even in terms of when we sit with IOM to develop project proposals or to look at project proposals, we tend to go back and look at the indicators what they're saying. If we have those indicators any at all. So, the establishment of that baseline is important and has been important.”

The improvement of their data collection capacities, however, could only be confirmed for the interviewed Caribbean states, while country focal points in Costa Rica and Mexico that have more sophisticated migration systems in place did not observe any change in their way and in their capacities to collect migration data. Nevertheless, almost all study participants reported to have improved their *understanding* of how other countries in the region produce their data and which definitions they are using for certain phenomena. It was also described as helpful to have been required to review their own definitions and forms of measuring and collecting migration data.

Interview partners also described the increased ownership of government partners as a key achievement. Using administrative data in a regional platform is only feasible with sufficient government buy-in, as governments might be reluctant to make migration data publicly available out of strategic political reasons. This was considered a great achievement as some of the data published on PRIMI were not publicly accessible before.

While all outputs were considered useful by the interviewed stakeholders, some of them were reported to have had a greater influence on the impact of the project than others. The establishment of the Regional Cooperation Network on Migration Data was one of the most important components of the project. All interviewed participants agreed on the usefulness of coordinating across the region, having exchange about terminologies, definitions and the way others are producing their data. The coordination workshops, the assistance of and exchange with GMDAC, the consultant as well as the project staff was considered as important steppingstone in order to increase their capacities to produce high-quality migration data. Even though there is only a limited number of countries indicating to actively using PRIMI, the platform had an important role building the frame of the activities and showing the goals towards the participating countries were working. The best practices workshop at the end of the project was only partly contributing to the impact of the project, as not all countries benefitted from it in the same manner.

Even though during the implementation period the global COVID-19 pandemic still had not reached the region, it played a crucial role in the longer-term impact of the project (see sustainability). Priorities were shifted towards contingency measures while household plans had to be revised due to a lack of income flowing from the revenue shortfall from important sectors like the tourism industry. Increased bureaucracy and security measures at borders additionally slowed down planned revisions of border management systems.

Coherence

The criterion “coherence” refers to “the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution” (OECD-DAC, 2019).

To what extent is this project compatible with other IOM and non-IOM interventions in this field?

The idea of having a platform with migration data on a regional level is not new. PRIMI is building upon experiences with platforms like “Statistical Information System on Migrations in Central America” (SIEMCA by its Spanish acronym) and SIEMMES which were operative in the late 1990s and 2000s respectively. After a short period with the University of Costa Rica, the platform was on idle mode for some years before it was taken up again by the project of which PRIMI emerged from in 2018 (IOM, 2021b).

Taking global initiatives into account, the biggest overlap exists with GMDAC’s Migration Data Portal and to some extent with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)’s Operational Data Portal¹². The cooperation between GMDAC and the Regional Office was appreciated by both parties and offered synergies between both programs/projects. In 2019, the RO San Jose and GMDAC organized a joint launch event and press release for the introduction of PRIMI as well as the presentation of the Spanish version of the Migration Data Portal. Both platforms are referring to each other on their respective websites.

Until the end of this evaluation, there was no regional data for the region North America, Central America and the Caribbean available on the Migration Data Portal. PRIMI fits in very well by closing a gap of reliable primary data from governments which in most cases is rather challenging to collect, as it was mentioned by an interview partner. But coordination not only happened at a regional level. The project additionally contributed to a more intensive exchange between country offices in the region and colleagues from GMDAC. As one result of PRIMI, the MIRAC-funded Regional Migration Data Unit was funded building the base for stronger engagement in the field of data management and analysis.

Critics were mentioned about the incompatibility between the platforms as there is no corporate guidance on which programs should be used to manage data banks or entire platforms. Some interview participants were furthermore wondering about the multitude of data platforms that are existing in the region (NTMI¹³, Migration Data Portal, PRIMI, SI-Estad¹⁴, IMILA¹⁵, UNHCR Operational Data Platform, to name some of them). At times they would get lost when trying to find certain data and would prefer to have it all in one place.

¹² For more information see: <http://data2.unhcr.org/es/situations/cam>

¹³ For more information see: <https://mic.iom.int/webntmi/>

¹⁴ For more information see: <https://www.sica.int/si-estad/inicio>

¹⁵ For more information see: <https://celade.cepal.org/bdcelade/imila/>

Sustainability

The criterion sustainability describes “the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue” (OECD-DAC, 2019).

To what extent have the interventions made during the project continued to be applied after the project ends?

At the time of the evaluation only two (Mexico and Costa Rica) out of twelve participating countries kept on contributing to the platform. Those were also the countries that reported having the necessary data in place, and particularly in the case of Mexico, having the processes automatized to an extent that it did not cause any significant additional effort for them to keep on contributing. Like other government focal points they criticised, however, that since the project had ended they do not know whom in IOM to refer to and if their data was actually still needed.

In terms of a sustainable change towards a more efficient and effective data collection and processing the project revealed **strong discrepancies between the Caribbean and countries from Central America and Mexico that are having stronger data collection and processing capacities**. While in Central America and Mexico the interviewees reported of no significant change in processes or capacities to collect data, the study participants from the Caribbean reported strong and sustainable changes in their way of processing and collecting migration data. Furthermore, the project helped to improve internal communication and data exchange. The revision of terminologies, definitions and available data in the (sub-)regional context was also considered very helpful in order to have a broader view of what is needed.

“That came about because we recognized that we were not where we were supposed to be. So, we are raising the bar. On that level, we are taking some of the best practices which came out of the project, which is strengthening production and analysis of regional migration data. So, we're taking those. We are implementing it in the creation of the new border system on your migration system. Then I think we can talk to you again for more support going forward, because it's a far-ranging change that we are doing. So, we are doing structural changes during the project that we are looking at now. [...] As I indicated, a lot, a lot of guidance came from the project for us to do that.”

Interview participants considered the project closure workshop at the end of the project as very interesting and useful, even though especially for the Caribbean countries some of the best practices were not relevant (see Relevance criterion).

What are the major factors affecting sustainability, including any identified challenges faced by the main implementing organization?

One of the main factors affecting sustainability is the **high resource intensity** resulting from the need to closely follow-up with the participating countries, the time-consuming data cleaning as well the **constant**

maintenance to keep the platform up-to-date and free of bugs. As highlighted earlier in the report, especially in the Caribbean, countries oftentimes do not have sufficient capacities in terms of data collection. At times, data collection still is being done completely or at least partially manually and paper based as they do not have appropriate systems to digitize or even collect the data due to a lack of an integrated border management system like MIDAS in Central America.

But not only lack of technical capacities on the side of the participating countries were raised. While the centralized approach of having the responsible IT-department in IOM's Manila Administrative Centre was described as inefficient and slow due to time differences and limited availability due to other commitments, there is also **no coherence in the platforms the different country offices are using**. While some are working with Power BI, others are using other programmes like Tableau or R Studio. This additionally hampers data transfer and integration between offices, and the necessary conversion is an additional source of transmission errors while tying up valuable resources.

Despite the close follow-up by the project staff and some improvements over the project period, key stakeholders noticed in some countries still **a lack of ownership in the process**. This articulated itself among others in changing staff assigned to the project as focal points that did not have much knowledge on previous steps that have been taken in the process. Changing administrations and/or focal persons as well as changing agendas and priorities in the participating countries make a close follow-up indispensable in order to keep up agreed workflows and commitments. The low response rate to the requested interviews for this evaluation is another indicator pointing in this direction.

“So, it seems to me that in order for this project, which is good, to have continuity, you need to re-establish a mechanism that allows you to maintain continuity on both sides so that the platform continues to function.” [Translated from Spanish]

The **lack of homogenization of concepts and definitions** is another strong challenge requiring large amounts of time and labour. As mentioned before, almost every country uses its own definitions of migration related phenomena which makes comparability between countries very difficult. As comparable data across the region is seen to be one of the selling-points of the platform, large amounts of work need to be invested to clean and prepare the data before uploading it to the platform. Considering the low degree of harmonization and the **mostly rather low quality of incoming data**, further financial resources are needed to keep the platform working. A review of the data available on the platform already disclosed errors that can be attributed to a lack of maintenance after the project's end.

One interviewee also reported of issues of data confidentiality within the government, especially when it comes to requested high levels of disaggregation. This in turn implies challenges for the data exchange, even intragovernmental.

On a more general note, participants raised **concerns about the short-term funding for these kinds of projects** as this impedes long-term planning and sustainable changes. Apart from that regularly having to look for new funding sources ties up important resources.

An external factor threatening PRIMI's sustainability is the global COVID-19 pandemic. According to a recent report by the World Bank (2021), in Latin America two thirds of the National Statistical Offices reported that government funding has decreased since the beginning of the pandemic, while the same share reported of increasing costs of data collection. Issues in the data collection have been particularly reported for specific population groups of interest like migrants, internally displaced populations and persons with disabilities.

Are necessary structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support?

Among the project documents there is a manual on how to update and insert data into the PRIMI portal. This can be an important tool to coherently clean the data and further populate the platform – in case sufficient data of acceptable quality is coming in. Well-equipped countries in terms of data collection capacities like Mexico or Costa Rica could probably very well keep on delivering data in the desired format, even without extensive external support. This is not the case for countries from the Caribbean and also not for all countries from Central America.

Also, the lack of a statistics department, or at least a dedicated person, that would engage in these kind of data collection and preparation exercises has been reported by the participants, meaning that in these cases the compilation of migration statistics is taken over by the IT-department which not necessarily has the background in migration statistics. For countries with this kind of limited technical capacities it will be challenging to produce high-quality migration data without ongoing external support.

Other factors mentioned in various occasions like differing definitions, labour-intensive maintenance and constant follow-up with the government focal points make a project continuation without external support and long-term funding commitments, which do not exist at this point, not feasible.

Is the technology used for the processing of data in the PRIMI appropriate to the needs of the beneficiaries?

This aspect has been answered in the Relevance section.

Gender Mainstreaming

Gender mainstreaming describes the process of assessing the implications of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, for people of different gender groups, in all areas and at all levels (IOM, 2020b).

Was the project designed and planned, taking into consideration a gender analysis, needs assessment and available guidance?

The project proposal explicitly mentions the objective of having an equalitarian representation of women and men as focal persons. During the workshops eight out of twelve country focal points were women. No gender-focused needs assessment on the demand for specific data has been conducted and there are

also no specific thematic pages focusing on persons with diverse Sexual Orientations, Gender Identities and Expressions, and Sex Characteristics (SOGIESC). However, all the data on the platform are disaggregated by sex and age, where applicable.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

Relevance

This evaluation rates the project as highly relevant¹⁶.

Findings in this report clearly show the high demand and relevance of having more comparable and complete migration data. The inclusion in basically every national, regional or global framework in the field of migration as well as the inclusion in national development plans back this finding.

Despite this clear relevance, the findings also proof the importance of a timely needs assessment, happening in the best case before starting with the implementation of activities. This enables project developers to identify risks, adapt plans, and, in this specific case, could have helped to react to the significant differences in the respective starting points in terms of ability to collect and process migration data and by this making the interventions more relevant to the respective counterparts.

- **Recommendation:** For future similar exercises, allow sufficient time for a needs assessment, including stakeholder consultations to identify the most important issues and the development of the respective strategies for addressing them before starting with project activities. An updated mapping of which data is available per country is recommended before starting any further interventions to reflect countries that were working on their data collection and processing abilities.

Even though the project itself was considered as highly relevant by all interviewed stakeholders, some of the outcomes of the workshops like best practices were only relevant to some of the countries, while they did not reflect the realities of those countries without sophisticated border management systems like MIDAS.

- **Recommendation:** For similar activities in the future, organize separate or additional workshops with a separate focus, e.g. how to improve data collection without strong border management systems.

A higher frequency of data upload was also mentioned to be important to increase relevance for political decision making (see effectiveness section). Furthermore, as the findings on the usage of the platform show, platform users are increasingly accessing the services via mobile devices. Thus, there is a strong need for optimizing the platform for the access via smartphone or tablet.

¹⁶ On a scale from “not relevant”, “partially relevant”, “relevant”, “highly relevant”.

- **Recommendation:** In case of a continuation or similar projects in the future, optimize platform accessibility for smartphones and tablets to keep pace with the development of increasing use of mobile devices.

The project logic revealed weaknesses. The lack of an explicit theory of change might have led to the point that some crucial aspects have not been considered in the results matrix like the maintenance of the platform that resulted in one of the main challenges for sustainability (see sustainability criteria) and that is not reflected in any of the activities of the project.

- **Recommendation:** Include an explicit theory of change into the project proposal of upcoming activities in this regard to have a stronger base for predicting the effects of project interventions and under which circumstances the desired change will happen. Additionally, set-up a risk assessment plan into the project proposal, as required per IOM's Project Handbook.

Effectiveness

This evaluation rates the effectiveness of the project as partially effective¹⁷.

As stated in the findings section, the objective has only partly been achieved. Out of the twelve participating countries six countries (five from Central America plus Mexico) were making use of the platform, none of the Caribbean. As, of these six countries, only the representative of Mexico responded to the repeated requests for an interview, this number might be even lower.

There are various reasons leading to this relatively low number:

1. The Caribbean countries have not had yet developed the capacities in terms of data collection to be able to deliver the requested data.
2. The frequency of data uploads was described as too low to be important for political decision makers so that they rather refer to their migration departments or statistics offices.
3. Differing definitions of migration phenomena making comparative analyses difficult.
4. A reported lack of promotion of the platform, which impedes the target group from accessing.

These challenges result in the following recommendations for similar projects in the future:

- **Recommendation:** Keep on working with Caribbean countries by supporting them setting up a solid data collection and management system. As many of them do not have yet a well-established system, neither very entrenched opinions on definitions of certain phenomena, there is a big opportunity to build on the progress made and to jointly set it up the "right" way in order increase comparability of data across the region.

¹⁷ On a scale from "not effective", "partially effective", "effective", "highly effective".

- **Recommendation:** Increase frequency of data uploads. Of course, this can only work if countries are able to deliver the requested data in the given period. Investing resources in increased automatization in the data cleaning process can help to reduce the time after data comes in. Uploads should also include a revision / comparison of existing data as governments continuously amend their registers based on new data from local authorities.
- **Recommendation:** Invest further time and resources to find least common denominators and try to work with the countries on ways how to either adapt their definitions or having the ability to produce data according to their national interest as well as for international comparison. Until this has been achieved at least to a great extent, focus on the strength of providing access to quality data on national level. Do not sell it as a tool to compare data between countries.
- **Recommendation:** Promote the publicity of the platform by actively engaging with universities, private and public sector. For this, strong liaison and advocacy work is needed. Other options could include to further join forces and create interlinkages with already known platforms like the Migration Data Portal or NTMI. Increase the presence on social media via targeted campaigns and provide political decision makers with regular updates in form of targeted, reader-friendly knowledge products and/or inviting them to (virtual) workshops. This can help to convince them of the added value of the platform for their daily decision making and by this increase their ownership and buy-in to invest more resources into the platform.

Despite these issues and as will be described also in the impact criterion later in this report, the work together with the project staff towards setting up the platform and the intent to gather the data was already an important step towards the ability of countries to gather important migration data (see outcome level). Even though the platform was not actively used by the majority of the countries, evidence-based decision making was promoted through the project.

Another important point to consider regarding the effectiveness of providing migration data for policy making is that political decisions oftentimes are not only done following a thorough research and analysis of the available data but are also strongly influenced by press notes and the general public opinion. In order to promote evidence-based decision making it is thus paramount to make the collected information as easily understandable as possible and provide interpretation assistance to prevent oversimplification and/or misinterpretation of complex phenomena and developments. Accompanying the data with regular and concise knowledge management products and / or trainings, webinars or other events for journalists, academics and persons working in the respective migration departments on how to read and understand the data might have a strong, even though at times indirect, effect on the correct use of the collected data and promote the use of the platform at the same time (see recommendation on increasing engagement with stakeholders through targeted knowledge products in this section).

One key aspect emerging from this evaluation is that at this stage, having a well-looking platform is only the very tip of the iceberg, even though an important target to show the direction and the imaginary finish-line in the process. However, one, and maybe the **most important take-away is to focus strongly**

on the preparatory work. As the recommendations in this evaluation suggest, this means starting to create common or at least compatible IT-platforms across the regions, working on definitions and standards in data collection, processing and delivery, and working on the automatization in data cleaning processes at IOM to reduce the need for manual work. The better the incoming data, the less effort it costs to bring it together in a platform.

At the outcome level, eight out of twelve participating migration institutions reported an improvement in their capacity to collect, process and/or analyse migration data in the course of the project. This means that the set target of 80 percent of NDM has not been reached.

Nevertheless, it has to be acknowledged that in some countries the project initiated important processes that have the potential to sustainably improve data collection capacities. This was particularly the case in countries that did not have very sophisticated data collection systems in place like some states in the Caribbean.

The fact that technological tools to collect data were outdated, incompatible (at times even within a country) or staff do not have capacity to work with systems or how to collect data properly shows, however, the great demand for greater investments in technical equipment and for strengthening capacities of staff on how to use these tools, particularly for Caribbean countries. As countries' data collection and processing capacities differ strongly, an individual approach should be taken, even if this means a much higher investment of time and resources.

- **Recommendation:** Further strengthen data collection and processing capacities by investing in new data collection tools, licenses, programs for countries in the region and accompany them with intensive capacity building measures (in form of longer workshops) to facilitate change management and reduce resistance to change.
- **Recommendation:** Take the time to discuss with every country individually, also on new ways how to collect the data needed. For this invite various stakeholder groups like statisticians, border managers, policy makers, migration department directors, planning ministry, and private sector representatives.

During the project implementation, the coordination by the project staff went well and was positively highlighted at various occasions by the government focal points. After the project manager had left IOM towards the end of the project, communication broke up very suddenly which came as a surprise to various stakeholders. The lack of a dedicated replacement caused confusion to some of the country focal point as it was not clear to them if they were expected to keep on delivering data.

Apart from that, critics came up on the (not-) involvement of IOM country offices. Some of the counterparts in IOM's national offices were only poorly informed about the project which caused confusion. Due to the oftentimes close and even personal relationship of many country office staff with the respective

government counterparts and their important contextual knowledge, a stronger involvement of IOM's National Offices could be beneficial.

- **Recommendation:** In future projects, designate a focal person in the respective IOM country offices to help facilitate communication and benefit from their contextual knowledge and relationship with the government counterparts. Make sure that this focal person (or a replacement) is able to take care of questions even after the project ends.

The issues when handing over responsibilities in case of a replacement of focal persons resulted in a loss of knowledge and additional efforts in order to maintain previously established communication channels and workflows. In addition to participant lists and meeting agendas, additional pre-defined working modalities like meeting minutes or guidelines on data sharing mechanisms between different agencies could have helped to improve and maintain information flows, especially if focal persons are replaced.

- **Recommendation:** Help countries establish well-defined working modalities through meeting minutes and workflow documents in order to facilitate and maintain data and information exchange. This is particularly relevant for countries with not so well established interagency information flows.

Efficiency

This evaluation rates the project as efficient¹⁸.

Even though some of the delays in the project were intentionally and due of strategic reasons, the various smaller delays resulted in a ten-months delay of the platform launch. Among these delays was the baseline assessment conducted by the consultant. As the information gained from this report were of crucial importance for the further implementation of the project, a more efficient and effective use of the funds could have been assured if the baseline study would have been conducted before starting with project activities (see first recommendation in relevance section).

After having identified challenges in the project during the project implementation and/or the baseline report, the project team addressed them quickly e.g. by focusing separately on Caribbean and Central American Countries due to their different data collection capacities. Other challenges identified in the project report were pre-visible and could thus have been incorporated in the workplan right from the beginning, like rotation in the government counterparts due to elections and thus the necessity to postpone the designation of focal points.

Project expenses remained within their overall budgetary limits. Despite the slightly overspending in staff and office costs, the distribution of funds was reasonable to reach the expected results, as the project does not include high material costs but consists of rather labor-intensive activities.

¹⁸ On a scale from “not efficient”, “partially efficient”, “efficient”, “highly efficient”

Even though interviewed stakeholders did not mention the need of more funds to achieve better results, rather general findings of the project showed the strong need to improve processes, revise concepts as well as data collection and management systems and maintenance over the longer term. Furthermore, strong deficits in capacities due to the lack of apt hardware but also the necessary skills to use it got evident during this evaluation. All these points are time and/or labor-intensive and thus need to be covered by respective funds. Even if over the short term, more funds would maybe not have made a much stronger impact, especially long-term funding commitments might help to increase planning security and enable IOM to accompany governments with their efforts to set-up effective and efficient migration data management systems (see recommendation on long-term funding commitments in sustainability section).

Project staff contributed to a more efficient fund allocation by identifying internal IT staff able to take over some tasks. This opened the possibility to use the saved funds for assigning other tasks to one of the consultants working on the project. Furthermore, the project could leverage some additional funds from GMDAC in order to fund graphic designers after the PRIMI project had ended.

Apart from that, synergies have been achieved by joint press releases as well as by indirectly fostering new project ideas through the promotion of interagency network events.

Also, a stronger integration into other platforms like GMDAC's Migration Data Portal could further increase efficiency as platform hosting and maintenance costs can be scaled-up and no parallel structures are created (see coherence section).

Impact

In overall terms, this evaluation finds the project to have had a moderate impact¹⁹.

Despite the fact that the project's objective could only partly be achieved (see effectiveness section), the changes brought about by the project at the outcome level contributed to a longer-term impact of the project. Especially countries with fewer capacities in terms of migration data collection and processing improved their capacity in various aspects:

- 1) Higher awareness of which data exists in other countries and what it can be used for
- 2) Improved interagency communication and thus higher awareness of which data exists in their own country
- 3) Higher awareness of which data still needs to be collected and a better idea of areas in which to improve to be able to collect this type of data

This type of awareness raising induced countries like Saint Lucia to even start revising and overhauling their border management systems in order to be able to collect relevant migration data. To bring this kind of actions on the political agenda requires significant government buy-in, which the project successfully

¹⁹ On a scale from "no impact", "limited impact", "moderate impact", "high impact".

achieved in various countries. Interviewed country focal points reported furthermore of a changing perception on what can be done with the data, shifting the focus from a sheer inner safety and border control to a more comprehensive migration management focus. The project furthermore required countries to actively look for data that already exists in their administration and by this improved their interagency communication and exchange. As highlighted before, in these countries it is recommendable to continue providing support, as this offers the opportunity to actively co-design their migration data collection and processing systems and align them with the data needs of the international community (see recommendation in effectiveness section).

Even though the definitions and standards could not be assimilated to a significant extent, the project contributed to a better understanding of which definitions are used by other countries which furthermore contributes to a better comparability. Still additional resources need to be invested in order to increase comparability of data across the region (see recommendation in effectiveness section).

The project's indirect impacts increased intraorganizational coordination by bringing together the regional office, country offices and GMDAC which already resulted in cooperations e.g. for IOM's e-campus and built the base for the Regional Migration Data Unit. Another rather indirect impact is that data from the platform has been used for various project developments, donor reporting, advocacy as well as action plans and is thus not only strengthening migration management from government side but also reinforcing IOM's project developing capacity and by this increasing its presence in the region.

In summary, even though the evaluation could only detect a limited number of governments that are actively using PRIMI due to various challenges outlined before, the whole process of improving data collection and processing capacities would probably not have been possible without a joint objective towards which the countries are working. In other words, the platform itself as a product has not made the biggest impact in the project, it was, however, a necessary vehicle to bring the countries together in the regional cooperation network and motivate them to work on their capacities to produce more and better migration data.

- **Recommendation:** Keep on promoting frequent exchange within a regional network of stakeholders working with migration data through events, workshops and capacity building measures as this resulted in an important vehicle to increase coordination and coherence among involved stakeholders across the region and builds the base for further interventions in this field.

Coherence

This evaluation rates this project as partially coherent²⁰.

The project connected well with similar initiatives in the field and built on the experience with former, similar projects like the SIEMMES while project staff also relied on external expertise from e.g. UN ECLAC

²⁰ On a scale from "not coherent", "partially coherent", "coherent", "highly coherent".

and UNHCR as agencies producing migration data in the region. In contrast to other platforms existing in the region, one of the unique selling points of PRIMI is the inclusion of administrative migration data which interview participants described as very innovative and useful. As until the end of this evaluation, there was no regional data for the region North America, Central America and the Caribbean available on the Migration Data Portal, PRIMI fits in very well by closing a gap of reliable primary data from governments which in many cases is rather challenging to collect.

Even though colleagues from IOM's GMDAC were included during the project implementation process, and both platforms, the Migration Data Portal and PRIMI, are referring to each other on their websites, during this evaluation it was not clearly answered why PRIMI was created as an independent platform and not included as sub-regional page of the Migration Data Portal, which is IOM's flagship platform and primary source for migration data. While the data gathering, processing and management could still be under the responsibility of the Regional Office in San Jose, over the medium term an integration into GMDAC's platform could be envisaged. By this, a resource intensive duplication of structures, like platform maintenance could be avoided while the regional focus could still be kept, thanks to sub-regional tabs in the Migration Data Portal. Furthermore, both platforms could benefit from synergies in terms of increasing their reach and target groups.

- **Recommendation:** Instead of creating more platforms with specific focuses which all require resources for set-up, maintenance and publicity, incorporate potential future versions of PRIMI into the Migration Data Portal as IOM's flagship for migration data under the respective regional tab. Data gathering, processing and management should still be under the responsibility of the Regional Office.

Another aspect pointing in the same direction is the incompatibility of data and programs used for the various data platforms in the organization. In order to facilitate the incorporation of data, institutional guidance on the use of programs for data management is needed. This should be accompanied by staff capacity building measures on how to use these programs to facilitate a smooth transition. As it is likely that any institutionally recommended program will be oriented at or at least compatible with the larger global platforms like the Migration Data Portal or the Displacement Tracking Matrix, any further work on new platforms should take into account compatibility to those two platforms.

- **Recommendation:** Promote the introduction of a global guidance on which programs should be used across the organization. Until this exists, promote the transition to data collection and management tools that are compatible to the main data platforms like the Migration Data Portal and DTM to facilitate data transfer.

This homogenization would also contribute to fewer workload on the side of the centralized IT support in IOM's Manila Administrative Center. To avoid delays in similar activities in the future, make sure that there are funds for a dedicated person able to react fast on IT related requests.

- **Recommendation:** Assure the availability of funds for a dedicated person (locally or in MAC) to react fast on IT related requests until the platform is set-up and request access rights for decentralized IT personnel at the Regional Office San Jose to be able to quickly respond to potential issues with high urgency.

When it comes to data gathering in the different countries, partnering with other regional organizations or actors in the field might be beneficial. This can help avoid duplication of work and facilitate access to the respective governments. One example is SICA who are collecting different types of administrative data in Central America and the Dominican Republic for their data platform si-ESTAD²¹. In terms of migration data, the thematic coverage, however, is still relatively narrow. Making use of SICA's access to the governments and structures to maintain communication and data cleaning, IOM could offer thematical expertise and assistance in setting-up standards and definitions of migration phenomena and assist in interpreting the incoming data. In any case, data should be available and compatible for integration into the Migration Data Portal as well. Other actors to be considered are e.g. OCAM and CARICOM in order to also cover the Caribbean part.

- **Recommendation:** Promote the creation of alliances for data gathering and cleaning with other actors in the field. While doing this, assure access and compatibility of the data for a potential later integration into IOM's Migration Data Portal.

Sustainability

In overall terms, sustainability of the project is facing strong challenges and is considered to be limited²² at this point.

One of the main challenges for sustainability is the high workload that is caused by the labor-intensive data cleaning and maintenance work to keep the data accurate and up to date. At the time of the evaluation, only two countries (Mexico and Costa Rica) had processes in place to automatically populate the data sheets. Also on the side of IOM, labor- and time-intensive data cleaning processes slowed down the process and can only be maintained with considerable investment of funds covering the necessary staff costs. Improving the quality and coherence of incoming data is key for enabling a sustainable existence of the platform.

As highlighted in other sections in this report, to guarantee a well-working, efficient and thus sustainable data management, it is crucial to

1. Harmonize the data collection processes on the side of the participating countries.
2. Help countries establish systems to compile the necessary data with the lowest effort possible, even if this means investments in hardware, licenses and/or capacity building measures.

²¹ For more information see: <https://www.sica.int/si-estad/inicio>

²² On a scale from "no sustainability", "limited sustainability", "moderate sustainability", "high sustainability"

3. Automatize data cleaning processes (including data quality checks) to the maximum on the side of IOM using macros or scripts in statistics programs.
4. Increase synergies with other actors in the field through shared platforms and/or cooperation in the field of data collection.

However, it has to be acknowledged that these processes need constant and longer-term commitment so that also participating countries can rest assured that their efforts will eventually pay-off.

- **Recommendation:** For future activities, strive for long-term funding commitment to promote stability, predictability and sustainable planning. This long-term commitment can also help to facilitate change management within the participating countries making sure that change efforts are not abandoned half-way.

Constant follow-up with governments while pointing out benefits that the project can have for them using concrete and targeted examples are also paramount to guarantee continuous ownership and buy-in, especially after changes in administration. This, combined with clearly defined processes, could also help convincing governments that are skeptical about sharing their data due to data protection issues (see also recommendation in impact section).

- **Recommendation:** Work on formalizing data exchange by setting up bi- or multilateral Memoranda of Understanding or data exchange agreements with governments.

A big challenge to the sustainability of PRIMI consists in the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting shift in priorities. As most of other government agencies, also the statistics offices and migration departments had and oftentimes still have to face severe cuts in their budget. This situation makes external funding sources even more important to continue improving national migration data capacities and to not losing the progress achieved.

Gender Mainstreaming

At this point, the aim of the platform is to generate basic migration related data for evidence-based policy making. As for some countries delivering the requested data in a high quality results challenging due to several reasons laid out in this report, a disaggregation by sex and age is considered sufficient. However, when working with the countries on their abilities to collect migration data, they should be encouraged to also collect data on gender and related data like information on persons with diverse SOGIESC. In case of a continuation, at a later stage and once the platform is more consolidated, a needs assessment in terms of gender specific data demands should furthermore be considered to facilitate gender sensitive political decision making based on evidence.

- **Recommendation:** Encourage countries to extend the level of disaggregation, so that, apart from sex and age, data can also be disaggregated by gender and related data like information on persons with diverse SOGIESC.

Literature

- Global Migration Group. (2013). *GMG Position Paper: "International Migration and Development"*. Retrieved from <https://www.globalmigrationgroup.org/system/files/uploads/news/GMG-position-paper-on-2013-High-Level-Dialogue.pdf>
- IOM & McKinsey. (2018). *More than numbers - How migration data can deliver real-life benefits for migrants and governments*. Retrieved from https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/more_than_numbers.pdf
- IOM. (2015). *Migration Governance Framework (MiGOF)*. Retrieved from <https://dmsportal/PublishedDocuments/Brochures%20and%20Info%20Sheets/02-MiGOF%20Brochure-A4-EN.pdf#search=migof>
- IOM. (2019). *Strategic Vision: Setting a Course for IOM*. Retrieved from <https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iom-strategic-vision.pdf>
- IOM. (2020a). *Central America, North America and the Caribbean – Regional Strategy 2020–2024*. Retrieved from <https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/CA-NA-and-the-Caribbean-Regional-Strategy-%202020-2024.pdf>
- IOM. (2020b). *IOM Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines*. Geneva: IOM.
- IOM. (2021a). *IOM Migration Data Strategy: Informing Policy and Action on Migration, Mobility and Displacement 2020 | 2025*. Retrieved from <https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/IOM-Migration-Data-Strategy.pdf>
- IOM. (2021b). *Regional Platform for Migration Information*. Retrieved from <https://primi.iom.int/en/background>
- IOM, DESA, U., & OECD. (2020). *IFMS - Meeting Summary*. Retrieved from <https://ifms.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd191/files/IFMSOutcomeDocument-V2.pdf>
- Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods (Vols. 1-0)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- OECD-DAC. (2019). *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation - Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>
- Robinson, R. S. (2014). Purposive Sampling. In M. A.C., *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. (pp. 5243-5245). Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007%2F978-94-007-0753-5_2337
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E



United Nations. (2018). *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration*. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/73/195

The World Bank. (2021). *One year into the pandemic: Monitoring the State of Statistical Operations Under COVID-19*. Retrieved from <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/911901627637432764/pdf/One-Year-Into-the-Pandemic-Monitoring-the-State-of-Statistical-Operations-Under-COVID-19.pdf>

Annexes

Evaluation terms of reference

Evaluation Terms of Reference

Ex-Post Evaluation for project: Regional Capacity-building for the Production and Analysis of Regional Migration Information in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean

Commissioned by: *the IOM Development Fund*

Project Identification :	Project Code PR.0221
Executing Organization	International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Project Management Site and Relevant Regional Office	Regional Office for North America, Central America and the Caribbean
Project Period and Overall Duration	01-02-2018/ 31/01/2020
Geographical Coverage	Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Saint Lucia and Suriname
Project Beneficiaries	Direct: National Migration Directorate of Mesoamerican and Caribbean countries Indirect: Statistics and Census departments; academia, civil society organizations, international organizations, migrants
Project Partner(s)	National Migration Directorates, Central American Commission of Migration Directors - OCAM; Caribbean Migration Consultations (CMC)
Total Funding	USD 300,000

Evaluation context

Established in 1951, IOM is the leading intergovernmental organization in the field of migration and works closely with governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental partners. IOM is dedicated to promoting humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all. It does so by providing services and advice to governments and migrants.

Migration management is a process that requires more coordination and consensus between the countries. The generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration serves as the basis to guide the efforts of the States in the development of migration policies based on evidence. In turn, evidence-based migration policies are an inherent part of good migration governance. Information



and data, on the one hand and policies based on them, are essential elements for the fulfillment of goals 10.7 and 17.18 of the 2030 Agenda.

However, there are multiple challenges to ensure the availability of up-to-date and real-time information and data on migration. In addition, there are obvious limitations in the coordination between countries for the exchange of them.

The IOM Development Fund (IDF) provides a unique global resource aimed at supporting developing Member States in their efforts to strengthen their migration management capacity. The fund, through “seed funding” for innovative projects has addressed the capacity-building needs of eligible Member States.

The project: Regional Capacity-building for the Production and Analysis of Regional Migration Information in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean, aims to contribute to the strengthening of capacities for the generation, systematization and access to information and data related to migration in Mesoamerica; through the development of a migration information system, the Regional Platform for Migration Information (PRIMI by its Spanish name), that allows Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Suriname, to have relevant data for the development of migration policies based on information and data. Which, fundamentally, will be developed by strengthening the capacities of the NDM in the region.

As per the Fund, all projects must undergo an ex-post evaluation commissioned by the Fund.

Evaluation purpose

The overall purpose of this internal ex-post evaluation is to assess the relevance of project design, coherence of the interventions in relation to other interventions, the effectiveness and performance of the project, the efficiency of project management and implementation, the impact and sustainability of the project. Additionally, the evaluation will draw out lessons learned and good practices that will inform the development of future projects. Cross-cutting themes such as gender mainstreaming will be analysed when relevant. The donor will use the findings of the evaluation in its decision-making on the use of the Fund as seed funding, and on regional project management, and IOM staff and the Regional Thematic Specialists will use the results to inform future programming.

Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover the period of the project implementation from February 1st, 2018 to 31 January 2020, and will analyse all activities delivered including all capacity-building trainings, sensitization activities, coordination efforts and others. The evaluation will also include all platform content as all the content on the platform is available for public use. Go to www.primi.iom.int to see content. Even if the platform is globally accessible, the evaluation should focus on the countries covered by the project, Belize, Costa

Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Suriname and Saint Lucia. Data will be remotely collected.

Evaluation criteria

Given the above stated purposes this evaluation will cover relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence of the interventions, impact and sustainability. The analysis will also cover the relevance of the data posted in PRIMI for the targeted beneficiaries. The specific evaluation questions are below.

Evaluation questions

Relevance

- To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account during project design?
- Was the project designed based on a solid rationale/needs assessment?
- Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objective?
- Is the project aligned with and supportive of IOM national, regional, and/or global strategies and the Migration Governance Framework?
- Are the data collected via the data collection tools and posted in PRIMI relevant to the initial intent and for use by the targeted beneficiaries?
- Is the project in line with donor priorities?
- To what extent have beneficiaries been actively involved in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation?

Effectiveness

- Have the project outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans and results matrix?
- Was the collaboration and coordination with partners and stakeholders effective?
- Were the target beneficiaries being reached as expected?
- Are the target beneficiaries finding the content and information they are looking for on the platform?
- Are there any factors that prevent beneficiaries and project partners from accessing the results/services/products?

Efficiency and cost effectiveness:

- Were the activities implemented according to the schedule of the project work plan? If not, what were the reasons and the steps taken to complete them?

- Were challenges in project implementation identified and addressed quickly and appropriately?
- Were the project expenses incurred in line with the agreed budget, and were the costs incurred consistent with the project strategy?
- Did the funds spent give the possibility of achieving the expected results?
- To what extent were resources efficiently used to achieve results?

Impact

- Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project?
- Does the impact come from the project activities, from external factors or from both?

Coherence

- Were project activities coordinated with other actors?
- To what extent is this project compatible with other IOM and non-IOM interventions in this field?

Sustainability

- Did the project take specific measures to guarantee sustainability and how was this supported by partners and the IOM?
- What are the major factors affecting sustainability, including any identified challenges faced by the main implementing organization?
- Are necessary structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support?
- Is the technology used for the processing of data in the PRIMI appropriate to the needs of the beneficiaries?

Gender Mainstreaming

- Was the project designed and planned, taking into consideration a gender analysis, needs assessment and available guidance?
- Is all relevant data reported on disaggregated by sex and age to the extent possible, and are any disparities relating to the data, project targets and/or results analyzed accordingly?

Evaluation methodology

The methodology will involve a combination of desk review and in-depth interviews to gather and triangulate data from beneficiary and partner perceptions with project data (secondary quantitative data). The following methodology is proposed:

1. Document review:

Project documents, mid-term and final reports; contracting consulting services documents; reports and consulting products; published documents; concept notes for activities and workshops; lists of participants of activities and workshops; press releases; Google Analytics (which include data such as user profiles, number of users, users' geographical location, etc.)

2. Key informant interviews:

Semi-structured interviews will be carried out with the actors involved in the implementation of the project. It is made up of members of the project's reference group. The sample will be defined together with the evaluator.

Below is a proposal from the key informants that will be adjusted with the evaluator:

1. Focal Points per country that participated in the project's activities (12 countries)
2. Secretariat for the Central American Commission of Migration Directors - OCAM
3. IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre
4. IOM staff that implemented the project.

The evaluation data should be disaggregated to the extent possible by gender, age, and other categories of social vulnerability. The evaluation must follow the IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, and relevant ethical guidelines.

Evaluation deliverables

The draft final report will be written and shared with relevant colleagues, the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer as well as the Fund for comment. Once all comments are addressed, the final report will be presented to the regional office and the Fund.

The evaluator will be expected to deliver the following products:

1. Evaluation matrix
2. Draft evaluation report (according to IOM format);
3. Final Evaluation Report
4. A short "Evaluation Learning Brief"
5. A Management Response Matrix

Evaluation workplan

Activity	Days	Responsible
Desk review	10	Evaluator
Evaluation Matrix	5	Evaluator
Data collection	10	Evaluator
Information processing and preparation of initial draft report	15	Evaluator
Initial report draft review	10	Project Coordinator / RO San José / donor
Final Report Evaluation Learning Brief + Management Response Matrix	15	Evaluator

Evaluation budget

A total budget of USD 5,000 has been allocated for the ex-post evaluation of the Project. The budget covers expenses for an external translator to assist in focus group meetings, an assistant to transcribe interviews, and translation of the final report.

Evaluation matrix

Criterion	Key Evaluation question	Sub-questions	Indicators	Sources of Data	Data Collection Tools
Relevance	To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders taken into account during project design?	To what extent do stakeholders feel that their needs were addressed?	% of stakeholders who feel that their needs were addressed	Government Stakeholders, Quant survey	KII, Survey
		Was there a needs assessment beforehand?	Availability of needs assessment / baseline study	Project Proposal and final narrative report	Doc Review
		To what extent were stakeholder consulted during project development?	# of stakeholders reporting that they have been consulted during PD	Project documents, Stakeholders (Project staff, Government stakeholders)	Doc Review, KII
		What has not been addressed?	Perception of Gov. Officials	Government officials	KII
		Did the project include all relevant stakeholders?	Inclusion of various groups (including rights holders and duty bearers, local civil society groups or nongovernmental organizations) in the project design	Project Proposal	Doc Review
	Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objective?	Was project logic based on a comprehensive Theory of Change?	Extent to which ToC is coherent and comprehensive	Project Proposal	Doc Review
		Is the Results Framework following a plausible logic?	Extent to which activities and outputs with the respective assumptions are leading to the respective next level	Project Proposal	Doc Review
	Is the project aligned with and supportive of IOM national, regional, and/or global strategies and the Migration Governance Framework?	Are project outcomes in line with RO SJO's Regional Strategy?	Level of alignment to Regional Strategy	IOM Regional Strategy, Project Docs (esp. PP)	Doc Review
		Are project outcomes in line with IOM's Data Strategy?	Level of alignment to Data Strategy	IOM Data Strategy, Project Docs (esp. PP)	Doc Review
		Are project outcomes in line with MiGOF?	Level of alignment to MiGOF	MiGOF, Project Docs (esp. PP)	Doc Review

		Are project outcomes in line with GCM?	Level of alignment to GCM	GCM, Project Docs (esp. PP)	Doc Review
		Are project outcomes in line with SDGs?	Level of alignment to SDGs	SDGs, Project Documents	Doc Review
Are the data collected via the data collection tools and posted in PRIMI relevant to the initial intent and for use by the targeted beneficiaries?		To what extent is the data in the platform up-to-date?	Availability of up-to-date data on the platform	PRIMI, Project Documents	Observation (PRIMI), Doc Review
		Is the data in the portal able to address questions raised in the project documents by the donor?	Quant: % of persons indicating in survey that they do not miss any information Qual: Extent to which data can contribute to informed political decision making	PRIMI, Project Documents Quant. Survey Gov Stakeholders	Doc Review Survey, KII,
		To what extent do beneficiaries find the data useful for their daily work?	Quant: % of persons indicating in survey that the data is relevant for their daily work Qual: Extent of relevance for daily work	Quant. Survey Gov. Stakeholders	Survey KII
		Is crucial data missing?	Quant: % of persons indicating in survey that they miss data on the platform Qual: Extent of relevance for daily work	Quant. Survey Gov. Stakeholders	Survey KII
		Did the project contribute to the overall objective?	Level of contribution to overall objective	Narrative report, Gov Stakeholders and Project Staff	Doc Review, KII, Survey
Effectiveness	Have the project objective, outputs and outcomes been achieved in accordance with the stated plans and results matrix?	Did the project achieve the set outcomes?	Outcome: - Regional network on PRIMI has been established - % of gov. counterparts reporting increased capacities in migration data management		
		Did the project achieve the set outputs?		Narrative report, Gov. Stakeholders	Doc Review, KII

		<p>Output 1.1: - # of participants in the PVIGMA, disaggregated by sex and age</p> <p>Output 1.2: - PRIMI platform is functional - Data collection tools are established (binary)</p> <p>Output 1.3: -% of gov. officials indicating that they know about available data on the platform</p> <p>Output 1.4: - A report on migration data collection tools in different countries has been created</p> <p>Output 1.5: - # of government officials trained in migration data management through workshops - # of circulated action reports including best-practices</p>		
<p>Was the collaboration and coordination with partners and stakeholders effective?</p>	<p>How frequent was the exchange between stakeholders?</p>	<p># of stakeholder meetings or other forms of contact</p>	<p>Project information material / Narrative report</p>	<p>Document Review</p>

	Were there well-defined working modalities between stakeholders?	Extent of formalization of meetings (e.g. Meeting ToRs, Minutes etc.)	Project information material (Annexes etc.)	Doc review
	To what extent do stakeholders agree that the coordination went well?	Extent to which Stakeholders agree that coordination went well	Qual Interview with Gov. Stakeholder and Project Staff	KII
To what extent were the target beneficiaries reached?	To which extent could all relevant target beneficiaries be reached?	Share of expected beneficiary groups that could be reached	Project Staff, Narrative report	KII, Doc Review
	How regularly did different stakeholder groups visit the platform?	% of persons indicating that they are visiting the platform on a regular basis during the last 2 years	Quant survey with Stakeholders	Survey
		# of platform visits over time	Platform Tracking Data	Doc/Data Review
Are the target beneficiaries finding the content and information they are looking for on the platform?	To what extent do stakeholders state that they are finding info they are looking for?	% of persons indicating that the platform is user-friendly	Quant Survey, Qual interview with Gov. authorities	Survey, KII
	Did users use all the functionalities of the website?	Extent to which users made use of all functionalities of website	Tracking Data of Website	Data Review
Are there any factors that prevent beneficiaries and project partners from accessing the results/services/products	Are there any specific groups reporting access problems to the services?	# of persons indicating that they have issues accessing the services according to stakeholder type	Quant Survey with stakeholders	Survey
	What are the factors preventing beneficiaries from accessing the results?	Perception of stakeholders	Stakeholders	KII Survey

Efficiency	Were the activities implemented according to the schedule of the project work plan? If not, what were the reasons and the steps taken to complete them?	Were activities on time according to the schedule of the workplan?	# of delayed activities	Project documents (Project Proposal, Monitoring reports)	Doc Review
		If delay, what were the reasons for the delay?	Perception of project staff	Project documents (monitoring reports), Project Staff	Doc Review, KII
	Were challenges in project implementation identified and addressed quickly and appropriately?	Did the project identify any challenges during the implementation?	# of challenges identified during implementation	Monitoring reports Project Team, Gov Stakeholders and Project Staff	Document Review, KII
		Were challenges addressed in an adequate and timely manner?	Perception of project team and beneficiaries of adequacy and timeliness of measures	Monitoring reports, Project Team, Gov Stakeholders and Project Staff	Document Review, KII
	Were the project expenses incurred in line with the agreed budget?	Were the project activities in line with the agreed budget?	Alignment of costs with budget	Financial reports	Document Review
		Were there any unexpected costs?	Amount of unexpected costs	Financial reports, Narrative reports, Interview with Project Staff	Document Review, KII
	Did the funds spent give the possibility of achieving the expected results?	Were the funds sufficient to reach the results?	Alignment of costs with budget	Financial reports, Narrative reports	Document Review
		Were there any results that could not be achieved due to the lack of funding?	Extent to which stakeholder agree that some results could not be achieved due to lack of funding	Interview with Project Staff	KII
	To what extent were resources efficiently used to achieve results?	Were funds allocated in accordance with their importance to generate change, according to stakeholders?	Extent to which funds were allocated to activities that are deemed most important by stakeholders?	Financial reports, Interview with Project staff and Gov. Stakeholder	Doc Review, KII
		Did the project leverage available resources (=seed funding)	Existence of investments that build upon the project	Final narrative report, Gov Stakeholders and Project Staff	Doc review, KII

Impact	Which positive/negative and intended/unintended effects are being produced by the project?	Were there any unplanned positive effects?	Level to which unintentional positive effects arose	Gov Stakeholders and Project Staff	KII
		Were there any unplanned negative effects?	Level to which unintentional negative effects arose	Gov Stakeholders and Project Staff	KII
		To what extent have unplanned positive effects contributed to the outcome / objective?	Level to which unplanned positive effects have contributed to the outcome / Objective	Government stakeholder and project staff	KII
	Does the impact come from the project activities, from external factors or from both?	What do beneficiaries consider to be the most valuable change brought about by the project?	Perception of stakeholders	Qual Interview with Gov. Stakeholder and Project Staff	KII
		What were the project components that contributed to that change or impact from beneficiary/stakeholder perspective	Perception of stakeholders	Stakeholder	KI
		Did any external macro-level factors have an influence on the changes happened?	Extent of which relevant macro-level factors could be identified	General literature (political, environmental or other events at the macro level)	Document review
Coherence	To what extent is this project compatible with other IOM and non-IOM interventions in this field?	How does the project fit with other ongoing IOM programmes towards the realization of broader change??	Extent to which the project connects to already existing IOM projects	Project Proposal and Narrative Report, Internet/Intranet research of existing projects Interview with project staff	Doc Review KII
		How does the project fit with other ongoing non-IOM programmes towards the realization of broader change??	Extent to which the project connects to already existing non-IOM projects	Project Proposal and Narrative Report, Internet/Intranet research of existing projects Interview with project staff	Doc Review KII
		To what extent have the interventions made during the project continued to be applied after the project ends?	To what extent are stakeholders keeping on contributing to the platform?	# of countries still delivering data to the platform	Narrative reports, Qual Interview Gov. Stakeholder and Project Staff

	Have governments changed their way of collecting data or reporting towards a more coherent way?	# of countries having changed their data collection methods or reporting	Qual interviews with Governments	KII
What are the major factors affecting sustainability, including any identified challenges faced by the main implementing organization?	What are the main challenges affecting sustainability?	Challenges identified by stakeholders, Challenges mentioned in narrative report	Qual Interview with Gov. Stakeholder and Project Staff, Narrative report	KII, Doc Review
Are necessary structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support?	Is regular maintenance assured after the project ends in order to avoid malfunctioning?	Extent to which measures (e.g. dedicated personnel) have been planned and initiated to guarantee functionality after project end	Project Proposal, Narrative Report, Qual Interviews with Project Staff	Doc Review, KII
	Have financial resources been assured to cover for staff working on the maintenance?	Availability of budget for maintenance	financial reports	Document review
	To which extent did the project design and implementation include measures to promote further use after project end?	Extent to which measures to guarantee further use after project end were included in project planning and implementation	Narrative reports, Qual Interview Gov. Stakeholder and Project Staff	Doc Review KII
Is the technology used for the processing of data in the PRIMI appropriate to the needs of the beneficiaries?	How user-friendly did the user find the platform from beneficiaries or user point of view?	# of persons stating that they find the platform user-friendly	Quantitative survey, Qualitative Interview with gov. Stakeholder	Survey, KII
	How likely is it that beneficiaries keep on using the platform in the future?	# of persons indicating that they will likely keep on using PRIMI in the future Development of # of platform visits over time	Quantitative survey, Qualitative Interview with gov. Stakeholder Tracking data	Survey, KII, Document review

Gender Main-streaming	Were gender dimensions adequately addressed in the planning and implementation of the project?	Were gender mainstreaming aspects considered when selecting government counterparts?	% of women government stakeholders	Narrative report	Doc review
		Was the project designed and planned, taking into consideration a gender analysis, needs assessment and available guidance?	% of indicators in the results framework that are disaggregated by gender, if applicable	Project Proposal, Narrative report	Document review
		Is all relevant data reported on disaggregated by sex and age to the extent possible	Extent to which data in the platform is disaggregated by gender and age	Narrative report, PRIMI Platform	Document and Data review
		Is data equally available for different gender groups (men, women, LGBTIQ+)?	Extent to which data is available for all gender groups	Data Review on Platform	Document review

List of documents reviewed

- 3 Interim reports (Financial and Narrative)
- 1 Final report (Financial and Narrative)
- Project Proposal
- Consultancy Document (“Características del proceso de recolección y uso de los registros administrativos sobre migración en Centroamérica, México y el Caribe”)
- Annexes to the reports (among them PRIMI Manual, Meeting Agendas, Press Briefings, Terms of References)
- Google Analytics Documents
- Review of several data platforms (NTMI, Si-ESTAD, IMILA, PRIMI, UNHCR Operational Data Platform, GMDAC’s Migration Data Portal)
- Several Framework and Strategies (GCM, Agenda 2030, Regional Strategy for Central America, North America & the Caribbean, Migration Data Strategy,

List of persons interviewed or consulted

- 4 government focal points from participating countries
 - Stacey Clarke-Callum (Jamaica)
 - Graciela Martinez Caballero (Mexico)
 - Ada Porras Salazar (Costa Rica)
 - Claudia Mon Louis (Saint Lucia)
- 2 IOM RO San José staff involved in the project (Project manager, Project staff)
 - Gabriela Rodriguez
 - Sofia Arce
- 2 staff from IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre
 - Susanne Melde
 - Carla Rojas Paz
- 1 consultant involved in the project (now IOM staff)
 - Fabio Jiménez

- 1 IOM staff acting as Secretary for the Central American Commission of Migration Directors - OCAM
 - Claudia Isabel Lara
- 2 staff from UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)
 - Jorge Martinez Pizarro
 - Leandro Reboiras Finardi

Data collection instruments

Qualitative Questionnaire Government Stakeholders

Questionnaire for country focal points

Introduction and Consent

First of all, I want to thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview.

My name is Martin Schmitt and I am working as Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer at the IOM Regional Office in San Jose, Costa Rica and I am commissioned to conduct this internal evaluation.

All projects funded by IOM Development Fund include an independent ex-post evaluation as an obligatory element. **The purpose** for this kind of evaluation is to guarantee a constant development and improvement of our projects by identifying best practices and lessons learnt. This will be done on the basis of several criteria like relevance, effectiveness, impact or sustainability, among others.

As mentioned, this evaluation is **independent** which means that I as the evaluator was not involved in the project in any stage of the project life cycle. Apart from a document review and a brief quantitative survey, this evaluation includes also qualitative key informant interviews with important project stakeholders.

As you as country focal point for [COUNTRY] were directly involved in the project your feedback and cooperation is of utmost importance in order to collect first-hand information. I would therefore like to thank you very much in advance for your time and efforts. Should any question be unclear or you have questions to me as evaluator, please feel free to pose your question at any time.

All the information you provide in the interview will be kept highly **confidential** and IOM's Data Protection Principles will be applied at every stage of the process.

If you agree, I will **record our conversation**. These records will only be used to make sure that I did not miss any important points and will be **immediately deleted after the end of the evaluation**. Your name or other personal data that would allow an identification will not appear in the report.

You have the right to not answer any of the questions and to terminate the interview at any point. You also have the right to request a full deletion of the recording or any other data you provided during the interview.

The interviewee agreed verbally to participate in the interview.

The interviewee agreed verbally to be recorded.

[Start Record]

Questions²³

1. What is your **current position and what was your role in the project**?
2. Could you please describe the **biggest achievements** of the project?
 - a. Which aspect of the project contributed most to this achievement?
3. Can you think of any positive or negative **effects that you did not expect**?
 - a. To which extent did these contribute to the achievements you mentioned?
4. Could you please describe the **biggest challenges** of the project?
5. Do you have any ideas how these **challenges could have been/could be mitigated** or generally recommendations for improvements?
6. Coming back to your role in the project, could you please describe your **involvement in the different stages of the project** (esp. design/development phase, implementation phase)?
7. What was your main **interest when deciding to participate in the project**?
8. To what extent have **your needs been addressed / your interests met**?
9. Is there anything that you are **missing in terms of data**?
10. How **relevant is the project for your daily work**?
 - a. How regularly are you using the platform?

²³ Numbers indicate the respective main question. Second level questions will only be asked if the interviewees in their answer are not providing respective information.

- b. For **what purpose** are you mostly visiting the platform?
 - c. What are you using the data for?
 - d. **What is the data that is/was most important for you?**
11. Could you please describe how did you find the **layout and user-friendliness** of the platform?
- a. How easily do you find what you are looking for?
 - b. Are there any barriers that prevent you from accessing any data or results?
 - c. Do you have an any suggestions for improvements?
12. How did you perceive the **coordination between the different actors?**
- a. How do you perceive effectiveness and efficiency of the coordination?
 - b. How would you consider the frequency of communication with the others?
 - c. Were there any formal mechanisms established?
 - d. How do you think it could be improved?
13. **Are there any changes in the way you collect, administer or analyse data that are attributable to the project,** and if yes, could you please describe these changes?
- a. Is there any data that you didn't collect before the project?
 - b. Do you feel significant improvement?
 - c. Do you feel more capable of collecting the requested data?
 - d. Are you thinking of maintaining any of the changes that were induced by the project?
14. Could you describe the **main challenges that you had delivering the requested data?**
- a. Any **idea how to mitigate these challenges?**
 - b. Is there any way IOM could have helped you facing the challenges?
15. How likely is it that you will be using the platform in the future and why?
- a. If not very likely: Why not? What could be done so that you will use this platform more often?
16. How do you see your involvement in this project, or similar projects, over the longer-term?

Any further comments or experiences you want to share?

Please feel free to reach out to me in case any further ideas or relevant thoughts are coming up!

Thank you very much!

Questionnaire for IOM Project Staff

First of all, I want to thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview.

As you might know, all projects funded by IOM Development Fund include an independent ex-post evaluation as an obligatory element. **The purpose** for this kind of evaluation is to guarantee a constant development and improvement of our projects by identifying best practices and lessons learnt. This will be done on the basis of several criteria like relevance, effectiveness, impact or sustainability, among others.

As mentioned, this evaluation is **independent** which means that I as the evaluator was not involved in the project in any stage of the project life cycle. Apart from a document review and a brief quantitative survey, this evaluation includes also qualitative key informant interviews with important project stakeholders.

According to my understanding you were directly involved in the project which makes your feedback and cooperation of utmost importance in order to collect first-hand information. I would therefore like to thank you very much in advance for your time and efforts. Should any question be unclear or you have questions to me as evaluator, please feel free to pose your question at any time.

All the information you provide in the interview will be kept highly **confidential** and IOM's Data Protection Principles will be applied at every stage of the process.

If you agree, I will **record our conversation**. These records will only be used to make sure that I did not miss any important points and will be **immediately deleted after the end of the evaluation**. Your name or other personal data that would allow an identification will not appear in the report.

You have the right to not answer any of the questions and to terminate the interview at any point. You also have the right to request a full deletion of the recording or any other data you provided during the interview.

The interviewee agreed verbally to participate in the interview.

The interviewee agreed verbally to be recorded.

[Start Record]

1. What is your current position and what was your role in the project?
 - a. In which moment were you involved in the project?
2. From your perspective, could you please describe the biggest achievements or benefits of the project?

- a. Which aspect of the project contributed most to this achievement?
3. Can you think of any positive or negative effects that you did not expect?
 - a. To which extent did these contribute to the achievements you mentioned?
4. Could you please describe where do you see the biggest challenges of the project?
 - a. How did you react to face these challenges?
5. Do you have any ideas how these challenges could have been/could be mitigated or generally recommendations for improvements?
6. How would you describe process of project implementation in general?
 - a. Were there any significant delays, if yes, for what reason?
 - b. How did you react to them?
 - c. Do you have any ideas on how this could have been prevented or your response be improved?
7. Could you please describe the role of the different stakeholder groups of the project? How and at which stage have they been involved in the project?
 - a. Do you feel any group could not be reached, if yes, which and why?
8. Could you please describe the process of incoming data from the governments during project implementation? (How) has it changed?
 - a. Did quality of incoming data change over time?
 - b. If it changed, do you have an idea why?
9. Could you please describe the coordination between the different stakeholders?
 - a. How did you agree on the way forward?
 - b. Were there any mechanisms established to facilitate the exchange?
 - c. Did all stakeholders participate in an even way?
 - d. Any suggestions for improvements?
10. How would you describe PRIMI fits into the field of other activities or initiatives in the area?
 - a. Data Portal, DTM (in general), NTMI
 - b. Non-IOM projects
11. Could you please describe the measures that were planned to promote further use after the project end?
 - a. How was the stakeholder involvement in terms of guaranteeing sustainability?
 - b. Do project stakeholder still contribute to the platform? In which way?

- c. How did you make sure that the platform is still being functional after project end?
 - d. Are further updates in terms of data planned?
 - e. How was made sure that technical abilities were retained to keep the platform functional and secure maintenance?
12. Could you please describe how you made sure that lessons-learnt were systematically captured?
13. I now would like to know a bit more about the financial side. Could you please briefly describe how you consider the amount of available funds in the project?
- a. Were the funds sufficient to reach the intended results?
 - b. Did you face any unexpected costs?
 - c. Can you think of a way how more funding would have contributed to much better results? In which way?
 - d. Are there any results that could have been achieved with fewer resources?
14. Could you please think of any other activities or project that benefited indirectly from the project (or also the unplanned effects of the project).
- a. Could the project leverage available resources and work like seed-funding or attract extra-funds?
15. As the almost last question I would like to know more about the integration of cross-cutting issues. How did you make sure, that cross-cutting themes like gender and human rights-based approaches were considered during project design and implementation?
16. Looking back, is there anything that you would have done differently?

Any further comments or experiences you want to share?

Please feel free to reach out to me in case any further ideas or relevant thoughts are coming up!

Thank you very much!

Questionnaire for GMDAC Staff

First of all, I want to thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview.

All projects funded by IOM Development Fund include an independent ex-post evaluation as an obligatory element. **The purpose** for this kind of evaluation is to guarantee a constant development and improvement of our projects by identifying best practices and lessons learnt. This will be done on the basis of several criteria like relevance, effectiveness, impact or sustainability, among others.

As part of the GMDAC you were directly involved in the project and thus your feedback and cooperation is of utmost importance in order to collect first-hand information. I would therefore like to thank you very much in advance for your time and efforts. Should any question be unclear or you have questions to me as evaluator, please feel free to pose your question at any time.

All the information you provide in the interview will be kept highly **confidential** and IOM's Data Protection Principles will be applied at every stage of the process.

If you agree, I will **record our conversation**. These records will only be used to make sure that I did not miss any important points and will be **immediately deleted after the end of the evaluation**. Your name or other personal data that would allow an identification will not appear in the report.

You have the right to not answer any of the questions and to terminate the interview at any point. You also have the right to request a full deletion of the recording or any other data you provided during the interview.

The interviewee agreed verbally to participate in the interview.

The interviewee agreed verbally to be recorded.

[Start Record]

1. What is your current position and what was your role in the project?
2. From your perspective, could you please describe the biggest achievements or benefits of the project?
 - a. Which aspect of the project contributed most to this achievement?
3. Can you think of any positive or negative effects that you did not expect?
 - a. To which extent did these contribute to the achievements you mentioned?

4. Could you please describe where do you see the biggest challenges of the project?
5. Do you have any ideas how these challenges could have been/could be mitigated or generally recommendations for improvements?
6. What was your main interest when deciding to participate in the project?
 - a. What are you using the platform / data for?
7. According to you, how does PRIMI fit into the field of other activities or initiatives in the area?
 - a. Data Portal
 - b. Iniciativa de Gestión de Información de Movilidad Humana en el Triángulo Norte (NTMI)
 - c. DTM
8. Could you please describe how do you see your involvement in the project over the longer-term?
 - a. Do you have plans to make use of the platform or the data in the platform in the future?
9. [optional] How did you perceive the coordination between the different stakeholders?
 - a. Any suggestions for improvements?
10. [optional] Can you think of any stakeholder groups that could not have been reached?
11. What do you think are the main challenges for the sustainability of this project?
 - a. Any idea how to face these challenges?
12. Looking back, are there any aspects in the project, that went particularly well? Or are there any points that did not go well or that you would do differently?

Any further comments or experiences you want to share?

Please feel free to reach out to me in case any further ideas or relevant thoughts are coming up!

Thank you very much!

Quantitative Questionnaire

*Thank you very much for participating in this online survey. The purpose of this survey is to gather more first-hand information on the platform PRIMI (Regional Platform for Migration Information) to be able to further improve our programming based on your experiences. There are no right or wrong answers. **The survey will not take more than 5 minutes of your time.***

-

I agree to voluntarily participate in this online survey. I understand and agree that my answers, including personal data, will be collected, used and otherwise processed to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities to further develop IOM's programming. I understand that my personal data will be collected, used, retained and otherwise processed by IOM in accordance with IOM's [Data Protection Principles](#). The collected data will be encrypted and will be kept confidential. The data will only be disclosed to IOM authorized staff members. No personal data will be shared with third parties. By agreeing to this, I hereby authorize IOM to collect, use, and otherwise process my personal data obtained through this online survey. I acknowledge that IOM will not be held liable for any damage caused, directly or indirectly, to me or any such person in connection with this authorization, that derives from circumstances outside the control of IOM. For any questions, requests or complaints concerning your personal data please contact us at mschmitt@iom.int.

-

I have **read, understood** and **accept** the terms for data usage

- Yes
- No [[→ go to Q21](#)]

1. Have you heard of the platform PRIMI (Regional Platform for Migration Information)?

- Yes
- No [[→ go to Q14](#)]
- I don't know [[→ go to Q14](#)]
- Prefer not to answer [[→ go to Q14](#)]

2. Have you visited PRIMI?

- Yes [[→ go to Q5](#)]
- No
- I don't know [[→ go to Q5](#)]

Prefer not to answer [*→ go to Q5*]

3. Why have you not visited PRIMI?

I did not have interest in the platform [*→ go to Q14*]

I did not have time [*→ go to Q14*]

Other

4. Please specify, why you have not visited PRIMI.

_____ [open text field] [*→ go to Q14*]

5. On average, how regularly did you visit PRIMI over the last two years?

Daily or almost daily

Several times a week but not daily

Several times a month but not every week

About once a month

Less than once a month

I visited PRIMI only once

Prefer not to answer

6. What is/was the purpose of you visiting PRIMI? (You can select more than one answer)

Private interest [*→ go to Q8*]

Work purposes [*→ go to Q8*]

Academic/study purposes [*→ go to Q8*]

Other

7. Could you please specify, what was the purpose of your visit to PRIMI?

_____ [open text field]

8. To which extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not applicable
--	----------------	-------	----------------------------	----------	-------------------	----------------

The data in the platform is relevant for my daily work.						
I consider the data on the platform relevant for policy making.						
The platform is user-friendly.						
I am easily finding the information that I am looking for.						
Important data is missing on the platform.						
I like the layout of the platform.						
It is likely that I will use the platform in the future.						
I feel the data on the platform is up-to-date.						
The platform addresses my needs in terms of data.						
The platform is well known to colleagues/friends/peers working with migration data.						

9. [*→ only asking if (strongly) agrees to “important data is missing”*]

You indicated that you are missing important data on the platform. Could you please specify the type of data you are missing?

_____ [open text field]

10. [*→ only asking if (strongly) disagrees to “The Platform is user-friendly”*]

You indicated that you do not find the platform very user-friendly. What is it that you don't like?

_____ [open text field]

11. What's the thing that you like least in the platform?

_____ [open text field]

12. What's the thing that you like most in the platform?

_____ [open text field]

13. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

_____ [open text field]

14. How old are you?

_____ [number field]

15. What is the gender you identify with?

- Man
- Woman
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

16. In which country do you currently live?

[List of countries]

17. Please specify the country where you are currently living.

_____ [open text field]

18. What is your sector of work?

- Government entity [*→ go to Q20*]
- Academic sector [*→ go to Q20*]
- Private sector [*→ go to Q20*]
- Multilateral Development Organization (UN, IADB, WB etc.) [*→ go to Q20*]
- Non-Governmental / INGO [*→ go to Q20*]
- Other, please specify [*→ go to Q20*]
- Prefer not to answer

19. Please specify your sector of work.

_____ [open text field]

20. Is there any other comment you would like to share?

_____ [open text field]

21. Please click on the “submit” button to send your answers. Thank you very much for answering this survey and by this helping us to further develop our programmes!