

External Evaluation of the WBAWARE Information Campaign

Final Evaluation Report

April 2023



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Abbreviations and Terms	3
Executive Summary	4
Key findings	4
Recommendations	7
Introduction and Background	11
The consortium	12
Methodology and Limitations	13
Documents and data available	14
Limitations	17
Findings	19
Campaign Design and Objectives	19
More specific objectives can help increase measurability in future campaigns	19
Campaign effectiveness can be defined and measured in a more systematic manner	20
Increased MEL capacities can provide future campaigns with a stronger evidence base	21
Preliminary research can identify key knowledge gaps and inform all campaign components more strategically in the future	24
Implementation: Efficacy	26
Working with stakeholders who have expertise with social media and migrants in TRCs should be continued	26
Audiences represented migrant profiles well; future campaigns should further distinguish audiences into subgroups	26
Using videos on Youtube and promoting them through Facebook allows reaching a large audience	27
While broad and long-lasting messages are great for a broad audience, future campaigns can create more targeted content	28
Effective planning and training improved the quality of information sessions	29
Future campaigns should allow for more message testing and adapting throughout the campaign period	30
Despite delays, the project team effectively adapted the campaign to address emerging contextual changes	31
Implementation: Impact	33
Social media can reach large amounts of people; including source countries can increase engagement with risk messaging	33
Campaign videos have relevance to target groups and the potential to prompt information seeking behaviours and exploration of alternatives	33
It is necessary to go beyond standard social media metrics when measuring the impact of campaigns	35
Future campaigns should focus on clear and actionable messages	35
Implementation: Efficiency	37
Sustainability	41
Best practices identified can be used in future campaigns, campaign can bring different	

stakeholders together	41
Campaign has potential for synergy and linkages with state and international civil society stakeholders	42
Annex 1: Key Informant Interview Protocol and Questions	43
Annex 2: Cost Effectiveness Summary	50
Annex 3: Cost Allocation Comparisons	52

Abbreviations and Terms

AMIF	Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund
AT-Mol	Federal Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Austria
AVRR	Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration
BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CoO	Countries of Origin
CREDI	Center for Development Evaluation and Social Science Research
DE-Mol	Federal Ministry of the Interior and Community of the Federal Republic of Germany
EU	European Union
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GMDAC	Global Migration Data Analysis Center
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude and Perception
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MHPS	Mental Health Psychosocial Support
TRCs	Temporary Reception Centres
WB	Western Balkans
WBAware	Awareness Raising and Information Campaigns on the Risks of Irregular Migration for the Western Balkans 4

Executive Summary

The International Organization for Migration (IOM), in partnership with and co-funded by the German and Austrian Ministries of Interior and with the financial support of the European Commission, implemented a project called "Awareness Raising and Information Campaigns on the Risks of Irregular Migration for the Western Balkans 4 (WBAware)" to raise awareness about the risks and challenges of irregular migration to the EU. An information campaign called "Migrants talk to migrants" was conducted as part of the project, targeting migrants in four Western Balkans transit countries: Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia. A shorter information campaign also targeted potential migrants in selected areas of the countries of origin.

This evaluation assesses the effectiveness of the information campaign and offers recommendations for future programming. Therefore, the evaluation team employed a mixed-methods approach, using both qualitative and quantitative data. A desk review of project documentation was conducted, as well as 17 semi-structured Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). Quantitative data collected by the campaign was reviewed as well.

Key findings

The key results of the information campaign included an overall reach to 3 million people on Facebook, engagement with over 60 thousand users on Instagram, and generation of 4.5 million views across 108 videos on Youtube, with an average percentage viewed rate of nearly 80%. In addition, the in-person information sessions reached 355 transit migrants across the 4 implementation countries in the Western Balkans via 50 carefully planned information sessions.

The overarching orientation of the campaign was found to be well-aligned with EU portfolio's funding goals. Analysis of the campaign's designs and objectives reflected the commendable ability of the project team's to adapt to a challenging environment, and its continuous efforts to meet beneficiary needs.

In interviews, the donor identified the campaign objectives as including behavioural changes related to reducing irregular migration to the EU and Member states (MS) and promoting voluntary return. Further, the majority of key informants from the implementation team agreed that the primary goal of the campaign was to raise awareness about the risks of irregular migration. This highlights the need to define campaign objectives more specifically in the future, clearly identifying the intended effects and a measurable future state. By establishing clear campaign objectives, there is a greater chance of alignment between donors and implementers and a higher likelihood of achieving those objectives.

Broad campaign objectives led to varying interpretations of effectiveness among KIIs. While some focused on adaptability, others looked at campaign reach. Social media metrics showed the campaign's reach, but not how it was received and understood. Midline and endline assessments addressed research questions well, but their effectiveness was limited due to small sample sizes and few direct beneficiaries of the project taking part in the assessments.

Notably, social media metrics provided useful insights into the reach of the online campaign, while periodic assessments were effective in addressing the research questions outlined by the project team in the service-provider's TOR.

With very few pre-committed measurements set in stone and many MEL activities only defined on an ad-hoc basis, it appears that a comprehensive MEL plan along with a dedicated MEL consultant at the start of a project is crucial for future campaigns. GMDAC lacked the capacity to lead granular MEL, so a stronger MEL plan along with a project MEL officer, could have linked campaign objectives more clearly and directly to activities while aggregating all existing and planned data sources into an overarching framework that can measure campaign success effectively.

The initial research was highly successful in pinpointing the information sources used by migrants as well as knowledge gaps on migration risks and opportunities, and categorising the risks associated with irregular migration. The baseline research further complemented initial finding with focus groups but it appeared that, due to project delays, the content creation and communication strategies were more reliant on previous IOM reports than recommendations from the two studies' analyses.

All project stakeholders involved had strong technical expertise in their areas of specialisation. Fabrika, the social media provider, had worked with IOM and implemented a similar campaign in the region (AVRR). Using the structures of existing Temporary Reception Centers (TRCs) to conduct information sessions was effective in building rapport and trust with migrants and in cooperating with Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) representatives and lawyers from a legal aid organisation.

The evaluation team found that a strong suit of the campaign was its focus on integrating language diversity into content - which was crucial to contextualization. The campaign identified audiences based on their spoken languages and their intention to seek information on migration¹. Although this approach enhanced accessibility to video materials and messaging for migrants, it may have missed an opportunity to segment the audience into subgroups and tailor activities and messaging further. By narrowing down the audience, it would have been possible to create more targeted and customised messages and interventions. The Center for Development Evaluation and Social Science Research's (CREDI) research was useful in identifying relevant differences between audience profiles and accordingly could have informed programming and campaign messaging.

The campaign produced engaging video content which was disseminated through various media channels (including Youtube and Facebook) to the target audience. The videos were created in the target groups' languages and featured migrants themselves which supported the content's credibility and relatability. The videos were short, authentic, and well-suited for a broad audience. The in-person sessions were interactive and good at rapport-building and could, in the future, be used for more discussion on legal alternatives and AVRR if that aligns with the campaign's larger goals.

The campaign messages effectively addressed the dynamic nature of migration trends and the circumstances for migrants in transit by expanding video content and boosting reach to also address migrants from Burundi, Cuba and India. While noting that the donor's requirements implied a focus on messaging on the risks of irregular migration, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) suggested that the balance between positive and negative messaging could have been improved. Preliminary research conducted by the project implementation team as well as in 2021, indicated that there were significant differences among specific migrant groups. Future campaigns should consider defining subgroups of

¹ Those looking for certain keywords on google were shown ads to redirect to campaign content.

audiences and creating separate target messages for each group in order to cater to specific social groups, including single migrants, families, etc.

The campaign included a number of different international actors and that clearly showed the value of that cooperation (discussed below). However, this meant less flexibility and ability to adapt to emerging situations on the ground. Several institutions may have been unable to provide analysis and take decisions at the speed that the campaign theory required. One such example includes being able to nimbly change strategy in response to emerging findings in social media analytics.

The project team successfully adapted the campaign to address emerging contextual changes such as Covid-19 lockdowns, challenges in recruiting partners, and unforeseen Ukrainian refugee movements. The team created videos that responded to new emerging nationalities being represented in migration trends and expanded the campaign to countries of origin, resulting in successful adaptations. Some recommendations from the midline report can be adopted to further enhance the reach of the campaign, provided the resources available allow for the same. An example is the pivoting of channels to include TikTok, to better target younger, single migrants.

Youtube and Facebook proved effective media to reach a large number of migrants. The campaign received over 5,000 unique views on its web page, 635 unique subscribers on YouTube, and 535 followers on Facebook. The top post on Facebook reached 473,000 users, generating an engagement with nearly 12,000 of them. YouTube videos received 4.5 million views across 108 videos, with views ranging from 70 to 277,000 per video². To ensure that the scaled-up campaign reaches a variety of audiences, scaling approaches based on the reach of videos by sub risks category and audience groups are suggested rather than focussing primarily on the highest reach across all videos. While targeting source countries was less expensive, it did marginally improve engagement. Once the campaign officially targeted countries of origin, the cost of converting a person into clicking on content to seek more information decreased by nearly 75% to Euros €22 per click, while increasing the proportion of those clicking on content by 25%.

The video content generated was received very well across all stakeholders, including funders, implementers and beneficiaries. The high-quality and relevant content can be further leveraged; while data collected by CREDI indicated there may be a specific subgroup of transit migrants who benefitted from the videos, the exact benefits are still to be further explored. If videos are adapted, they could further lead to more information-seeking behaviour among transit migrants. Different types of information, such as specific steps one can take to access legal aid or AVR R support, may need to be included in the videos in order to prompt behavioural change. Programmatic investment into indicators and methods that track such changes on a continual basis in the future would shed more light on this.

While reach and watchtime of videos were high, the success of the social media component in terms of the actual impact of the videos was difficult to determine due to the limitations of social media metrics. It remains unclear whether viewers were in fact representative of the target audience. Posting more often on Facebook, using comments to engage with the audience, and A/B testing of posts, would provide an even wider reach for relatively low-cost investments.

Messaging on AVR R in transit countries remains challenging. Migrants were often reluctant to receive information about AVR R during in-person sessions. Videos on social media did not seem to include

² Figures have been extracted from the campaign's Dashboard, designed and maintained by Fabrika. Data retrieved on March 20, 2023, using January 2021 to February 2023 date ranges where applicable. Summaries provided by Fabrika on the conclusion page were also referenced. Youtube subscription and Facebook followers were noted from the respective web pages.

easy-to-access links for direct click throughs to AVRR information for interested viewers. In order to improve future AVRR messaging, targeting audiences who are interested in receiving the information will be crucial. Such targeting would also focus on redirecting them to certain next steps which they are not averted to. A targeted AVRR social media campaign would prioritise clear, accessible and easy-to-understand information as well as access to the relevant resources.

It was commendable that the campaign allocated a significant portion (18%) of the budget towards monitoring, evaluation, and research outputs, which is higher than industry average. The evaluation suggests that more investment in implementation could be considered. One could, for example, allocate more resources towards implementation than training in order to enhance impact. A budget analysis revealed that 15% of the budget was allocated towards training for in-person sessions, while only 11% was spent on actual implementation. Further, it is noteworthy that costs of staff delivering information sessions were covered by other projects, while the costs of the venue and equipment were given in kind by IOM. Given that in-person sessions are likely to have the greatest potential for behavioural impact, and that prioritising and engaging with beneficiaries is a key campaign objective, making more resources available for implementation during budget planning in future projects is recommended. Finding remote training methods to keep training costs low can further add to this orientation. At the same time, with a significant budget proportion dedicated to M&E, applying the recommendations from this evaluation to strengthen internal capacities and investing more into collecting information from direct beneficiaries will help better measure campaign effectiveness in the future.

The project proposal included a sustainability strategy, which aimed to generate best practices for future outreach campaigns and to enable local actors to implement their own campaigns. The project's content was also planned to remain open-source for EU and local partners. It was challenging to assess the campaign's sustainability at the time of evaluation as it remains open whether best practices generated through this campaign will be used in the future. While the campaign helped bring stakeholders together, lessons from that collaboration can also contribute to the campaign's sustainability goal.

Recommendations

1. **Clearly define SMART campaign objectives that align with overall funding priorities and instruments.** Explicitly state whether the campaigns aim to raise awareness, change attitudes, and/or change behaviours. Specific objectives will ensure greater alignment between donors and implementers while enabling the definition of precise indicators to measure the achievement of objectives. It is also important to not assume that awareness changes will automatically lead to behavioural changes. Moreover, if behavioural changes are desired, they should be explicitly stated. By following these guidelines, campaigns can become more specific, targeted, and more likely to achieve their intended outcomes. In cases where both migration management and protection objectives are present, it is crucial to analyse trade-offs and ensure that implementers understand the hierarchy of objectives.
2. **Define MEL plan and indicators clearly at the inception phase and, ideally, ensure that MEL staff are internal and supervise all campaign components.** It is also advisable to establish a minimum standard for MEL at the project's outset, as well as a budget to support it. Hiring a MEL specialist to serve as the project's MEL manager can help ensure consistency throughout the project, and facilitate campaign monitoring to assess progress toward intended goals at any given time. Part of the MEL plan (see [section](#) on MEL capacities for further

details) could include trialling more innovative MEL methods to complement social media metrics such as running Facebook surveys and conducting a sentiment analysis on received comments. Dedicated resources and appropriate planning can enable systematic testing to establish effectiveness of campaigns and of specific learning questions, for example “What is the influence of content on migrants’ decision-making related to AVR?” This would enable the clear identification of campaign achievements, enable periodic aggregation to evidence achievements across different components and allow to effectively adapt campaigns throughout implementation. While the current campaign included useful Facebook metrics for progress monitoring³, one could track such data points disaggregated by target group, type of risk and key end message to improve project learning and resulting adaptations.

3. **Continue leveraging existing campaign materials and structures to support migrants for new campaigns.** Existing migration support programme structures can often be easily integrated with new communication campaigns. For instance, well-designed AVR webpages were interlinked with this campaign’s web pages and curated on its Youtube channel. Future campaigns can build upon and augment these structures by replacing outros (messages at the end of a video) which point migrants to ‘consider AVR’ with specific messaging on seeking AVR consultations and other services. Given IOM’s extensive experience and success throughout numerous campaigns, bureaucratic processes should be streamlined to allow for the reuse of materials, reducing the need for redesigns. Moreover, creating a new Facebook page and generating followers can be a time-consuming task; therefore, exploring opportunities to leverage existing Facebook pages from IOM brands is recommended to maximise the reach of the campaign.
4. **Improve audience targeting for future campaigns by focusing on migrant profiles rather than source countries.** To improve targeting for future campaigns, it is recommended to shift focus from source countries to migrant profiles. The high variability within the Western Balkans context makes segmentation based on source countries very difficult. Instead, segmentation based on migrant profiles could be more effective. For example, migrants who have been travelling for more or less than 12 months could be considered as two separate profiles. Other options would include focusing more on profiles such as single university students or married men with children back home. Given Facebook’s limitations in targeting based on narrow profiles, there are two possible ways to achieve effective targeting. The first is to correlate vulnerability profiles with demographic targeting data that Facebook allows. This would involve identifying the characteristics of vulnerable groups and then targeting them through Facebook’s demographic filters. The second option would be to create tailored types of posts and promote them to the same audience, but use headlines that speak specifically to each group. This way, both vulnerable and non-vulnerable individuals can be reached through the same campaign. For in-person sessions, rapid screening mechanisms should be established to identify vulnerable individuals quickly. To maximise the effectiveness of the sessions, they should be delivered in smaller groups based on migrant profiles. By doing this, specific issues and concerns can be addressed for each group, and the information can be tailored to their unique needs. In doing so, future campaigns will be more effective in reaching their intended audiences through tailored messaging. That however assumes that any consortium structure that manages such a program does allow such a campaign (see recommendation 7).
5. **Enhance the effectiveness of in-person activities by allocating more time to discuss the available options and understanding personal motivations.** Spending more time

³ Including watch-time and reach for videos, and click-throughs and engagements for posts amongst others.

discussing an individual's motivations for migration, their experiences thus far, and the factors that influence their decision-making (for example, onwards migration/return) would enhance both targeting and project effectiveness. While this was done as part of the preliminary research, by continuing to delve deeper into these topics, the information sessions can become more tailored to the individual's needs, increasing their engagement and motivation to consider voluntary return. This approach can also help build trust and rapport between the individual and the facilitator, leading to more honest and open discussions. Furthermore, taking the time to understand an individual's decision-making process can also inform the development of tailored reintegration support plans. This will ensure that the individual receives the necessary assistance and resources to successfully reintegrate into their home country⁴.

6. **Tailor messaging to specific subgroups within the target audience.** With unique and personal challenges, experiences, and motivations for migrating, a more targeted and relatable content for subgroups would create a stronger connection between the audience and the campaign message and increase project effectiveness. Additionally, it is important to translate video intros and outros into languages that are understood by the target audience as this can make the message more powerful and accessible, especially for migrants with weaker English proficiency.
7. **Make sure the campaign's institutional arrangements support the campaign's theory of change and operational requirements.** The campaign design emphasised the need for flexibility and nimbleness in monitoring and changing campaign strategy and adapting activities, but, in practice, as discussed by many key informants, the time leading up to the finalisation of proposed adaptations point out that perhaps institutional arrangements did not allow for rapid adaptation. It is important to consider the strengths and weaknesses of implementing a campaign through multiple national organisations and governments when designing a campaign's theory of change in this way. In the future, a similar consortium may be better suited to a campaign that's more static to ensure the institutional arrangements can support the campaign's requirements.
8. **Expand the current campaign concept to include in-person programming in source countries.** The current concept has proven successful in certain areas and can be effectively applied to home country campaigns through the use of video content, trusted messengers, and online playlists that can be accessed for an extended period of time. However, it is essential to define the objectives of the campaign before using a video-based approach, as this method is best suited for certain types of messaging. If a video campaign is chosen, adding an in-person component to encourage behavioural change is recommended. It is essential to allocate resources where they will have the most significant impact. This may involve targeting specific regions, groups, and subgroups within the source country. Additionally, we recommend partnering with local organisations in countries of origin and using trusted messengers to ensure that the message resonates with the target audience. Using the cost effectiveness analyses presented in this evaluation to support proposal and budget development in the future can help make decisions on where to allocate resources.
9. **To effectively prioritise sustainability, it is important to start with a clear definition of sustainability in the context of campaign goals.** If the aim is to achieve sustainable behavioural change, consider using in-person messaging that extends over a longer period

⁴ It is noteworthy that individuals interested in asylum or AVRR are indeed referred to individual consultations where IOM and/or UNHCR partners provide further information and assistance services - often covered by other projects. This recommendation is stressing the importance of campaigns like WBAware to allow in-person information session protocols to prioritise sufficient discussions to increase the likelihood of an individual to begin thinking of taking steps towards the aforementioned decisions and related services.

and includes evidence-based messages that have been shown to lead to intended behavioural change. For example, if the aim is abandonment of irregular transit plans, discuss with them clear anecdotes of delaying transit, other alternative options available for them and highlight the benefits of safer return and reintegration routes and programs. If project objectives deem it within scope to promote best practice sharing among EU Member states, incorporate mechanisms for sharing and tracking the adoption of these practices. For campaigns focused on migration management, sustainability might involve ensuring the long-term availability of resources and support, even after the campaign has ended. This could involve partnering with local organisations or creating sustainable funding mechanisms to ensure continued support for migrants and their communities.

10. **Expand partnerships to generate effective content.** For example, collaborate with member states (destination countries) to provide accurate and up-to-date information on migration policies, laws, and regulations⁵. Additionally, engagement with donors can facilitate funding streams and build sustainable partnerships. Future campaigns can also build on successful partnerships with local stakeholders such as community-based organisations, civil society organisations, and faith-based groups to increase reach and impact. Establishing referral mechanisms for migrant support services and fostering partnerships with local media outlets (as applicable to the targeted regions of each campaign) can also increase visibility and credibility of the campaign.

⁵ While such efforts were made during the campaign, establishing partnerships beyond the initial group of partners proved to be challenging. It may be worthwhile for future campaigns to first reflect and workout the bottlenecks before including such results into intended plans and related measures.

Introduction and Background

The International Organization for Migration (IOM), in partnership with the German Ministry of Interior (DE-Mol) and the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior (AT-Mol) and with the financial support of the European Commission, the German and the AT Mol have implemented the Awareness Raising and Information Campaigns on the Risks of Irregular Migration for the Western Balkans 4 (WBAware)” project. To bring about perception, attitudinal and behavioural change among migrants, an information campaign, "Migrants talk to migrants", was conducted as part of the overall project, with the aim to raise awareness on the risks and challenges associated with irregular migration on the road to Europe. The campaign targeted migrants in four transit Western Balkan countries⁶ attempting to reach the EU and promote safe, orderly, and informed migration decision making. A shorter pilot campaign also targeted potential migrants in selected areas of the countries of origin.

This external evaluation focuses on assessing the effectiveness of the information campaign piloted through the WBAware project. The objective is to inform IOM and project partners about lessons learned and recognized good practices, enabling them to adjust and improve information campaigns in future programming. The evaluation investigates the research, approach, methodology, and content development to implement the information campaign. Furthermore, it considers the expansion of the campaign to include countries of origin, to assess the adaptation's efficacy. By providing evidence-based information on the performance of the WBAware information campaign, the evaluation offers an analytical and objective review of the campaign's relevance and effectiveness. In doing so, it contributes to the continuous improvement of IOM and partners' initiatives in promoting safe, orderly, and informed migration decisions.

The campaign

As part of the WBAware project, an information campaign, "Migrants talk to migrants," was implemented targeting transit migrants making their way towards the European Union (EU) through the Western Balkans - specifically in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Montenegro, North Macedonia, and Serbia. A revision of the project expanded its reach by promoting selected videos in some of the countries of origin. The campaign, which focused on migrants in the Western Balkans, occurred from January 15, 2022, to February 28, 2023, while the subsequent campaign targeting migrants in countries of origin took place between March 8, 2023, and April 4, 2023. Managed by IOM in BiH, the project aimed to achieve the following expected outcomes⁷:

- Enhanced understanding of information sources, influencers and migration decision making processes of migrants in transit.
- Research contributes to the optimization of innovative approaches to awareness raising of migrants in transit through migrant influencers.
- Migrants in transit consume relevant information in their own language that is conveyed by sources credible to them.
- EU and local partners have the knowledge and see the added value of innovative communications strategies to deliver awareness raising campaigns to migrants at risk of irregular migration.

⁶ BiH, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia

⁷ As detailed by the Austrian Ministry of Interior in the Terms of Reference for the external evaluation of the campaign.

The aim was to pilot an innovative approach to raise the awareness of the risks of irregular migration, thereby changing perceptions and behaviours, which in turn, promotes safe, orderly and informed migration decision making among migrants from Algeria, Morocco, Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Bangladesh and later also India, Cuba, and Burundi. The approach proposed to use online advertisement targeting tools to 'redirect' migrants from YouTube to curated online playlists of migrant testimonies and factual information on the risks of irregular migration. These video testimonies were produced by a professional company, and recorded migrants narrating their experiences in their native languages. The online campaign was also initially designed such that it would be complemented by face-to-face info sessions, held in temporary reception centres in targeted countries covered by the project. A total of 50 in-person information sessions were conducted across BiH, Serbia, and Macedonia, with a total of 355 transit migrants in TRCs between November 2022 and February 2023⁸.

Considering the challenges posed by COVID-19 in 2021, the campaign underwent a revision from its original scope and was then implemented over 18 months from November 2021 - April 2023. The following is a synopsis of the campaign implemented. An initial preparatory phase took place from November 2021 to January 2022, during which the campaign's concept and design were finalised, communication channels were set up, and video content was curated. The following six months, until July 2022, marked the "Alpha phase" of the campaign, where the online campaign was delivered and monitored with the intention of revising it for a Beta Phase (implemented from August 2022 to December 2023) and a Countries of Origin (CoO) campaign, which took place between March 8th and April 4th, 2023. Both a midline report and an Alpha Phase report were produced to document progress and present findings.

Key changes in the project revision included the addition of more languages, such as Malayalam and English (India), French (Burundi), and Spanish (Cuba). Furthermore, there was an increased focus on boosting videos and social media posts to CoO including Burundi, India, Pakistan, Algeria, Morocco, and Bangladesh.

After revision, Afghanistan was not targeted due to the ongoing conflict and unstable situation. The instability of the situation rendered the "Migrants talk to migrants" messages, which promote AVRR as one of the main solutions for irregular migrants, not appropriate for the target group. For Cuba, efforts were made to reach potential migrants in transit locations, such as Dubai and Turkey, as the country could not be targeted directly because of the unavailability of Meta services at the time of the campaign. Lastly, Iraq was excluded from the campaign following the advice of the IOM Mission, as it was deemed politically sensitive at the time.

The consortium

The implementation of the WBAware project relied on a consortium. IOM acted as the leading implementing partner, responsible for setting up the project management structure and overseeing the administrative, procurement, sub-contracting, and financial aspects of the project. Additionally, IOM established the Advisory Board, and coordinated the Monitoring & Evaluation (MEL) efforts. The project was managed by IOM BiH and implemented by IOM in BiH, North Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia. IOM Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) supported the preparatory research phase and MEL activities, while IOM Media and Communication Division (MCD) provided guidance on

⁸ Most project documents were received from the IOM team by mid February 2023, so the sessions conducted in March 2023 were not included for quantitative analysis.

the communications strategy and the content of the awareness-raising campaign. The company Fabrika was engaged to assist with the digital and social media campaign implementation, while IOM engaged the Center for Development Evaluation and Social Science Research (CREDI) to carry out research for the development, monitoring, and assessment of the project's efforts.

The project was financed by the European Union's Fund for Asylum, Migration and Integration (AMIF) and co-financed by AT-Mol and DE-Mol. Both AT-Mol and DE-Mol, were responsible for appointing members to the Advisory Board, attending Board meetings, and providing inputs, advice, guidance, and other expertise when relevant. AT-Mol additionally supported the project by providing field assistance and access to migrants who transited through the Western Balkans and were currently in Austria, to inform the initial research on migrant information sources. Furthermore, AT-Mol was responsible for evaluating the awareness-raising campaign and participating in best practices and lessons learned workshops on information campaign methodologies.

Methodology and Limitations

The methodology for this evaluation employed a mixed-methods approach, drawing on both qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation's purpose and objectives are addressed using several methods.

Firstly, a desk review was conducted, which involved a thorough analysis of all project documentation shared by IOM management. The documents included progress reports, monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) tools and evidence, as well as videos and social media materials produced as part of the campaign. The evaluation questions, listed below, guided this analysis, with findings being clarified during the KIIs.

Secondly, qualitative data was collected through 17 semi-structured Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with IOM staff and project service providers. Despite efforts to directly interview beneficiaries, it wasn't feasible, as due to the campaign structure there was not a way to connect with beneficiaries who had seen the campaign. For each interview, priority topics and potential questions were prepared to allow for the discovery of nuanced insights that could not be obtained from project documentation alone and enabled evaluators to ask specific questions based on preliminary findings from the documentation review. Following data collection, a framework analysis approach was applied and allowed the evaluation team to produce comparative, top-level summary findings based on a rigorous analysis of each interview.

Lastly, the quantitative analysis component consisted of three parts: a) statistical data related to the reach of the campaign, obtained through collaboration with the company contracted to carry the campaign online; b) analysis of baseline, midline, and endline survey data collected by the Research Centre contracted by the project to monitor the campaign results; and c) reports and statistics from face-to-face info sessions with migrants.

Evaluation questions and data collection tools

In the following tables (page 15-16), we present an overview of the key evaluation questions, respondent groups, tools, and relevant desk review documents utilised in the evaluation process. This table serves as a summary of the various sources of information and analysis that have been employed to address the evaluation's objectives.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

A total of 17 KIIs were conducted to support this evaluation. To explore research questions and triangulate findings, the following mix of actors were selected based on their experience and involvement in the WBAware project:

- Two individuals who served on the advisory board and represented the donors/partners of the project;
- Five individuals who oversaw design, development and implementation of the project and represented IOM's core management on the project;
- One individual out of the two-person team who oversaw MEL on the project on behalf of GMDAC;
- Three individuals who delivered services contracted for the project, including its communication material, strategy, research and evaluation;
- Three individuals who serve on IOM Protection Teams in TRCs, who were trained to and then delivered information sessions for the in-person campaign of the project;
- Two individuals representing AVRRI and Vasa Prava - alternative and legal service providers in TRCs who were implementation partners for in-person campaign; and
- One individual who worked closely with the IOM Bosnia office to adapt and use this project's content towards meeting IOM Pakistan's training needs.

Documents and data available

The table below (page 17) provides an overview of the data and documentation shared by IOM during the course of the evaluation. This compilation of resources has been instrumental in informing the analysis, offering critical insights, and ensuring a thorough understanding of the project's progress and outcomes. By presenting the complete list of shared documents, this table highlights the depth and breadth of information used to support the evaluation findings and recommendations.

Key Learning / Research Question	Key Respondent	Tool(s)	Desk Review Documents (if applicable)
Campaign Design and Objectives			
<p>Did the project design/campaign information build on known needs of beneficiaries?</p> <p>Did adaptations cater to changing needs? What evidence exists of contextualization to improve campaign relevance.</p> <p>Are the messages of the campaign, and the chosen channels for communicating them, relevant for targeted beneficiaries?</p> <p>How did the campaign define effectiveness? How was this measured and tracked?</p>	IOM- Management Project Staff Project Service Providers	KIIs - semi-structured	Baseline report (Pre-campaign research) Midline report Campaign dashboard
Are campaign objectives measurable? Is the chosen system of indicators aligned with evidence requirements?	N/A	N/A	Baseline Report Communication Strategy
How have the objectives of the campaign been understood by the Donor, IOM, and Project Staff?	Donor Project Liaisons IOM- Management Project Staff Project Service Provider	KIIs - semi-structured	N/A
How does the campaign align with other relevant campaigns in the EU portfolio, ongoing and planned.	Donor Project Liaisons IOM- Management	KIIs - semi-structured	Independent research, when applicable
Implementation: Efficacy			
Did the campaign use the appropriate channels and methods (social media platforms, paid advertisement, info sessions) to engage the target audience, including analysis by subgroups, based on nationalities, age and gender?	IOM- Management Project Staff Project Service Provider	KIIs - semi-structured	Communication Strategy Baseline, midline and endline reports Campaign dashboard
Is the content developed adapted to the target audience, including analysis by subgroups, based on nationalities, age and gender?	N/A	N/A	Communication Strategy Baseline, midline and endline reports
Does the content provide a balanced perspective on the risks of irregular migration and the options available for migrants in irregular situations while in transit?	N/A	N/A	Communication Strategy Curated content Midline and endline Reports
To what extent did the information campaign meet its objective to help migrants make well informed decisions?	Project Staff Project Service Provider	KIIs - semi-structured	Project MEL Data Midline and endline Reports Alpha Phase Report AVRR and face-to-face sessions evaluations Kobo dataset
Which messages, channels and methods (both online and offline) were the most effective in reaching and engaging migrants?	Project Staff Project Service Provider	KIIs - semi-structured	Midline and endline Reports Alpha Phase Report Campaign dashboard
What internal or external factors may have influenced the performance of the campaign?	IOM- Management Project Service Provider	KIIs - semi-structured	Midline Report Alpha Phase Report Quarterly reports
To what extent has IOM and partners adapted to external factors and changes to ensure the achievements of the targeted results?	Donor Project Liaisons IOM- Management	KIIs - semi-structured	Alpha Phase Report Quarterly reports

Key Learning / Research Question	Key Respondent	Tool(s)	Desk Review Documents (if applicable)
Implementation: Impact			
Are the beneficiaries reached through the campaign satisfied with the information received? Were they reached via the most trusted messengers? How is the campaign brand perceived among migrants?	Project Staff	KIIs - semi-structured	Project MEL Data (Evaluation) Alpha Phase Report
Is there a change (or changes) in the intentions of migrants in the WB regarding irregular migration that is attributable to the campaign?	IOM Management Project Staff	KIIs - semi-structured	Midline and endline Reports AVRR and face-to-face sessions evaluations Kobo datasets
Is there an increase in the number of migrants in the WB that seek information about the IOM AVRR programme that is attributable to the campaign?	IOM Management Project Service Providers	KIIs - semi-structured	
Is there an increase in the number of migrants in the WB that return to their country of origin through the IOM AVRR programme that is attributable to the campaign?	Project Staff	KIIs - semi-structured	
What is the likely contribution of this project to observed changes, considering also other factors?	Project Staff Project Service Providers	KIIs - semi-structured	N/A
Were the project's activities undertaken and outputs delivered on time?	Donor Project Staff	KIIs - semi-structured	Project Progress reports
Did the project manage to address changes in the situation on the ground and needs of beneficiaries?	IOM Management Project Staff	KIIs - semi-structured	Project Progress reports
Implementation: Efficacy (cost)			
How was the budget allocated and prioritised across the channels and deliverables of the project? How do budgets allocated align with the campaign's objectives? How were budgets allocated to establishing evidence across the Theory of Change?	IOM Management	KIIs - semi-structured	Budgets provided in 'Revised Project documentation' (actuals unavailable)
Sustainability			
What evidence exists to support the longer-term impact of the campaign? Can the sustainability of results be measured in the project's lifetime?	IOM Management Project Staff Project Service Provider Project partners Advisory Board	KIIs - semi-structured	Project Final Evaluation Plan
Did the campaign activities work in synergy/-complementarity with similar projects/activities implemented in targeted countries of origin, or along the route (IOM or others)?	IOM Management Project Liaisons Project Staff Project partners Advisory Board	KIIs - semi-structured	N/A
What other synergies and linkages with state authorities and other stakeholders/donor community could be made in future campaigns?	Donor IOM Management Project Staff Project partners Advisory Board	KIIs - semi-structured	Independent Research

1	Campaign Preliminary Research
2	WBAware Revised Project Document
3	WBAware Baseline Report
4	WBAware Midline Report
5	Alpha Phase - Campaign Report
6	Impact Evaluation Plan
7	WBAware Communications Strategy
8	Video content, websites, infographics and other audio-visual content
9	WBAware Project Document
10	Info Sessions Evaluation Monitoring Tool
11	Evaluation Form
12	WBAware Endline Report Draft
13	WBAware Datasets: BOSNIA Preliminary research BOSNIA Baseline BOSNIA Midline BOSNIA Endline AUSTRIA Baseline SERBIA Midline SERBIA Endline
14	WBAware Progress Reports

Limitations

The evaluation has potential limitations.

The findings presented below are based on review of project documents as well as information discovered during interviews with key informants. The evaluation team was however unable to reach direct beneficiaries of the campaign, despite multiple attempts by IOM management to identify returnee migrants via the AVRR campaign (who had indicated they had seen the WBAware campaign) and the evaluation team setting up time, platforms (both Google meet and Whatsapp) to attempt to approach such respondents. This limitation was also a consequence of the high turnover of migrants in the Western Balkan Countries - since direct beneficiaries of the campaign could not be traced across the implementation geographies. Hence, a principal limitation of this evaluation is that it was not able to include qualitative insights directly sourced from direct beneficiaries of project activities.

Furthermore, given the design and sampling frame followed by the research and MEL service provider, it was challenging to determine changes in key achievement metrics; i.e. statistically significant calculations were not possible, given the number of respondents who were also direct beneficiaries of the project.

Lastly, all findings supported by evidence discovered during KIIs may have been influenced by Respondent Bias based on social desirability. Key Informants could understandably be careful with sharing any information which they perceive to be hampering the working relationship shared among project partners, especially given the significant investment already put forward towards the project. The same biases could also have influenced respondents of the baseline, midline and endline survey, as migrants in transit can understandably exaggerate reviews of a campaign run by IOM when also accessing crucial services provided by IOM teams in TRCs.

Findings

Campaign Design and Objectives

The campaign's overarching objectives aligned with the EU portfolio's funding goals for managing irregular migration. Two key examples of this alignment are the "renewed EU action plan against migrant smuggling (2021-2025)" and the "New Pact on Migration and Asylum" by the EU. The campaign's goals align with portfolio goals of managing migration through border control, responsibility-sharing, and solidarity, at the same time, addressing the root causes of irregular migration and disrupting the business model of smugglers and traffickers. The campaign supports these objectives by raising awareness of the dangers of irregular migration and promoting attitudes and behaviours that discourage it. In addition, the campaign helped the EU's strategy to increase voluntary return and reintegration by providing migrants open to AVRR with information and guidance about how to access AVRR services.

More specific objectives can help increase measurability in future campaigns

The campaign was funded by AMIF to address "objective number ii. Support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals." The proposal suggested that "by informing migrants on risks of irregular migration, the action will aim to reduce such actions, while also informing migrants on legal mechanisms in place."

This translated to project documents primarily mentioning the campaign objective being "raising awareness on risks and dangers of irregular migrations among migrants transiting WB, and people considering migration in general". Documents also refer to changing behaviours concerning irregular migration, contributing to reducing further irregular migration flows and promoting durable solutions such as AVRR. Other mentions of behavioural changes include "To bring about perception, attitudinal and behavioural change among migrants".

Most Key Informants agreed that the campaign's main goal was to raise awareness about the dangers of irregular migration and share information about the AVRR programme. In addition, others also highlighted the objective of managing migration flows, particularly preventing irregular migration to Austria and the European Union. Additionally, a few KIIs mentioned promoting safety and a rights-based approach to migration, focusing on encouraging low-risk decision-making. Most informants agreed that behaviour change was outside the scope of this campaign.

“Behaviour change isn't just an outcome from this one campaign; its larger geo-political framework- a change of perceptions among migrants was beyond the scope of the campaign”.

Key informant

The evaluation team could not identify a more specific agreed upon definition of the type of perception, attitudinal and behavioural change the campaign aimed for. It seemed that the type of behavioural changes aimed for were abandonment of irregular migration plans, looking for regular routes or taking up voluntary return. Reflections elicited during KIIs further clarified that other shorter-term behavioural changes considered as successful included: repeat participation in information sessions; information seeking attempts registered with protection officers, representatives of AVRRO or legal aid organisations; and accessing psychological support services at the TRCs.

This suggests that there is an opportunity to define campaign objectives more narrowly in the future. More effective campaign objectives would clearly identify the intended effects of the campaign on a specific target audience; be realistically achievable within the intended timeframe; and should refer to a measurable future. For the current campaign, mentioning the intended behavioural change for a more specific audience could have represented an improvement. Donor and implementer agreement on clear campaign objectives would facilitate the overall achievement of campaign objectives.

Campaign effectiveness can be defined and measured in a more systematic manner

Like campaign objectives, the definition of the campaign's effectiveness was also rather broad, and understandings of campaign effectiveness differed across KIIs. When asked about campaign effectiveness, most KIIs referred to the project team's ability to adapt to a challenging environment including the COVID-19 pandemic-related restrictions, as well as efforts to adapt the original proposal to better fit the beneficiaries' needs. Other KIIs focused on the reach of the online campaign while acknowledging that specific behaviour change lacked evidence. Implementer KIIs emphasised the value of video content in fostering emotional connections and rapport building with migrants.

While social media metrics provide useful insights into the reach of an online campaign, they can be limited in understanding how the posts are interpreted by the audience. For the online campaign, the indicators to determine the campaign's effectiveness included reach, watch time and views (for videos), link clicks for Facebook posts, Facebook page followers, and engagements. While such metrics are useful to see if posts are popular, they provide little insight into reactions to posts and the subsequent impact on a recipient after seeing a post or video.

“The campaign objectives were quite clear: to reach the people with the messages; the internal KPI as well as campaign KPIs were exceeded”.

Key informant

“We had some Key Performance indicators, but not in terms of the numbers - [our goal was to] reach as many people as possible.”

Key informant

There are several possible methods for improving the measurement of social media impact in future campaigns, including monitoring comments and conducting surveys on social media platforms. While survey responses may have limited reach, they can still offer valuable insights into audience reception. Sentiment analysis of comments could help assess social media behaviour. Most notably, as discussed during a KII, social-media usage data indicates that digital awareness and use of internet-enabled devices is high among users in the WB region. Although profiling these users might be challenging, efforts can be made to characterise users and estimate the population's reactions to content through strategic pre-testing.

Beyond the online metrics, data collection by CREDI provided information on the campaign's effectiveness. Data collection at baseline, midline and endline assessed the effectiveness of the campaign by analysing a) the extent to which the information campaign has reached the target audience, b) the level of migrants' awareness and understanding related to risks of irregular migrations as a result of the campaign. Assessment was based on cross-sectional data collected in Temporary Reception Centres (TRCs).

While CREDI's data collection was effective in addressing research questions, sampling could be further improved. Few individuals CREDI spoke to were actual beneficiaries of the campaign. In BiH, only 31.5% (39 of 124) of migrants surveyed during the midline were aware of the campaign, compared to 17.2% (21 of 125) at the endline. Similarly, in Serbia, 17.6% (22 of 125) of migrants reported their awareness during the midline, while slightly less than 10% (12 of 125) did so at the endline. Possible suggestions for enhancing data collection include increased sample sizes and efforts that would allow the collection of measurements from the same group of migrants at each point in time. Currently, each measurement is taken from a different group of migrants, based on a convenience sample of migrants present in TRCs at the time of measurement. This limitation was also a consequence of the high turnover of migrants in the Western Balkan Countries - since direct beneficiaries of the campaign could not be traced across the implementation geographies. While it's difficult to maintain contact with people, especially migrants in transit who often move within a short time frame, efforts to stay in touch with people through phone numbers and/or social media, would significantly benefit over time analyses.

Increased MEL capacities can provide future campaigns with a stronger evidence base

Initial proposals and the inception report appeared to not include pre-committed measurements and many MEL activities were defined on an *ad hoc* basis. This included mostly using a framework supplied by Fabrika, the company implementing the social media strategy. KIIs explained that no particular indicators were defined in the beginning because this was a pilot project.

Campaigns will benefit from strengthening linkages between objectives and the services contracted to different providers. In future, MEL activities could be predefined and include specific metrics/indicators in alignment with the design and implementation methodology, with target groups defined and recommended (listed as objective 1.1, baseline report). It appears that, during the baseline phase, CREDI focused on objective 1.1, and did not define the KPIs and a full MEL plan as part of Objective 1.2. (monitor and assess campaign at baseline, midline and endline). The current approach would be much enhanced with the support of a comprehensive MEL plan that:

- links research with a specific problem statement to be addressed by the campaign along with key entry points for programming (e.g. improving knowledge of realities in destination countries);
- outlines a specific set of impact pathways into a Theory of Change;
- helps create KPIs which, when tracked over implementation, can establish systematic evidence along the campaign's intended Theory of Change;
- Determines which data points will be collected when, and to evidence which level (output vs outcome) of result achievement;
- improve evidence for effectiveness with predefined metrics for achievement set early in the project's inception phase.

The project team experienced significant delays in contracting a research and monitoring service provider due to the lack of offers/responses to the call for applications. GMDAC provided MEL expertise, but KIIs suggested that their involvement in this campaign was high-level due to their small team size and involvement in other IOM campaigns. It appears that GMDAC is not mandated, nor has the capacity to lead and support granular MEL on specific campaigns. Two GMDAC analysts worked intermittently to review ToRs, data collection tools, reports etc. and a representative was involved in supervising CREDI's baseline data collection. However, there was no continuous, dedicated, involvement with implementation teams and management on an ongoing basis. This required significant effort from project management to secure MEL support and services from the existing infrastructure.

“(We were) not really involved (and didn't) know about the adaptations or the actual implementation of the campaign”

Key informant

The project would have benefitted from continuous monitoring and the presence of MEL staff for the entirety of the project. As an approach to address future MEL needs on projects, hiring an internal MEL consultant from inception to evaluation would ensure ongoing monitoring and help to

validate whether the project is achieving its intended goals. It would also reduce coordination efforts between different MEL experts. This resource can also help IOM management map existing sources of data across teams (e.g., Protection Office, Communication, MHPSS) and enable periodic aggregation to evidence the achievement of a particular campaign across different components. Such a resource would provide reliable and credible data quality assurance.

“We didn’t have enough resources to adapt the MEL system based on the findings. The team was overburdened with just design and negotiations, so we focused on communicating reliable information - what can be done and what cannot be done.”

Key informant

In some cases, *ad hoc* data collection was planned for existing data sources. A project document says that “MHPSS focal points will enable the Project Team to quickly capture any changes in migrants’ perceptions and improve the overall quality of messages delivered through the campaign. Focal points will report to Project Team if in conversation with migrants they notice any changes in migrants’ understanding of risks of irregular migrations.” However, the evaluation team was unable to find a systematic mechanism (outside of meetings which may have internal documentation) to collect, analyse, present lessons from such a source of data. KIIs revealed that an integration of existing data sources was considered entirely out of scope for the service provider’s engagement.

From the KIIs, it instead appears that IOM’s Protection Officers maintain a monthly log of questions which migrants at TRCs ask repeatedly, as well as risks and issues which seem to repeatedly trend across migrant groups. It seems that such insights can be very useful for campaign implementers, and the process by which they are collated, analysed further, and linked to implementation planning can be improved. If such inputs are systematically collected into a central repository, and linked to a clear monthly protocol by which inputs are processed for action, it would provide a key database to identify emerging trends in information seeking behaviour as a direct result of campaign activities⁹.

“Tracking beneficiaries in transit is very difficult; even with all the resources, money and time, a project can end up with invalid data since migrants do not want to share data as they continue their journeys.”

Key informant

Investing more in on-going monitoring and the immediate impact could support better adaptations and identify disconnects between project objectives and operational circumstances. For example, the ‘Evaluation Form’ for information sessions collected data to establish participants’ self-reported gain in understanding of concepts and topics, perceived usefulness of information sessions, prior exposure to “Migrants Talk to Migrants” videos or content, usefulness of the campaign’s general content, perceived truthfulness of the campaign as a source of

⁹ Monthly reports are shared with project’s manager, coordinator, and assistant via a regional online repository (process introduced in February 2023). Our recommendation is to define protocols for its consequent use and integration into reporting and decision-making.

information, and whether they would like to receive similar sessions. Based on the reviewed Evaluation Form monthly summary sheet, the evaluation team recommends:

- **Establishing data quality assurance.** The 'total respondents' row was missing from the data which made for a difficult independent assessment of numbers reported across answer options of each question.
- **Ways to improve implementation approaches by target group.** The data does not allow for the implementation team to determine which target group (either by language, migrant profile or even TRC) has benefited from a better understanding of concepts. The relative gains across target groups could help the team standardise approaches and quality across translators, cultural mediators and protection officers.
- **Capturing evidence on shorter-term outcomes.** A simple Likert-scale or multiple-choice question would gauge the types of immediate outcomes the information session was achieving among the target audience. Specifically, a question to explore how many participants were willing to take expected "next-steps", although self-reported, would establish evidence of shorter-term outcomes.
- **Contributing to longer-term outcome assessment.** Missed opportunity to collect consent and then contact information on migrants willing to provide independent feedback to research partners.

Preliminary research can identify key knowledge gaps and inform all campaign components more strategically in the future

Preliminary research included focus group discussions (FGDs) with 30 migrants accommodated in two TRCs in BiH. The main objective of the FGDs was to gather information from migrants regarding their perceptions of actual risks of irregular migration, as well as sources of information used before their travel and upon arrival in BiH. The choice of using this kind of preliminary research was influenced by COVID-19 restrictions and the postponement of contracting a research service provider.

“Focus Group discussions in camps provided preliminary research which was mostly used to inform the campaign. From these insights Fabrika developed the communication strategy - this process took an enormous amount of time”

Key informant

The rationale for selecting BiH was sound for the preliminary research as it is often the last transit country before entering the EU. The sampling of migrants was based on convenience as the cultural mediators available to the team were fluent in Arabic and Persian. It ought to be noted that while Arabic covers many countries of origin, cultural differences are known to be key drivers of knowledge, attitudes and behaviour - and hence future preliminary research may want to consider covering a wider range of language.

The preliminary research conducted was effective in identifying information sources used by migrants, key knowledge gaps on migration, and classifying the risks associated with irregular migration. Specifically, the research generated valuable information regarding migration drivers, knowledge of risks and dangers, and the linkage between these factors and migration decisions. Additionally, the research yielded insights into the likelihood of discouraging fellow countrymen from

embarking on irregular migration journeys and the likelihood of continuing one's own migration journey. The research also uncovered differences in perceptions of risks and linked migration behaviour between single males vs. individuals with families, and Arabic vs non-Arabic speakers. Further, the research found that migrants find information provided on digital platforms is not always reliable although usage is high.

Baseline research could further improve benchmarking of campaign achievement in the future.

It seems that future campaigns could further refine the baseline research objectives to: (i) test campaign messaging using the early sets of videos; (ii) use Knowledge, Attitude and Perception (KAP) tools to measure gaps in target audiences based on exposure to pilot messages; and (iii) ultimately identify more nuanced sub-segments of the target audience beyond country of origin and language (eg. marital status, number of transit countries experienced, age group and gender).

Starting content creation and its communication strategy before finishing contextual research (due to contract and pandemic delays) may have hindered the campaign's intended evidence-based approach.

Findings from IOM's preliminary study and CREDI's baseline study could have informed the communication strategy of the campaign more. One reason was the delay in contracting the data collection company which resulted in the project team launching the campaign before the finalisation of data analysis to prevent further delays in project implementation. However, the intention was to integrate such analysis to refine the design of the campaign, at a later stage. The evaluation team could, however, not identify specific recommendations and action points from the analysis. KIIs indicated that communication strategy was based on other IOM research reports and the WBAware campaign's overall objectives. While the findings from the preliminary research study do not seem to have been included in the design of the communication strategy, the project team has shared that several actions were taken to implement findings from the midline research. Namely, adding a page on the campaign website with 'useful information' and adapting videos to share information on risks highlighted by migrants during midline focus group discussions.

“Baseline insights were helpful - we got a tip on journeys on land - what is happening and how fast they are moving in the offline world (in the field) - who is coming from where and in what population - then we knew who to look for and how. Profiling really shaped tracking and analysis of content efficacy”

Key informant

Implementation: Efficacy

Working with stakeholders who have expertise with social media and migrants in TRCs should be continued

Contracting Fabrika, a 3rd-party social media management service provider added strong technical expertise to the team. Fabrika had extensive experience with IOM campaigns, having implemented an AVRR campaign in the same region. As gathered from KIIs, Fabrika was a good fit as a communications service provider given their experience with digital marketing, and expertise in leveraging various social media channels to amplify reach of campaign content for online consumption. Fabrika was able to provide project management with various insights throughout the 'Alpha' phase, which informed project adaptations. Project documents also refer to the positive feedback Fabrika received from project partners on the video content generated from migrants in TRCs.

“Fabrika is a good-fit. They know the basis of the IOM approach”

Key informant

Using the existing setup of TRCs to conduct information sessions was impactful in building rapport and trust with migrants. The sessions showed videos and discussed the risks of irregular migration followed by interaction-based activities to explore migrants' individual journeys and aspirations. Each migrant marked on a map their journey from their home country to their destination. Based on the journeys and aspirations uncovered, session facilitators including IOM protection officers, AVRR representatives and Lawyers from Vasa Prava (Legal aid organisation), provided the group with details on available legal alternatives and how to access them at the TRC. The information sessions which utilised the campaign videos formed a good basis on which to start discussions with migrants on their potential journey or return options.

It is noteworthy that IOM Protection Officers, AVRR representatives and Vasa Prava lawyers have been conducting such sessions for some years now. KIIs revealed that staff carefully selected specific videos from the campaign to show during information sessions, ensuring they were not harshly trauma-triggering in nature. The evaluation team did not see documentation on which videos were used. Such an overview would have allowed for comprehensive lessons for the larger communications and content strategy of future campaigns, especially when combining videos and in-person components. Efficacy of video content during in-person information sessions, versus online, would have helped management understand how structure and messaging of information sessions can be improved.

Audiences represented migrant profiles well; future campaigns should further distinguish audiences into subgroups

Audiences in this campaign were initially defined by language. For the social media campaign, Fabrika was given the responsibility of defining audience segments further with little guidance or distinction regarding social characteristics and vulnerabilities. The target group was defined as “all people speaking these languages with affinity towards migration”. KIs revealed that most project actors were satisfied with this targeting approach, believing that the language spoken could be one primary factor which could address multiple logistical realities (such as the proportion of nationalities represented in the target region and the capacity of digital tools available for reaching such populations). However, many KIs acknowledged the limits to this approach and mentioned that the benefit of less specific targeting was the improved accessibility of video materials and messaging to migrants. When it came to the in-person sessions as well, the teams could not select the most relevant migrants (most in need or most likely to access services) but invited anyone who expressed an interest.

CREDI’s research pointed out some differences between profiles (e.g. marital status and family size), but did not make specific recommendations on how to incorporate these differences into the campaign. They also found that the most significant gaps in knowledge about the realities of destination countries was among Afghans and Pakistanis who were the most likely to expect gaining citizenship in these countries. They also found that younger migrants (those under 24 years old) are more vulnerable to forced labour, kidnapping, and trafficking compared to their older counterparts. Messaging could have been adapted accordingly.

Identifying and narrowing down audiences can benefit future campaigns. This could mean going from a broad audience such as “transit migrants in the WB” to more specific demographics. That’s important because a 35-year-old male former farmer from a rural area with four children is unlikely to respond to certain messaging in the same way as a 21-year-old single female university student from a city centre. Moving from “transit migrants in the WB” to more specific demographics allows for more targeted and tailored messages and interventions.

“(…) Best reach videos (were a) reflection of nationalities present in the WB. The content and messaging were very similar. They had shared experiences.”

Key informant

Using videos on Youtube and promoting them through Facebook allows reaching a large audience

The main channels utilised were YouTube and Facebook with content including videos, a meticulously curated playlist in migrant languages, and text-based content¹⁰. To promote the

¹⁰ The campaign evolved from using English content on Facebook posts in 2022 to releasing the content (videos and posts) in targeted languages in addition to English. It was important for the campaign to improve access of people to campaign content on social media, by not only ensuring that videos were recorded in native languages but that they were also released on platforms using the same language posts.

videos and playlists effectively, the campaign website prominently featured video stories with the support of Instagram and Google adwords. The videos were designed to include a range of elements that have been proven to be effective in engaging with migrants including, for example, producing videos in the audiences' languages with actual migrants serving as the messengers. This is likely to have increased the credibility and trustworthiness of the videos and is in line with IOM's focus on peer-to-peer communication. The choice of messengers within the videos was also well-considered, as research suggests that trusted communicators can have a significant impact. The length of the videos was also deemed appropriate, and helped increase their visibility and reach.

“The videos add a lot of emotion that may move people. The movies are emotional, they are not really about facts, but about how bad it can get. People make decisions not just based on rationale, but based on emotional considerations.”

Key informant

The videos were well-executed, featuring simple, clear, relatable and authentic testimonies from the field . The use of real migrants and real experiences likely made it easy for many migrant viewers to identify with the content and feel connected to the message being conveyed. The campaign messages were designed to appeal to a broad audience of migrants by covering a wide range of relevant topics. Campaign videos were effective in following best practices for media campaigns by being short and impactful. By using emotional messaging and an empowering slogan that leaves the decision up to migrants, the videos encourage a call to action as recommended in campaigns. Additionally, the use of videos, as opposed to articles, aligns with current recommendations for maximum impact.

“I see their faces when they are watching the videos, I can tell they are listening intently and are very emotionally invested. I also see them asking a lot of questions and interacting in the group later. Videos certainly help connect emotionally and start conversations.”

Key informant

Content for in-person programming (i.e. information sessions) can be further adapted to emphasise the call for action. While sharing videos and conducting interactive activities help build rapport (usually taking up 1.5 hours of the session's 2 hours), our analysis of the sessions' alignment with the larger objective suggests that there exists an opportunity to redesign sessions to allow more time for AVRR and Vasa Prava to present legal facts and options (assuming a larger objective to counter misinformation with a clear understanding of legal alternatives and raise awareness on AVRR as an option). Hence more time and space is recommended for such options to be discussed; or the session could be ended with clear messaging on “Come to an AVRR session / Legal-aid session” or “Make a one-on-one appointment”. Video and printed content of future campaigns can be developed along similar lines to specifically target migrants in TRCs and encourage legal alternatives or voluntary return.

While broad and long-lasting messages are great for a broad audience, future campaigns can create more targeted content

The messages defined were relevant within a changing migration landscape. In the current context and especially in transit countries, one of the challenges of developing effective communication strategies for migration is the constantly evolving dynamics of migration trends as underlying drivers of migration, such as push/pull factors, policies, and values are constantly evolving. To overcome this challenge, communication messaging should be organised around types of risks that are likely to remain constant for a certain period (e.g. 2 years). The evaluation team found those defined by this campaign's preliminary research (journey related risks, violence risks, psychological trauma risks) to be clean and trackable such risks.

Analysis of KIIs revealed that most interviewees believed that a better balance between positive and negative messaging could have been achieved. While positive messaging was considered important by many KIIs, it was noted that the European Union (EU) had required emphasis to be prioritised on communication of risks in the messaging. This was especially challenging for an audience of transit migrants who were principally in need of information on alternatives rather than the risks they had already faced and were very much aware of.

“Campaign needs to be much bigger, (and to) concentrate on the advantages of staying in the origin country”

Key informant

The campaign messages had a broad appeal, but could have been tailored to specific subgroups. Different migrant groups have unique challenges, experiences, and motivations for migrating, and creating more targeted content could have increased the impact of the campaign. Additionally, it was noted that the intro and outro of the videos were in English, which could have made the videos less effective for migrants with weaker English skills. The content recorded for the campaign could have been segregated into two categories for each language group, targeting single men and families separately. This approach would have aligned the online content with the in-person information sessions and made the campaign messages more relatable in some instances.

Effective planning and training improved the quality of information sessions

Information sessions were well planned on the basis of beneficiary needs, which were identified by research. During the planning of information sessions, the most important messages identified were expectations in countries of destinations, legal status, human trafficking, and gender-based violence. These topics were identified from midline data analysis in BiH. Based on KIIs, the evaluation team understands that the sessions lasted 2-hours with 1.5 hours dedicated to showing "Migrants Talk to Migrants" videos and building rapport (interactive activities and discussions), leaving only 10-15 minutes for AVRR and Vasa Prava representatives to present information on statuses and options. It is recommended to either split the rapport building and information sessions or add a dedicated follow-up session.

The training and preparedness of the teams conducting in-person information sessions was significantly improved by workshops organised in 2023. According to KIIs, protection officers initially underwent training with IOM without AVRR or Vasa Prava representatives. Noting a lack of information flow between IOM and its field partners, interviews confirmed that the Belgrade-based workshop approaches for the information sessions attended by facilitators from different countries and TRCs proved beneficial in several ways. It allowed for role-playing exercises and helped establish a common understanding of how efforts can be combined, information shared, and lessons learned to achieve mutual objectives. To further enhance the effectiveness of these workshops, it may be worthwhile to include a MEL component to assist with standardisation of data collection processes across all TRCs which would, in turn, facilitate evidence gathering for continuous learning, adaptation, evaluation, and programming.

Future campaigns should allow for more message testing and adapting throughout the campaign period

The Alpha phase could have informed the Beta phase. Although the Alpha phase report provides metrics and answers to learning questions, it could have also offered recommendations. For instance, while the report highlights which types of videos were popular among migrants, it does not provide many insights on the significance/meaning of these findings. Furthermore, the evaluation team could not identify how they were used to improve the campaign in the Beta phase, aside from additions made to the website and to the approach to filming additional videos. Nonetheless, the report sheds light on valuable data such as the effectiveness of the campaign in reaching its intended audience as well as the videos that resonated with them.

During the Alpha phase of the social media campaign, 60 videos were tested for six months. The team tested two key performance indicators: watch time and tracking optimization. KIIs revealed that tracking and optimization were critical on a day to day basis. The team also had to adjust what content could be communicated as per Meta and Google policies, which prohibited the inclusion of sad or harmful content. Based on the results in the Alpha phase, the best-performing videos (most views) were then circulated both in the WB and countries of origin. Overall, the team prioritised testing of videos over multiple months, tracking reach and optimization of content to strategic platforms to determine the most effective messaging.

The involvement of multiple partners that included international organisations and governments, had an influence on the campaign. Several KIIs suggested that there may have been a mismatch between the theory of campaign that was based on flexible and adaptable messaging, versus the strengths and weaknesses of international organisations and member state governments. Such institutions typically do not provide decisions at the speed that the campaign theory requires¹¹. Being unable to nimbly change strategy in response to emerging findings from social media analytics left the campaign less flexible and struggling to adapt to changing situations on the ground. For example, it took 6 to 7 months to get the original campaign strategy approved. Similarly, ToRs for evidence and research service providers required more than 2 months of the project team's valuable time during the campaign's inception phase.

The findings suggest that the involvement of international organisations and donors in a campaign could benefit from a different approach. This may require re-evaluating the campaign strategy to

¹¹ The contract signed with the donor was a grant agreement, which allowed for limited flexibility and required donor approval and formal revisions for changes in project implementation.

ensure it aligns with the practical realities of working with multiple international stakeholders. The nature of EU funding requires a focused campaign, but this limits the ability to adapt messaging and respond to the needs of the target groups during the campaign itself. Overall, it is important to consider the practical implications of the different levels of involvement of international organisations and donors in a campaign and to adjust the approach accordingly. While a focused campaign may be necessary to meet the funding requirements, allowing for greater flexibility where possible could improve the campaign's effectiveness and impact in a timely manner.

Despite delays, the project team effectively adapted the campaign to address emerging contextual changes

COVID-19 led to significant delays in the project's start, impacting all IOM activities in the WB region during the first quarter of 2021. Many IOM staff members (including those in Human Resources) contracted COVID-19, causing recruitment delays for project staff. The pandemic also hindered field activities and access to reception centres due to government-imposed restrictions. The kick-off event was postponed to early April 2021, and other project components such as hiring the research team, implementing inception research, and developing a continuous monitoring plan experienced delays.

The project team efficiently adapted to changing logistical circumstances throughout the campaign. COVID-19 lockdowns impacted the inception research activities. In response, the Project Team devised an intermediary solution to conduct preliminary research on gaps in migrants' knowledge on the risks of irregular migration. The solution was a change in methodology and a decision to conduct FGDs in a way that would allow the Advisory Board to maintain an overview of the gaps while also identifying potential messengers for the campaign from FGDs participants.

Additional delays occurred as a result of the influx of Ukrainian refugees in Austria and coordination challenges in recruiting suppliers for implementing the communication strategy and overseeing the monitoring, evaluation, and learning aspects of the overall project. The influx of Ukrainian refugees and the urgent reception needs led to postponements in obtaining authorization from the Austrian authority responsible for migrant reception to film new migrant stories, and consequently delayed video production. Moreover, the project partners' involvement in developing the ToRs for the information campaign, monitoring, and assessment extended the development process from April 2021 until August 2021 due to extensive coordination and consultation between the Advisory Board and the project team. These factors contributed to the overall project delays.

To address the difficulties in obtaining authorization from the Austrian authority, the IOM team explored filming options in other countries, gathered additional video materials previously produced by IOM, and promoted them through the online campaign. Despite the challenges, the project team proposed to expand the campaign by adding 15 videos of migrants from nationalities which were seen to increase representation in migration trends. Migrants from Cuba, India, and Burundi were then approached to create videos with. This was aimed at addressing the emerging trends while informing additional migrant groups about the risks of irregular migration and the possibilities of voluntary return with IOM support.

The team created videos that responded to new emerging nationalities being represented in migration trends and expanded the campaign to countries of origin, resulting in successful adaptations.

KIIs and reports suggested that the campaign adaptations planned and implemented for the project could have better integrated key lessons and evidence-based recommendations. As an example, the midline report by CREDI presented recommendations following the midline report. These included, amongst others, publicising solution-focused information on regular migration, increasing access to information and counselling services, piloting campaign material in countries of origin, using auditory formats of messages in native languages, monitoring video watch time, linking campaign material to official sites, balancing negative stories with positive ones, and providing information on destination countries. KIIs seemed to suggest that adaptations in the Beta phase were based primarily on insights generated from Fabrika's platform monitoring framework which was considered far reaching and representative of the target audience. Adapting the programme based on CREDI's recommendations could have also proven valuable. Future campaigns will benefit from clear protocols on exactly how qualitative and quantitative data sources are intended to supplement each other to respond to the campaign's learning agenda(s).

“There is a need to standardise (the approach to the information sessions), scale up and give to other service providers. Some might say "can't do more than the 3 days" - a shift in attitudes and knowledge awareness and behaviour is required to shift from a needs based to a rights based approach. Such campaigns certainly contribute to this shift.”

Key informant

12

Overall, the project team attempted and succeeded to an extent in adapting the campaign to emerging contextual challenges and to the evidence presented by service providers. This also meant that the campaign adapted significantly away from its original target audience. Instead of creating more content to meet the needs of transit migrants stranded in the WB (as suggested by the midline report), the team had to find a target audience for whom the content created was most relevant and useful (potential migrants in countries of origin). As explained in multiple KIIs, the option to create communication content to inform transit migrants of their legal rights and options, or success stories in accessing the same, via mass media, was entirely out of scope for donor approval.

Integration of language diversity into content was a crucial element of the campaign's contextualization success. This approach meant creating content that resonated with migrants in their home-country languages. KIIs frequently highlighted this aspect of contextualization, emphasising the use of IOM staff in TRCs as cultural mediators for joint information sessions. For example, protection officers fluent in Farsi, Urdu (extendable to Hindi and Bengali speakers), and Punjabi were able to plan sessions tailored to the unique needs of migrants from Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh. These protection officers were not only interested in understanding the varying contexts but were also highly aware of the migrants' needs. They sought to learn from each other, specifically in terms of addressing the influx of migrants from Burundi.

¹² Clarifications on quote: “There is a need to standardise (the approach to the information sessions across all actors/organisations working in TRCs), scale up (MtM approach) and give to other service providers (in the ecosystem, working with transit migrants in the region). Some (actors) might say "can't do more than the 3 days" (migrants don't stay, so programming cannot be effective) - a shift in attitudes and knowledge awareness and behaviour is required (among actors working with migrants) to shift from a needs based to a rights based approach. Such campaigns (WBAWARE) certainly contribute to this (very needed) shift. ”

Implementation: Impact

Social media can reach large amounts of people; including source countries can increase engagement with risk messaging

Social media was the most effective when it came to reaching a large number of migrants.

Youtube was also impactful in its reach numbers. Between January 2022 and March 2023, the online campaign's web page had over 5,000 unique views, its Youtube channel had 635 unique subscribers, its Facebook page had 535 followers and its top post on the latter platform had reached 473,000 users, generating an engagement with nearly 12,000 of them - specifically eliciting click-throughs from Facebook to Youtube videos to further content among nearly 9k. Videos hosted on the channel had views in the range of 70 - 277,000, with overall 4.5 million views generated across 108 videos.

Pivoting to source countries marginally improved engagement with those reached via the campaign for a lower cost.

In the Alpha phase, the campaign spent Euros €89 per click on content shared via Facebook, effectively converting 0.4% of those reached into taking the 'next step' to seek further information¹³. In the Beta phase, the campaign reach was higher, but the proportion of that reach being converted into 'clicks' (and its cost) more or less remained the same¹⁴. In 2023, once the campaign officially scaled to target countries of origin, the cost of converting a person into taking the 'next step' reduced to one-third €21.90 per click while the conversion rate (proportion of those reached who clicked on content to seek more information) increased by 25%¹⁵. Future campaigns are recommended to continue benchmarking against these findings to evaluate the trade-off between budget expenditure and reach pay-offs. This benchmarking can also be strengthened by conducting similar analysis of other IOM awareness campaigns.

Future campaigns should analyse video reach by subgroups and subthemes before scaling up.

It seemed that the highest-reach videos were used for further programming and scaling up. 4 out of 10 videos were in Arabic. The Arabic videos that were scaled included a good mix of messaging with different end messages of the videos and covering different types of risks. However, for Pakistani Urdu speakers, the scaled videos only covered journey-related risks. Choosing videos for scaling based solely on reach can miss chances to speak to certain audiences and inform them about the variety of risks. Assessing video reach by sub risks and audiences is recommended to determine which videos to promote in source countries.

Campaign videos have relevance to target groups and the potential to prompt information seeking behaviours and exploration of alternatives

While specific subgroups of transit migrants may have benefitted from the videos, it seems unclear if campaign videos presented new information for transit migrants suggesting that content may need different information to prompt behavioural change. Regrettably, CREDI's M&E efforts could not use a representative sample of beneficiaries, with only 94 participants familiar with the campaign as part of CREDI's multi-country data collection at midline (61 out of 250 sampled)

¹³ Campaign's reach was 483K, with over 2000 clicks, while spending \$195,000.

¹⁴ Campaign's reach was 629K, with over 2000 clicks, while spending \$170,000, i.e \$85 per click.

¹⁵ Conversion rate in Alpha phase was 0.4%, and in 2023 was 0.5%. In 2023 the reach of the campaign was 3 million, with over 15,000 clicks, while spending \$361,000.

and endline (33 out of 250 sampled). However, among those identified, a significant percentage found the videos' information useful and credible. This was particularly the case in BiH where 87.2% (34 out of 39) and 86.4% (19 out of 22) considered it useful during midline and endline respectively, and in Serbia where all 22 respondents at midline found it useful and 72.7% (16 out of 22) considered it credible. Additionally, migrants who were familiar with the campaign seemed more informed about the risks and opportunities of migration than those who were not aware of it. While the sample methods and low sample sizes cannot speak to the representativeness of the findings, future campaigns should include mechanisms to identify subgroups of transit migrants who can benefit from such videos and identify the reasons for such benefits. For example, beneficiaries who in this case deemed the videos as useful may have felt understood or comforted by someone else like them having gone through a similar experience rather than because they provided new information

The endline data suggested value in studying the potential of videos to prompt migrants to take initial steps towards legal and safer options for migration. Analysis revealed that of those familiar with the campaign, migrants in BiH (8 out of 22 or 36.4%) and Serbia (11 out of 12 or 91.7%) reported that they looked for information on how to migrate regularly to their destination country. Additionally, 72.7% (16 out of 22) of respondents in BiH and 50% (6 out of 12) in Serbia sought more information on the risks of the journey after being exposed to the campaign. However, it is important to note that the data does not allow for definitive conclusions as to whether this was due to exposure to the campaign or other factors such as information-seeking behaviour, access to internet-enabled devices, or information networks. Additionally, the analysis linking awareness of risks to likelihood of losing money or facing violence has only been established via correlations and has not been subjected to statistical tests of significance, such as T-Tests or Anovas. Therefore, improved sampling methods and more in-depth study and analysis are required to determine whether such videos can prompt behavioural changes.

Similarly, CREDI interviewed a few offline session participants for the endline survey. In BiH, 8% (10 out of 125) of migrants surveyed confirmed their participation in offline sessions, with 60% (6 out of 10) of them reporting that they had used or applied the information acquired. However, it was not clear how they used the information. While the positive feedback from the small number of participants in the offline sessions is encouraging, the low participation rate and limited data on the effectiveness of the sessions highlight the need for further immediate or medium-term evaluation of the in-person sessions' impact and further exploration of how the information was used.

These findings support our initial analysis and recommendations regarding the campaign's theory of change and related communications and content strategy (see section on [campaign design](#)). Awareness raising campaigns such as 'Migrants Talk to Migrants' can benefit from developing and then tracking a logical flow of behaviour changes which amount to smaller, more immediate changes such as seeking information online or in-person, as opposed to more serious steps such as approaching an AVRR representative. While the campaign may have encouraged some migrants to explore legal and safer options, it is challenging to make generalisations about the campaign's audience. Therefore, it is important to continue investing in tracking possible behaviour changes, and establishing estimations of the impact of risk messaging on migrants in transit. The key to defining these indicators is to ensure including when, for whom, why, and how such messaging may encourage migrants to consider alternatives and which steps towards alternatives (e.g. initial versus serious steps).

It is necessary to go beyond standard social media metrics when measuring the impact of campaigns

It is difficult to determine the success of the social media component in helping migrants make well informed decisions or changing other behaviours due to the limitations of social media metrics. While the videos achieved a high watch time and generated 4.5 million views on the campaign's official YouTube Channel, the exact audience cannot be determined. Although the high average percentage viewed rate of 81.12% suggests that the videos were well-targeted, social media metrics do not provide enough information to determine if the intended audience was reached or how any of the videos impact viewers. When interviewees (KIIs) were asked about the impact of the campaign, many mentioned the 85% watch time indicator. Most were aware of little evidence available on how videos impacted migrant decision-making.

Facebook's overall reach was 450,000 people during the Alpha phase and 20,000 post engagements. Possible ways to improve measurements on social media without more resource investments could include focusing more on engagements in comments, posting more frequently, and also analysing these comments to see how people react. KIIs indicated that Fabrika also considered this a potential way forward. Posting more often, and A/B testing of posts, could have given an even wider reach for relatively low-cost investments.

Future campaigns should focus on clear and actionable messages

Migrants did not appear interested in receiving information about AVRR and videos were limited in their capacity to promote AVRR. According to one interviewee (KII), migrants were often averse to discussing AVRR during in-person sessions. While the campaign featured YouTube videos suggesting that migrants should look into AVRR, they did not redirect viewers to a link on AVRR, and the video description box was not translated to the local language. Even if the videos aroused interest in AVRR amongst viewers, they did not facilitate access to further information that might result in immediate behavioural change, such as seeking further information. Additionally, this limited the campaign's ability to measure success through click-through rates.

Garnering interest in AVRR remains a challenging task. One interviewee (KII) suggested that the initial general belief that exposing migrants to the terrifying risks of migration would encourage a significant portion to opt for the AVRR programme was incorrect. Another noted that there has not been a significant increase in the number of migrants seeking information about the AVRR programme since the campaign began with interest consistently remaining low. Endline data corroborates this claim, as only 4 (<10%) out of 45 respondents who had been exposed to the online campaign reported looking for information on AVRR after seeing the campaign's material, and only 2 out of 45 reported considering applying for it. Across all three assessments conducted in BiH, an almost identical percentage (PRE 31.5%; MID 31.5%; END 32%) of migrants reported they have at times considered going back home in the past four months.

“For migrants, AVRR is perceived as deportation. (Often when) we are trying to inform them... they are not ready to listen. Only if I say “may God never show you the day” - then they at least listen”

Key informant

Focusing solely on risks could have limited the campaign's impact. While understanding risks is necessary, it is equally important to provide a perspective for those who know the risks. Most interviewees agreed on a potential misalignment of the campaign with beneficiary needs. Many recognized that raising awareness of irregular migration risks among migrants who already faced such risks might not be the most effective strategy. Meanwhile, field staff identified a disconnect between the video campaign and a rights-based approach to migrant protection for transit migrants' needs that leaned more towards legal alternatives for safe and secure routes. Several interviewees at donor and implementation team level emphasised the need to provide beneficiaries with additional alternatives, not only at the information provisioning level but also at the policy level.

“They (migrants) have already taken that journey and often they have reached their ultimate destination - so the painful experiences have already been faced”

Key informant

A social media campaign which includes promoting voluntary return should prioritise clear and accessible information about the process, enabling those interested to easily understand and access the necessary resources. Although it is likely that only a small percentage of individuals will seek voluntary return, it is crucial to make the process as straightforward as possible for those who do and, furthermore, identify those audiences. The campaign should also address concerns about being perceived as a failed migrant upon returning home. By showcasing successful reintegration stories, the campaign can inspire confidence in potential returnees and demonstrate the positive outcomes of choosing voluntary return. This approach not only provides practical guidance but also alleviates common fears associated with returning to one's home country.

The campaign might have presented a chance to document more of the risks migrants' failed attempts to enter EU and the realities of continuing journeys via legal or irregular routes. Migrants in videos and elsewhere have mentioned being stuck in TRCs for months and years although they did not speak about whether they were considering returning or migrating onwards.

Finally, added value of the campaign was observed in the use of the campaign videos by the Pakistan office of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Interviewees reported that the videos were used to sensitise government officials during a training session on trafficking and returnee management. The audience was engaged and the IOM Pakistan team reported that the videos contributed greatly to the overall objective of ensuring that authorities dealing with returnees could empathise with their journeys and experiences. This demonstrates that the campaign videos had an impact beyond their original intended audience, reaching and engaging government officials who play a crucial role in the management of returnees.

Implementation: Efficiency

The evaluation team used a data quality assurance check-list to establish the quality of the data collected by CREDI. The check-list assessed the datasets provided to gain insight across the following 5 data quality criteria:

Criteria	Examples of checks conducted	Findings
Validity	Verification of collection tools, specifically reviewing questions asked to elicit responses	While clear and relevant questions exploring migration intentions and plans were impressively incorporated, questions to measure and benchmarks for knowledge and perception of risks among migrants could be improved by using established/standardised KAP tools. This would avoid relying on respondent's self-reporting and mitigate respondent bias to a large extent. These tools also allow for standardised measurement across multiple points and repetitions of data collection (baseline to endline).
Reliability	Review of response sheets to assess completion rate of responses, both valuable and individual entry	Data sets were found to be complete and well cleaned. All variables were coded as per expected standards, demonstrating the value of using a platform like CAPI to enter data being collected in multiple languages. However, KIIs revealed that despite plans to use CAPI, data was collected on hard-copies first and then later entered into the platform. Use of technology in future campaigns can reduce data entry errors and timeline delays.
Precision	<i>Unable to verify this criteria as checks are usually associated with executing spot-checks at the data collection stage of MEL evidence establishment.</i>	
Integrity	Verify data collection schedules	Datasets provided did not contain timestamps although CREDI clarified that all delays had been specified in reporting. Both project documentation and KIIs revealed significant delays in data collection. Most factors causing these delays were outside the control of the implementation team or the service provider. Delays seem to have resulted in misalignment of findings and recommendations with the end of the Alpha phase of the project.
Confidentiality	Verify data processing of personal identifying information (PII)	All datasets provided to Seefar were void of PII and shared using a secure data sharing platform.

The evaluation team was also able to work with IOM to extract and classify the project's planned and actual expenditures in order to analyse and extract useful recommendations for budget allocation and future implementation. In general, it is considered important to allocate budgets whereby the largest portion is focused where it can have the highest impact as per campaign objectives. It is recommended to consider expected outcomes and the highest value outcomes when deciding on budget allocations. The tables below display the most important costs. Please note that direct costs calculations include allocation of staff costs, when deemed appropriate by management.

Output	Direct Costs (Planned)	Direct Costs (Actual)	Actual as % of Planned	% of total direct costs	% of total direct costs
Communications Strategy	91,000	3,500	63%	1%	38%
Communications Material		53,560		16%	
Dissemination of developed material as per strategy (including monitoring)	54,000	69,190	128%	21%	
Information Sessions - training and planning	32,400	50,000	154%	15%	26%
Information Sessions conducting and executing	33,000	36,000%	109%	10.8%	

There may have been a chance to allocate more resources to implementation over training. It appeared that over one-third of direct costs (38%) was allocated to the development and dissemination of materials for the online campaign while about a quarter (26%) was put forward towards in-person campaigning via information sessions. Resources spent for training for the in-person component were higher than those spent for actual implementation. If implementation and impact of implementation has priority, future campaigns may find cheaper ways of training staff for in-person campaigning and diverting savings towards actual implementation of the same (interviewees suggested that the information sessions were very effective). Further, the evaluation suggests that more investment in implementation could be beneficial to enhance impact. That's because a budget analysis revealed that 15% of the budget was allocated towards training for in-person sessions, while only 11% was spent on actual implementation of the in-person component. This is even further underlined by the fact that costs of staff delivering information sessions were covered by other projects, while the costs of the venue and equipment were given in kind by IOM. Given that in-person sessions are likely to have the greatest potential for behavioural impact, and that prioritising and engaging with beneficiaries is a key campaign objective, making more investment available for implementation during budget planning in future projects is recommended. Finding remote training methods to keep training costs low can further add to this orientation.

While in-person information sessions may be more costly and reach a smaller audience, they can result in targeted implementation and stronger evidence of achieving intended project outcomes. According to the Cost Effectiveness Summary provided in Annex 2, a 2-hour information session to one transit migrant in the Western Balkans costs €349¹⁶. In comparison, it cost only Euros

¹⁶ Direct costs only, not accounting for expenditure on support staff and other resources IOM leverages and gave in kind for this campaign.

€0.054 to obtain one view on a video and Euros €376.6 to acquire one social-media user to subscribe to the campaign's YouTube channel and enable them to access more information (becoming a subscriber). Although in-person sessions are more expensive, the cost-benefit is that they allow for the beneficiary to be (certainly) part of the target audience, ensuring that changes can be controlled and measured more reliably. It must be noted that 9 out of 10 (103 out of 109)¹⁷ migrants attending information sessions reported having a clear understanding of concepts that were discussed during the session. Using such cost-benefit analyses in future campaigns can help resourcing decisions.

Output	Direct Costs (Planned)	Direct Costs (Actual)	Actual as % of Planned	% of total direct costs
Baseline Research	21,760	26,605	122%	7.9%
Midline Research	20,900	15,690	75%	4.7%
Endline Research	22,400	17,510	78%	5.2%

Allocating resources to MEL activities were above industry standards but could have been redirected towards establishing evidence directly from beneficiaries themselves and increasing internal team MEL capacity. While the campaign allocated a healthy portion (18%) of the budget towards MEL activities, the pay-off was not as significant as it could have been considering the relatively large investment in pre-campaign research. Compared to its cost, it appears it did not inform the campaign strategy as much as expected; nor did it survey a large number of actual program/campaign beneficiaries. For future programs, it is suggested to allocate similar proportions of budgets to MEL activities and apply recommendations to improve MEL strategies by enabling data collection from direct beneficiaries of the program. This would significantly improve the evidence base for the programme's actual achievements across target groups. Additionally, funds overspent on baseline research deliverables could be redirected towards a locally available and specifically recruited MEL consultancy. As recommended, dedicated resources on the project team to internally coordinate MEL activities is a key addition that can help campaigns strengthen future evidence bases.

KII data suggested that interviewees considered the campaign to be good value for money. Some key informants, for example, reported that prior to the campaign, they were uncertain about the most effective platforms to use for reaching out to migrants, but this has now been clarified with the campaign. In addition, field staff in TRCs reported that some of the campaign videos can be used to build rapport with migrants, which is a valuable outcome. Another positive outcome that was mentioned concerned the development of far-reaching materials to campaign in source countries which can help to raise awareness and encourage safe migration practices at source country level.

Reaching people on social media was relatively cost-effective within the campaign. In 2023, the cost of reaching an individual on social media was Euros €0.017¹⁸. It cost Euros €14.63 to elicit further information-seeking behaviour in an individual on social media (as they click through to access the information provided by the viewed social media post)¹⁹. This was less expensive in 2023

¹⁷ Based on data provided by IOM management which was collected during information sessions.

¹⁸ Based on Fabrika dashboard: \$326,000 spent to reach 4 million, conversion USD to EUR April 12 2023

¹⁹ Based on Fabrika dashboard: \$326,000 spent to get 20,275 clicks.

compared to 2022. In 2022, it cost Euros €0.34 to reach an individual on social media and Euros €73.35 to prompt further information seeking behaviour²⁰. If we assume that the ideal migrant profile to reach on social media is that of males aged 18-34 years-old (based on pre campaign research and the majority of users in campaign reach on social media), the campaign continued to reach such audience in a more cost effective manner in 2023 (Euros €0.11) than in 2022 (Euros €0.53).

In summary, while social media was cost-effective, a future campaign could be enhanced with cost-benefit analyses on resource allocation and decision making. For example, if more than one channel is used in a campaign, it may prove useful to allocate most resources to the channel that is presumed the best in achieving the intended objective. This is particularly the case when components are separate such as the present campaign. Meanwhile, social media campaigning can influence participation of people in information sessions (which, in turn, have the bigger potential of changing behaviours). If behaviour change is indeed a key objective, more budget would be allocated to this component.

²⁰ Based on Fabrika dashboard: \$371,000 spent to reach 1 million and get 4603 clicks.

Sustainability

Best practices identified can be used in future campaigns, campaign can bring different stakeholders together

The project proposal references the project's sustainability beyond EU funding by describing a sustainability strategy. The strategy included generating best practices for national outreach campaigns and public use. Findings and best practices are to be published to support future programming and design in the field. Local actors in target transit countries would then be enabled to implement their own awareness raising campaigns. The proposal also suggested showcasing the cost-efficiency and effectiveness of online campaigns. Finally, the project proposal suggested that the project's content would remain online and open-source for EU and local partners to use as a resource.

At the time of the evaluation, it was challenging to assess the success of the campaign's sustainability considering the very recent ending of the campaign. Project reporting and input from key informants have provided valuable insights that could serve as best practices in the future. To ensure that the campaign's learnings are leveraged effectively, it is essential to summarise and disseminate these best practices.

When asked, few key informants could speak to the campaign's sustainability. One suggested that the way videos were produced (e.g. including risks that do not change) ensures that they can continue to be used over time and in different geographical locations. This was also supported by the content's focus on experiences rather than facts. Others mentioned a different interpretation of sustainability that included the continuation of the campaign, noting that communications campaigns do not address root causes of migration nor address the lack of legal alternatives to irregular migration. Thus, a continuation of such a communication campaign would ensure sustainability.

The campaign helped to bring stakeholders together. Work Package 5 had the goal of "Improving capacities of EU partners to deliver awareness raising campaigns". Progress reports mention that Hilfswerk International and their network of CSOs was included. While it is clear that they presented at a board meeting - it is unclear which areas of collaboration were identified. One key informant mentioned the strength of the current campaign as a coordination platform that brought different stakeholders together to discuss migration communications. It appeared that the partnership between IOM and the Austrian and German ministries had been very strong with a lot of understanding and willingness to work together on joint issues.

Key informants agreed that leveraging social media (SM) platforms and staying up-to-date with the platforms used by migrants is essential for countering misinformation in future campaigns. However, some noted that the impact of social media posts may diminish six months after the campaign ends if there is no financial support for ongoing promotion. To address this, IOM Pakistan plans to train media professionals to report sensitively on migration issues and incorporate risk awareness raising into mass media campaigns. Some actors believe that only a rights-based approach and counselling can lead to sustainable awareness campaigns that encourage safe decision-making among migrants.

Campaign has potential for synergy and linkages with state and international civil society stakeholders

There are several synergies and linkages that could be made with state authorities, civil society, and donor communities in future campaigns. Future campaigns could collaborate with member states so that MS themselves provide accurate and up-to-date information on migration policies, laws, and regulations, and campaign management can provide expertise in how to communicate such information to migrants. As outlined by key informants with AVR and legal aid staff in TRCs, there is a need for legal aid staff to have deeper knowledge on legal frameworks beyond the country they are working in. Engagement among donors can help fill gaps and can also facilitate access to funding for the campaign while building sustainable partnerships that can support ongoing communication efforts.

This campaign has also demonstrated potential for successful partnerships among member states and other stakeholders who bring expertise in working with migrants. Future campaigns can build on and partner with even more stakeholders such as community-based organisations, civil society organisations, and faith-based groups to increase the reach and impact of the campaign. These organisations can help disseminate information about the campaign to their networks, provide feedback on campaign messaging and activities, and offer support to migrants and their families.

Finally, one can work with relevant state agencies and other stakeholders to establish referral mechanisms for migrant support services beyond TRCs, including legal, health, and psychosocial services. Campaigns can offer sign-up mechanisms with service providers that are promoted through social media. This can help ensure that migrants have access to the support they need to make informed decisions about their migration journeys and to stay safe along the way. If partnerships with local media outlets are fostered, it will help amplify campaign messaging and reach broader audiences. This, in turn, can help increase the visibility and credibility of the campaign, as well as provide opportunities for journalists to report on migration issues in an informed and responsible manner.

Annex 1: Key Informant Interview Protocol and Questions

Questions - Donors

Research Question	Instructions/Prompts	Timing
Structured questions (Prefilled)	Interview #	
	Date of interview:	
	Organisation and position:	
Intro/Warm-up	<i>[Interviewer: A short warm-up to get the respondent focused on our areas of interest.]</i> 1. Could you briefly describe your role at and relationship with WB-Aware, the pilot? Feel free to add any information you may think is necessary for me to know for our conversation going forward.	3 minutes
RA 1 - Content of campaigns	I'm interested in exploring what you know about WB-Aware. I'd like to start with a few questions about the rationale and objectives of the campaign. 2. Could you tell me why you decided to fund this particular pilot under WB-Aware over other possible campaigns? 3. What were the primary objectives of the campaign? 4. Did these objectives change based on the Alpha phase implementation (social media only)? If yes/no, why? 5. In your opinion, what was the tradeoff between the objective of reducing irregular migration and protecting migrants in this irregular migration awareness campaign? 6. What influence did implementing partners (like Vasa Prava, providing free legal aid and also facilitating sessions) have on the design of content to be delivered during information sessions? 7. What were the key findings from the Alpha phase that fed into the design of communication materials and approaches used in the Beta phase? 8. How was sustainability defined and addressed in the context of WB-Aware?	15 minutes
RA 2 - Implementation: Efficacy	9. With a view to the objectives of the campaign we already discussed, can you reflect on what you consider have been its successes and areas for improvement? 10. Can we discuss what you think are the pros and cons of having IOM as a consortium partner, given your experience with handling mig comms in the region? 11. How did geo-socio-political events through 2021 and 2022 influence the implementation of the campaign? Can we discuss what you considered key points of campaign and project management adaptation?	10 minutes
RA 3 - Implementation: Impact	Next, I want to talk more about the effectiveness of the WB-Aware pilot and the approaches to measuring results and identifying lessons. 12. How important do you think it is to systematically evaluate irregular migration awareness campaigns? 13. How well would you say you understood the data provided to you on the campaign, how often they were updated, what do you think was missing? 14. To what extent have the objectives of the campaign been met? 15. Can you reflect on what you consider the campaign's successes and areas for improvement were?	10 minutes
RA 4 - Sustainability	Now we would like to ask you for some lessons learned and recommendations for the future of migration communication campaigns. What lessons have been learned from WB-Aware how does that change the way you think about future migration awareness campaigns? In your opinion, are there any 'critical elements' of an awareness campaign that should be taken into account in the design, implementation and evaluation of future campaigns?	15 minutes

Questions - IOM Management

Research Question	Instructions/Prompts	Timing
Structured questions (Prefilled)	Interview #	
	Date of interview:	
	Organisation and position:	
Intro/Warm-up	Could you briefly describe your role at and relationship with WB-Aware, the pilot? Feel free to add any information you may think is necessary for me to know for our conversation going forward.	3 minutes
RA 1 - Content of campaigns	<p>I'm interested in exploring what you know about WE-Aware. I'd like to start with a few questions about the rationale and objectives of the campaign.</p> <p>What were the primary objectives of the campaign?</p> <p>Did these objectives change based on the Alpha phase implementation (social media only)? If yes/no, why?</p> <p>In your opinion, what was the tradeoff between the objective of reducing irregular migration and protecting migrants in this irregular migration awareness campaign?</p> <p>Could you tell me about the process of developing the WB-Aware communications-based response to migration?</p> <p>What factors made Fabrika a good-fit service provider to develop the communications strategy and material for the campaign?</p> <p>Can we discuss the key messaging in the campaign?</p> <p>How have campaign tools, activities and messages been tested prior to and during implementation?</p> <p>What channels/tools were most effective to achieve the objectives you mentioned?</p> <p>What influence did implementing partners (like Vasa Prava, providing free legal aid and also facilitating sessions) have on the design of content to be delivered during information sessions?</p> <p>How was sustainability defined and addressed in the context of WB-Aware?</p>	10 minutes
RA 2 - Implementation: Efficacy	<p>With a view to the objectives of the campaign we already discussed, can you reflect on what you consider have been its successes and areas for improvement?</p> <p>What in your opinion was the most helpful tool used during implementation to track the appropriateness (good-fit or not) of channels and methods?</p> <p>Did IOM's past experience with implementing campaigns in the Western Balkans influence this campaign's implementation? If yes, how? If no, why not?</p> <p>How did geo-socio-political events through 2021 and 2022 influence the implementation of the campaign? Can we discuss what you considered key points of campaign and project management adaptation?</p> <p>How did you adapt the messages and campaign activities to changing circumstances and needs on the ground?</p> <p>How did information session facilitators' varied backgrounds influence training for and delivery of the information session service?</p>	10 minutes
RA 3 - Implementation: Impact	<p>Next, I want to talk more about the effectiveness of the WB-Aware pilot and the approaches to measuring results and identifying lessons.</p> <p>Which WP (Work package as specified in the revised project document) was the most challenging for the team to implement?.</p> <p>How important do you think it is to systematically evaluate irregular migration awareness campaigns?</p> <p>How important was it to establish systematic evidence of results achieved for this campaign?</p> <p>Where would you say the priority lay in terms of establishing evidence of achievement during this campaign?</p> <p>To what extent have the objectives of the campaign been met?</p> <p>How do you know whether different campaign objectives have been met or not?</p> <p>Can you reflect on what you consider the campaign's successes and areas for improvement were?</p>	10 minutes

Research Question	Instructions/Prompts	Timing
M&E Specific Questions	<p>What is the Theory of Change behind the campaign?</p> <p>What was the monitoring strategy for the campaign?</p> <p>What do you think are the pros and cons of outsourcing the campaign's final evaluation to a service provide?</p> <p>What do you think were the most important indicators that you were using to measure the effectiveness of the campaign?</p> <p>In your opinion, are there any 'critical elements' of an M&E strategy that should be part of all irregular migration awareness campaigns?</p>	10 minutes
RA 4 - Sustainability	<p>Now we would like to ask you for some lessons learned and recommendations for the future of migration communication campaigns.</p> <p>What lessons have been learned from WB-Aware how does that change the way you think about future migration awareness campaigns?</p> <p>In your opinion, are there any 'critical elements' of an awareness campaign that should be taken into account in the design, implementation and evaluation of future campaigns?</p>	10 minutes

Questions: Project Staff (Including M&E)

Research Question	Instructions/Prompts	Timing
Structured questions (Prefilled)	Interview #	
	Date of interview:	
	Organisation and position:	
Intro/Warm-up	<i>[Interviewer: A short warm-up to get the respondent focused on our areas of interest.]</i> Could you briefly describe your role at and relationship with WB-Aware, the pilot? Feel free to add any information you may think is necessary for me to know for our conversation going forward.	3 minutes
RA 1 - Content of campaigns	<p>I'm interested in exploring what you know about WE-Aware. I'd like to start with a few questions about the rationale and objectives of the campaign.</p> <p>What were the primary objectives of the campaign?</p> <p>Did these objectives change based on the Alpha phase implementation (social media only)? If yes/no, why?</p> <p>In your opinion, what was the tradeoff between the objective of reducing irregular migration and protecting migrants in this irregular migration awareness campaign?</p> <p>Could you tell me about the process of developing the WB-Aware communications-based response to migration?</p> <p>What factors made Fabrika a good-fit service provider to develop the communications strategy and material for the campaign?</p> <p>Can we discuss the key messaging in the campaign?</p> <p>How have campaign tools, activities and messages been tested prior to and during implementation?</p> <p>What channels/tools were most effective to achieve the objectives you mentioned?</p> <p>What influence did implementing partners (like Vasa Prava, providing free legal aid and also facilitating sessions) have on the design of content to be delivered during information sessions?</p> <p>How was sustainability defined and addressed in the context of WB-Aware?</p>	10 minutes
RA 2 - Implementation: Efficacy	<p>With a view to the objectives of the campaign we already discussed, can you reflect on what you consider have been its successes and areas for improvement?</p> <p>What in your opinion was the most helpful tool used during implementation to track the appropriateness (good-fit or not) of channels and methods?</p> <p>Did IOM's past experience with implementing campaigns in the Western Balkans influence this campaign's implementation? If yes, how? If no, why not?</p> <p>How did geo-socio-political events through 2021 and 2022 influence the implementation of the campaign? Can we discuss what you considered key points of campaign and project management adaptation?</p> <p>How did you adapt the messages and campaign activities to changing circumstances and needs on the ground?</p> <p>How did information session facilitators' varied backgrounds influence training for and delivery of the information session service?</p>	10 minutes
RA 3 - Implementation: Impact	<p>Next, I want to talk more about the effectiveness of the WB-Aware pilot and the approaches to measuring results and identifying lessons.</p> <p>Which WP (Work package as specified in the revised project document) was the most challenging for the team to implement?.</p> <p>How important do you think it is to systematically evaluate irregular migration awareness campaigns?</p> <p>How important was it to establish systematic evidence of results achieved for this campaign?</p> <p>Where would you say the priority lay in terms of establishing evidence of achievement during this campaign?</p> <p>To what extent have the objectives of the campaign been met?</p> <p>How do you know whether different campaign objectives have been met or not?</p> <p>Can you reflect on what you consider the campaign's successes and areas for improvement were?</p>	10 minutes

Research Question	Instructions/Prompts	Timing
<p>M&E Specific Questions</p>	<p>What is the Theory of Change behind the campaign?</p> <p>What was the monitoring strategy for the campaign?</p> <p>What do you think are the pros and cons of outsourcing the campaign's final evaluation to a service provided?</p> <p>What do you think were the most important indicators that you were using to measure the effectiveness of the campaign?</p> <p>Based on the data that you have available up until now, which tools, campaign activities and messages do you consider to be the most and least effective so far and why is that?</p> <p>What is your opinion about Randomised Control Trials (RCTs) to evaluate irregular migration awareness campaigns?</p> <p>In your opinion, are there any 'critical elements' of an M&E strategy that should be part of all irregular migration awareness campaigns?</p>	<p>10 minutes</p>
<p>RA 4 - Sustainability</p>	<p>Now we would like to ask you for some lessons learned and recommendations for the future of migration communication campaigns.</p> <p>What lessons have been learned from WB-Aware how does that change the way you think about future migration awareness campaigns?</p> <p>In your opinion, are there any 'critical elements' of an awareness campaign that should be taken into account in the design, implementation and evaluation of future campaigns?</p>	<p>10 minutes</p>

Questions: Project Service Provider

Research Question	Instructions/Prompts	Timing
Structured questions (Prefilled)	Interview #	
	Date of interview:	
	Organisation and position:	
Intro/Warm-up	<i>[Interviewer: A short warm-up to get the respondent focused on our areas of interest.]</i> Could you briefly describe your role at and relationship with WB-Aware, the pilot? Feel free to add any information you may think is necessary for me to know for our conversation going forward.	3 minutes
RA 1 - Content of campaigns	I'm interested in exploring what you know about WE-Aware. I'd like to start with a few questions about the rationale and objectives of the campaign. What were the primary objectives of the campaign? Did these objectives change based on the Alpha phase implementation (social media only)? If yes/no, why? In your opinion, what was the tradeoff between the objective of reducing irregular migration and protecting migrants in this irregular migration awareness campaign? Can we discuss the key messaging in the campaign? (FABRIKA ONLY) How was sustainability defined and addressed in the context of WB-Aware?	10 minutes
RA 2 - Implementation: Efficacy	With a view to the objectives of the campaign we already discussed, can you reflect on what you consider have been its successes and areas for improvement? What in your opinion was the most helpful tool used during implementation to track the appropriateness (good-fit or not) of channels and methods? Which tools, campaign activities and messages did you consider to be the least effective and why is that? Did (FABRIKA / CREDI) past experience with implementing campaigns in the Western Balkans influence this campaign's implementation? If yes, how? If no, why not?	10 minutes
RA 3 - Implementation: Impact	Next, I want to talk more about the effectiveness of the WB-Aware pilot and the approaches to measuring results and identifying lessons. How important do you think it is to systematically evaluate irregular migration awareness campaigns? (CREDI ONLY) How important was it to establish systematic evidence of results achieved for this campaign? Where would you say the priority lay in terms of establishing evidence of achievement during this campaign? To what extent have the objectives of the campaign been met? To what extent were specific campaign objectives met? Can you reflect on what you consider the campaign's successes and areas for improvement were?	10 minutes
M&E Specific Questions	What is the Theory of Change behind the campaign? What was the monitoring strategy for the campaign? (CREDI ONLY) What do you think are the pros and cons of outsourcing the campaign's final evaluation to a service provider? (CREDI ONLY) What do you think were the most important indicators that you were using to measure the effectiveness of the campaign? In your opinion, are there any 'critical elements' of an M&E strategy that should be part of all irregular migration awareness campaigns?	10 minutes
RA 4 - Sustainability	Now we would like to ask you for some lessons learned and recommendations for the future of migration communication campaigns. What lessons have been learned from WB-Aware? How does that change the way you think about future migration awareness campaigns and your work towards providing services for them?	10 minutes

Annex 2: Cost Effectiveness Summary

Achievement / Cost	CY21Q4 to date	Breakdown of activities/costs
<p>Number of viewers in target countries consuming campaign content</p>	<p>4.5 mil views on total of all YT content created</p>	<p>Total: 261,000.00</p> <p>Service provider fee for development of comms strategy, website, social media channels, videos, social media campaign and video paid promotion = 130,000 EUR; % of internet connection in TRCs = 4000 EUR; % of S&O for management = 118,000 EUR; % of overhead = 9000 EUR</p>
<p>Number of transit migrants attending information outreach sessions conducted in targeted TRCs</p>	<p>355</p>	<p>Total: 124,000.00</p> <p>Training of staff delivering info session in 4WB countries = 25,000 EUR (travel, DSA, materials, venue, meals); Expert fee to provide legal information for info sessions materials and training to staff = 12,000 EUR; % of salaries for staff and translators delivering info sessions (not paid by WBAware!!!) = 22,000; Development and printing of posters, leaflets and info sessions materials, and refreshments for info sessions = 17,000 EUR; % of internet connection in TRCs = 4000 EUR; S&O for management = 40,000 EUR; Overhead = 4,000 EUR.</p> <p><i>Note: venue and equipment were provided in kind by IOM. Also, info sessions are delivered by IOM staff and UNHCR partners who also work on other programs. If info sessions are to be set up from scratch, staff costs would increase.</i></p>

Annex 3: Cost Allocation Comparisons

Output	Planned	Actual (Project End)	% of planned budget spent	% of total direct costs
Communications Strategy	91,000	3,500	62.70%	1.05%
Communications Material		53,560		16.07%
Dissemination of developed material as per strategy	54,000	66,640	128.13%	19.99%
Tracking (M&E) of Online campaign in Alpha Phase		1,300		0.39%
Tracking (M&E) of Online campaign in Beta Phase		1,250		0.37%
Information sessions - training and planning	32,400	50,000	154.32%	15.00%
Information sessions - conducting and execution	33,000	36,000	109.09%	10.80%
Tracking (M&E) of Face-to-Face campaign (Info Sessions) in Beta Phase	7,000	7,000	100.00%	2.10%
Un-official research (By PM in inception phase) which fed into Fabrika content creation	N/A	2,700	N/A	0.81%
Baseline Research	21,760	26,605	122.27%	7.98%
Midline Research	20,900	15,690	75.07%	4.71%
Endline Research	22,400	17,510	78.17%	5.25%
Reflection / Project Board Meetings	26,500	19,500	73.58%	5.85%
Final evaluation	23,900	32,100	134.31%	9.63%