

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

AMEEN YOUTH GROUP



Enhancing Resilience and Protection of Marginalized Communities Affected by Protracted Conflicts and Effects of Adverse Climatic Conditions in Kenya

AUTHOR: BRIAN WITTBOLD

12 MARCH 2015



Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	3
Abbreviations and Acronyms	4
Executive Summary.....	5
1. Introduction	8
1.1 Context	8
1.2 Evaluation objectives	10
1.3 Evaluation framework and methodology	10
1.3.1 Data collection methods	11
1.3.1.1 Document review	11
1.3.1.2 Semi-structured interviews	12
1.3.1.3 Focus group discussions	12
1.3.1.4 Field observation	13
1.3.1.5 Data analysis	13
1.4 Limitations	14
2. Findings.....	15
2.1 Relevance.....	15
2.1.1 Relevance to context	15
2.1.2 Project rationale.....	18
2.1.3 Alignment with stakeholders needs and priorities	19
2.2 Effectiveness	20
2.2.1 Project Objective – Enhanced community resilience and protection.....	20
2.2.2 Outcome 1 – Community capacity to address conflicts and promote peace	22
2.2.2.1 Output 1.1 – Reinforced positive community relations	23
2.2.2.2 Output 1.2 – Conflict early warning and response systems.....	25
2.2.3 Outcome 2 – Improved pastoralist youth livelihoods.....	28
2.2.3.1 Output 2.1 – Youth access to entrepreneurial training.....	29
2.2.3.2 Output 2.2 – Youth access to self-employment opportunities	30
2.2.4 Outcome 3 – Improved knowledge and skills of social protection practitioners.....	32
2.2.4.1 Output 3.1 – Skills, knowledge and resources	33
2.2.4.2 Output 3.2 – Direct assistance and support for victims	35
2.2.4.3 Output 3.3 – Community sensitisation	35
2.2.5 Beneficiary and stakeholder involvement	37
2.2.6 Factors influencing project achievement.....	38
2.3 Efficiency and cost-effectiveness.....	40
2.3.1 Efficiency of project management and monitoring	40
2.3.2 Cost-effectiveness of project	43
2.4 Sustainability.....	45
3. Conclusions/Lessons Learned.....	48
4. Recommendations	50
Annex 1 – Evaluation Matrix	52
Annex 2 – Key Informant Interview Tool	58
Annex 3 – Respondent List.....	67
Annex 4 – Terms of Reference	69

Acknowledgement

The evaluator is indebted to the IOM Kenya MCRU team and the many community members and stakeholders who provided invaluable perspective in informing this survey. Special thanks are due to the IOM Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Marsabit and Garissa field teams for their efforts, insight and consistent support throughout the evaluation.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CAP - Consolidated Appeal Process

CBO - Community-based organisation

CEWARN - Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism

DPC - District Peace Committee

FGM - Female genital mutilation

GoK - Government of Kenya

IDP - Internally displaced person

IEC - Information, education and communication

IGA - Income generating activity

IGAD - Intergovernmental Authority on Development

IOM - International Organization for Migration

KHRP - Kenya Humanitarian Response Plan

MCOF - Migration Crisis Operational Framework

MCRU - Migration Crisis Response Unit

NDMA - National Drought Management Authority

NSC - National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management

OECD - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

SEK - Swedish Krona

SGBV - Sexual and gender-based violence

Sida - Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency

ToT - Training of trainers

UNDSS - United Nations Department of Safety and Security

UNEG - United Nations Evaluation Group

WASH - Water, sanitation and hygiene

Executive Summary

In February 2015, the International Organization for Migration commissioned an independent evaluation of its project “Enhancing Resilience and Protection of Marginalized Communities Affected by Protracted Conflicts and Effects of Adverse Climatic Conditions in Kenya”. The project sought to contribute to the resilience and protection of conflict-affected and marginalised communities throughout Kenya’s Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Marsabit and Garissa counties and was conceived of within the framework of the Organization’s community stabilisation programming. It envisioned a three-pronged approach that foresaw the strengthening of communities’ capacities to address conflict and promote peace; the improvement of marginalised pastoralist youth’s access to livelihoods; and enhanced social protection awareness and services.

With an aim to generating lessons learned, recommendations and providing perspective that would assist IOM in evaluating performance, improving decision-making and enhancing programme design and implementation, the external evaluation was carried out over the period of three weeks and included site visits, key informant interviews and focus group discussions with a range of stakeholders throughout the project’s target locations. Findings of the evaluation are presented within the context of an assessment of the project’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, cost-effectiveness and sustainability.

With regard to the project’s relevance, it is clear that IOM has conceived of a highly relevant intervention that addresses priority needs identified throughout target communities of Northern Kenya. The evaluation found that a more rigorous and coherent project design pivoting on a well-defined theory of change may have provided a more robust conceptual framework for advancing and measuring the project’s overall objective of contributing to community resilience and protection. To this end, it is recommended that future projects be anchored to a detailed theory of change including indicators that measure the progress of activities’ intended impact as opposed to merely the status of their delivery.

The project’s peacebuilding activities are witnessed to have been an integral component of IOM’s strategy to bring communities together in the pursuit of positive and cooperative action, and synergies identified with Government of Kenya-led initiatives and structures have been highly effective in filling voids, which might have otherwise undermined Government efforts. An optic of peacebuilding will remain a relevant entry point for community engagement addressing objectives of resilience and stabilisation, though as is evidenced in this project, pairing this with parallel programmatic outputs will serve to anchor and provide context for peace itself. In this respect, it has been recommended that IOM seek to develop peacebuilding messages that incorporate awareness raising on socio-economic costs of conflict to communities, with a specific emphasis of targeting community leaders. Strategies that engage communities as active contributors in the joint achievement of objectives as opposed to joint receipt of benefits should be prioritised, and given the evident relevance of peacebuilding to all target communities, IOM should reassess opportunities for delivering such programming in areas that were not supported through this project.

IOM has very appropriately placed an emphasis on increasing youth access to vocational skills training and livelihood support, which has resonated within target communities as the single most important element for achieving greater stability. Demand for and relevance of such support is likely to remain high and any future community stabilisation programmes should consider expanding further on this element as a key investment. Engaging youth has served to open a door to IOM for deepened and sustainable community relations that will facilitate subsequent phases of programming and possibly provide a conduit for delivering both peace and social protection messages and programmes. In this respect, it has been recommended that IOM further investigate stakeholder interest in developing livelihood skills that address not only market gaps, but also contribute to addressing priority community issues, such as environmental degradation and food security.

The project has witnessed considerable success in reaching various and multiple layers of relevant stakeholders with social protection messages, though there is recognition that the issues of sexual and gender-based violence and trafficking remain poorly understood, marginally addressed and rampant throughout target areas. This project's success in involving a wide range of stakeholders attests to the broad interest among target communities in addressing these issues. IOM's investment in developing relationships with community leaders and social protection practitioners should facilitate further phases of programming that are evidently necessary in order to generate greater awareness and strengthen communities' links to institutional resources that may be leveraged in addressing these issues. In order to enhance the effectiveness of IOM's social protection programming, it has been recommended that IOM seek to expand its scope, investigating strategies to provide support for victims with communication and mobility challenges, building on national and regional efforts to establish safe houses and developing designated spaces within police facilities and hospitals to receive victims and survivors.

The project was evaluated to be very efficiently managed, and though it suffered delays and reorientations resulting primarily from external factors, there was evidence that mitigation strategies were in place to facilitate an appropriate and adequate response to ensure continuity and sustained effectiveness. The evaluation found that the successful delivery of this project was directly attributable to both strong management and excellent quality staff overseeing project activities in the field locations. Inefficiencies resulting from gaps in training and relatively high staff turnover are evidently being addressed, though this evaluation has recommended that IOM continue to invest in staff training as a means to ensure that requisite skills and knowledge enable staff to work across various project components, to facilitate communication with central administration on policies and procedures and to increase staff retention rates.

The cost-effectiveness of the intervention is evidenced by achievements in reaching far beyond initial beneficiary targets within the allocated budget, though where hyper-achievement was registered, it is suggested that IOM may undertake a review of costing estimates and planning figures, as these were apparently not aligned with initial assumptions. The evaluation found evidence that an alternative weighting of the project's respective components may have been more appropriate for advancing its stated objective,

though there was recognition that IOM's approach had permitted broad engagement among wide segments of target populations as well as deeper involvement of youth, a demographic which was deemed to be an essential focus of a community stabilisation strategy.

The evaluation found that elements of sustainability had been mainstreamed throughout the project and that the Organization's emphasis on linking communities to Government-led programmes is likely to ensure that benefits continue to be witnessed into the future. However, in light of the evident continued need to build community resilience, enhance protection and contribute to community stabilisation efforts, it was recommended that IOM seek to expand this project into a multi-year programme, investigating alternative activity mixes within and across the project's three components, though with a sustained focus on targeting youth.

1. Introduction

1.1 Context

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is the leading international organisation working in the field of migration governance. IOM acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management, advance understanding of migration issues, encourage social and economic development through migration, and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants. To contribute towards meeting these goals IOM implements projects aiming to enhance the resilience and protection of marginalised communities affected by conflicts and natural disasters. IOM has been in partnership with the Government of Kenya since 1984 to deliver migration management programming.

Straddling the equator and marked by extremely variable geographic zones and climatic conditions, Kenya is susceptible to both recurrent drought and large-scale flooding, which have increased in frequency, intensity and duration in recent years as a result of climate change and environmental degradation. Competition over scarce resources, poor land tenure systems and conflict-prone politics have resulted in both sustained low-intensity conflicts and frequent instances of localised violence and clashes, which have exacted casualties and precipitated displacement among large swathes of the population. Social safety nets are not commensurate to the need, and within this context, vulnerable communities and marginalised groups struggle to cope with environmental and political shocks. The resilience of such communities and groups to external shocks is undermined by intermittent conflict, entrenched poverty and broad social vulnerability. Many of Kenya's communities most vulnerable to environmental and/or political shocks are in Garissa, Marsabit, Turkana counties and most parts of Rift Valley.

Through the project “Enhancing Resilience and Protection of Marginalized Communities Affected by Protracted Conflicts and Effects of Adverse Climatic Conditions in Kenya”, the International Organization for Migration has sought to contribute to the resilience and protection of conflict-affected and marginalized communities throughout Kenya's Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Marsabit and Garissa counties. The project was managed by IOM Kenya's Migration Crisis Response Unit (MCRU) and conceived of within the framework of the Organization's community stabilisation programming. It was funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and was to be delivered over a period of 11 months.

The overall objective of the project to ‘contribute to the resilience and protection of conflict-affected or marginalised communities’ was to be realised through a three-pronged approach that foresaw the strengthening of communities' capacities to address conflict and promote peace through community-led peace building activities and the development of shared resources to reinforce positive engagement between communities; the improved access of youth to alternative livelihoods; and the enhanced capacity of social protection practitioners to promote and provide social protection services. These intended outcomes responded to

issues and needs common to communities across the target counties and were identified through IOM’s previous and on-going interventions within selected communities. The programmatic outputs developed to achieve the project’s intended outcomes were informed and delivered in consultation and cooperation with a range of stakeholders representing target beneficiaries, civil society groups, central and local Government administrative bodies, local and international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) and aid agencies. Designed to be mutually reinforcing, the project’s intended outputs were distributed across the three programmatic pillars accordingly:

Peacebuilding

- Community members have reinforced positive engagement and enhanced cohesion through shared resources.
- Communities with migration-related vulnerabilities are more aware of potential conflicts through early warning and response mechanisms.

Livelihoods

- Youth have access to entrepreneurial training.
- Youth have access to self-employment opportunities.

Social Protection

- Social protection practitioners have improved skills, knowledge, and resources necessary to provide quality social protection services.
- Enhanced access to direct assistance and support services for victims and survivors.
- Community members are sensitised on safe migration practices and prevention of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV).

The total budget for the project was Swedish Krona (SEK) 6 million, as per the below breakdown:

Budget Item	Total (SEK)
Programme Support Staff	221 166
Direct Programme Support Staff	1 366 806
<i>Staff Sub-Total</i>	<i>1 587 972</i>
Office Costs	529 350
<i>Office Sub-Total</i>	<i>529 350</i>
<i>Staff and Office</i>	<i>2 117 322</i>
Early Recovery	1 921 799
Protection	799 108
Other Support Costs	728 507
External Audit and Evaluation	167 550
<i>Operations Costs Sub-Total</i>	<i>3 596 963</i>

<i>Operations</i>	3 596 963
Budget Sub-Total	5 714 285
HQ Overhead (5%)	285 714
Grand Total	6 000 000

1.2 Evaluation objectives

In line with its commitment to improve results-based management of its programming, the International Organization for Migration has commissioned an independent evaluation of its project “Enhancing Resilience and Protection of Marginalized Communities Affected by Protracted Conflicts and Effects of Adverse Climatic Conditions in Kenya”. Evaluation results are intended to be used to improve decision-making and evaluate performance and to improve project and programme design and implementation.

Specifically, the objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Assess the relevance of the project’s intended results.
2. Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation.
3. Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching its stated objectives.
4. Assess prospects for sustainability.
5. Assess the appropriateness of the project design and management arrangements for achieving its stated objectives.
6. Identify lessons learned and best practices.
7. Assess existing proposed follow up programmes and make recommendations for improvements.

The primary audience for the outcomes and findings of the project evaluation include IOM and Sida.

1.3 Evaluation framework and methodology

The evaluation was carried out in accordance with international evaluation standards and guidelines as developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and reflected within Sida’s Evaluation Manual, “Looking Back, Moving Forward”. Definitions of *relevance*, *effectiveness*, *efficiency*, *cost-effectiveness* and *sustainability* informing the evaluation scope are based on those of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD-DAC) Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance. The evaluation was evidence-based and oriented towards generating findings and recommendations that can be utilised to inform and improve the quality of future programming. Throughout the evaluation process, the input of project stakeholders was sought in order to augment the evaluator’s understanding of information collected and to be incorporated into the contextual and data analysis performed, findings presented and recommendations made. The evaluator was contracted by IOM Kenya as an external and independent consultant, thus conclusions

reached within the scope of the evaluation are solely those of the evaluator.

The evaluation was conducted within an evaluation framework mutually agreed upon by IOM and the consultant. Departing from the proposed evaluation objectives and criteria, and in consultation with the project manager, the evaluator elaborated an evaluation matrix (Annex 1) that served to further clarify the scope of the intended evaluation outcomes and to define the specific questions that were to be addressed within the study. The evaluation matrix established the parameters of the investigation and indicated the most appropriate and feasible means by which information relevant to answering the proposed primary and sub-questions was to be sourced. Analysis and synthesis of information obtained in response to the sub-questions informed the overall evaluation of the primary questions of investigation. Sources of primary data and contextual information, as well as the method of their analysis within the evaluation, were indicated. In an attempt to achieve greater balance and accuracy in evaluating the investigation's principle questions, to the extent possible, the evaluation has sought to incorporate a wide range of primary and secondary data sources and stakeholder views.

The evaluation framework is structured around the key evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, cost-effectiveness and sustainability.

1.3.1. Data collection methods

Data collection methods adopted within the evaluation included a desk review of primary and secondary documents, semi-structured interviews with key informants representing a range of stakeholder groups, focus group discussions with project beneficiaries and field observations at project implementation sites. The logic and primary purpose of employing a specific data source and method of analysis in answering each question was to ensure that the most appropriate, feasible and balanced sources of information informed the evaluation's final results. Over a three-week period of field study, the evaluator visited several locations throughout each of the four counties in which the project was delivered and obtained first-hand accounts from stakeholders on their involvement within the project.

1.3.1.1 Document review

In the inception phase of the evaluation, an initial review of project documents was carried out by the evaluator in order to define and concretely establish the scope of the evaluation objectives and parameters as reflected in the Terms of Reference (Annex 4). The review further served to inform methods of data collection and to identify gaps in knowledge and data that may be relevant and/or pose limitations to subsequent analysis and evaluation outcomes. Upon request, supplementary project documentation was provided to the evaluator by IOM field staff and project management. Collection of documents relevant to the overall project context, including data and situational analysis pertaining to the project's various geographic target zones, as well as sector-specific data and background reports, were sourced independently by the evaluator throughout the evaluation period. Primary categories of documents reviewed include:

- Project document
- Project budget
- Interim and final project reports
- Monitoring tools and periodic reports
- IOM and SIDA strategy papers
- Government of Kenya and United Nations development agendas and frameworks

1.3.1.2 Semi-structured interviews

In order to obtain accurate and detailed perspectives of key stakeholders involved in the design and delivery of IOM's intervention and to understand their assessment of the project's achievements and challenges in relation to its intended outcomes, the evaluation included several semi-structured interviews conducted with a range of involved stakeholders. To this end, a detailed key informant interview tool (Annex 2) was developed and employed within the scope of semi-structured interviews. The full list of interviews conducted is included in Annex 3. Given that most stakeholders were aware of and involved in only specific components of the project, the interview tool was designed to be comprehensive in scope though containing specific sections that would permit a more tailored and precise discussion of stakeholders' respective experiences. Categories of key stakeholder respondents included:

- IOM Kenya staff in the Nairobi office, IOM Kenya staff in field offices in Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Marsabit and Garissa counties
- Government and local authority officials (District County Commission representatives, local police officials)
- Members of partner organisations and agencies involved in delivery of programme activities

As per the interview tool, semi-structured interviews were conducted in accordance with the primary themes of the evaluation, guided by sub-questions detailed within the evaluation matrix and adjusted to accommodate for meaningful discussions based on stakeholders' knowledge relevant to the project's overall objective, intended outcomes and outputs. The evaluator conducted a total of 27 semi-structured interviews over the course of three weeks of field survey.

1.3.1.3 Focus group discussions

In accordance with the objective of the evaluation and its intended purpose of generating information that might be formulated within recommendations and lessons learned informing eventual follow-up actions, there was an emphasis on engaging beneficiaries in focus group discussions that would permit reflection of their perspectives with regard to the intervention's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, cost-effectiveness and sustainability. Focus group discussions were arranged by project staff in IOM's field offices involved in the delivery of project activities and afforded the evaluator an opportunity to engage in discussions with a wide range of individuals and groups benefitting from the project's

peacebuilding, livelihoods and social protection components. Following briefings with concerned staff members from the various field offices, and at the request of the evaluator, IOM field staff participated in focus group discussions with beneficiaries, which were led and moderated by the evaluator. Focus group discussions loosely followed the outline of semi-structured interviews, with an emphasis on eliciting beneficiaries' honest assessments of the project's successes and deficiencies as well as recommendations for adjustments and reorientations within a hypothetical subsequent action. The evaluator conducted a total of 13 focus group discussions over the course of three weeks of field survey.

1.3.1.4 Field observation

In light of project activities that foresaw the installation of infrastructure and provision of in-kind support to various beneficiary groups, there was scope within the evaluation to conduct a number of field visits and carry out focus group discussions with beneficiaries at supported project sites. Visible observation of project-supported installations and in-kind donations provided context for focus group discussions and permitted deeper appreciation of beneficiaries' perspectives of the project's outcomes. While it was not possible within the limited three-week field survey period to visit all sites, the sampling of sites reached by the evaluator did provide scope for a representative assessment of related activities. Supplementary information on these activities was provided to the evaluator by the IOM field teams through semi-structured interviews and in the form of project documentation. The evaluator visited a total of 13 project sites over the course of three weeks of field survey.

1.3.1.5 Data analysis

Data obtained through document review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and site visits was compiled and analysed by the evaluator following completion of the three-week field survey and was subsequently synthesised within a presentation of initial findings shared with members of the IOM Nairobi Migration Crisis Response Unit team prior to drafting of the final report. Presentation of initial findings provided the evaluator an opportunity to share an overview of activities conducted within the scope of the field survey and to highlight points of focus that would be further elaborated within the context of a complete evaluation report. Following the presentation, MCRU staff members were afforded an opportunity to pose questions and to comment on the evaluation's preliminary outcomes, which provided further content and perspective for the evaluator in elaborating findings and appropriately orientating recommendations.

It must be noted that given the short duration of the project and its conceptualisation within the framework of IOM's community stabilisation programming, which necessarily takes a longer and more comprehensive view of objectives such as resilience building, evaluation findings are mostly limited to the level of outputs and outcomes. Only limited anecdotal evidence of impact was available to inform an evaluation of the project's intended objective-level outcome.

1.4 Limitations

The proposed methodology of the assessment was outlined within the Terms of Reference specified for the evaluation delivery and noted sources of information that may be made available to the evaluator throughout the various phases of the evaluation process. It accounted for challenges of access and mobility that would be faced by the evaluator in reaching project sites within insecure areas and was conditioned by time and budget constraints that were jointly identified by the project manager and the evaluator. Consideration for necessary security measures for field visits conducted throughout project locations was anticipated within the planning phase, and the scheduling of travel arrangements around the availability of relevant field staff involved in the delivery of the project necessitated consistent coordination efforts on behalf of the IOM team. The considerable amount of travel by air and road required to reach the disparate project locations posed a significant obstacle to obtaining comprehensive input from relevant stakeholders, though this challenge was partially mitigated by convening a number of focus group discussions and interviews at central locations within the various counties.

A lack of baseline data relevant to many of the project's activities and outputs was a significant impediment to generation of findings addressing higher-level outcomes, and it proved beyond the scope of the evaluation to attempt the reconstruction of such baselines in order to permit an assessment of progress made towards impacts and a determination of the achievement of the overall project objective.

2. Findings

The following section addresses the core elements of the evaluation's outcomes and presents key findings pertaining to the main evaluation criteria as emerging from an analysis of data obtained through the desk review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and field observations made in the course of site visits. It is structured around the primary and sub-questions detailed within the evaluation matrix.

2.1 Relevance

The OECD Development Assistance Committee defines 'relevance' as the 'extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.' This definition may be expanded to account for temporal considerations which assess relevance across a specific time-frame and at various critical points throughout an intervention's duration. In order to assess the relevance of IOM's intervention within the prevailing context, the evaluation posited three primary questions, which were accompanied by specific sub-queries and are elaborated in the following.

2.1.1 Relevance to context

According to documents reviewed and interviews conducted, the context in which IOM conceived of the project comprises various elements which were given consideration within the conceptualization of the project itself and which played a role in shaping the contours of project design and delivery. These elements included an IOM-led analysis of Kenya's prevailing socio-political atmosphere and identification of the corresponding vulnerabilities and needs of target populations; an assessment of the Government of Kenya's (GoK) plans and priorities in addressing these needs; a review of IOM's current and evolving programmatic objectives within Kenya; and a stocktake of potential donors that may share a similar analysis and understanding of the issues and be engaged to support programmatic interventions responding to these.

According to IOM's analysis, the political and social situation in Kenya remained volatile throughout 2013 due to a number of internal and external factors directly impacting upon the well-being of large swaths of the country's population. A pervasive fear of reignited ethno-political conflict within the context of the March presidential elections was accompanied by deepened socio-economic hardship precipitated by large-scale humanitarian emergencies resulting from natural disasters such as drought and floods. Resultant strain upon affected communities dependent upon natural resource-based livelihoods continued to fuel resource-based inter-communal conflict and give rise to a range of critical social protection issues that were deemed to be inadequately understood and insufficiently addressed.

Ethnic and political tensions ran high throughout the first quarter of 2013 in the lead-up to presidential elections, and while these were largely peaceful, a repeat of post-election

violence comparable to that witnessed in 2007-2008 could not be precluded, as drivers of ethno-political tensions persisted and remained incompletely addressed. A culture of impunity, high unemployment, on-going land reform, stalled resettlement of internally displaced persons (IDPs), ethnic tensions, weak institutions and regional and socio-economic inequality continued to foment discontent among the broader population and served as potential triggers for localized as well as broad-based instability and conflict.

Unmitigated environmental degradation accompanied by unpredictable and variable rainfall throughout geographic zones predominantly populated by mobile pastoralist communities continued to fuel conflict over scarce resources while recurrent natural calamities further subjected these populations to episodes of mass displacement, acute deprivation and heightened inter-communal tensions. Chronic underdevelopment throughout arid regions of northern Kenya and perpetual marginalisation of these region's populations was deemed to amount to Government-imposed self-sufficiency, which, despite historic precedent, was and remains increasingly untenable in light of the scale of climate-induced disasters witnessed in recent years.

Populations living within affected communities and along potential fault lines were reported to associate a heightened risk of social protection issues, including sexual and gender-based violence, with spreading inter-communal resource-based conflict and attributed a rise in incidence of cases to the same. The on-going loss of traditional livelihoods among pastoralist communities resulting from climate change and environmental degradation was witnessed to have destabilised social structures, giving rise to sexual violence, exploitation and domestic abuse, and prompting some individuals to revert to unsafe coping strategies including irregular migration via human smuggling and trafficking networks. Northern Kenyan mobile pastoralist societies were considered to possess inadequate social protection mechanisms and available measures to afford victims recourse to support, and the deeply patriarchal nature of these societies was viewed as an impediment to community-initiated responses.

IOM's submissions to the 2013 Kenya Humanitarian Response Plan (KHRP) developed within the framework of the United Nations Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP), elaborated on these issues and provided insight into the Organization's analysis and understanding of the prevailing conditions within Kenya at the time of project conceptualisation. The issues highlighted by IOM within the scope of its 2013 CAP project submissions are well-documented in literature, recognised by national and international stakeholders and are reflected in joint context analyses of actors across the humanitarian and development communities. IOM's assessment of various issues impacting upon the population is by no means exhaustive, though does serve to demonstrate a clear need for sector-specific and/or cross-cutting interventions that address issues of peace and conflict among pastoralist communities, including insufficient livelihoods for pastoralist youth and chronic social protection issues.

Given the context within which the project was conceptualised and the components it included, and in accordance with IOM's internal project classification guidelines, the project

under review was determined to be a ‘community stabilisation’ intervention and was vetted by competent IOM programme development staff and units within the IOM Nairobi Regional Office for East Africa and the Organization’s headquarters in Geneva. The project’s overall objective, ‘to contribute to the resilience and protection of disaster-affected and/or marginalised communities’, is clearly aligned with IOM’s stated national and regional objectives and strategies and lies squarely within the Organization’s globally demonstrated competence to deliver community stabilisation programming in line with the project’s outcomes and outputs. IOM defines community stabilisation as an approach ‘that aims at fostering stability and security in vulnerable communities, including communities of return, by preventing, mitigating and addressing the adverse impact of forced migration that can arise after a natural and/or man-made crisis’. Programmatic platforms supportive of this project’s activities are reflected in IOM’s Migration Crisis Operational Framework (MCOF), specifically in Sector 7 (Activities to Support Community Stabilization and Transition), Sector 8 (Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience Building) and Sector 10 (Counter-trafficking and Protection of Vulnerable Migrants). The Organization’s previous and on-going projects in Kenya in support of the objectives of peacebuilding, livelihood development and social protection enhancement attest to its sustained focus on these issues and evolving capacity to deliver relevant programming.

A review of Kenya’s national and regional humanitarian and development strategy documents reveals a shared interpretation of issues as well as endorsement of identified programmatic initiatives to address these. The Government of Kenya-endorsed United Nations 2013 Emergency Humanitarian Response Plan elaborates on a range of humanitarian issues affecting populations across the country and synthesises programmatic initiatives proposed by aid agencies involved in response actions. IOM’s project is in line with the three overall strategic objectives outlined therein and outputs correspond to specific response plans foreseen under the Agriculture and Livestock, Coordination, Education, Multisector, Protection, and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) sectors. The project is in line with and supports the three economic, social and political governance pillars of Kenya’s Vision 2030, which aspires to be a ‘national long-term development blue-print to create a globally competitive and prosperous nation with a high quality of life by 2030...’. At the local level, the project responds to issues and needs detailed within the Integrated Development Plans of Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Marsabit and Garissa counties, which IOM has evidently played a role in assisting in elaborating.

IOM’s intervention was funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, whose commitment to advancing the following six objectives within its Aid Policy Framework has provided orientation for the conceptualisation of the project’s objectives and delivery of its activities:

- Strengthened democracy and gender equality, greater respect for human rights and freedom from oppression
- Better opportunities for people living in poverty to contribute to and benefit from economic growth and obtain a good education
- A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to

- environmental impact, climate change and natural disasters
- Improved basic health
- Safeguarding human security and freedom from violence
- Saving lives, alleviating suffering and maintaining human dignity

2.1.2 Project rationale

Framed within the parameters of IOM's 'community stabilisation' approach, the project rationale highlights a number of issues identified as contributing to instability and protection concerns within pastoralist communities throughout arid and semi-arid regions of northern Kenya. The underlying rationale of the project's intervention logic departs from the contextual analysis outlined in the above and is informed by a number of hypotheses and assumptions that are only partially defined and mostly inferred within the project document. While there was no theory of change elaborated within the project document to establish an explicit causal link between indicators, intervention outcomes and assumptions within a defined overall framework, a results matrix provides a general overview of how specific activities were envisioned as contributing to the project's outputs, outcomes and objective.

From key informant interviews with project staff and a review of IOM reports and strategy documents, it is evident that IOM has a clear understanding of the issues which the project intended to address as well as competency to delivery the specific interventions foreseen to that end. However, given the extremely short duration of the project and the complexity of issues to be addressed through the optic of community stabilisation, there was recognition among IOM project management and field staff alike that the overall objective of the project might have been too ambitiously framed. Development of a more detailed theory of change at the stage of project design may have aided IOM in the conceptualisation and articulation of objectives, outcomes and outputs that may have been more appropriate for the short timeline and which would have relied upon measurable indicators linked to the intended impact of activities themselves rather than IOM's ability to deliver such activities.

While the relevance of the intervention is evident and broadly reflected within the project's rationale, a more detailed articulation of the concepts of resilience and protection and a causal link of these to the specific outcome-level objectives of peace-building, livelihood development and enhancement of social protection might have aided IOM in framing the various outcomes within a more coherent community stabilisation optic. Issues related to project design will be elaborated on further in subsequent sections.

Despite deficiencies in the conceptual elaboration of the rationale underlying the intervention logic, stakeholders interviewed in all project locations shared a common understanding of the challenges and issues which the project's specific activities and sub-components sought to address. Though there was limited demonstrated understanding for the concept of resilience at a macro level, stakeholders clearly understood the intervention logic of the project's subcomponents that they were familiar with, could identify the links between the issues and readily recognized the mutually reinforcing nature and relevance of the project's three components. In their own words, most stakeholders were able to define

what stability, protection and resilience meant to them as individuals and community members and offered such interpretations within the context of their comments on the project's relevance.

2.1.3 Alignment with stakeholder needs and priorities

The primary stakeholders of the project included target beneficiary groups, national and local authorities and administrative bodies, ministry representatives at the national and county levels, local and international non-governmental organisations and a wide range of community groups and civil society organisations. As has been highlighted above, IOM's intervention responds to needs and priorities identified by the Government of Kenya at the national and county levels, which is reflected in multilateral relief strategies and official development agendas. Beyond a review of foundational documents supporting the alignment of IOM's intervention with stakeholder needs and priorities at the phase of project conceptualisation, interviews conducted with key stakeholders during field visits attest to the effectiveness of strategies employed and consistency of IOM in engaging stakeholders in consultation to ensure the project's relevance at the national, regional and community levels.

At the county and community levels, it is evidently IOM's sustained presence within targeted communities and progressively deepened relationships with a range of relevant stakeholders that has facilitated on-going dialogue on their respective needs and perspectives in addressing the issues relevant to the project. This presence has allowed IOM to perceive of emerging needs and opportunities for initiatives in a timely manner and to seek to engage communities and relevant stakeholders in a meaningful exchange that adequately accommodates their distinct viewpoints within programmatic initiatives. IOM's previous programming addressing peacebuilding and livelihoods within target communities in the aftermath of the 2007-2008 post-election violence has paid dividends into the future by providing a foothold from which successive interventions might be developed with the active participation of communities, local administrative bodies and authorities. It is clear that sustained pre-existing relationships and maintained channels of communication have been leveraged in the lead-up to the SIDA-funded intervention to inform programmatic initiatives and have served to facilitate the delivery of activities. Informal consultation of stakeholders occurred during the conceptualization phase, which was followed by a round of formal stakeholder workshops delivered in the four counties at the inception phase (September and October) in order to introduce the project objective, its specific activities and prepare stakeholders to become active participants in its delivery. It is evident that consultation with stakeholders has continued throughout the delivery of the intervention, and this has served to allow IOM to continuously manage expectations, address concerns, pre-empt security-related issues and capitalise on emerging opportunities.

IOM's detailed knowledge of the operational environment within the target counties, strong working relationships with institutional and civil society actors, and the Organization's excellent reputation as a competent and consistent partner has ensured and facilitated broad and effective consultation with relevant stakeholders and was an integral element to

IOM's success in conceiving of and delivering a highly relevant intervention.

Finding 1: The project's intended results are highly relevant to the context within which it was conceived and delivered, and despite project design issues identified with regard to the rationale underlying its intervention logic, the project very accurately responded to needs and priorities of stakeholders involved at all levels.

2.2 Effectiveness

The OECD-DAC defines 'effectiveness' as 'a measure to the extent which an aid activity attains its objectives'. This definition may be expanded to account for factors that may be of relevance in influencing the achievement or non-achievement of an intervention's objectives, thus permitting a broader assessment of how effectiveness may be subject to controllable and uncontrollable variables. This evaluation's consideration of the effectiveness of the intervention departs from a review of the project's objective and intended outcomes vis-à-vis their associated indicators, with attention given to specific activities foreseen within the various components' outputs, and supplements this assessment with consideration of beneficiary involvement in the delivery of activities, coordination of the action with partners and stakeholders and a non-exhaustive review of primary internal and external factors which may have influenced the achievement of the project's outcomes.

2.2.1 Project Objective – Enhanced resilience and protection of communities

It is recalled here that the stated objective of the project was 'to contribute to the resilience and protection of disaster-affected and/or marginalized communities'. Three outcomes supported this objective, namely i) communities affected by resource-based conflict have improved capacities to address conflicts and promote peace; ii) pastoralist youth have improved livelihoods; and iii) social protection practitioners in marginalized communities have improved capacities to promote and provide social protection services. These outcomes were sub-divided into seven outputs, which were in turn to be achieved through the delivery of fifteen distinct, though mutually-reinforcing activities.

At the level of the project objective, achievement was to be measured through an associated indicator that tracked the 'proportion of vulnerable or marginalised community members who participated in peace-building activities, received livelihoods support and social protection services in the project', or, in other words, the cumulative number of individuals benefitting from the project's three sub-components. The articulation of this indicator presupposes that enhanced resilience and protection of disaster-affected and/or marginalised communities may be determined through a cumulative tally of project beneficiaries, though offers no scope for measuring actual resilience or protection itself. The intervention logic makes an implicit assumption that both resilience and protection are functions of communities' enhanced capacities to address conflict and promote peace, the

improved livelihoods of pastoralist youth and an enhanced capacity of social protection providers to promote and provide social protection services. While these may well be fundamental elements of more resilient and effectively protected communities, the articulation of the indicator prevents a true measure of effectiveness of the project in reaching its overall objective.

This indicator lacked a baseline and the overall target was set at 10,000 beneficiaries. At the level of project objective, reported achievement was 44,397 beneficiaries, or, again, the cumulative number of individuals reached through the project's subcomponents. The overall achievement rate of 444% is attributable to a general overachievement across all of the project's outcomes and most of its outputs. While such hyper-achievement may generally be desirable within the context of reaching beneficiaries through the project's activities, it provides no scope for a truly measurable evaluation of the project's effectiveness in advancing the stated objective, and is rather indicative of the wide reach of IOM's activities and the ability of the Organization itself to deliver these to target populations.

Overachievement by such a dramatic magnitude begs the question of how initial assumptions, planning figures and costing of associated budget lines were arrived at in the project conception phase and if and/or how IOM was able to capitalise on synergies to realise savings or otherwise stretch resources to reach such a large number of beneficiaries. It was evident through key informant interviews and focus group discussions that project beneficiaries were largely satisfied with their involvement in the project, though virtually all commented that they had hoped that cooperation might have been deepened or extended into the future in order to enhance and further solidify gains made with respect to intended outputs of individual project activities. While the criteria of efficiency and cost-effectiveness will be addressed below, it is worth noting in this context that the achievement rate of 444% should prompt IOM to reassess planning figures and costing of activities in delivering subsequent related actions.

Though the indicator associated with the project objective did not permit a truly measurable evaluation of the actual effectiveness of the project in advancing resilience and protection of communities, discussions with beneficiaries and key stakeholders provides anecdotal evidence that the project was indeed effective in increasing beneficiaries' *perceptions* of enhanced resilience and protection. In many interviews, beneficiaries of the various activities were able to define in their own terms what resilience and protection meant to them and their communities and how they interpreted this to be enhanced through their engagement with IOM within the scope of the project. Future interventions with similar objectives might benefit from more clearly defined indicators that depart from a baseline and take stock of beneficiary perception at regular intervals throughout the duration of the action.

2.2.2 Outcome 1 – Community capacity to address conflicts and promote peace

The first outcome of the project sought to address a need to improve capacity of communities affected by resource-based conflict to promote peace and address conflicts. This was to be achieved through two outputs that aimed to reinforce positive engagement and enhance cohesion among community members through developing shared resources and by enhancing communities' awareness of potential conflicts through developing and diffusing knowledge on early warning and response mechanisms. This project component was to be delivered in three of the target areas, namely Turkana, Marsabit and Garissa counties, and relied upon the close cooperation of identified 'peace stakeholders' including local administration, District Peace Committees (DPC), religious leaders, Government ministries and entities such as the National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management and local and international NGOs.

The project foresaw five specific activities that would contribute to achieving the objective of the peace-building component. Achievement of the component's objective of improving communities' capacities to address conflict and promote peace was to be measured through two indicators that gauged community members' i) perceptions of improved relations between conflict-prone communities and social groups, and ii) perceptions of improved knowledge of conflict early warning and response mechanisms. Neither indicator was anchored to a defined baseline, though IOM carried out a community member survey at the inception phase of the project (September-October) in order to establish a benchmark for community members' perceptions of levels of conflict and tension and to obtain data on their nature and severity, their origin and the underlying causes associated therewith.

At the level of outcome within this subcomponent, it is interesting to note that the only indicator within the entire project which produced sub-target levels of achievement was that associated with the 'proportion of community members who perceive improved relations between conflict-prone communities and social groups'. A total of 266 respondents were interviewed to generate data on this indicator (92 in the initial survey and 174 at the end of the project), and IOM's intended target of a 50% rate of change in improvement of perception fell short by 18 percentage points, registering only 32%. Articulation of the indicator suggests that the intention of this component was to reduce conflict, though the actual objective of the outcome was to 'improve capacities [of community members] to address conflicts and promote peace'. While it is certainly interesting to gauge individuals' perception of conflict and tensions within their communities, it is arguably beyond the scope of the project's activities to directly reduce conflict. A more appropriately articulated indicator for measuring outcome achievement may have sought to capture community members' perceptions of their capacity to address conflict and promote peace, and not the existence of conflict as such. Nonetheless, the low achievement of this indicator may not be indicative of the overall effectiveness of the subcomponent as field interviews with key informants and focus groups involved in this project component invariably returned evidence of communities' enhanced awareness of conflict triggers and means for de-escalation and resolution. It is also worth noting that the imbalance in number of community members surveyed in the initial assessment (92) versus those surveyed in the

final assessment (174), may have skewed results.

The second indicator associated with the outcome, (proportion of community members who perceive improved knowledge of early warning and response mechanisms) reported achievement beyond the intended target of 30%, (36%), with an overall 88% of surveyed individuals responding positively to having received related information. It was evident in key informant interviews and focus group discussions with District Peace Committee members that IOM's awareness raising activities, including diffusion of educational materials and support for local-level conflict resolution mechanisms, had been effective enough to register achievements also at the outcome level.

2.2.2.1 Output 1.1 – Reinforced positive community relations

Activities carried out within this project output were reported to have met or exceeded initial targets, though their respective contributions towards advancing the objective of improving community capacities to address conflict and promote peace were variable. The intended output objective of reinforcing communities' positive engagement and enhanced cohesion through shared resources foresaw three activities, namely: i) convening of community consultations and focus group discussions; ii) installation of small-scale peace infrastructure projects, and iii) establishment/rehabilitation of water points along key migratory routes.

Over the course of the project, IOM carried out a total of 121 focus group discussions with 5,371 participants within the three counties targeted under this component. Focus group discussions were originally conceived of as a means to advancing the related activities of peace infrastructure development and water point installation, though given their reported significance in serving as a broad-based forum to address contentious resource issues, share knowledge with neighbouring communities and to generate a common understanding of challenges and identify potential cooperative responses to these, they assumed a more prominent role within the activities delivered and were more frequently convened and widely attended. In interviews with local community members and District Peace Committee representatives, the importance of a moderated forum at the community level that engaged the active participation of tribal elders, Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs, local administration, youth representatives, police officers and Government officials was emphasized, and respondents were able to offer anecdotal evidence of focus group discussions' contributions to pre-empting inter-and intra-communal conflict resulting from cattle rustling, sharing scarce resources such as pasture and water, theft within the community and other illicit activities of youth whose behaviour was considered to have a destabilizing effect upon community relations. It is evident that the inclusiveness of community-led focus group discussions was deemed to be key in ensuring that awareness for potential conflict issues was diffused among the broader community and for creating broad accountability for upholding decisions and outcomes. While there were concerns raised by IOM project staff in Nairobi that incentives provided to community members to engage in focus group discussions (catering of lunches) might serve as an ulterior motive for participation, this had not been raised in the field and discussions conducted with individuals directly involved in

these activities suggested that this element of IOM's intervention was perceived to be an important and effective means for advancing the outcome objective. There is evidence that IOM has sought to pursue alternative cooperative arrangements with participating groups whereby communities themselves are held responsible for contributing food for the event; an approach which may further enhance a sense of shared ownership among the beneficiary groups.

The development of small-scale peace infrastructure projects was foreseen as a means to pre-empting conflict between communities by engaging them in a cooperative activity that would promote positive interaction around a common objective and which might be sustained into the future, establishing a platform for cooperation and generating patterns of peaceful interaction. The project foresaw two such peace infrastructure activities, which were eventually realised in Marsabit and Garissa counties. In Garissa county, a consultative forum convened by the District Peace Committee discussed the objective of the peace infrastructure activity and ultimately proposed the installation of a milk shade at a market place where women from various ethnic groups were densely concentrated and competed for adequate space where they might sell their milk without it becoming spoiled under the strong mid-morning sun. A site visit to the milk shade and discussion with beneficiaries there confirmed that the objective of the activity was indeed being realised and that levels of trust had been increased while tensions among the women and between their respective communities had dissipated as a result.

The peace infrastructure project realised in Marsabit county was witnessed to have failed in achieving the intended outcome of bringing communities together in pursuit of positive, cooperative activity. The Marsabit project, which was jointly identified by District Peace Committee members and Government officials, foresaw the joint development and management of a livestock market, which would serve to promote peace among the Rendile, Borana and Gabara tribes who compete for water, pasture and markets to sustain livelihoods dependent upon cattle rearing. A site visit to the intended livestock market and focus group discussion held with stakeholder community members revealed that the project was deemed by the participants to be both incomplete and unsatisfactorily executed. The livestock market itself was reported to not correspond with participants' expectations, as it lacked essential elements which would ensure its function. Its construction was evaluated as sub-par and participants complained that their communities had not been involved in the actual construction, which was sub-contracted to a third party. On this point, the participants stressed that joint construction by the communities themselves would have been in accordance with widely-recognised best practices and the joint action would have been a logical and effective means for bringing them together in a positive and cooperative pursuit. The name given to the livestock market and indicated on the official sign at its location was apparently associated with only one of the participating tribes, and the group's proposed name for the market, the 'Amani Livestock Market' ('amani' meaning 'peace' in Swahili), was apparently disregarded. The group reported that their dissatisfaction had been communicated to IOM, but that no action had been taken to complete the project or rectify the grievance associated with the naming of the location. Subsequent discussions with IOM project staff revealed that the grievances were indeed understood and appreciated, but that

staff who had been involved in the delivery of this activity had unduly raised beneficiaries' expectations and since left IOM without providing a complete handover to the incoming staff member assuming responsibility for following up with the group. It is evident that though the activity had been delivered, the market itself was not functional and its effect did not advance the objective of promoting peace among the concerned communities, rather represented a point of discord and mistrust between the stakeholders. This extensive account of the issue serves primarily to permit the identification of relevant lessons learned through the action and to provide context for recommendations.

The variable success realised by this activity in the two sites, and the reasons for its partial failure in advancing the objective suggest that while the mechanism may be an effective means for advancing peace outcomes, it is paramount that infrastructure peace-building initiatives be consistently delivered through the optic of peace and that stakeholders' expectations are transparently and uniformly managed throughout the duration of the action. Staff members involved in the delivery of these activities must be adequately sensitised to the delicacy of such interventions and trained to anticipate and address eventualities that may undermine the overall effectiveness of the initiative. The risk of peace infrastructure initiatives being delivered through the lens of livelihood activities must be recognised by programme management and measures should be taken to ensure that there is appreciation among involved staff for the necessary difference in their conceptualisation and implementation.

Due to time constraints in the field, the evaluator did not have an opportunity to visit the water points rehabilitated and installed under this project, though interviews with project staff indicate that they were effective in achieving the intended outcome and anecdotal evidence substantiating this claim was provided in the form of pictures and third-party stakeholder testimony, including the Deputy County Commissioner of Marsabit and heads of District Peace Committees overseeing related GoK programming.

In order to enhance the effectiveness of IOM's peacebuilding activities, it was suggested that the Organization continue to seek to establish simple physical structures along community boundaries that would serve to host peace dialogue fora and community consultations. It was noted that several such structures already exist in the areas of activity, with some serving as 'cultural centres', though it was commented that they were not made available to communities targeted under this project through peacebuilding activities. It was likewise noted by stakeholders that communities engaged in peace activities need to remain active contributors to ensure their investment beyond being recipients of support. While it is evident that IOM has endeavoured to do this, an emphasis on 'achieving together' as opposed to 'receiving together' should be maintained.

2.2.2.2 Output 1.2 – Conflict early warning and response systems

Activities carried out within this project output were likewise reported to have met or exceeded initial targets, and evidently made a significant contribution to advancing the outcome objective. The intended output objective of enhancing community awareness of

potential conflicts and early warning and response mechanisms foresaw two activities, namely: i) development of education material on early warning systems to strengthen linkages between local level and national early warning systems; and ii) establishment and/or development of local level conflict resolution mechanisms through support to District Peace Committees.

Under this component, IOM reports to have developed 1,450 information, education and communication (IEC) materials containing peace messages and raising awareness on early warning systems. This number corresponds to a rate of almost 300% achievement beyond the initial target of 500. Messages and materials were developed in cooperation with Kenya's National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management and the Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN), which is a collaborative effort of the seven Member States of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). Materials included reflector jackets, t-shirts and umbrellas and were reported to have been distributed throughout priority communities. Field interviews and focus group discussions conducted with community members, representatives of District Peace Committees and Deputy County Commissioners overseeing the Kenyan Government's peacebuilding initiatives unanimously endorsed distribution of IEC materials as an effective means for spreading peace messages, as these prompted curiosity about the related activities. Additionally, it was noted that garments were seen to lend legitimacy to the actions and efforts of peace actors responsible for facilitating peace dialogue fora within their communities. The presence of IEC materials was readily perceivable within some communities, and it was evident that they were not worn or displayed solely for the benefit of the evaluator.

Following post election violence in 2007/2008, there has been growing recognition of the need to institutionalise traditional and community-based peace structures at the district, sub-district and community levels. This is reflected in Kenya's 2008 National Accord and Reconciliation Act, and progress has been made in the establishment of District and Local Peace Committees. Within the target communities, IOM has been engaged with the local Government in the roll out of peace activities since at least 2010, contributing to the strengthening of an emerging national peace architecture. Having contributed to Government of Kenya efforts to establish a National Steering Committee for Conflict Management and Peace Building, IOM developed strong relations and a good reputation not only at the community level, but also with local and national Government partners. IOM's support under this project for Government of Kenya peacebuilding efforts is most visible in its continued engagement with District Peace Committees and local peace committees, which are viewed to be instrumental in pre-empting the spread of resource-based conflict and sustaining mediated and cooperative development within and across communities throughout northern Kenya. Emerging from interviews and discussions carried out in the field, the establishment and further development of local-level conflict resolution mechanisms is widely regarded as the single most effective activity delivered by the Organization in support of advancing the objective of building community capacity to promote peace and address conflicts.

Specifically, this activity foresaw the collaboration of IOM with the NSC to jointly deliver training to district and local peace committee members on conflict resolution mechanisms and early warning systems. Resulting from the on-going process of decentralisation occurring across Kenya, community level peacebuilding activities have gained greater significance and have been facilitated by the progressive devolution of authority to lower levels of administration in closer proximity to communities. As local peace committee members are now directly elected by their communities to represent their interests within DPC fora, many participants may lack pre-existing knowledge of peacebuilding, so their effective contribution within dialogue fora and resultant returns to their communities is witnessed to be variable. IOM's support for training to district and local level peace committee members is seen to have ensured that these representatives are not 'empty vessels' and that they are able to proactively contribute to peacebuilding efforts within and beyond their communities, establishing an effective link between the various levels - from the individual *boma* to the Deputy County Commissioner's office - ultimately enabling the Government structure to function in a meaningful way within target areas.

IOM reported having carried out a total of three large-scale peacebuilding trainings and 51 peacebuilding sessions over the duration of the project, reaching 3,894 individuals throughout target communities. Beneficiaries of trainings were reported to be considered 'custodians of peace' within their communities and the training not only provided them with relevant skills and knowledge with which they were more able to effectively communicate peace messages and leverage Government-supported early warning and response mechanisms, but also lent them a degree of prestige and legitimacy within the eyes of their communities. Community members reported that messages and knowledge were becoming diffuse and they were able to provide anecdotal evidence of measures enacted which pre-empted and/or mitigated conflict between communities over pasture and water resources, both within target counties and even across international borders (Kenya-Turkana/Uganda). Peace actors operating within communities are evidently increasingly viewed as figures of authority, are approached by community members on relevant issues, and they have been empowered to bring together relevant stakeholders including Chiefs, tribal elders, religious leaders, prominent community members and local authorities including police officials in order to promote dialogue, enact mediation, guarantee verbal agreements and address emerging conflict scenarios.

With the exception of Moyale in Marsabit county, there were no major incidents of conflict throughout the target areas during project implementation. Given that this conflict occurred before roll out of project activities in this area, there was no scope to evaluate IOM's contribution to enhancing the Government's peacebuilding and early warning and response mechanisms there. Beyond this, given the relative stability throughout the project period, there was no larger-scale litmus test for the actual effectiveness of the Government's early warning and response mechanism, though data and contextual evidence obtained through field interviews and discussions suggest that, due to IOM's support for a Government-led initiative, this activity was indeed an effective element of IOM's peacebuilding component. The reported achievement against the outcome level indicator of 'raised community awareness for potential conflict and mitigating measures' seems to validate this finding,

though more severe and generalized conflict may yet test its true effectiveness. In any case, training and knowledge enhancement has proven itself an essential element within IOM's strategy of contributing to the resilience and protection of marginalised communities, and synergies with the other project components are readily recognisable in terms of delivering mutually reinforcing elements of a community stabilisation approach.

Finding 2: The effectiveness of IOM's peacebuilding activities has been most visible through support afforded to Government of Kenya structures and initiatives whereby IOM-delivered capacity building and knowledge enhancement have amplified the coordination and functioning of Government-led institutions and programmes.

2.2.3 Outcome 2 – Improved livelihoods of marginalized pastoralist youth

The second outcome of the project sought to address a need to improve livelihoods of marginalised pastoralist youth. This was to be achieved through two outputs that aimed to increase youth access to entrepreneurial training and enhance their access to self-employment activities. This project component was to be delivered in all four target counties and relied upon the close cooperation of Government entities including the Ministry of Gender and Social Services, the Ministry of Youth Affairs, the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Industrialisation and Enterprise Management, the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA), the Kenya Equity Bank, local administration, community-based organisations (CBO), local and international NGOs and youth groups.

The project foresaw five specific activities that would contribute to achieving the objective of the livelihoods component of improving youth livelihoods. This was to be measured through two indicators that gauged the i) proportion of pastoralist youth that have acquired skills and enhanced knowledge through vocational trainings, and ii) the proportion of pastoralist youth participating in the project's income generating activities at the end of the project cycle. Neither indicator was anchored to a defined baseline, though IOM carried out market assessments in each of the target counties at the inception phase in order to identify the most appropriate and relevant vocational skills to support within the scope of the project. A total of 126 individuals were interviewed for this purpose.

At the level of outcome within this subcomponent, IOM exceeded initial targets whereby 92% of surveyed youth participating in the project reported having acquired skills and enhanced knowledge through participating in vocational trainings, and 82% of youth participating in the income-generating activity (IGA) support mechanism were still engaged in this activity at the end of the project cycle.

2.2.3.1 Output 2.1 – Youth access to entrepreneurial training

IOM's market assessment and consultations with key stakeholders within the four target counties revealed a number of market segments that were relevant to the local economies and which could absorb increased labour supply. A total of five vocational skills sets were assessed to be of primary relevance, with variance in priority according to the specific local context. The vocational skills sets identified by IOM for support under this component were entrepreneurship, tailoring, computer literacy, driving and agriculture, with entrepreneurship skills training streamlined and delivered across all counties. A total of 433 youth participated in the vocational skills trainings throughout the duration of the project, with slightly more women benefitting than men (54% and 46%, respectively). The outcome of 433 individuals trained represents an overachievement beyond the initial target of 100 beneficiaries, corresponding to a rate of 433%. Training courses were delivered over the course of three-month periods and beneficiaries were selected according to a standardized set of criteria, which was evidently uniformly applied across the target areas. Key informant interviews revealed that IOM's selection criteria favoured support for individuals, including small business owners, who had previously engaged with IOM through other projects, were lacking key skills necessary to obtain organised or self-employment, and who demonstrated a commitment to completing the three-month courses. Special consideration was given to individuals with social protection needs and referral across project components was witnessed.

Data and anecdotal evidence obtained through stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions revealed that the vast majority of youth who had participated in the vocational trainings were putting their newly acquired or further developed skills to use and had witnessed measurable returns on the time investment made participating in the course. Most youth who had obtained vocational skills were actively employed – either independently or formally, and entrepreneurial skills were recognised to have broad application beyond what might have been anticipated as their originally intended focus. While youth interviewed by the evaluator stressed that trainings were typically too short in duration in order to allow them to completely acquire and perfect skill sets, they recognised that the training had opened doors by introducing new skill sets that would have otherwise not been available to them through alternative avenues. Youth reported an intention to continue to develop skill sets and unanimously requested IOM to continue to support such initiatives in order that they might again benefit from trainings. It was evident that skills acquired had permitted many youth to realise earnings which they could invest in further productive inputs to advance livelihoods that were either related or unrelated to the vocational skills IOM had trained them in. Several youth who had benefitted from the training were successfully managing small businesses and they attributed this success at least partially to the support received from IOM through vocational training. The awarding of IOM-issued certificates upon completion of trainings was recognised to be at least as valuable as the training itself, as these were deemed important for attesting to youth's professional level qualifications and were viewed as passports for entry into local job markets. In some cases, anecdotal evidence suggested that income generated through application of acquired skills might be cascading benefits to families and broader

communities, as these were enabled to access services that might have otherwise cost them considerably more in the external market.

Support provided for vocational skill development was viewed as having had a knock-on effect in terms of advancing the objectives of both peacebuilding and social protection. There was abundant evidence offered for this assertion, whereby youth who might otherwise have engaged in socially destabilising or illegal activities or even irregular migration had been afforded an opportunity to develop skill sets that would give them access to the local labour market and permit them to contribute positively to both their household economies and broader communities. Interviews with individuals and groups formerly engaged in illegal brewing, cattle rustling and/or who had contemplated irregular migration via traffickers and human smugglers to other countries attest to this.

The evident effectiveness of this activity in regards to the component's objective of improving marginalised pastoralist youth's livelihoods is considerable. Throughout all target counties and across all project components, key informants and focus groups interviewed were aware of and extremely appreciative of IOM's support for vocational training targeting youth. Though the total caseload of beneficiaries reached through this activity represented less than 1% of the entire beneficiary caseload of the project's three components, its relevance to the success of the project's community stabilisation approach cannot be overstated. Beyond the effectiveness of the activity at the output and outcome level, there was broad consensus among respondents that skills enhancement linked to subsequent livelihood support was crucial to achieving both resilience and protection within the target communities. The direct correlation noted between idleness of youth and instability within communities was uniformly echoed by peacebuilding, livelihood and social protection stakeholders, and while there was appreciation for the relevance of the three components, most respondents emphasised that focusing on enhancing youth access to marketable and remunerative vocational skills should be considered as the core element of IOM's programme.

2.2.3.2 Output 2.2 – Youth access to self-employment opportunities

With the intention of amplifying the effectiveness of vocational skills training and providing support which would enable youth to leverage newly acquired skills towards productive ends, the project foresaw the provision of business start-up kits and small grants to graduates of vocational skills training courses. IOM developed strict criteria by which the awarding of a start-up kit would be made and prioritisation of candidates proceeded in line with an assessment of suitability of location, relevant experience, performance in the vocational skills training courses and relative need/vulnerability. Again, It was made clear to individuals participating in the vocational skills trainings that not all would benefit from IGA support, though there was evidently considerable overlap of these two beneficiary categories. IOM intended to support up to sixteen groups with income generating activity inputs, and overachieved with respect to this target, supporting a final total of 25 groups comprising 380 individuals. Youth groups aspiring to benefit from IGA activities were obliged to be registered with the Ministry of Social Services and to respond to a call for proposals

issued by IOM, after which their IGA project submissions would be vetted according to criteria elaborated above with further consideration given to the viability of their business concepts.

The effectiveness of pairing vocational skills training with subsequent support for the development of an income-generating activity is well-documented and IOM's approach to the delivery of this activity has not only been well-received by beneficiaries, but has also served the intended purpose of enhancing their access to alternative livelihoods. Articulation of business concepts within project applications submitted to IOM has afforded participants an opportunity to utilise skills obtained in entrepreneurial trainings, and the productive inputs provided by IOM in accordance with these has permitted practical application of skills for the advancement of individuals' and groups' chosen alternative livelihood activities. The model of supporting groups with IGA inputs is seen to have been a very effective approach to bringing together youth from different tribes and ethnicities in the pursuit of a common objective, and the returns witnessed through their various micro-enterprises is not merely of a monetary value. From car wash enterprises to event planning and management, beauty salons, shoemaking, horticulture, tailoring, dairy and passion fruit farming businesses and beyond, IGA-supported groups invariably report positive experiences as a result of having benefitted from this project. Income-generating activities have provided beneficiaries the means to establish a platform from which they can pursue alternative livelihoods within their communities and afforded them positive alternatives to oftentimes otherwise risky, illegal or untenable means of sourcing an income. Groups have not only reinvested revenue in their original businesses, but many have also chosen to further diversify their investments through group loans, which have allowed for sub-groups and individuals to further pursue alternative livelihoods beyond those supported by IOM.

While there is a clear interest among youth to pursue alternative livelihoods within their communities that are not dependent upon traditional agro-pastoral lifestyles, it is evident that some youth have approached the issue of environmental degradation head-on, and are investigating opportunities to develop businesses that address environmental degradation itself. While this had not been part of their original business concept, subsequent trainings offered by IOM have increased their awareness of these issues from a community perspective, and the revenue they've gained through their original micro-enterprises has allowed them to entertain the possibility of small business ventures within the sector of sustainable development.

In order to enhance the effectiveness of IOM's livelihood support activities, it was suggested that the Organization might investigate the possibility of pairing this with activities that would address issues of primary concern to communities, such as food security and environmental degradation, seeking to align these activities for amplified impact. Respondents commented that support for small-scale saving schemes such as village saving loans associations and village community banks would further encourage a culture of saving that would likely enhance the effectiveness of primary activities, resulting in greater economic empowerment of marginalised youth and women, and ultimately, broader community resilience. Many groups interviewed emphasised the value of exchange visits to other community-based projects in order to gain perspective on approaches, share lessons

learned in similar contexts and create links beyond immediate community borders.

Though it was evident that IOM-supported small business endeavours were not devoid of their challenges and that beneficiaries hoped to receive additional input support that would allow them to address operational failures and meet the demands of difficult local business environments, as has been witnessed with regard to the perceived effectiveness of vocational training, support for IGA is considered to be a particularly effective means for furthering community resilience and protection. Again, while the IGA support provided to 380 individuals represents less than 1% of the entire project's beneficiary caseload, stakeholders across the board recognised its value and relevance and perceived it as a crucial element within the portfolio of activities delivered by IOM. Respondents were unanimous in their desire for further similarly sequenced and paired training/IGA initiatives for youth and were evidently eager to share their ideas with IOM. Though the very short project duration has impeded the evaluation of longer-term effectiveness and eventual impact of the activity, given the relatively small size of the beneficiary group supported through this project component, there may be scope under future actions to pursue a follow up survey targeting this control group that would provide insight into the situation of the beneficiaries vis-à-vis that of their peers. This might shed light on the extent to which this activity has contributed to any outcomes that may be identifiable, and future actions may consider allocating a specific budget line to monitoring and evaluation of these specific activities.

Finding 3: Support for improving youth access to vocational and entrepreneurial training paired with self-determined income generating activities is seen as highly effective in advancing the objective of increasing resilience of communities, and within the prevailing context, should be envisioned as a cornerstone of community stabilisation programming.

2.2.4 Outcome 3 – Improved knowledge and skills of social protection practitioners

The third outcome of the project sought to address a need to improve the capacity of social protection practitioners to promote and provide social protection services. This was to be achieved through three outputs that aimed to i) improve social practitioners' skills, knowledge and resources; ii) enhance victims' and survivors' access to direct assistance and support services, and iii) sensitise community members on safe migration practices and prevention of SGBV. This project component was to be delivered in all four target counties and relied upon the close cooperation of Government entities including the Ministry of Gender and Social Services, the Ministry of Health, immigration officers, women's group leaders, local police officers, local administration, community-based organisations and local and international NGOs.

The project foresaw six specific activities that would contribute to achieving the objective of this component, which was to be measured through two indicators that gauged the i) number of social protection practitioners completing training on identification and referral of SGBV and human trafficking cases in accordance with Kenya's 2006 Sexual Offenses Act

and 2010 Counter-trafficking in Persons Act; and ii) proportion of identified victims of SGBV provided with psychosocial support and referral to appropriate institutions. Only the first indicator had a baseline, which referred to practitioners trained in Eldoret (Uasin Gishu) and Nairobi in 2008, which was thus largely irrelevant in measuring achievement of the outcome.

At the level of outcome within this subcomponent, IOM vastly exceeded one of the initial targets whereby 479 social practitioners received training (against the target of 100), and 100% of the victims of trafficking and SGBV were provided with psychosocial support and referral. In this context, it is worth noting that the indicators developed to measure the success of the outcome are primarily useful in evaluating IOM's success in delivering the related activities and do not necessarily provide scope for an assessment of the effectiveness of the outputs in advancing the component objective. The indicators of outcomes and outputs within this component may have yielded more conclusive evidence of the effectiveness of the activities if they have been articulated in a manner so as to permit assessment of demonstration of knowledge and skills enhanced and afforded scope to evaluate this at intervals throughout the lifetime of the project.

2.2.4.1 Output 3.1 – Skills, knowledge and resources

The intended objective of this output was to be achieved through the delivery of three activities that focused on training social protection practitioners and health professionals on provision of psychosocial support in emergencies, identification and referral of victims of trafficking and SGBV, and the provision of in-kind support to Government health facilities to enable their provision of clinical care and management of SGBV cases. IOM reports to have trained a total of 479 social protection practitioners, well exceeding the intended target of 100 individuals. Stakeholders interviewed and participants of focus group discussions recognized the critical need to diffuse information on issues such as SGBV, female genital mutilation (FGM) and trafficking, and indicated that IOM's delivery of this was relevant, timely and comprehensive. IOM's engagement of community elders evidently helped to overcome cultural stigmas associated with diffusing such messages within communities, and elders themselves are reported to have played an active role in generating acceptance of the activities at the community level. Gender Desk Officers at local police stations reported never having been introduced to the 2006 Sexual Offenses and 2010 Counter Trafficking in Persons Acts before their participation in IOM's trainings and confirmed that this exposure had provided them with relevant skills and knowledge to more effectively carry out their functions. Training of police officers beyond those who manned the Gender Desk was considered to be especially critical in order to sensitise frontline responders who could not only provide timely referral and protection, but also seek to prosecute offenders. This remained an evident challenge and respondents commented that IOM's trainings had not yet penetrated deep enough into law enforcement bodies to enable a consistent approach to the issues. While training to Gender Desk Officers was carried out in all locations, it was evident that knowledge had not always been retained within the various units as individuals were often reassigned to other units or locations without having first passed this knowledge on to incoming officers. IEC materials on human trafficking distributed to training

participants including law enforcement officers were reported to be useful references that could be reached for as explanatory aids in further relaying messages, though they couldn't replace trainings.

In order to ensure that information was diffused beyond the beneficiaries of IOM's own trainings, stakeholders recognised a need to facilitate regular training of trainers (ToT) involving not only social protection practitioners but also prominent community members such as religious leaders who have a platform from which they can share messages with the wider population. It was suggested that this might be the most effective means of penetrating into the rural communities beyond the reach of social protection practitioners in urban centres, who were invariably the primary beneficiaries of IOM's actions. Engagement of a local radio station to broadcast messages on SGBV and trafficking was deemed to have been a very effective means for diffusing information in Turkana, particularly in light of high rates of illiteracy, and there was evidence that such programmes were received with considerable interest by the broader population that had come to recognize Turkana as a hub for trafficking activities. In general, most stakeholders stressed a need to more effectively leverage local media outlets for diffusion of such messages.

There was wide consensus among interviewed stakeholders that though the activities realised thus far had been effective in raising awareness for SGBV and trafficking in proximate locations, it was but a drop in the bucket when viewed within the scope of needs beyond the central county level. Stakeholders unanimously referenced issues of mobility and communication as posing significant hurdles to providing support services and referral to any victim beyond the immediate urban centres, and such obstacles were among the chief deterrents to victims seeking support and redress. Social protection hotlines were not witnessed to be present or functioning in all target counties, though there was an evident desire among stakeholders that these be operational. Suggestions were made that IOM pursue community-wide sensitisation campaigns leveraging schools, local radio and print media to disseminate messages that would help to curb stigmas and generate awareness.

Despite IOM's achievement beyond the initial target, stakeholders invariably pointed to SGBV as a primary concern that was still grossly under-addressed throughout their communities and wider counties. IOM's success in reaching so many social protection practitioners with training within the more accessible areas of the target counties may have been overshadowed by its evident success in creating broad enthusiasm among the population for addressing such issues on a grander scale. Though IOM was evidently successful in delivering workshops and trainings, due primarily to the short timeframe of the project, there was reportedly no scope to deliver follow up actions to assess retention of skills and knowledge and to address identified gaps.

Complementing training provided to social protection practitioners under this project output, IOM has sought to enhance the capacity of health practitioners to respond to SGBV cases and to provide psychosocial support. A reported six Government health facilities and one Gender Desk at a local police station received support to enable their response to SGBV cases. The evaluator had the opportunity to visit two supported facilities: one health clinic

where it was evident that IOM's support had enabled the facility to meet a greater number of cases than it otherwise would have been able to assist, and one Gender Desk, which had received furniture enabling the establishment of a counselling room where victims of SGBV might receive temporary shelter. In both cases, IOM's support was deemed timely and relevant.

2.2.4.2 Output 3.2 – Direct assistance and support for victims

The objective of this output was to be achieved through providing psychosocial support to victims of trafficking of SGBV. IOM reported having reached a total of 1,117 victims (46% men / 64 % women) with individual and group counselling, which represents an overachievement of 1112% as compared to IOM's original target. A partnership with community health care workers and counsellors registered with the Ministry of Health was forged under this output, which has evidently extended cooperation between social protection practitioners into the future. At an institutional level, the relationships between practitioners that IOM's support enabled is estimated to have been of at least equal importance, as this has ensured that referral mechanisms have been strengthened. IOM project staff are reported to have likewise benefitted from training offered under this activity, which has evidently better prepared them to facilitate the delivery of technical aspects in cooperation with service providers. The effectiveness of this activity in advancing the outcome objective is particularly visible as it has filled a significant gap in service availability, and given the evident demand, it would appear that IOM's emphasis on capacitating social protection service providers is well-placed.

Nonetheless, it is clear that much remains to be done in this regard and it was suggested that IOM might continue to establish protection facilities within police stations and hospitals where SGBV and trafficking cases might be received and where requisite special care would be available. The establishment of safe houses within communities was suggested by numerous stakeholders as a way to enhance the effectiveness of IOM's social protection programming.

2.2.4.3 Output 3.3 – Community sensitisation

The objective of this output was to be achieved through the delivery of two activities at the community level that foresaw the development and distribution of IEC materials on SGBV and safe migration and the conducting of outreach sessions to raise awareness on SGBV and human trafficking. IOM initially intended to reach a caseload of 1,000 individuals through outreach, though achieved far beyond this target, ultimately conducting 182 outreach sessions that saw the participation of 8,925 men and women. Educational materials were distributed to 11,201 individuals, messages were diffused via media outlets such as the radio station in Kakuma, Turkana county, and IOM seized upon key opportunities to promote awareness on these issues in Uasin Gishu, Garissa and Turkana by arranging for campaigns and celebrations to mark the World Day Against Trafficking in Persons. Within the scope of such events, IOM distributed information, education and communication materials in the form of t-shirts, *khangas* (coloured cloths) and stickers with social protection to an

estimated 1,000 participants.

Beyond the visible achievements that are reflected in the successful delivery of IOM's activities, there is evidence that community-level sensitisation has been an effective and appropriate vehicle for addressing SGBV and pre-empting trafficking. For example, in Uasin Gishu county, stakeholders reported that IOM's messages had reached a community in time to prevent a number of young women from being trafficked to Saudi Arabia. Upon receiving information provided by IOM, the community reportedly chased the trafficker away and she hasn't returned since. Such preventive messages have reportedly been well-received by community elders who ensure that they are passed on in local schools and that sensitisation continues beyond the duration of IOM's own outreach activities. Messages on SGBV are reportedly likewise well-received and the link between inter-communal conflict arising from competition over resources and the issue of sexual and gender-based violence has been made explicit within peace dialogue fora. Stakeholders report that garments with IEC messages have continued to have the intended effect of generating discussion around the issues and serve as a reminder within many communities with an 'oral tradition', that the issues persist. Community leaders who have benefitted from IOM trainings are reported to be perceived as local authorities on issues related to SGBV and FGM, and they serve not only as points of reference within their communities but also a reminder to all that related laws now exist and may be enforced through their cooperative action with official law enforcement agencies. While no data or official records were provided by stakeholders to the evaluator that would allow corroboration, it was suggested that SGBV and trafficking are perceived to be on the rise, though it was not clear if this perception was based on an actual increase in the phenomenon, greater awareness and more effective reporting, or, a combination of these. What was clear, however, is that incidents are indeed increasingly reported to community social protection focal points, and service providers and authorities report to be better informed of and more adequately equipped to deal with such issues.

It is evident that IOM's approach of casting a wide net and ensuring the inclusive, multi-level and diverse participation of social protection practitioners and advocates has been an effective means of advancing the outcome's objective. There is evidence that awareness is not merely diffuse, but has become incrementally deepened through reiterative action, sustained presence and broadened cooperation and coordination led by the Organization.

Finding 4: IOM's strategy of garnering inclusive, multi-level and diverse participation of stakeholders in the promotion and provision of social protection messages and services has ensured progressive advancement of the project's objective and has served to build relationships that have endured and paid dividends beyond the lifetime of the project.

2.2.5 Beneficiary and stakeholder involvement

The beneficiaries of IOM's intervention include a wide range of stakeholders who have been engaged with the project at various levels and through various means. The primary categories of beneficiaries and stakeholders include:

- Individual and community beneficiaries as recipients of peacebuilding, livelihoods and social protection support activities
- Community-based organisations engaged as beneficiaries and participants
- Local administration and local authority representatives engaged as beneficiaries and partners
- Youth groups and community-based organisations engaged as beneficiaries and partners
- Service providers engaged as beneficiaries and partners
- Local and international NGOs as beneficiaries and partners

Emerging from stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions, it is evident that IOM has sought to secure the support and input from these stakeholders at all phases of the intervention. From the project's inception, throughout its active delivery, up until its finalisation and beyond, beneficiaries have been involved in ensuring the effectiveness of the various activities and achievement of intended outcomes. Given IOM's sustained presence in the project's target counties and the Organization's continued interaction with many of the beneficiary and stakeholder categories through other, related actions, it is evident that their perspectives have also played an active role in shaping the contours of project design. A range of beneficiaries and stakeholders were convened at the inception phase of the project in each target county in order to present the project's intended objectives and activities and to secure their active support and participation in its delivery. Consultative stakeholder meetings helped to ensure that respective roles and responsibilities were clarified, expectations were harmonised and that beneficiary categories present were afforded an opportunity to have further input in the roll out of the intervention.

Throughout the project duration, IOM convened regular and inclusive stakeholder meetings which brought several beneficiary categories, partners and institutional counterparts to the table to identify and discuss emerging issues and conceive of coordinated and cooperative solutions. These consultations were often thematic in nature and involved both regular and ad hoc participation of relevant stakeholders. It was witnessed that IOM is an active participant in multi-lateral coordination bodies, including relevant clusters and working groups, and it is clear that this participation has facilitated the effective coordination of project activities in line with mutually identified expectations for cooperation and coordination. In the delivery of the project, it is evident that IOM has leveraged its relationships with local service providers and partner agencies to ensure that timely and appropriate support is afforded to direct beneficiaries, particularly within the scope of providing social protection services, and there is a distinct sense that relative competencies have been accounted for in the cooperative design and delivery of activities.

IOM's evident inclusive and consultative approach has ensured that beneficiaries and stakeholders perceive ownership of the project's results and that they have become active and empowered participants in advancing the project's objectives. Targeting of beneficiary categories themselves is witnessed to have been appropriate and there was no evidence of significant omissions within the composition of beneficiaries involved. Well-defined targeting criteria have likewise ensured that the particular needs of certain groups have been reflected in objectives and intervention strategies, resulting in the equal empowerment of both women and men. Involvement of specific categories of beneficiaries has not been limited to individual project components, and evidence of IOM's community stabilisation approach to the delivery of the various activities is visible in synergies among activities whereby there has been referral across project components. This is particularly evident where both social protection and livelihoods support has been offered to the same individuals and groups, and the approach has been endorsed by IOM's institutional partners who perceive a knock-on effect in terms of advancing intended objectives.

While there was already mention made of beneficiary dissatisfaction in the delivery of some peacebuilding activities, it must also be noted that some beneficiaries of direct assistance activities expressed concern that IOM staff are frequently replaced and thus unreachable. This perception seems misplaced with regards to this project specifically, as project management confirmed that there had been only two staff replacements made during the project's duration. Such comments were typically witnessed at the level of individual beneficiaries who had been in direct contact with individual IOM staff members during successive interventions, and thus cannot be seen to reflect the overall beneficiary perception of IOM's approach or performance in engaging them. Though beneficiaries often possess and often utilize the direct line they have to IOM staff, it cannot be assumed that the limited number of field staff can maintain consistent contact with each and every beneficiary of a project that has reached over 44,000 individuals throughout four vast counties. Such complaints may rather be indicative of the wide reach of IOM's activities and the proximity of Organization's staff to the populations they serve.

Finding 5: IOM's close proximity to a wide range of beneficiary and stakeholder categories, and its visibly consistent involvement and effective communication with these, has been a fundamental element of the Organization's success in delivering the project and has further served to solidify IOM's reputation as an accountable and consistent partner.

2.2.6 Factors influencing project achievement

Delivery of the project has been conditioned by a number of external factors which have necessitated shifts in strategy, adjustments in activities, reallocation of project inputs and the physical relocation of some project activities and support structures.

During the project period, heightened insecurity in Marsabit, Garissa and Turkana counties required IOM to revise some project plans and shift activities. An outbreak of violence in

Moyale, Marsabit county was reported by IOM to have delayed implementation of project activities foreseen to be delivered there. Increasing inter-tribal tensions over pasture and water resources eventually erupted in armed skirmishes that continued for a period of six months and which were only checked through the military intervention of Kenyan Defence Forces. Clashes resulted in loss of life, destruction of properties and displacement of over 50,000 individuals, and tensions remained high despite the Government's intervention. IOM had intended to deliver the full range of peacebuilding, livelihood and social protection activities within this sub-district and had apparently already begun to arrange the roll out of the project through consultations with a range of stakeholders. However, in light of the escalating violence and resultant security measures instituted by the United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS), the Organization was ultimately forced to temporarily close its office and relocate to Marsabit Town, 250 kilometres south of Moyale. Relocation of the office and revision of IOM's implementation strategy and schedule necessitated unanticipated expenditure of both time and resources, and ultimately delayed the delivery of project activities within this county by an estimated 2-3 months. While tensions were known to exist and their escalation into more generalised conflict might have been anticipated, discussions with project staff and management indicate that assumptions and risk assessments were fairly evaluated and mitigating strategies permitted reorientation and revised administrative structures. In light of the evolving scenario, the Organization's subsequent response appears to have been timely and appropriate and administrative and management procedures were able to accommodate the unforeseen event in an acceptably flexible manner whereby program activities and support structures were relocated and re-activated within a relatively short period of time.

Natural disasters are reported to have likewise impacted upon the delivery schedule of IOM's activities in some target areas. In Turkana county, heavy rains and flash floods rendered access roads impassable and project sites inaccessible, necessitating the suspension of some project activities for an estimated three weeks. Despite the operational challenge and resultant delay, it is evident that IOM was able to resume activities once conditions permitted access to target populations.

Due to the on-going and yet incomplete process of decentralisation and devolution occurring across Kenya, some challenges have been faced in coordinating project activities with IOM's institutional counterparts. As functions and competencies have been reallocated within and across various Government ministries and local administrations, disrupted or diverted channels of communication are reported to have sometimes led to uncertainty about the coordination of specific actions and have resulted in delays in the delivery of project activities. It is evident that the on-going process has generated confusion as to respective competencies of some administrative bodies at the local level, where there may also be unwillingness to forfeit prior responsibilities. However, it seems that the process is slowly taking hold and institutional counterparts are becoming more aware of their respective duties and authorities. Interviews with IOM staff and key informants suggest that doubts and delays resulting from the decentralisation process were effectively mitigated through consistent and close consultation with the Government at the county and central levels, and there is a general consensus that continued devolution will ultimately benefit

coordination, cooperation and the achievement of similar programming objectives. The process has already been witnessed to have facilitated the delivery of some activities, such as peacebuilding and livelihoods, effectively allowing for more grassroots and community-driven outcomes that were more efficiently coordinated with local administrative stakeholders.

Internal factors that impacted upon the achievement of project objectives are overwhelmingly positive and are identifiable within IOM's familiarity with the operating environment, sustained presence in the target counties and broad and well-managed network of institutional partners. The Organization's global expertise in delivering the range of activities foreseen under the project's peacebuilding, livelihoods and social protection components is evident at the level of project management, and the intervention's community stabilisation approach is witnessed to have been of significance in ensuring coherence among the project's subcomponents. Consideration of other internal factors that may have influenced project delivery is elaborated under the efficiency sub-section.

External factors causing delays at the field level and impacting upon the overall timeline of project delivery prompted IOM to seek a three-month no-cost extension from SIDA in order to complete the intervention and commit unexpended funding. Interviews with IOM project management indicate that consistent communication with the donor had anticipated this eventuality and a three-month period of extension beyond the initial 11-month timeframe was granted accordingly.

Finding 6: External factors arising throughout the lifetime of the project have impacted upon the scope and timeliness of IOM's intervention, though there is evidence that appropriate and effective mitigating strategies and measures served to ensure continuity of delivery and sustained project relevance and effectiveness.

2.3 Efficiency and cost-effectiveness

According to the OECD's evaluation criteria, efficiency 'measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs'. Elaborating on this definition, efficiency can be defined as the extent to which the project resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are optimally used and converted into intended outputs. This evaluation approaches efficiency from the standpoint of staff competence and retention, project management structures and mechanisms and monitoring strategies.

2.3.1 Efficiency of project management and monitoring

This project was overseen by a dedicated project manager based in Nairobi under the overall supervision of IOM Kenya's Migration Crisis Response Unit. Delivery of the project's activities at the field level was executed through a network of field staff based in offices located in each of the project's target counties. The project manager and the field assistants were responsible for the delivery of this and other related IOM projects within the field locations.

Each IOM sub-office involved in project delivery was staffed by at least two field assistants who were apportioned different responsibilities for ensuring the delivery and direct coordination of the project's three components. Budget resources allocated for staff costs represented a total of 26% of the entire project funding.

Based on an analysis of project documents, reports, field observations and interviews with project management and field staff located across the various field offices, it is evident that project management structures were well-conceived of and competencies generally well-allocated to permit the effective and timely delivery of the project's activities. Given that the project comprised three distinct programmatic pillars, where funding and human resources were available, there was an attempt made to assign field staff oversight of these in accordance with their respective experience and competencies. However, this was apparently not always possible, and individual staff members who had originally been responsible for following up on one component often found themselves assuming oversight of others. In general, while this was sometimes perceived by field staff to be problematic due to a relative lack of experience or requisite technical knowledge relevant to the activities, most appreciated that it had afforded them the opportunity to learn new skills and become familiar with new programmatic focuses, which ultimately aided in their overall comprehension of the objective of the project itself. Despite misgivings articulated by some project staff of their relevant inexperience with respect to some of the more technical elements of the project's activities, staff were invariably witnessed to be dedicated, motivated and highly qualified. It was clear that IOM project management was aware of a need to continuously build capacity of project staff in order ensure their competence and as a means of incentivising them, and there was evidence that some trainings had indeed been offered throughout the course of the project.

High staff turnover in field locations was unanimously mentioned as an obstacle to ensuring consistent and efficient delivery of IOM's activities, though this comment is more relevant within the context of IOM's programming and is not specific to this project, as the project itself witnessed only three cases of field staff reassignment during its lifetime. Within the scope of broader programming, the challenge was recognised by project management in Nairobi and discussions revealed that this was often attributed to IOM projectization, which often restricted the type and duration of contracts that staff might be engaged on. While this was recognised to be a global issue affecting not only field staff but also national and international staff in Nairobi, there was consensus that inefficiencies had resulted whereby staff who had been engaged, trained and capacitated by IOM through this and other projects often found more secure employment with other agencies that were able to offer longer and more stable contractual arrangements. In some field locations, the issue of staff retention and turnover was likewise perceived by partners who noted that their cooperation with IOM had at times suffered as a result. Nonetheless, it must be stressed that the high-calibre staff that IOM has gained and retained over several years throughout the field locations were crucial to the Organization's success in delivery of this project. They may be counted as the single most important asset of the Organization in sustaining and growing its operations in these counties.

IOM's established presence within the target counties and existing relationships with a range of stakeholders was determined to be a key element aiding in the efficiency of implementation of the project. This played a significant role in ensuring that the project was able to commence within a reasonable period of time and that the delivery of activities was facilitated by staff who were well acquainted with the operating environment and IOM's network of partners. A well-developed and detailed project schedule and work plan was evidently shared with all project staff at the inception phase and was deemed to be key to ensuring that staff were aware of the scope of the project and timeline for delivery. As a result, there was evidence that the vast majority of project activities were implemented within planned budget constraints and according to established timeframes, with the exception of those that were delayed due to external factors. It is worth noting that project staff perceived some delays in receiving project inputs, which they attributed to slow procurement processes at the head office level. Discussions with resource management staff confirmed that project procurement plans had indeed been elaborated and shared with the procurement unit, and that inputs had generally been sourced in accordance with mutually agreed timelines. There was a suggestion that field staff didn't fully appreciate the processes involved in procuring the range of project inputs and perceived delays were typically due to incomplete information on the specifications of inputs required. It was commented that while it would have been ideal to have administrative and resource support staff present within each field office, tight budgets limited this and field staff were aware that such responsibilities fell within their scope of work. A mitigation measure that was proposed was to train focal points within field offices on procurement policies and procedures in order to ensure compliance and accuracy in their requests before they arrived to Nairobi. Project management confirmed that workshops convening all staff members had been utilised to remind staff of such policies and procedures, but that it had not yet been possible to carry out a more formal training.

With regard to monitoring of the project's activities and delivery, it was evident that this had been an emphasis from the outset whereby detailed project monitoring tools for the specific sub-components had been elaborated at the inception phase and staff had been guided on their implementation. These tools were used to collect gender-disaggregated data from the field at monthly intervals and information was subsequently compiled in Nairobi for synthesis within reports containing both empirical and limited contextual content. This allowed for the collection of information relevant for IOM in tracking its achievements in delivering against project indicators, anticipating shortcomings and adjusting planning schedules where necessary. These tools were recognised by most staff to be excellent aids in ensuring consistent delivery and accountability and were evidently useful in keeping management apprised of the overall status of the project's various activities. However, there was recognition that the monitoring tools were designed primarily to gain information that would allow IOM to track its delivery of project outputs and that information relevant to higher level outcomes was not being collected as systematically. This was evidently due to the manner in which the project's original indicators had been articulated, which was recognised to be insufficient for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness and eventual impact of many of the activities themselves. A lack of baseline data for 90% of the indicators was likewise perceived to pose a challenge to monitoring achievement of outcome level

objectives, and there was general agreement that since IOM has been involved in the delivery of similar activities in other projects over the course of a number of years, monitoring of higher level outcome objectives, including capturing information relevant to assessing resilience and protection, might have been possible through use of more probing indicators and elaborate monitoring tools. Beyond this, and despite evidence of consistent and quality reporting, the evaluation found that given the community stabilisation nature of the project, reporting might have been expanded to include deeper contextual analysis of the specific issues within the broader context. It is clear that the limited project duration posed a challenge to more in-depth contextual analysis, though this may be emphasised in subsequent actions.

Finding 7: The effective and efficient delivery of the project is attributable to IOM's motivated and high quality staff, though inefficiencies have been registered as resulting from gaps in technical training and high staff turnover.

2.3.2 Cost-effectiveness of project

An assessment of cost-effectiveness within this evaluation considers how inputs were converted into outputs, and whether different outputs might have been produced that would have had a greater impact in achieving the project purpose.

While the project's elements of peacebuilding, livelihoods and social protection were widely recognised to be essential ingredients within a community stabilisation programme in the prevailing context, interviews with stakeholders reveal that the respective weight of these components may have been more appropriately distributed in advancing the project's overall objective.

An analysis of the budget reveals that programmatic inputs for the peacebuilding component represent 28% of the total activity budget, while livelihoods was allocated 43% and social protection 29%. An analysis of the project's beneficiaries across these components confirms that 45% of the total caseload is comprised of beneficiaries from the peacebuilding component; less than 1% of beneficiaries are attributed to the livelihoods component and 44% benefitted from the project's social protection activities. The preponderance of funding allocated to support for livelihoods activities contrasts sharply with the total number of beneficiaries reached through this activity. It is quite understandable that the nature of livelihood support requires greater cost per beneficiary investments and is necessarily restrictive in scope while activities foreseen under the peacebuilding and social protection components were designed to be broad-reaching and inclusive. While an analysis of cost per beneficiary may not be of particular utility in arriving at conclusions of cost-effectiveness of the overall intervention, it is interesting to note in considering the perspectives of stakeholders with regard to the relevance of these components in advancing the project's overall objective. As has already been highlighted, there was near unanimity among stakeholders that the key to advancing both resilience and protection within target communities lie in support for livelihood activities. While such

activities are evidently much more costly than those supporting peacebuilding and social protection, this finding suggests that a strategy based on an alternative alignment of funding may produce greater results.

Beyond considerations for how the project's components may have been alternatively weighted, it must be noted that IOM's approach under this project indicates that both peacebuilding and social protection activities were highly effective and efficient means for penetrating into communities, and both components realized considerable returns on respective investments, with instances of IOM reaching over 1000% of the initial target caseload. That said, while broad-based and inclusive targeting has evidently been efficient in reaching wide segments of target communities through messaging, limited scope for follow up has precluded conclusive assessment of internalisation of information and knowledge received through such messaging. Discussions with stakeholders involved in both peacebuilding and social protection suggest that a focus on providing broad support to target communities through the envisioned activities might have been achieved at the cost of reaching communities beyond the immediate target areas. Peacebuilding and social protection stakeholders highlighted issues of mobility and communication as hurdles, whereby populations beyond the periphery of project locations were unreachable. An analysis of achievements within these components indicates that there may have been scope to reallocate some funding for the purpose of supporting communication and mobility costs for victims beyond the peripheries, while still reaching and even exceeding the initial target beneficiary caseloads. Inclusion of such support might be piloted within a follow-up action.

Within the livelihood component, it is clear that income generating support activities were highly considered by all and that they were viewed to be an integral element in ensuring that the entrepreneurial and vocational skills enhanced through IOM's trainings may take root. There were however suggestions made that the training component was more important and that longer duration trainings would have been of value in ensuring that acquired skill sets were complete, permitting beneficiaries' active competition within the local labour market. Discussions with project staff revealed that such considerations had been taken into account during project design and that three-month course durations were specified due to the likelihood of drop-out beyond this timeframe.

As the short project duration and articulation of indicators have precluded conclusive evaluation of the actual effectiveness of most of the project's activities in advancing the project's objective, related conclusions as to the relative cost-effectiveness of specific actions are also rather inconclusive. It may be assumed that investments made in enhancing youth vocational and entrepreneurship skills and support for income generating activities are likely to produce dividends into the future and thus represent a cost-effective means of advancing the project's objective, though the true value of this would remain to be ascertained in a more targeted follow up survey. Likewise, it is worth recalling that IOM's support for both peacebuilding and social protection is very closely linked to Government of Kenya institutions and programmes, suggesting that investments made may be sustained into the future independently of IOM and thus represent cost-effective strategies. For the

moment, anecdotal evidence may serve as a more useful perspective from which to evaluate cost-effectiveness and measure the appropriateness of the mix of activities, and this clearly points to stakeholders' greater estimation of livelihood support.

Finally, it is worth noting again here IOM's initial targets and associated costing of related activities. As has been indicated, IOM exceeded initial targets set for almost all activities. This is no doubt desirable, though may prompt a review of how initial planning figures were associated with costs and how and why such dramatic savings were realised. There was very limited evidence to suggest that funds committed to various activities had produced sub-standard results with respect to the outcome of the activities themselves, though a thorough assessment of this was not possible within the scope of this evaluation.

Finding 8: Within the scope of community stabilisation programming in the prevailing context, an alternative weighting of the project's components further emphasising support for livelihoods may have been more cost-effective in advancing the project's intended objectives of resilience and protection.

2.4 Sustainability

The definition of sustainability used within this evaluation is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn, and consideration is given to the extent that major external factors may condition the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project's outcomes.

Though this project did not foresee a specific sustainability strategy as such, it may be said that sustainability is somewhat inherent within the majority of the project's activities. Each project component contained at least one activity that was likely to produce sustainable outcomes.

Within the project's peacebuilding component, IOM's activities were closely aligned and synergized with Government of Kenya peacebuilding structures, mechanisms and programmes and an emphasis on capacitating peace actors to function within these institutions and through related initiatives has evidently strengthened their overall viability. Interviews with District County Commissioners responsible for oversight of Government peacebuilding programmes at the county level confirmed that IOM's support had filled a void in capacity of local peace actors that would have otherwise impacted upon the effectiveness of the Government's programme. Peace actors themselves reported that information and awareness was being cascaded down within their communities and that reiterative action delivered through this project built on IOM's previous activities and had reinforced gains. As has been noted with regard to conflict early warning and response mechanisms, these remain to be tested at a macro level by more intense and generalised conflict, though the incidents in Moyale in 2013 might serve as an indicator that these are yet to become completely effective means of pre-empting inter-communal conflict. Indeed, IOM's activities under this project had not yet been rolled out in this area by the time the

conflict had gained momentum, though the event serves to provide perspective as to how sustainability of a specific activity might be undermined if the context is not conducive.

The sustainability of outcomes related to peace infrastructure projects is likewise questionable, as stakeholders recognised that there were a multitude of factors that contributed to tensions beyond competition over scarce resources. Initiatives such as the installation of a milk shade in Garissa or establishment of a livestock market in Marsabit are viewed to be effective means for bringing communities together within a very circumscribed context, though the many and multi-layered drivers of conflict among broader segments of the population are viewed to persist. The same may be assumed of water points. Key to sustainability within this component is the emphasis that IOM has placed on ensuring communities' perception of ownership of the results of such joint projects, and even where these have been less than completely successful, IOM's activities are witnessed to have established a platform and facilitated the identification and emergence of patterns of cooperative behaviour that may be reiterated, taking root to be sustained into the future.

Positive outcomes achieved through IOM's support for vocational skills trainings and livelihoods may be considered as particularly likely to be sustained into the future. Entrepreneurial and vocational skill sets were perceived to be relevant to the evolving local markets, and evidently appropriate targeting of beneficiaries suggests that support received has and/or will be capitalised upon in order to further gains made. Supported youth have been afforded the means of entry into alternative livelihoods, and in some cases, there is evidence that this is being put to use not only to advance their personal household economies, but also address socio-economic issues relevant to their broader communities. Training certificates awarded to youth are perceived to serve to open doors that will enable continued future applicability of skills obtained and youth suggest that they intend to further invest their own resources into building such skills. IOM's support for group-led micro-enterprises has been significant in fostering relationships among youth from different tribes and backgrounds, and the emphasis that has been placed on linking youth groups to Government institutions and similar support schemes are clearly an effective means of ensuring the longer-term viability of such groups and the sustainability of their productive cooperation. The establishment and continued functioning of micro-enterprises supported under this project is evidence of the sustainability of this action and attests to the value of the approach. Though there has been limited scope within this project for follow-up trainings and workshops to gauge retention and internalisation of skills and knowledge and to carry out a more in-depth evaluation of impact of livelihoods support, provided IOM's sustained presence within the target communities and continued engagement with this project's beneficiaries, future actions may present an opportunity to revisit these beneficiaries as a control group in order to assess their relative socio-economic status vis-à-vis the broader demographic.

The sustainability of IOM's activities in support of social protection objectives may prove harder to assess. The phenomenon of SGBV and trafficking are still incompletely understood among the broader population, and despite progress made in drafting and enacting national laws, there is evidence that the Government of Kenya has made only limited progress in

establishing mechanisms by which knowledge may be diffused, victims may be supported and perpetrators prosecuted. It was not clear that local authorities had instituted strategies and mechanisms adequate for consistent reporting and tracking of incidents or that there was any significant progress made within the target communities in prosecuting offenders. In light of such deficiencies, IOM's emphasis on broad community engagement seems well-placed, though follow up evaluations intended to gauge internalisation of knowledge had not been possible under this project. Support for the establishment and continued roll-out of community-based referral networks linked to Government entities at the county level should remain a priority in ensuring progressive institutionalisation of responsive support mechanisms. Progress made to date suggests that pending further elaboration of Government-supported programmes, deeper, broader and incremental capacity building of local authorities will be crucial to ensuring that these issues may be addressed in a more comprehensive and proactive manner.

Overall, IOM's intervention can clearly count a number of significant achievements within each the project's components that are likely to continue to pay dividends of enhanced resilience and protection into the future, though it is evident that considerable gaps remain. Sida has apparently continued to support IOM in Kenya, though this support targets other needs such as shelter and has not been aligned with the components of this project. While there are other actors present within these communities that are likewise contributing to the individual outcome objectives foreseen under this project's components, there was no evidence of partners taking a similar community stabilisation approach to tackling issues through such a mix of mutually-reinforcing activities. Though other, limited sources of funding are currently being used by IOM to advance peacebuilding, livelihoods and social protection objectives in Kenya, with some apparent overlap with this project's target communities, activities have not been packaged within the framework of a coherent community stabilisation programme that would seek to address the causal links between priority issues identified within the prevailing context. While community-wide resilience, protection and resultant stability gains have indeed been achieved through this project, the overall sustainability of these is likely to be enhanced through a follow-up action capitalising on lessons learned through this intervention.

Finding 9: Elements of sustainability have been mainstreamed throughout the project and IOM's emphasis on capacity building and linking communities to Government institutions and mechanisms will likely produce dividends into the future; however, there would be considerable scope to build on achievements to date in order to crystallise progress made towards the objectives of increased resilience and protection.

3. Conclusion/Lessons Learned

A number of conclusions emerge from this evaluation that may also serve as lessons learned for IOM Kenya in the conceptualisation and delivery of community stabilisation programming in Northern Kenya.

Though IOM has conceived of a highly relevant intervention that addresses priority needs identified throughout target communities of Northern Kenya, a more rigorous and coherent project design pivoting on a well-defined theory of change may have provided a more robust conceptual framework for advancing and measuring the project's overall objective of contributing to community resilience and protection.

Peacebuilding activities are witnessed to have been an integral component of IOM's strategy to bring communities together in the pursuit of positive and cooperative action to address common concerns, and synergies identified with Government of Kenya-led initiatives and structures have been highly effective in filling voids which might have otherwise undermined Government efforts. An optic of peacebuilding will remain a relevant entry point for community engagement addressing objectives of resilience and stabilisation, though as is evidenced in this project, pairing this with parallel programmatic outputs will serve to anchor and provide context for peace itself.

IOM has very appropriately placed an emphasis on increasing youth access to vocational skills training and livelihood support, which has resonated within target communities as the single most important element for achieving greater stability. Demand for and relevance of such support is likely to remain high and any future community stabilisation programmes should consider expanding further on this element as a key investment. Engaging youth has served to open a door to IOM for deepened and sustainable community relations that will facilitate subsequent phases of programming and possibly provide a conduit for delivering both peace and social protection messages and programmes.

The project has witnessed considerable success in reaching various and multiple layers of relevant stakeholders with social protection messages, though there is recognition that the issues of sexual and gender-based violence and trafficking remain poorly understood, marginally addressed and rampant throughout target areas. This project's success in involving a wide range of stakeholders attests to the broad interest among target communities in addressing these issues. IOM's investment in developing relationships with community leaders and social protection practitioners should facilitate further phases of programming that are evidently necessary in order to generate greater awareness and strengthen communities' links to institutional resources that may be leveraged in addressing these issues. Such broad stakeholder involvement has facilitated the delivery of all of the projects' components and it is evident that the relations forged with communities through successive and varied forms of engagement have been crucial to the success of this action.

Though the project suffered delays and reorientations resulting primarily from external factors, mitigation strategies were in place to facilitate an appropriate and adequate

response to ensure continuity and sustained effectiveness of the project. The successful delivery is directly attributable to both strong management and excellent quality staff overseeing project activities in the field locations, and while the project has witnessed some degree of inefficiency resulting from gaps in training and staff turnover, implementation has been mostly in line with schedules and budgets.

With the project having registered hyper-achievement across many of its initial targets, IOM may be prompted to review costing estimates and planning figures, as these were apparently not aligned with initial assumptions. There is evidence that an alternative weighting of the project's respective components may have been more appropriate for advancing its stated objective, though it must be recognized that IOM's strategy has permitted broad engagement among wide segments of target populations as well as deeper involvement of the youth demographic that is essential to community stability.

Elements of sustainability have been mainstreamed throughout the project and the Organization's emphasis on linking communities to Government-led programmes is likely to ensure that benefits continue to be witnessed into the future. Critical gaps in social protection awareness and service provision beyond the peripheries of the project's target areas will require sustained support in order for effective links to Government initiatives to be created and there will likely be scope for IOM to seek to provide relevant support at the community, county and national levels.

4. Recommendations

1. Conceptualisation of future community stabilisation projects should be anchored to a detailed theory of change including indicators that measure the progress of activities' intended impact as opposed to merely the status of their delivery.
2. IOM should continue to seek opportunities to graft its programming to Government of Kenya-led initiatives, both for the purpose of creating synergies and the sake of ensuring sustainability.
3. Peace infrastructure projects require careful planning and consistent delivery through an optic of peace; to the extent possible, it is recommended that IOM seek to ensure that such activities have a dedicated focal point with the requisite experience and skills to effectively oversee delivery in line with intended outcome objectives. IOM should seek to further develop strategies that engage communities as active contributors in the joint achievement of objectives as opposed to joint receipt of benefits.
4. An evident persisting need and desire for peacebuilding programming in Uasin Gishu County should prompt IOM to reassess opportunities for delivering related activities there within the scope of community stabilisation programming.
5. Peacebuilding messages should incorporate awareness raising on socio-economic costs of conflict to communities, with a specific emphasis on targeting community elders.
6. Livelihood programming should remain the foundation of IOM community stabilisation projects in the target counties and it is recommended that IOM further investigate stakeholder interest in developing livelihood skills that address not only market gaps, but also contribute to addressing priority community issues, such as environmental degradation and food security.
7. The great need for social protection programming within the target communities merits a focused project that would complement awareness raising with a more comprehensive range of support; it is recommended that IOM seek to expand this programming, investigating strategies to provide support for victims with communication and mobility challenges, establishing safe houses and developing designated spaces within police facilities and hospitals to receive victims and survivors.
8. IOM should continue to invest in staff training as a means to ensure that requisite skills and knowledge enable staff to work across various project components, to facilitate communication with central administration on policies and procedures and to increase staff retention rates.
9. Within the scope of longer-term community stabilisation programming, IOM should expand project monitoring tools to accommodate for capturing of effect and impact of activities, and feed this data into expanded contextual analysis.

10. In light of the evident continued need to build community resilience, enhance protection and contribute to community stabilisation efforts, it is recommended that IOM seek to expand this project into a multi-year programme, investigating alternative activity mixes within and across the project's three components, though with a sustained focus on targeting youth.

Annex 1

Evaluation Matrix

RELEVANCE			
<i>The extent to which the project strategy, proposed activities and expected outcomes and outputs are justified and remain relevant to beneficiaries' assessed needs, the country's policies and donor priorities. The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</i>			
Main Questions	Sub-Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of Data Analysis
1. How appropriate are the project's intended results for the context within which it operates?	<p>Is there a demonstrated need for the project and its activities and are the project's intended results relevant to the issues the project intends to address?</p> <p>Are the project objectives in line with IOM's strategy, priorities and expertise?</p> <p>Are the project objectives in line with Government of Kenya planning and priorities?</p> <p>Is the intervention in line with donor priorities?</p>	<p>Project proposal</p> <p>Regional documents</p> <p>Country documents</p>	<p>Document review</p>
2. What is the rationale underlying the intervention logic?	<p>What are the hypotheses and assumptions within the rationale and to what degree are these reasonable?</p> <p>To what extent are the causal links between the project objective, outcomes, outputs and related assumptions clearly defined within the project rationale? Are these realistic?</p>	<p>Project proposal and design documents</p> <p>IOM Project Development Handbook</p> <p>Interviews with IOM, project partners</p> <p>Best practices in project design and relevant literature</p>	
3. To what extent were the needs and priorities of stakeholders taken into account in project design?	<p>To what extent were stakeholders consulted during the design phase of the project? How were they consulted, what input was taken into consideration?</p> <p>To what extent is the project aligned with the priorities of key stakeholders including beneficiaries, service providers, county-level authorities and central Government? To what extent is it aligned with their identified needs and operational capacities? Human and financial resources? How supportive are IOM's counterparts?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>IOM strategy papers</p> <p>SIDA strategy papers</p> <p>Interviews with key stakeholders including beneficiaries, Government and local authority representatives</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p>
EFFECTIVENESS			
<i>A measure of the extent to which the project has attained its objectives, with consideration given to major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement.</i>			

Main Questions	Sub-Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of Data Analysis
<p>4. To what extent did the project contribute to enhancing the resilience and protection of disaster-affected and/or marginalized communities?</p>	<p>Do the project outputs, outcomes and objectives reflect the promotion of best practices within the context of building community resilience and enhancing protection of disaster-affected and marginalized populations?</p> <p>How successful have the activities been with respect to outputs, outcomes and progress toward impact?</p> <p>Does evidence exist that the project has successful, proven outputs and progress toward reaching the overall project objective?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Interviews with key stakeholders</p> <p>Interviews with Government/local authority representatives</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions</p>
<p>5. To what extent did the project succeed in building capacity among communities to address conflict and promote peace?</p>	<p>Is there evidence that community members perceive improved relations between conflict prone communities and social groups?</p> <p>Is there evidence that community members perceive and display knowledge of early warning and response mechanisms?</p> <p>To what extent have peacebuilding activities contributed to achieving the overall objective of the project?</p>	<p>Project component training materials</p> <p>Project monitoring and evaluation documents</p> <p>Training materials</p> <p>Interviews with Government/local authority representatives</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions</p>
<p>6. To what extent did the project contribute to improving the livelihoods of pastoralist youth?</p>	<p>Is there evidence that pastoralist youth have acquired and enhanced entrepreneurial skills through the project?</p> <p>Is there evidence that training and support for income generating activities have improved the livelihoods of pastoralist youth?</p> <p>To what extent have livelihood activities contributed to achieving the overall objective of the project?</p>	<p>Project component training materials</p> <p>Project monitoring and evaluation documents</p> <p>Training materials</p> <p>Interviews with Government/local authority representatives</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions</p>
<p>7. To what extent did the project improve capacities of social protection practitioners to promote and provide social protection services?</p>	<p>Is there evidence that training on identification and referral of SGBV and human trafficking cases has enhanced social protection practitioners' capacities to provide social protection services?</p> <p>Is there evidence that social protection service providers have knowledge of the Sexual Offences Act and Counter Trafficking in Persons Act?</p> <p>Is there evidence that victims of SGBV and trafficking have been</p>	<p>Project component training materials</p> <p>Project monitoring and evaluation documents</p> <p>Training materials</p> <p>Interviews with Government/local authority</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions</p>

	<p>provided psychosocial support and referral to appropriate institutions?</p> <p>To what extent have social protection activities contributed to achieving the overall objective of the project?</p>		
8. To what extent have the target beneficiaries been involved in the process?	<p>In what way have the beneficiaries participated in the design, implementation and monitoring of the operation? Were the arrangements adequate? What was the impact of their participation or non-participation?</p> <p>Was beneficiary involvement empowering of men and women and equitable across impacted ethnic groups?</p> <p>How have beneficiary groups/areas been identified and were the special needs of certain groups/areas considered?</p> <p>Were targeting objectives appropriate?</p> <p>Were arrangements made to review and update the targeting strategy?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Interviews with key stakeholders including beneficiaries</p> <p>Interviews with Government representatives</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Potentially focus groups</p>
9. How effectively has the implementation of the project been coordinated with partners and stakeholders?	<p>Were other agencies included in the analysis of the problem and the drawing-up of the response plans?</p> <p>What mechanisms were put in place for coordination with the Government, donors, United Nations agencies, NGOs, etc. and how effective were they? Were sectorial responsibilities divided among partners?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Project reporting documents</p> <p>Sectorial coordination reports</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
10. What are the major internal factors influencing the achievement of the project?	<p>Were the implementation schedule and management arrangements realistic (financial management and budgeting systems)?</p> <p>Were implementation plans developed in a timely manner and communicated with relevant operational and support units involved in the action?</p> <p>Did internal factors lead to any changes in intended project activities or locations of operation? Why? On the basis of what analysis or what</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Project reporting documents</p> <p>Interviews with IOM staff and support units</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

	<p>events?</p> <p>Have there been delays in implementation? How were these dealt with? What was the impact of such delays?</p>		
<p>11. What external factors have impacted the implementation of the project and how are they being managed?</p>	<p>Did planned activities change during implementation due to external factors? Why? On the basis of what analysis or what events?</p> <p>Have there been delays in implementation? How were these dealt with? What was the impact of such delays?</p> <p>How well were risks and problems identified and managed?</p> <p>Were appropriate mitigating strategies conceived of and put into place?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Project reporting documents</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
<p>EFFICIENCY & COST EFFECTIVENESS</p> <p><i>The extent to which the project resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.) were optimally used and converted into intended outputs. Cost-effectiveness looks beyond how inputs were converted into outputs, to whether different outputs could have been produced that would have had a greater impact in achieving the project purpose.</i></p>			
<p>Main Questions</p>	<p>Sub-Questions</p>	<p>Sources of Data</p>	<p>Methods of Data Analysis</p>
<p>12. How efficient is the overall management of the project and are the management practices appropriate for achieving the expected outcomes?</p>	<p>To what extent were the appropriate resources (human/financial) allocated to the functioning of the project?</p> <p>To what extent were project activities implemented within planned budgets and timelines?</p> <p>Were technical and managerial staff provided with the necessary training, resources and logistical support to fulfil their responsibilities?</p> <p>Are there staff or skill shortages? What has been done about these?</p> <p>Did implementing partners fulfil their contractual obligations? How was their capacity assessed?</p> <p>Did the country office, sub-offices and specialised units fulfil their roles effectively and efficiently?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Budget/finance documents</p> <p>Interviews with IOM</p> <p>Comparison with best practices</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

<p>13. How effectively are the programme performance and results monitored?</p>	<p>Were baseline data collected and were appropriate indicators identified at the outset for measuring progress and results?</p> <p>Were systems and tools established and activated to ensure regular collection of information in each of the technical sectors and to identify whether the indicators for each standard are being met?</p> <p>Were beneficiary women, men and children from all affected groups regularly consulted and involved in monitoring activities?</p> <p>What was the type and frequency of reporting for the project, including periodic participatory appraisals? Were reports submitted on time? Were they complete? What problems were experienced? Is the information analysed and used to make decisions regarding the management of the operation?</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Budget/finance documents</p> <p>Interviews with IOM</p> <p>Comparison with best practices</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
<p>14. How appropriate is project design to achieve its objectives?</p>	<p>Was the design of the operation logical and coherent? Did it provide a good road map for implementation and a sound basis for review and evaluation?</p> <p>Were assumptions reasonable when they were specified, and were contingency plans made for known risks?</p> <p>Which external factors were not taken into account during design?</p> <p>Has the operational context of the intervention changed since its design, and if so has the project adapted effectively?</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Budget/finance documents</p> <p>Interviews with IOM</p> <p>Comparison with best practices</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
<p>15. How cost-effective is the project vis-à-vis other available alternative methods?</p>	<p>What was the planned vs. actual expenditure for the operation as a whole and were budget reallocations necessary?</p> <p>Was the budget appropriate in relation to its objectives/activities, and what factors affected individual budget items?</p> <p>Did the project reach the projected number of beneficiaries with the resources available?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Project reporting documents</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn, with consideration given to the extent

that major external factors may influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project.

Main Questions	Sub-Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of Data Analysis
<p>16. Were suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented?</p>	<p>Was the capacity of national and local organisations strengthened to promote long-term sustainability?</p> <p>Has ownership of the project been taken over by national partners?</p> <p>Have follow-ups on training been planned, to see whether trainees retain and are using what they were taught?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation documents</p> <p>Interviews with IOM</p> <p>Interviews with project partners</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
<p>17. To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?</p>	<p>How long are these benefits likely to last? What are the prospects for the sustainability of activities and outputs? What factors are likely to undermine sustainability of benefits? Are the sustainable benefits likely to exceed the costs?</p> <p>What costs will have to be borne by Government, implementing partners, beneficiaries or other stakeholders in order for the benefits to continue?</p> <p>Are the objectives and activities of the operation/programme compatible with and complementary to those of the other operations currently being implemented by the country office and/or partners?</p> <p>Have sources of financing been identified for the post-project period/for additional phase(s)?</p>	<p>Project planning documents</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation documents</p> <p>Interviews with IOM staff</p> <p>Interviews with project partners</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

i. Introduction

1	Interviewer name	
2	Date	
3	Location of interview	
4	Organization name	
5	Interviewee name	
6	Interviewee position	
7	Interviewee phone number	
8	Interviewee email address	

ii. General Overview

9	What is your organisation's involvement in this project?	
10	What has been your involvement in this project?	
11	What positive impacts has the project had?	
12	What negative impacts has the project had?	
13	Are there any external factors that have influenced the project? If so, what has the impact been?	

iii. Identification, Design & Relevance

Project Identification	
14	To what extent were stakeholders (beneficiaries, Government, other agencies, service providers, etc.) consulted during the contextual analysis of the project?

15	How were they consulted, what input was taken into consideration, and to what extent?	
16	Was this process fair, inclusive and equitable in empowering men, women, affected ethnic groups and marginalized groups?	
Project Design		
17	To what extent were stakeholders (beneficiaries, Government, other agencies, service providers, etc.) consulted during the design phase of the project?	
18	How do you judge the quality of the design, why?	
19	Are the project components reasonably balanced to adequately address the identified issues?	
Project Relevance		
20	What are the needs/issues that justify the project's activities, intended outcomes and objective?	
21	Does the project respond to the priority issues identified?	
22	Were there other priorities identified that were disregarded in the project?	

iv. Implementation & Effectiveness – Peacebuilding, Livelihoods, Social Protection

Implementation – Peacebuilding (as applicable)		
P.23	What mechanisms were put in place for coordination with the Government, donors, United Nations agencies, NGOs, etc. and how effective were they? How has the recent decentralization process impacted upon coordination and cooperation?	
P.24	Who was involved in community consultations and focus group discussions for peacebuilding activities?	
P.25	How were peacebuilding infrastructure projects identified and who was involved in their implementation?	

P.26	How were water points along migratory routes identified and installed and who was involved in the decision-making and installation?	
P.27	How were educational materials on early warning mechanisms developed and introduced to stakeholders, including CEWARN and NSC, at the local and national level?	
P.28	How were local-level conflict resolution mechanisms established/developed and how do these interact with and support District Peace Committees?	
P.29	Were there any major challenges to implementation? How did these impact upon delivery of this component?	
P.30	Has monitoring been consistent and adequate and has a need for substantial shift in activity/approach or strategy been identified through this? If so, how and why?	
P.31	What was the strongest element of the implementation? How might implementation been improved?	
Effectiveness – Peacebuilding (as applicable)		
P.32	Since the beginning of the project, to what extent did the project succeed in building capacity among communities to address conflict and promote peace? How do you measure this?	
P.33	<p>Since the beginning of the project, is there evidence of improved relations between conflict prone communities and social groups? How do you measure this?</p> <p>What role did focus group discussions play in advancing this outcome?</p> <p>What role did infrastructure projects play in advancing this outcome?</p> <p>What role did water points play in advancing this outcome?</p>	
P.34	Since the beginning of the project, is there evidence that community members have increased knowledge of	

	<p>early warning and response mechanisms? How do you measure this?</p> <p>What role did educational materials play in advancing this outcome?</p> <p>What role did enhanced conflict resolution mechanisms play in advancing this outcome?</p>	
P.35	Were there synergies between the project's peacebuilding component and its livelihoods and social protection components? In what way?	
P.36	Which of the project's components was most relevant in terms of ensuring the overall objective of contributing to the resilience and protection of target communities? Why and how do you judge this?	
P.37	Are there other, external factors that may be attributed to having contributed to the outcome?	

Implementation - Livelihoods (as applicable)

L.23	What mechanisms were put in place for coordination with the Government, donors, United Nations agencies, NGOs, etc. and how effective were they? How has the recent decentralization process impacted upon coordination and cooperation?	
L.24	Who was involved in designing and carrying out market assessments to inform occupational skills trainings?	
L.25	How were individuals selected to participate in entrepreneurial trainings?	
L.26	How were appropriate income generating activities selected and prioritized for support?	
L.27	How were beneficiaries of vocational skills training start up kits identified and prioritized?	
L.28	How were beneficiaries of small grants identified and prioritized?	

L.29	Were there any major challenges to implementation? How did these impact upon delivery of this component?	
L.30	Has monitoring been consistent and adequate and has a need for substantial shift in activity/approach or strategy been identified through this? If so, how and why?	
L.31	What was the strongest element of the implementation? How might implementation been improved?	
Effectiveness - Livelihoods (as applicable)		
L.32	Since the beginning of the project, to what extent did the project succeed in improving the livelihoods of marginalized pastoralist youth? How do you measure this?	
L.33	Is there evidence that the trainings have provided marginalized youth with skills relevant to the market as assessed under this project?	
L.34	<p>Since the beginning of the project, is there evidence that pastoralist youth have acquired skills and enhanced knowledge through entrepreneurial trainings? How do you measure this?</p> <p>What role did support for income generating play in advancing this outcome?</p> <p>What role did vocational skills training and start-up kits play in advancing this outcome?</p> <p>What role did small grants for small-scale enterprises play in advancing this outcome?</p>	
L.35	Were there synergies between the project's livelihoods component and its I peacebuilding and social protection components? In what way?	
L.36	Which of the project's components was most relevant in terms of ensuring the overall objective of contributing to	

	the resilience and protection of target communities? Why and how to do you judge this?	
L.37	Are there other, external factors that may be attributed to having contributed to the outcome?	

Implementation – Social Protection (as applicable)		
S.23	What mechanisms were put in place for coordination with the Government, donors, United Nations agencies, NGOs, etc. and how effective were they? How has the recent decentralization process impacted upon coordination and cooperation?	
S.24	How were social protection practitioners selected to participate in workshops on psychosocial assistance in emergencies, identification and referral of SGBV, human trafficking and the Sexual Offenses Act and Counter-Trafficking in Persons Act? What was the satisfaction of participants and were they provided informational materials, certificates, etc. upon completion?	
S.25	How were health practitioners trained on SGBV, psychosocial response and safe migration? What was the satisfaction of participants and were they provided informational materials, certificates, etc. upon completion?	
S.26	How were Government health facilities and health care workers supported to respond to clinical care and management of SGBC cases? How were they supported to strengthen the referral system? Was this support timely and adequate?	
S.27	How was support provided to victims of SGBV and human trafficking? Was this support timely and adequate?	
S.28	Who was involved in designing and distributing IEC materials on SGBV and safe migration practices? How were communities targeted as distribution sites?	

S.29	Were there any major challenges to implementation? How did these impact upon delivery of this component?	
S.30	Has monitoring been consistent and adequate and has a need for substantial shift in activity/approach or strategy been identified through this? If so, how and why?	
S.31	What was the strongest element of the implementation? How might implementation been improved?	
Effectiveness – Social Protection (as applicable)		
S.32	<p>Since the beginning of the project, to what extent did the project succeed in improving the skills, knowledge and resources of social protection practitioners necessary for them to provide quality services? How do you measure this?</p> <p>What role did workshops play in advancing this outcome?</p> <p>What role did support for Government health facilities play in advancing this outcome?</p>	
S.33	Since the beginning of the project, is there evidence that the project has afforded victims of SGBV and trafficking increased access to direct assistance and support services?	
S.34	Since the beginning of the project, is there evidence that community members have become increasingly sensitized to safe migration practices and prevention of SGBV?	
S.35	Were there synergies between the project's livelihoods component and its peacebuilding and social protection components? In what way?	
S.36	Which of the project's components was most relevant in terms of ensuring the overall objective of contributing to the resilience and protection of target communities? Why and how do you judge this?	
S.37	Are there other, external factors that may be attributed to having contributed to the outcome?	

--	--	--

v. Efficiency & Cost-Effectiveness

Efficiency		
38	Do you know how much the project cost?	
39	Did the project reach the projected number of beneficiaries with the resources available?	
40	Do you think that the project quality is in line with the costs?	
41	How would longer term funding impact upon the efficiency of the action in achieving the intended outcomes and overall objective?	
42	To what extent did efficiency of project management (effective communication and coordination, competence of IOM project staff, timeliness of project inputs and provision of necessary support) impact on the overall success of the project? Were there deficiencies or challenges that impacted upon project delivery?	
Cost-Effectiveness		
43	Are there alternative activities that would have achieved similar results? If so, would these have been better investments?	
44	What costs will have to be borne by Government, implementing partners, beneficiaries or other stakeholders in order for the benefits to continue?	

vi. Sustainability & Lessons Learned

Sustainability		
-----------------------	--	--

45	How was the capacity of national and local organisations strengthened to promote long-term sustainability?	
46	Has ownership of these project activities been taken over by national partners?	
47	How long are benefits of this component likely to last? What factors might undermine sustainability of benefits? Are the sustainable benefits likely to exceed the costs of the action?	
48	Have sources of financing been identified for the post-project period/for additional phase(s) by IOM or partners?	
Lessons Learned		
49	What lessons have been learned from this project that should be shared in order to better inform and improve future interventions? What recommendations would you make?	

Annex 3

Respondent List

Key Informant Interviews

Nairobi		
1	Etsuko Teranishi (f)	Project Manager, IOM Nairobi Migration Crisis Response Unit
2	Ahmed Sharif (m)	Head of Unit, IOM Nairobi Migration Crisis Response Unit
3	Fatma Said (f)	National Programme Officer, IOM Nairobi Migration Crisis Response Unit
4	Annie Wario (f)	IOM Nairobi Sr. Finance Assistant
5	Henry Ojiambo (m)	IOM Nairobi Procurement
Uasin Gishu County		
6	Lucy Mutuku (f)	IOM Eldoret – Livelihoods Field Assistant
7	Hillary Ruto (m)	IOM Eldoret – Social Protection Field Assistant
8	Corporal Alice Hafula (f)	Eldoret Police Gender Desk
9	Corporal David Mutsi (m)	Eldoret Police Gender Desk
10	Joel Wabuti (m)	Director, Interfaith
11	Wilson Ngaira (m)	Director, Change Agents for Peace International
12	Helen Chgnugtich (f)	Assistant Manager – Ainabko Women Empowerment Organization (AWEMO)
13	Andrew Kimeli (m)	Assistant - Ainabko Women Empowerment Organization (AWEMO)
Turkana County		
14	Lillian Otieno (f)	IOM Kakuma – Livelihoods Field Assistant
15	Anne Lopuwa (f)	IOM Kakuma – Social Protection Field Assistant
16	Augustine Lambert (m)	IOM Lodwar – Project Assistant
17	Corporal Jane Ouko (f)	Gender Desk Officer, Kakuma Police
18	Corporal Jennifer Kamal (f)	Gender Desk Officer, Kakuma Police
19	Samuel Osodo (m)	Assistant County Commissioner, Kakuma Sub-County Office
20	Friar Augustine Kharmuti (m)	Institute Coordinator, Salesians of Don Bosco, Kakuma
Marsabit County		
21	Hilary Kosgei (m)	IOM Marsabit Field Assistant
22	Abdi Hussein Abdirahman (m)	IOM Moyale Field Assistant
23	Kipchumba Rutto (m)	County Commissioner, Marsabit Sub-County Office
Garissa County		
24	Ahmed Guhad (m)	IOM Garissa – Field Assistant
25	Abdiaziz Kusow (m)	IOM Garissa – Field Assistant
26	Abdinur Adan (m)	County Director for Youth Development, State Dept. of Planning
27	Romana Nur (f)	Director, Sisters Maternity Home (Simaho)

Focus Group Discussions

Uasin Gishu County		
1	Inget Ngetiet Women's Group	15 individuals (12 women, 3 men) – Livelihood beneficiaries
2	Passion Fruit Farm Tabarin Ketikoi Self-Help Group	10 individuals (4 women, 6 men) – Livelihood beneficiaries
3	Irene Kirwa (f)	Social Protection, Livelihoods Beneficiary
Turkana County		
4	Kakuma – Kaamaret Youth Group	6 individuals (4 women, 2 men) – Livelihood beneficiaries

5	Kakuma – Social Protection Beneficiaries	3 individuals (women) – Social Protection beneficiaries
6	Kakuma – Peace building Beneficiaries	3 individuals (2 women, 1 man) – Peace building beneficiaries
7	Kakuma – Atanayeche Radio Station	3 individuals (1 woman, 2 men) – Livelihood and Social Protection beneficiaries
Marsabit County		
8	Marsabit Police Station Gender Desk	3 Gender Desk Officers (2 women, 1 man); 1 Captain (male) – Social Protection partners / beneficiaries
9	Badasa Livestock Market Group	12 individuals (5 women, 7 men) – Peacebuilding beneficiaries
10	Young Star Youth Group	15 individuals (5 women, 10 men) – Livelihood beneficiaries
Garissa County		
11	Ibnu-Khatlum Integrated Programme (IKIP)	6 individuals (4 women, 2 men) – Livelihood beneficiaries
12	District Community Cultural Centre	4 individuals (4 women) – Livelihood beneficiaries
13	Ameen Youth Group	4 individuals (1 woman, 3 men) – Livelihood beneficiaries



Annex 4

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. POSITION INFORMATION	
Position title	MCRU - Evaluator
Position type	Consultancy
Duty station	Nairobi, Kenya
Duration of contract	One month
Estimated start date	12 January 2015
Seniority band:	n/a
Job family:	Migration
Organizational unit:	Migration Crisis Response Unit
Subject to rotation	No
Reporting directly to	Project Manager
Overall supervision by	Programme Coordinator
Managerial responsibility	n/a
Directly reporting staff	n/a
II. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT AND SCOPE	
<p>The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As the leading international organization for migration, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration, and; uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.</p> <p>In Kenya, IOM has since significantly diversified its programming since 2005. IOM currently implements interventions within the areas of emergency and post-conflict response, preparedness and response, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods, healthcare and psychosocial assistance, assisted voluntary return of migrants, immigration and border management, migration and development, resettlement and repatriation, family reunification, counter human trafficking, assistance to vulnerable migrants, and labour migration.</p>	
III. OBJECTIVE	
<p>The objective of the consultancy is to conduct an independent final evaluation of the project entitled “Enhancing resilience and protection of marginalized communities affected by protracted conflicts and effects of adverse weather conditions, Kenya”.</p> <p>The objective of this project is to contribute to the resilience and protection of conflict-affected or marginalized communities in Kenya, targeting Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Garissa and Marsabit County.</p>	



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITIES
Under the overall supervision of the Programme Coordinator and the direct supervision of the Project Manager, the Consultant will be responsible for conducting an independent evaluation of the Project “Enhancing resilience and protection of marginalized communities affected by protracted conflicts and effects of adverse weather conditions, Kenya” as per the agreed upon terms of reference. The terms of reference are attached as Annex A.
V. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A terms of reference for the evaluation.2. An evaluation inception report, inclusive of evaluation matrix (questions and sub questions, indicators and data sources), proposed methodology, and proposed work plan.3. A final inception report, incorporating the IOM’s implementing teams comments and agreed upon work plan.4. A final evaluation report.
VI. REQUIRED BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Advanced university degree in specialized fields of social or political sciences. Candidates holding a PhD from an internationally recognized university will be favourably considered.2. Demonstrated experience in leading evaluations of development projects (e.g., five years full time evaluation experience and/or having lead five or more evaluations).3. Previous experience in conducting evaluations relevant to migration, data and information management, and/or institutional capacity development.4. Previous experience with field work in developing countries. Prior experience in East Africa and the Horn preferred.
VII. REQUIRED LANGUAGES
Fluency in both written and spoken English.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of the IOM project “Enhancing resilience and protection of marginalized communities affected by protracted conflicts and effects of adverse weather conditions, Kenya”

Evaluation context

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As the leading international organization for migration, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration, and; uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants. To contribute towards meeting these goals IOM implements projects on enhancing resilience and protection for marginalized communities affected by conflicts and natural disasters.

The objective of this project is to contribute to the resilience and protection of conflict-affected or marginalized communities in Kenya, targeting Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Garissa and Marsabit County. This objective is realized through improved capacity of communities affected by resource-based conflicts and peace stakeholders to address conflicts, promote peace; and facilitate community-led peace building activities; developing shared resources that reinforce positive engagement between communities and alleviate resource-based conflicts; improving and providing alternative livelihoods for marginalized youth; and by improving capacity of social protection practitioners in marginalized communities to promote and provide social protection services.

Evaluation purpose

IOM conducts project and programme evaluations as part of its commitment to improved results based management. Evaluation results are used to improve decision-making and evaluate performance, and to improve project and programme design and implementation. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance of the project, review the effectiveness, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness of implementation, assess prospects for sustainability, identify and document lessons learned and best practices, and inform the development of follow up projects and programmes.

Evaluation scope

This evaluation will focus solely on the project entitled “Enhancing resilience and protection of marginalized communities affected by protracted conflicts and effects of adverse weather conditions, Kenya” funded by the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). This project was implemented in Kenya (Uasin Gishu, Turkana, Garissa and Marsabit County) from August 2013 to September 2014.

Evaluation criteria

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

8. Assess the relevance of the project’s intended results.
9. Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation.
10. Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching its stated objectives.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

11. Assess prospects for sustainability.
12. Assess the appropriateness of the project design and management arrangements for achieving its stated objectives.
13. Identify lessons learned and best practices.
14. Assess existing proposed follow up programmes and make recommendations for improvements.

Evaluation questions

The broad themes which should be addressed as part of the evaluation are outlined below. The list of questions is not exhaustive, however is indicative of the types of issues to be included. A complete list of evaluation questions and sub-questions will be jointly developed between the IOM project team and the evaluator.

Relevance

1. How appropriate are the project's intended results for the context within which it operates?
2. What is the rationale underlying the intervention logic?
3. To what extent were the needs and priorities of stakeholders taken into account in project design?

Effectiveness

4. To what extent did the project contribute to enhancing the resilience and protection of disaster-affected and/or marginalized communities?
5. To what extent did the project succeed in building capacity among communities to address conflict and promote peace?
6. To what extent did the project contribute to improving the livelihoods of pastoralist youth?
7. To what extent did the project improve capacities of social protection practitioners to promote and provide social protection services?
8. To what extent have the target beneficiaries been involved in the process?
9. How effectively has the implementation of the project been coordinated with partners and stakeholders?
10. What are the major internal factors influencing the achievement of the project?
11. What external factors have impacted the implementation of the project and how are they being managed?

Efficiency and cost-effectiveness

12. How cost-effective is the project vis-à-vis other available alternative methods?
13. How efficient is the overall management of the project and are management practices appropriate for achieving the expected outcomes?
14. How appropriate is project design to achieve its objectives?
15. How effectively are the programme performance and results monitored?

Sustainability

16. Were suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented?
17. To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?

Evaluation methodology

A proposed evaluation methodology is outlined below. The final methodology will be agreed upon between the evaluator and IOM during the initial phase of the evaluation. The evaluation is to be conducted using a combination of the following methods.



Document review

IOM will provide the following documents upon signature of contract:

- Project document
- Project budget
- Interim financial and narrative reports
- Monitoring reports, including the project monitoring framework and associated toolkit
- IOM strategy papers

Assistance will be provided in the identification of key stakeholders, and in organizing the schedule of interviews, focus groups, and site visits.

Evaluation Deliverables

The evaluator will produce the following:

1. A terms of reference for the evaluation.
2. An evaluation inception report, inclusive of evaluation matrix (questions and sub questions, indicators and data sources), proposed methodology, and proposed work plan.
3. A final inception report, incorporating the IOM’s implementing teams comments and agreed upon work plan.
4. A final evaluation report.

Evaluation workplan

The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between the project manager in IOM Kenya and the consultant. The evaluation will take place over a month period, including two week travel in Kenya. A general workplan is presented below.

Activity	Days	Location	1	2	3	4
Initial document review and revision of ToRs	2	Home-based	X			
Draft inception brief (2 to 5 pages)	1	Home-based	X			
Management interviews and meetings	20	Kenya (Nairobi, Uasin Gishu, Garissa, Turkana and Marsabit)	X			
Final inception brief				X		
Travel, interviews, and data collection				X	X	
Draft evaluation report	7	Home-based			X	X
Final evaluation report						X