

Annex I

Terms of Reference

ENHANCING PROTECTION AND IMPROVING KNOWLEDGE ON THE RISKS OF IRREGULAR MIGRATION IN SUDAN– PROJECT: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION

International Organization for Migration (IOM) is implementing a 12-month project “Enhancing Protection and Improving Knowledge on the Risks of Irregular Migration in Sudan. The duration of this project is January 1st-December 31st 2016. Within its framework IOM is expected to conduct an external evaluation. The project is a phase II of a project with the same name which was implemented between December 14th 2014 and March 31st 2016. A phase III of the project is expected to begin in January 2017. This evaluation will play a critical part not only in assessing to what extent objectives of the current project have been reached and results achieved, but also in further contribute to strengthening the monitoring and evaluation framework of the phase III of the project. The project has a budget of 3, 9,000 NoK and it is funded by the Ministry of Justice of Norway.

2. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

Sudan is at the center of migration routes from the Horn of Africa and West Africa towards North Africa and onwards to Europe and the Middle East. The journeys of migrants using these routes, including refugees, asylum seekers, and other migrants are often perilous and involve people using irregular means to reach their destinations. In December 2014, IOM began implementing a project, whose main objective was to contribute towards strengthening humane management of mixed migration flows in Sudan through equipping migrants with information that would assist them to make more informed migration decisions and reduce their vulnerability to the risks of irregular migration through community outreach and direct assistance activities. Phase I of the project, of which a final external evaluation was completed in May 2016, included establishing a Migrant Resource and Response Centre (MRRC) in Khartoum, which became operational in October 2015. The current phase II of the project continues responding to the needs of vulnerable migrants in Khartoum through information and services. The project provides these services to migrants at the MRRC, through referrals, and through community outreach and participation initiatives. Through information and direct assistance services provided to migrants, the project aims to contribute towards strengthening humane management of mixed migration flows in Sudan.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The overall objective of this final evaluation of the project is to assess to what extent the project has contributed to its overall objective and achieved its results, and to evaluate if the project’s approach (design and implementation) was the right strategy. The evaluation of the phase II will present a learning opportunity for IOM Sudan in view of the implementation of the expected phase III of the project, and the planning of other similar projects.

The key objective of this final evaluation is to

- Assess to what extent the project has contributed to its overall objective and achieved its results, and to evaluate if the project’s approach (design and implementation) was the right strategy.

Specific objectives include to:

- Evaluate the relevance and validity of the choice of strategies and activities for achieving the project,
- Evaluate the project's effectiveness in achieving its objective and project purposes including assessing level of quality the project has achieved,
- Analyze the efficiency in addressing the project objective, measuring how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time) are converted into results,
- Analyze the project outcome and impact looking at primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended,
- Analyze the sustainability of the project by looking at the lesson learned and best practices.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

An outline for the evaluation methodology will be included in the evaluation proposal to be submitted to the IOM by the consultant. An evaluation matrix will be included in the inception report and further developed by the consultant based on the desk review of project documents.

The below questions are indicative of the key questions to be addressed in the evaluation:

Relevance

1. Are the project activities relevant to project objectives and expected results?
2. Is the strategy of the project relevant to the challenges and risks faced by the target population of migrants?
3. Have the projects' assumptions been accurate?
4. Is the design of the budget of the project relevant to answering the needs identified and implement all activities?
5. Are the objectives relevant to the needs of the project's key target groups?

Effectiveness

1. Is the project and its specific objectives effective in supporting efforts to protect and assist vulnerable migrants?
2. How effective was the project in reaching target populations, identifying target locations and in implementing activities in order to reach objectives? Would other activities have been more cost-effective for reaching the projects' objectives? Did the project target the right beneficiaries?
3. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has encountered during implementation? Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles and how? How did they affect the overall effectiveness of the project?
4. How effectively were the project results monitored?

Efficiency

1. How well have resources been managed to achieve the results in the context in which it operates?
3. What external socio-economic and political factors, if any, affected the implementation of the project?

4. How effective were adaptations to project made to accommodate changes during implementation due to socio-economic and political factors?

Outcome and Impact

1. To what extent were the outcomes reached and did they lead to additional results? If so, which results? Did the adaptations to original design of the project have had repercussions on its expected impact?
2. What observed changes in attitudes, capacities and institutions can be causally linked to the project's interventions?
3. What do the beneficiaries and other stakeholders perceive to be the outcome and impact of the project?
4. Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the projects' interventions?

Sustainability

1. To what extent are the projects' results likely to be sustained in the long-term?
2. Is the project supported by local institutions and well integrated with social, political and cultural conditions in Sudan?
3. Can the project's results be replicated or scaled up by IOM or national partners?
4. What should have been done in order to better guarantee sustainability, if applicable?
5. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources for guaranteeing sustainability of project results, including but not limited to other IOM Sudan projects?

The evaluation will also identify the most important results, lessons learned, or best practices to be considered while continuing to implement this project, and what should be avoided in order to improve implementation (a recommendations/next steps section).

5. METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

A mixed method approach will be used with qualitative and quantitative evaluation techniques. In particular, comprised of:

- a documentation review: IOM Sudan will be responsible for providing the necessary documentation, including activity and project reports, M&E tools, financial data, correspondence, specific agreements and/or sub-agreements, technical documentation reports, together with any other documentation that IOM Sudan considers important for the evaluation exercise,
- A series of interviews with beneficiaries and implementing partners, IOM Sudan's project manager and Chief of Mission, and other persons that IOM Sudan or the evaluator deem necessary.

6. EVALUATION OUTPUTS

The outputs of the evaluation will be;

- a) An evaluation matrix which includes methodology to be used, indicators, evaluation questions and detailed work plan
- b) A maximum of 40-page long report in English without annexes (including an executive summary and outlining the methodology pursued, indicators, data sources and findings of the

evaluation, good practices, lessons learnt, missed opportunities, strengths and failures, gaps and challenges on the design, management and implementation of the project). The draft will be presented to IOM for comments and inputs.

Based on IOM's feedback the evaluator will integrate the inputs into the report and submit the final evaluation report to IOM.

7. EVALUATION CONSULTANT/TEAM QUALIFICATION

An external independent consultant will be hired to conduct the project evaluation.

Required qualification for the assignment:

- a) Completed a university or post-graduate from accredited academic institution preferably in management, public administration, international development, or related field.
- b) Minimum 5 years of experience in project evaluation
- c) Experience evaluating projects implemented by IOM in the North/East African region welcome.
- d) Experience in the conduct of needs and gap analysis and the associated design, development, management and implementation of counter trafficking and/or migrant assistance projects; particularly having direct experiences working on direct medical and psycho social services to vulnerable migrants and awareness raising on risks of irregular migration.
- e) Demonstrated knowledge of MENA context particularly related to needs and vulnerabilities of migrants, including victims of trafficking
- f) Demonstrated sound understanding of migrant's thematic topics, i.e. trafficking in persons, victim protection, provision of direct assistance, assisted voluntary return etc.
- g) Extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation and writing comprehensive reports.

8. RESOURCES: REMUNERATION, TERMS OF PAYMENT AND TIMING:

The recruitment of evaluation team/an external consultant and evaluation costs will be borne under the project:

Remuneration

The total budget of the evaluation cannot exceed USD 8,000 including all related fees: consultancy fees, expenses, travel and DSA in Sudan.

Terms of payment

The total fee shall be payable within 14 working days after receiving IOM's written approval of the final evaluation report (see Evaluation output (b).

IOM shall review and approve the final report no later than 10 working days after submission by the Evaluator, if considered meeting the quality standard for an evaluation report as per UNEG guidance (available under technical references of the IOM Evaluation webpage www.iom.int/evaluation).

Time table

The provisional timetable for the evaluation consultant is as follows:

A. Submission of Evaluation Proposal

B Desk Review: Reviewing documents and tools developed, desk research, development of methodology and evaluation matrix, and production of inception report

C Field Visit (4 full working days in Khartoum + 1 day travel time) to meet with project managers, implementers, stakeholders & beneficiaries and debriefing

D Report Production / Drafting
Finalizing

9. APPLICATION PROCESS

The interested applicant is invited to submit to IOM Sudan specific documents as stated below:

- An updated CV and contact details;
- A 2-page approach paper/proposal discussing the evaluation methodology, including a work plan that will be adopted in carrying out the tasks in the TOR;
- A financial proposal, all-inclusive, including travel and accommodation costs

Proposals shall be submitted electronically to the Project Officer Veera Jansa (tvjansa@iom.int) by September 22nd 2016.

Annex II

Evaluation Matrix

Proposed Research Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources			
		Document review	IOM Staff	Donors and partners	Beneficiaries
Relevance					
1. To what extent did the project “Enhancing Protection and Improving Knowledge on the Risks of Irregular Migration in Sudan – phase II” address a clearly defined need?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was the project developed? • Were there specific problems you felt the project was designed to address? Specifically in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provision of information and outreach to migrants communities on the service provided by the MRRC, including opportunities for AVRR - provision of support, access to basic services and referrals to more specialized services 	X	X	X	
2. How appropriate was the project design and strategy to achieve project results and specific objectives in the context in which it operates?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you ensure that the project would be consistent with, and supportive of the needs of target beneficiaries? • To what extent do you consider the project documents identify the outcomes and impacts expected from the project? • How coherent and realistic do you consider the intervention logic? • What assumptions underlined the project design? To what extent do you consider the assumptions have been accurate? • To what extent do you consider the target populations, target locations and activities sufficiently well-defined and implemented in order to reach the project’s objectives? 	X	X	X	
Effectiveness					
3. How did the project design and the project stakeholders conceptualize the link between planned activities (including target groups and locations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the primary activities implemented as part of the project? • Were there any activities planned, but not implemented? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If so, what were they? ○ Why were they not implemented? 	X	X	X	

Proposed Research Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources			
		Document review	IOM Staff	Donors and partners	Beneficiaries
and desired outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you understand the link between the project's activities and the desired objectives? 				
4. How do key stakeholders understand the extent to which projects objectives have been achieved / are likely to be achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent do you consider project objectives have been met under <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome 1: Potential migrants, migrants' en-route demonstrate a decreased preference for irregular migration. Outcome 2: MRRC contributes to mixed migrant populations in Khartoum realizing their protection rights. 	X	X	X	
5. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has encountered during the implementation of the project? Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles and how?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did you experience any barriers or challenges to implementation of project activities? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, which challenges/barriers and on which activities? How did they affect the outcome of the activity(ies)? Were you able to overcome them? If so, how? 	X	X	X	
Efficiency					
6. What factors contributed to the efficiency /inefficiency of project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled? If there were delays, how were they addressed? To what extent do you consider these delays affected the quality of activities delivered? How were resources allocated and monitored to encourage cost-effective implementation? What factors, in your view, contributed to the efficiency or inefficiency of project implementation? What, if any, alternative strategies could have achieved similar results in a more cost effective manner? 	X	X	(X)	
Impact					

Proposed Research Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources			
		Document review	IOM Staff	Donors and partners	Beneficiaries
7. What do those who participated in the project activities regard as their primary achievements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What, in your opinion, have been the main achievements of the project? • In your view, what type of observed changes did the project contribute to with regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – knowledge – attitude – capacity (personal/institutional) • What difference has the project made to the project beneficiaries? 		X	X	X
8. Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What if any unintended or unexpected effects occurred as a consequence of the project's interventions? • Were these effects positive or negative? 		X	X	X
Sustainability					
9. To what extent are the key outcomes achieved sustainable beyond the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the identified achievements, are there any plans in place to ensure that they continue beyond this project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If yes, please provide details • In the view of stakeholders, what additional measures could have been taken to promote sustainability? 		X	X	
10. What are the major factors influencing the sustainability or non-sustainability of project's achievements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are project's activities supported by local institutions? • To what extent are they well integrated with social, political and cultural conditions in Sudan? 	X	X	X	
11. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources for guaranteeing sustainability of project results, including but not limited to other IOM Sudan projects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were there other IOM and/or non-IOM resources or activities devoted to: 1) the provision of information and outreach to migrants communities on the service provided by the MRRC, including opportunities for AVRR; 2) the provision of support, access basic services and referrals to more specialized services? If yes, please provide details 		X	X	
Good practices and Lessons Learned					

Proposed Research Question	Data Collection Questions	Data Sources			
		Document review	IOM Staff	Donors and partners	Beneficiaries
12. To what extent has the project been able to draw on the recommendations from the evaluation of phase I?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project been able to draw on the recommendations from the evaluation of the first phase? • If yes, provide details 	X	X	X	(X)
13. What good practice and lessons learned can be drawn from implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your view, which objectives could be built-on further? • Which, if any, aspects should be avoided to improve implementation? • In your view, which (if any) results, lessons learned, or good practices should be considered for the next phase of the project? 	X	X		

Annex III

Interview Guides

Interviewer name: _____

Respondent title: _____

Date: _____

RELEVANCE

1. How was the project developed?
2. Were there specific problems you felt the project was designed to address?
Specifically in relation to:
 - provision of information and outreach to migrants communities on the service provided by the MRRC, including opportunities for AVRR
 - provision of support, access basic services and referrals to more specialized services
3. How did you ensure that this second phase of the project would be consistent with, and supportive of target beneficiaries needs?
4. To what extent do you consider the project document identifies the outcomes and impacts expected from the project?
5. How coherent and realistic do you consider the intervention logic? (including indicators)
6. What assumptions underlined the project design? To what extent do you consider the assumptions have been accurate?
7. To what extent do you consider the target populations, target locations and activities sufficiently well-defined and implemented in order to reach the project's objectives?

EFFECTIVENESS

13. What were the primary activities implemented as part of this phase of the project?
14. Were there any activities planned, but not implemented?
 - a. If so, what were they?
 - b. Why were they not implemented?
15. How do you understand the link between the project's activities and the desired objectives?
16. To what extent do you consider project objectives have been met under
 - Outcome 1: Potential migrants, migrants' en-route demonstrate a decreased preference for irregular migration.
 - Outcome 2: MRRC contributes to mixed migrant populations in Khartoum realizing their protection rights.

Please elaborate on your answers as appropriate.
17. Did you experience any barriers or challenges to implementation of project activities?
 - a. If so, which challenges/barriers and on which activities?
 - b. How did they affect the outcome of the activity(ies)?
18. Were you able to overcome them? If so, how?

EFFICIENCY

19. To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled? If there were delays,
 - a. how were they addressed?
 - b. to what extent do you consider they affected the quality of activities delivered?
20. How were resources allocated and monitored to encourage cost-effective implementation?
21. What factors, in your view, contributed to the efficiency or inefficiency of project implementation?
22. What, if any, alternative strategies could have achieved similar results in a more cost effective manner?

IMPACT

23. What, in your opinion, have been the main achievements of the project?
24. In your view, what type of observed changes did the project contribute to with regard to:
 - knowledge
 - attitudes
 - capacity (personal/institutional)
25. What difference has the project made to the project beneficiaries?
26. What if any unintended or unexpected effects occurred as a consequence of the project's interventions? Were these effects positive or negative?

SUSTAINABILITY

27. Of the achievements you listed, are there any plans in place to ensure that they continue beyond this project? *If yes, please provide details, including with regard to the planned phase III of the project*
28. In your view, what additional measures could have been taken to promote sustainability?
29. To what extent are project's activities supported by local institutions and well integrated with social, political and cultural conditions in Sudan?
30. Were there other IOM and/or non-IOM resources or activities devoted to: 1) the provision of information and outreach to migrants communities on the service provided by the MRRC, including opportunities for AVRR; 2) the provision of support, access basic services and referrals to more specialized services *If yes, please provide details*

GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

31. Has the project been able to draw on the recommendations from the evaluation of the first phase? *If yes, provide details*
32. In your view, which objectives could be built-on further?
33. Which, if any, aspects should be avoided to improve implementation?
34. In your view, which (if any) results, lessons learned, or good practices should be considered for the next phase of the project?

Interview Guide Donor

Interviewer name: _____

Respondent title: _____

Date: _____

RELEVANCE

1. How was the project developed?
2. How does this second phase of project link with, and build on, the previous project phase, including the phase one evaluation findings?
3. Were there specific problems you felt the project was designed to address? Specifically in relation to:
 - provision of information and outreach to migrants communities on the service provided by the MRRC, including opportunities for AVRR
 - provision of support, access basic services and referrals to more specialized services
4. How did the project design and implementation ensure that the project would be consistent with, and supportive of target beneficiaries needs?
5. To what extent do you consider the project documents identify the outcomes and impacts expected from the project?
6. How coherent and realistic do you consider the intervention logic?
7. What assumptions underlined the project design? To what extent do you consider the assumptions have been accurate?
8. To what extent do you consider the target populations, target locations and activities sufficiently well-defined and implemented in order to reach the project's objectives?

EFFECTIVENESS

9. What were the primary activities implemented as part of this phase of the project?
10. How do you understand the link between the project's activities and the desired objectives?
11. To what extent do you consider project objectives have been met under
 - Outcome 1: Potential migrants, migrants' en-route demonstrate a decreased preference for irregular migration.
 - Outcome 2: MRRC contributes to mixed migrant populations in Khartoum realizing their protection rights. *Please elaborate on your answers as appropriate.*
12. Did the project experience any barriers or challenges in the implementation of activities?
 - a. If so, which challenges/barriers and on which activities?
 - b. How did they affect the outcome of the activity(ies)?
 - c. How did the project overcome them?

EFFICIENCY

13. To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled?
 - a. If there were delays, how were they addressed?
 - b. To what extent do you consider they affected the quality of activities delivered?
14. What factors, in your view, contributed to the efficiency or inefficiency of project implementation?

15. What, if any, alternative strategies could have achieved similar results in a more cost effective manner?

IMPACT

17. What, in your opinion, have been the main achievements of the project?
18. What difference has the project made to the project beneficiaries?

SUSTAINABILITY

19. Of the achievements you listed, are there any plans in place to ensure that they continue beyond this project?
 - a. If yes, please provide details
20. In your view, what additional measures could have been taken to promote sustainability?
21. In your view, to what extent are project's activities supported by local institutions and well integrated with social, political and cultural conditions in Sudan?

GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

22. In your view, has the project been able to draw on the recommendations from the evaluation of the first phase?
23. In your view, which objective could be built-on further?
24. Which, if any, aspects should be avoided to improve implementation?
25. In your view, which (if any) results, lessons learned, or good practices should be considered for the next phase of the project?