



EX-POST EVALUATION REPORT

**STRENGTHENING LABOUR MIGRATION MANAGEMENT IN BOTSWANA
(LM. 0325)**

Rogers MUTIE
Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
IOM Regional Office for Southern Africa

May 2020

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Context and Purpose of the Evaluation.....	2
2.1 Context	2
2.2 Evaluation purpose.....	3
2.3 Evaluation scope and criteria	3
3. Evaluation Framework and Methodology	4
3.1 Data sources and collection	4
3.2 Data analysis.....	5
3.3 Sampling	5
3.4 Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies	5
4. Findings.....	6
4.1 Findings on Evaluation Criteria.....	6
4.2 Other Findings, Lessons and Good Practices.....	8
5. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	11
5.1 Conclusion	11
5.2 Recommendations.....	12
6. Annexes	14
6.1 Evaluation terms of reference.....	14
6.2 List of documents reviewed	18
6.3 List of persons who participated in the evaluation	18
6.4 Data collection instruments	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IOM Botswana, with support from the IOM Development Fund, implemented an 18-month project in Selebi-Phikwe region of Botswana. Selebi-Phikwe is a renowned mining region in the North- Eastern part of Botswana and 357 KMs away from the capital city, Gaborone. Over the last few years, the economic fortunes of the region were negatively impacted by closure of the largest and main mining government-owned operation, the Bamagwato Concessions Limited. This rendered more than five thousand workers to be unemployed. As custom, mining towns tend to attract migrant workers and their families. Therefore, a migration dynamic was present in the region warranting IOM's intervention.

The project aimed at generating strategic information on the labour skills market in the region as well as capacity building of stakeholders on migration matters. It also organised a trade mission/study tour to Mauritius for local officials as part of efforts to create links for foreign direct investment. The project ended in June 2019 and evaluated seven months later from February 2020. The evaluation was conducted by the Regional M&E Officer for Southern Africa. It adopted a qualitative approach and utilised both convenience and purposive sampling principles to identify participants. Key informant interviews and document review were the main data collection methods utilised. An online survey for officials trained through the project was also carried out to assess the level of utilisation of acquired knowledge and any behavioural or performance changes that may be attributed to the training event.

Following five key evaluation criteria, the evaluation found that although the project did not directly result in economic revitalization of the region, it was still relevant and an essential first step to inform planning and potential investors. In terms of effectiveness, the project scored well in that it delivered all of its commitments at activity and output levels with some minor targets missed. The good score in effectiveness is also underpinned by the fact that it was delivered in fairly difficult context related to long distance from IOM office, limited staffing and low level of participation by some critical stakeholders. The evaluation also scored well on efficiency in budget burn rate and timely delivery of the project.

Management efficiency is demonstrated by innovative allocation of staff and sharing of duties among the few staff available and involving stakeholders to monitor the project on a monthly basis, thus enhancing participatory implementation and monitoring. While it is early to make an objective judgement on impact, the evaluation concludes that the knowledge imparted, the links created with Mauritius and the data generated have potential to contribute to a future economic revitalization. This will however depend on the level of utilization and follow up on some of the key actions identified.

At the time of the evaluation, there appeared to be limited action thus compromising the potential future impact. On sustainability, the evaluation concludes that sustainability of benefits just as impact, will largely depend on how much is done by IOM but mostly by stakeholders (especially the Selebi-Phikwe Economic Development Unit-SPEDU) to take forward the recommendations of the skills assessment and action plan emanating from the Mauritius visit.

The report recommends that IOM instigates a stakeholder led post project follow up mechanism; continued resource mobilization for follow up projects and to beef up the country mission staff contingent; as well as enhance a long-term vision and strategic planning process that ensures that IOM implements its projects with a long-term and interconnected programmatic perspective rather than one time stand-alone interventions.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BITC	-Botswana Investment and Trade Centre
BCL	-Bamangwato Concessions Limited
CO	-Country Office
DAC	-Development Assistance Committee
GOB	-Government of Botswana
HRDC	- Human Resource Development Council
ICT	-Information and Communication Technology
IDF	-IOM Development Fund
IOM	-International Organization for Migration
M&E	-Monitoring and Evaluation
MITI	-Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry
OECD	-Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OiC	-Officer-in-Charge
PD	-Project Development
RO	-Regional Office
SADC	-Southern Africa Development Community
SPEDU	- Selebi-Phikwe Economic Diversification Unit
TOC	-Theory of Change
TVET	- Technical and Vocational Education and Training
TWG	-Technical Working Group

1. Introduction

The Strengthening Labour Migration project in Botswana was implemented in Selebi-Phikwe region in the North east part of Botswana following a request by the government of Botswana for partners to assist in revitalizing the economy of Selebi- Phikwe following liquidation of the main mine in the area, the Bamangwato Concessions Limited (BCL). The project was 18 month long, started in January 2018 and finalized in June 2019. As custom with the IOM Development Fund procedures, a post project evaluation at 6-12 months after finalization was planned.

The IOM regional office for Southern Africa was requested to undertake the evaluation. This made the evaluation an internal independent exercise as per IOM's Evaluation Policy. The process of planning for the evaluation was initiated in January 2020. IOM Botswana country office developed the initial draft of the evaluation terms of reference. The regional office and the IOM Development Fund reviewed and/or added inputs to the draft. Once the final TOR was agreed on, the evaluator in conjunction with the country office team developed a schedule for the evaluation which comprised a desk-based phase and a field data collection phase.

Field data collection took place in March 2019 mostly in Selebi-Phikwe. This is because the project's geographical coverage was mainly Selebi-Phikwe. The evaluator conducted all data collection interviews in person and undertook all secondary data collection through document/literature review. This report follows several weeks of data synthesis in order to make judgements about what worked well, what did not work well as well as lessons learnt that can be applied in future similar projects.

The report is structured following IOM's standard evaluation report format. The formative sections of the report are descriptive and provide background information about the project, the evaluation and the research methodology applied in data collection and analysis. The subsequent section provides findings emanating from the data synthesis. Findings are structured according to the various evaluation criteria. The findings section also present other lessons and best practices that were explicit from data collection.

Following the findings section is a recommendations section enumerating actions that the evaluator, having reflected upon the findings believes would be key take aways or follow up actions to ensure that IOM learns and acts. Several annexes such as the terms of reference, list of persons and institutions involved in the evaluation, data collection tools among others are provided at the end of the report.

2. Context and Purpose of the Evaluation

2.1. Context

The overall objective of this project was to support the Government of Botswana, specifically the Selebi-Phikwe Economic Revitalization Programme under the Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry, in collecting and utilizing skills data to inform and guide efforts to revitalize the economy of the Selebi-Phikwe region. The Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry (MITI) had requested United Nations agencies and other development partners to assist in the efforts to revitalize the economy of Selebi-Phikwe region, a mining district in the Central part of Botswana, which experienced challenges due to the closure of the Bamangwato Concessions Limited (BCL) copper and nickel mine, which was the main economic backbone of the region.

There were concerns that the region would turn into a “ghost district and town” due to the anticipated mass out-migration of former employees, their families and businesses in search of economic opportunities in other parts of the country and beyond. IOM was one of the agencies that responded positively to the government request for assistance with an approved funding from the IOM Development Fund (IDF). Through this project, IOM sought to strengthen the government’s institutional capacity to utilize quality data to guide and inform economic development planning and decision-making geared at revitalizing the economy of the town and its surroundings. The 18-month project was implemented from 1 January 2018 to 30 June 2019 and comprised of the following key interventions:

- **Skills Assessment:** IOM engaged a labour consultant to carry out a skills audit in the Selebi-Phikwe region. This included an assessment of skills the region had as a result of mine operations and related services. The assessment aimed to provide a profile of skills currently available, skills that were lost/skills gaps, as well as skills and expertise needed to support new envisioned economic revitalization activities. The consultant also conducted a rapid scoping of the national labour market to assess the national context regarding opportunities and gaps in industries.
- **Capacity Building:** In an effort to strengthen the capacity of the Government and other local stakeholders’ capacity on labour migration management, IOM conducted a three-day training from 26-28 March 2019. Selebi-Phikwe District Commissioner’s Office hosted the training (provided a venue), while IOM covered logistics and refreshments.
- **Labour Migration Trade Mission/Study Tour:** To supplement the three-day training and further facilitate learning through the sharing of experiences and best practices for labour migration management, IOM supported a select team of relevant officials from Government and other entities on a trade mission/study tour to Mauritius from 5-9 May 2019. The study tour was led by the Office of the District Commissioner, the Botswana delegation comprising of representatives from Statistics Botswana, Ministry of Employment, Labour Productivity and Skills Development, Department of Cooperatives Development under Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry, as well as Selebi-Phikwe Town Council. The team managed to have meetings and exchanged views and ideas with a number of Mauritius counterparts, such as the Economic Development Board, Human Resource Development Council (HRDC), and Ministry of Tourism.

2.2 Evaluation purpose

This evaluation served both accountability and learning broad objectives. In terms of accountability, the evaluation intended to ascertain whether the project delivered what it set out to deliver as stipulated in the approved results matrix. In terms of learning, the evaluation sought to generate key lessons learnt on what worked well, what did not work well and how IOM performance could be improved in future similar projects. In fulfilling the above two broad objectives the following were the specific objectives of the evaluation:

- a) assess how the project performed against key evaluation criteria;
- b) gather feedback about IOM's work quality from project stakeholders and partners and generate lessons for future performance;
- c) identify ways through which data generated from the project and knowledge gained through capacity building events have been applied to improve labour migration management primarily in Selebi-Phikwe region and in Botswana in general; and,
- d) assess the extent to which gender mainstreaming and other cross-cutting factors were integrated in project design, implementation and the results thereof.

2.3 Evaluation scope and criteria

As highlighted above, the evaluation served both accountability and learning purposes. First and foremost, it sought to examine and verify if IOM Botswana delivered the project as reported in its periodic results and as outlined in the project's result framework. Secondly it also aimed at assessing whether the accomplishment of the various project activities and outputs had yielded or had potential to yield any results in the future. It sought to get feedback from stakeholders on IOM's work especially the coordination/facilitation and technical capacity building roles.

This was an evaluation of IOM's work and did not constitute assessing the performance of the Government of Botswana as an institution, its officials or for each individual evaluation participant except where such assessment helps to analyse how it affected IOM's performance. The evaluation assessed IOM's performance in the period of the project and to a limited extent the post project period in terms of what IOM did to follow up on the project. In terms of geographical scope, the evaluation focused on Selebi-Phikwe because that is where all project activities were implemented. Some limited capital city level data collection was also included though a key participant, the Ministry of Trade, Investment and Industry was not available for the interview despite several requests and follow ups by IOM Botswana.

In terms of evaluation criteria, the evaluation focused on five OECD-DAC criteria including: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Impact and Sustainability. It also assessed the extent to which the project mainstreamed cross cutting issues especially gender and human rights perspective. As the evaluation was conducted about seven months after the project ended, emphasis was made on some certain criteria more than others. Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency formed the first priority criteria analysed while impact and sustainability formed the second priority criteria given the short time frame to allow for an objective assessment.

3. Evaluation Framework and Methodology

3.1. Data sources and collection

The evaluation followed a qualitative research design. Qualitative research is an exploratory type of research that seeks to gather insight into phenomena of interest. Creswell (2014)¹. notes that qualitative research design intends to “discover” “develop an understanding”, “describe” and “report” on a phenomenon. Qualitative research seeks to present information without necessarily using statistics or quantification, but rather through textual data or words to describe phenomena (Fossey, Harvey, McDermott & Davidson, 2002)². Informed by this, the evaluation utilized the following data collection methods:

a. Document review

Relevant documentation was reviewed, including the project main documents such as the project proposal, project budget and project periodic reports. Other key documents reviewed included key project output documents such as the skills assessment report, assessment snapshot, meeting minutes and reports, among others. See Annex 6.4 for the full list of documents reviewed. This formed the secondary data collection part of the evaluation.

b. Key informant interviews

One-on-one interviews were held with preidentified participants deemed to hold key information about the project. Most interviews were held face-to-face and a few via Skype. On two occasions more than one individual participated in the interview. This occurred in situations where the originally identified participant came along with others that he/she considered to hold key information. Upon careful evaluation of those additional participants, in all cases the evaluator found them appropriate to participate and in this case a group interview approach was taken, allowing each participant to contribute answers, while ensuring that some were not dominating the conversation more than others.

Annex 6.3 presents a full list of individuals who were interviewed. To be included in the survey as an interviewee, participants had to fulfil the following inclusion criteria.

- Were actively involved in the project affairs and thus familiar with the project.
- Held critical information such as privileged or technical information which doesn't require familiarity with the project (rather the subject matter).
- Were available for an interview in person or virtually, at the time of the evaluation.
- Personally, gave consent to be interviewed or were requested by their seniors to be interviewed and accepted the request.

¹Creswell, J.W. 2014. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 4th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

² Fossey, E., Harvey, C., McDermott, F. & Davidson, I. 2002. Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 36:717-732.

Interviews took place in Pretoria IOM regional Office, Gaborone and in Selebi-Phikwe.

c. Online follow up survey to capacity building participants

The evaluator developed and shared a capacity building post training follow up survey to see the extent to which officials trained through the project were using acquired knowledge and the changes that have come about from the learning made. Though the response rate was relatively low (30%), likely attributed to internet challenges for some of the participants, it generated some useful feedback that is also presented in this report.

d. Direct observation

During data collection and during travels in the field, the evaluator made key observations that provided some clues into perceptions, attitudes and knowledge of study participants. Additionally, in Selebi-Phikwe, the evaluator observed the state of economic activities currently taking place in the town to triangulate reports from interviewees and from the media on the stressed economic situation following closure of the BCL mine.

3.2. Data analysis

Cross case analysis of collected data was utilized to review and order data into specific themes. The themes for analysis were ordered following evaluation criteria outlined in the terms of reference. Other data that did not fall within the categories but was deemed useful for making overall evaluation judgement or to generate lessons learnt was categorized separately and its utility determined by the frequency such data was highlighted in interviews or in document review. The findings presented in this report are a product of analysis of different viewpoints from data collection rather than a descriptive presentation of individual viewpoints from specific evaluation participants. Where specific participant viewpoints are used, it is for the purpose of illustrating or exemplifying the overall finding.

3.3. Sampling

As this was a qualitative design, sampling was not applicable. However, efforts were made to ensure the right participants especially for interviews were identified in a process that utilized both random purposive and convenience sampling technique principles.

3.4. Limitations and proposed mitigation strategies

The main limitation was the availability of some key informants who had either retired, moved job locations or were just unavailable for the interviews for various personal and/or official reasons. The Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry headquarters was especially a key informant who did not participate despite IOM Botswana's repeated follow up and request for an interview. It was understood that the previous focal point had moved to another department and was unwilling to give an interview and referred IOM to his replacement, but this was not successful. The Ministry was therefore represented only at the Selebi-Phikwe regional level.

4. Findings

4.1 Findings on Evaluation Criteria

	Criteria	Main findings
1.	Relevance	<p>The project scored well on the relevance criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> It was responding to a direct government request for support made through the UN Country Team (UNCT). <input type="checkbox"/> Contributed to the country's Vision 2036 pillar one of promoting sustainable economic development. Specifically supported economic revitalization efforts in Selebi-Phikwe region. <input type="checkbox"/> It was contributing to the country's National Development Plan 11, which prioritizes developing diversified sources of economic growth. <input type="checkbox"/> However, as the project focused on generation of strategic information and capacity building rather than immediate creation of jobs (which was everyone's priority), there is a likelihood that this could have been one of the underlying factors explaining the low level of commitment/engagement by some of the stakeholders.
2.	Effectiveness	<p>The project was effective and delivered its commitments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> In spite of initial delays, the project was eventually delivered within the planned time. <input type="checkbox"/> For capacity building activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70%³ of trained officials reported that the training has helped improve the quality of their work and performance. • 89% of trained individuals reported to have shared knowledge with others and 90% report that they will continue to use it. • All who participated in the Mauritius trade mission, describe the mission as eye opening, though most view the lack of immediate follow up by SPEDU for a reciprocal visit by Mauritius as a lost opportunity. <input type="checkbox"/> Except for minor target misses on some of the activities and output indicators, the project's final report indicated nearly 100% achievement on planned outputs and activities in spite of the fairly difficult implementation context (long distance from IOM office to project site and low level of engagement by some key stakeholders). <input type="checkbox"/> The project established a participatory progress tracking mechanism (monthly update meetings) that provided effective self-monitoring.

³ For all percentages provided emanating from the online post training follow up survey conducted during the evaluation, n=10.

<p>3. Efficiency</p>	<p>A satisfactory level of implementation, coordination and cost effectiveness is observed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Despite initial delays, the project was delivered within the planned time indicating efficient project management. <input type="checkbox"/> The project incorporated stakeholders in monitoring project progress. <input type="checkbox"/> Mauritius visit was good value for money and holds great potential for investment if properly followed up. Additionally, the project conducted just one training workshop but 100% of those who attended rated it very highly and report having acquired a lot of new knowledge on migration. <input type="checkbox"/> USD \$96,772 out of \$120,000 total project budget (excluding the post project evaluation budget) was utilised representing, 81% budget consumption. The slightly lower consumption is attributed to the smaller Mauritius visit delegation as some stakeholders did not join for various reasons. <input type="checkbox"/> The project staffing was thin but efficient utilisation of available staff enabled project delivery e.g. mission driver was capacitated to also support organisation and running of some key project events such as meetings and workshops, stakeholder liaison and ICT support. <input type="checkbox"/> Participants rated IOM’s technical support and coordination between “Good and Excellent”. Frequently, participants highlighted IOM’s timely communication and staff professional conduct. <input type="checkbox"/> Efficiency is however affected by the level of utilisation of project products by stakeholders. While some reported not to have received the final report, nearly all who had received it reported not to have utilised the information. <input type="checkbox"/> As the project was implemented in a far-flung region where IOM has no presence, coupled with the mission’s inadequate staffing and resourcing, post project follow up will be difficult. This, with SPEDU’s un-assuring commitment to take the study findings forward, presents a risk that IOM’s investment may have been in vain.
<p>4. Impact</p>	<p>Some higher-level results, intended and unintended were achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project created an opportunity to establish inter-ministerial coordination and networking at both provincial and national level. Participants appreciated the opportunity to bond with colleagues from other ministries as it also helps in their other daily work. <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity building improved the quality of work among 90% of those trained and increased knowledge and awareness on migration⁴. Increased understanding among stakeholders of how and why IOM was involved in the region’s broader economic revitalization efforts helped manage expectations. Stakeholders interviewed appeared to have clearly appreciated the value of IOM’s data collection exercise as an important first step towards an evidence based economic revitalization and jobs creation effort. <input type="checkbox"/> The project helped market the region internationally and prepositioned it for future potential investment thus contributing to the higher goal of economic revitalization of Selebi-Phikwe region. The visit also helped to advance the project’s strategic information and capacity building work to the practical level and action towards investment attraction for the region’s economic revitalization. The foundation for a future Botswana-Mauritius trade and investment collaboration has been laid.

⁴ IOM Post Training Follow-up/Impact Survey, February. 2020

<p>5. Sustainability</p>	<p>The project scored moderately on this criterion. The project put in place the following measures to ensure sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Working with established government institutions and departments at Selebi-Phikwe region. They can integrate some actions in their normal work after the end of the project. The evaluation however established that this was happening at a very limited scale and there were no intentional efforts established to implement the study recommendations. <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity building of region-based officials to impart knowledge. That knowledge remains in the area even after the project. Interviewed officials and those responding to the online survey mostly indicated that the use of knowledge is mostly restricted to their office work, but not for broader more impactful goals such as in planning or policy development/reform. This means knowledge imparted is yet to go far in effecting higher level change. <input type="checkbox"/> The project planned for a sustainability workshop at the end of the project where a plan to ensure continuity of project benefits was developed and different stakeholders assigned roles. The evaluation finds the level of implementation on assigned roles to be very low. Stakeholders feel a need to be reminded and coordinated on follow up actions and at the time of the evaluation, no agency was doing that as IOM had left the area. There is consensus that SPEDU specifically, or the District Commissioner's Office should play that role in IOM's absence. <input type="checkbox"/> The project engaged a local consultant for data collection. This expert is readily available in the country and can be called upon by government independently to provide insight into the study findings and/or provide technical support in conducting similar or different studies that are recommended in the report. <input type="checkbox"/> A lack of post project follow-up and monitoring mechanism (similar to the monthly update meetings that IOM coordinated) threatens the sustainability and continuity of IOM investments. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of and/or low level of self-engagement by the two foremost partners-the MITI at national level and SPEDU at the local level also threatens the sustainability prospects of the project. The evaluation takes note of the tireless efforts IOM Botswana team made to ensure that these two partners were well informed, updated, and invited into meetings, efforts that did not necessarily yield better level of involvement. The two have a pivotal role to play to build upon the foundations laid by the IOM project.
---------------------------------	--

4.2 Other Findings, Lessons and Good Practices

- The project's performance on cross-cutting themes.**
 - Gender was the most prominently factored into the design, implementation and M&E in comparison with other crosscutting themes. The project proposal outlined clearly that a gender perspective would be mainstreamed in activity planning and execution. It also identifies the SADC Gender and Development Protocol as well as the Botswana National Gender and Development Policy as key instruments to ensure alignment to. The project's results matrix included indicators that required gender balance and/ or sex disaggregation.
 - In implementation, the project made efforts to ensure equitable participation of male and female participants in meetings and project activities. The Skills Assessment report does present disaggregated data where it was possible, and its methodology put into

- consideration gender dynamics and specifically reached out to specific gender groups like women during data collection. The evaluation takes note that it was impossible to disaggregate secondary data if it was originally not disaggregated.
- The project also always provided sex disaggregated data in its periodic reports. What is lacking is going a step further to enumerate whether and how project work was improving specific gender outcomes. For example, what was observed from ensuring gender balance in meetings, what difference incorporating a women's perspective in the study made in understanding the skills landscape in Selebi-Phikwe as examples.
 - In terms of upholding human rights, the assessment process followed IOM's research and data collection guidelines. Participants consent was requested before interviews or group discussions, and the report provides anonymity of responses as much as possible.
- **The project could have benefited from greater participation of SPEDU and the ministry of Trade, Investment and Industry:**
- Interviewed stakeholders expressed dissatisfaction with the level of participation in project activities by the two partners. They acknowledged that both were central to this project, and the majority indicated that despite being invited in project activities and with additional follow up from IOM, they did not attend most meetings. Stakeholders were also concerned that whenever they attended meetings usually it would be a junior staff member who would be sent to the meetings. SPEDU also failed to participate in the Mauritius tour. This concern was expressed in technical working group meetings. IOM did its part to keep the two updated on project events and the evaluation as well as interviewed stakeholders were satisfied with the efforts IOM Botswana team made to keep the two partners engaged in the project. These efforts did not seem to bear fruit. The evaluator for example, did not manage to speak to the Ministry's HQ staff because a request for appointment for the interview with several telephone follow ups by IOM Botswana went unanswered. The evaluator made attempts to speak to a management level staff at SPEDU in addition to the originally identified respondent. Although an appointment was successfully made, the specific respondent had very little time at his disposal for a meaningful interview; also attributed to the fact that it was a short notice appointment request.
- **Failure to actualize the Mauritius government delegation scoping visit to Selebi-Phikwe may be a lost opportunity.**
- Stakeholders felt that the Mauritius visit created a real opportunity to bring investors into Selebi-Phikwe. Those who participated indicated how the Mauritius team was very interested and requested to visit Phikwe within two weeks. The Government of Botswana (specifically SPEDU) was entrusted to facilitate that visit. Nearly all stakeholders who were aware of this felt that SPEDU had dragged its feet on this matter. IOM indicated that several months after the visit was supposed to take place, SPEDU eventually reached out to IOM for support in facilitating the visit. IOM Botswana did its part and contacted IOM Mauritius, but before long SPEDU cancelled the event without any reasons. To date, no further information has been received. SPEDU senior Director who was interviewed gave a conflicting account and indicated that they may be able to organise the visit around June 2020 because Mauritius was interested to visit on dates around the Annual Selebi -Phikwe

Desert Race. This is an annual tourism event held in the town every June. From the evaluator's judgement there is potentially a lack of commitment to make use of some of these opportunities. The evaluator did make contact with IOM Mauritius to understand the Mauritius perspective. From the interview it was gathered that Mauritius was still keen to actualize the visit but remained in limbo because no further communication has been made on a possible visit date after cancellation was received from Botswana.

□ **High level of satisfaction with IOM's coordination and quality of technical support.**

- Very good feedback received independently from different stakeholders on the consistency, timeliness and fervency of IOM Botswana team to drive the project despite several hiccups such as the low level of engagement of some key stakeholders. This commitment played a key role in project delivery and is a key lesson learnt that project team's consistency, creativity and commitment are critical factors for delivering a fairly difficult project as this one

□ **High expectations for tangible, jobs and incoming generating projects.**

- Selebi-Phikwe is in a desperate need for economic revival and as such any new intervention tends to raise a lot of expectations from the local stakeholders and populace. IOM's intervention was at best indirect and could not produce the much-needed immediate benefits. Many stakeholders interviewed were keen to know what would follow next after IOM's maiden intervention, yet IOM Botswana did not quite have the means for follow up interventions. A key lesson here is to ensure partners understand the scope of intervention and discuss at the onset of the project who will be responsible for taking forward the final results. This is a kind of exit planning at the conception stage; a process similar to the sustainability workshop held at the end of the project. When partners know what they ought to do after the project (early enough), it may boost continuity prospects and their engagement during implementation stage may possibly be influenced by the future roles and investments they will be required to play or make respectively.
- It is also a lesson for IOM in the future to consider expanding the scope and funding of projects such as these to include a kind of a pilot intervention. A pilot intervention in this case would have, for example, have been to take forward the recommendation of reskilling former miners so that they can possibly be able to compete for jobs in other sectors or in other regions. IOM could in this case pay training fees for beneficiaries to take courses in local Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Institutions such as Selebi-Phikwe Technical College or elsewhere. Pilot interventions can also involve providing seed funding for income generating activities for individuals and groups. It can also be to support one of SPEDU's initiatives as SPEDU reports to be carrying out a number of economic revitalization activities in the area. The trade mission that the project undertook is a good related "pilot intervention". However, its benefits may only be felt in the longer term.

□ **Lessons on strategic stakeholder engagement and commitment.**

- The Ministry of International Affairs and Cooperation and the Botswana Investment and Trade Centre (<https://www.gobotswana.com/>) are two key partners that the evaluator and the project management agree could have been better engaged as they can play key roles with the

Mauritius mission and could perhaps help in following up other than SPEDU who are based at a local level. BITC's mandate is investment promotion and attraction. As such it is assumed that they have the knowhow and follow up capacity that could have helped, just as the international affairs ministry. BITC was not involved in the project in any way and a key lesson learnt would have been to engage them especially when planning for the Mauritius trade mission. The IOM project management still has a chance to meet with international affairs (having been involved in some way in the Mauritius visit planning) and with BITC to brief them on the potential the successful mission had and explore ways in which the two could take it forward in coordination with MITI and SPEDU. This will be a proactive approach to ensure post project success of IOM's work.

- On enhancing key partner commitment, IOM in Madagascar and IOM Lesotho has found it a working practice to sign a cooperation agreement with the highest official possible (Minister or Permanent Secretary) at the onset of the project. The agreement commits the ministry (or partner) and IOM to play their roles in time to ensure a steady implementation of the project. The agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) can also define future roles after the project ends. It is a symbolic way of committing political support to the project and the two missions highlighted they found it to be a useful reference point. The evaluator having conducted evaluations in other countries in the region finds this practice of signing pre-implementation agreements relevant especially for non-traditional partners. In Botswana, MITI is a non-traditional partner. IOM Botswana can learn from this practice for future projects. If a project implementation agreement or MOU had been signed with MITI and/or SPEDU at the very beginning, perhaps their level of commitment would have been different. Officers in the ministry and/or at lower levels will also feel covered to participate freely in activities that accomplish their respective ministry's stipulated roles.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusion

Overall, IOM's project was ground-breaking in many ways for the country office. It was the first of its kind for the country office in a remote location and addressing practical rather than strategic needs. IOM Botswana has in the last several years since establishment, undertaken policy and strategic level initiatives mostly concentrated in the capital city. It is in this sense that the evaluation finds this to be ground-breaking. Despite several challenges related to low level of cooperation by some key stakeholders, it is worth noting that the project achieved its objectives.

What is at stake is the continuity aspect which has been enumerated in more detail earlier in this report. For a ground-breaking initiative as this one, there ought to have been a strategic plan outlining the future of such work geographically (in Selebi-Phikwe or in other areas) and thematically (in relation the project's scope of work).

Does IOM Botswana intend to continue working in Selebi-Phikwe? Does IOM Botswana intend to continue doing such skills assessment and capacity building in other local areas in the country? Where

does this one-time local based intervention fit in the bigger scheme of work in the country? Does the region experience a significant migration dynamic to warrant IOM's intervention or presence? Who else is also intervening in the area to support, complement or continue IOM's work? A strategy could have answered such questions.

It is imperative that IOM Botswana with support from the Regional Office for Southern Africa looks into ways of ensuring that this precious investment continues to be of strategic influence especially at national level. The work that IOM is doing with the Migration Profile and with Statistics Botswana to strengthen migration data collection and analysis is a good step to entrench this in national processes. However, practical interventions that go beyond data generation, capacity building and policy formulation are needed when we decide to intervene in places like Selebi-Phikwe. Whether IOM Botswana has the capacity to do such work in places like Selebi-Phikwe are issues that a country office strategy would need to address.

5.2. Recommendations

- 1. To IOM Botswana: Establish a continuity monitoring mechanism.** As the project had put in place a monthly stakeholder update meeting hosted at Selebi-Phikwe with very little expense as it was mostly hosted by one of the stakeholders, IOM needs to work with SPEDU and the District Commissioners office to revive this group. The frequency of meetings can be reduced, the TOR modified, and IOM can provide remote support initially but SPEDU and DC's office needs to be officially handed this role. It is recommended that meetings are hosted by and at SPEDU offices or District Commissioner's office as a way of making SPEDU engaged. The forum can look into other broader matters. Interviewed stakeholders did express their interest in continuing the dialogue and coordination but, it was apparent that a convener was lacking.
- 2. To IOM Botswana with support from RO Pretoria: Develop a country strategy.** IOM is currently in the process of developing/aligning strategies in line with the new Director General's Vision. A process of developing an overarching IOM institutional results framework is also ongoing. IOM Regional office is also looking to revise its regional strategy (2019-2023) to align itself to the DG's vision. The country office will need to take this opportunity to start looking into developing an aligned country strategy that blends the expectations, standards and direction that IOM is taking with the needs (strategic and practical) in Botswana. The questions raised in the conclusion above regarding labour migration programme rather than project approach are some of the key considerations to make while drafting such a strategy alongside other thematic areas.
- 3. To IOM Botswana: Resource mobilization.** The work done calls for follow up actions and greater resource mobilization efforts are needed in the country office. The strategy outlined above would need to incorporate a resource mobilization plan. Resource mobilization would also need to be guided by the strategic plan to avoid once off activities that the country office cannot sustain. Given the limited human resource capacity in the county office⁵ and the known difficulties in

⁵ At the time of finalization of this report, the country office was run by only three staff members. The Officer in Charge who also doubles up as a Project Manager, a Finance and Admin Assistant and an intern.

accessing donor funding in Botswana, the evaluation calls upon RO Pretoria Project Development and Regional Thematic Specialists to continue supporting the country office in this pursuit. Regional project managers or new regionally funded projects should also intentionally include Botswana.

- 4. To Regional Director, RO Pretoria: Staff secondment.** The evaluation also recommends to the Regional Director to consider the possibility of seconding one of the RO staff members for a limited period of time (like 3-6 months) to provide dedicated resource mobilization and country strategy development support in line with ongoing organization wide processes. Such a staff can still sit in RO Pretoria and do occasional travel to Botswana but provide dedicated support on the two above as an extra hand to the OIC. This is informed by the fact that with OIC also doing activity implementation, UN and government liaison, mission management among others she is already constrained of time to do significant resource mobilization. The key roles of the seconded staff would not only help put together a draft strategy for the mission but also develop a resource mobilization plan; look out for funding opportunities, develop and submit proposals and concept notes to donors , ensure the country office is included in new regional proposals among others. The mission needs a sizeable and visible programme portfolio given that it also supports liaison with SADC.

6. Annexes

6.1. Evaluation Terms of Reference

Project Summary

Executing Organization:	International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Project Identification and Contract Numbers	BW10P0001/LM.0325
Project Management Site and Relevant Regional Office:	Botswana-CO-Gaborone-BW10 Regional Office: RO Pretoria
Project Period:	01-01-2018 - 30-06-2019
Geographical Coverage:	Botswana (Selebi-Phikwe)
Project Partner(s):	Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry (MITI), Ministry of Nationality, Immigration and Gender Affairs, Ministry of Employment, Labour Productivity and Skills Development, Selebi-Phikwe Economic Revitalization Unit (SPEDU), Selebi-Phikwe Town Council, Selebi-Phikwe District Commissioner's Office, Statistics Botswana.
Reporting Period:	for the period from 01 January 2018 to 30 June 2019
Total Project Funding:	\$120,000
Total Expenditures at end of project (excluding evaluation budget):	\$96,772.00

1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

The overall objective of this project was to support the Government of Botswana, specifically the Selebi-Phikwe Economic Revitalization Programme under the Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry, in collecting and utilizing skills data to inform and guide efforts to revitalize the economy of the Selebi-Phikwe region. The Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry (MITI) had requested United Nations agencies and other development partners to assist in the efforts to revitalize the economy of Selebi-Phikwe region, a mining district in the Central part of Botswana, which experienced challenges due to the closure of the Bamangwato Concessions Limited (BCL) copper and nickel mine, which was the main economic backbone of the region. There were concerns that the region would turn into a “ghost district and town” due to the anticipated mass out-migration of former employees, their families and businesses in search of economic opportunities in other parts of the country and beyond. IOM was one of the agencies that responded positively to the government request for assistance with an approved funding from the IOM Development Fund (IDF). Through this project IOM sought to strengthen the government’s institutional capacity to utilize quality data to guide and inform economic development planning and decision-making geared at revitalizing the economy of the town and surroundings. The 18-month project was implemented from 1 January 2018 to 30 June 2019 and comprised of the following key interventions:

- **Skills Assessment:** IOM engaged a labour consultant to carry out a skills audit in the Selibe-Phikwe region. This included an assessment of skills the region had as a result of mine operations and related services. The assessment aimed to provide a profile of skills currently available, skills that were lost/skills gaps, as well as skills and expertise needed to support new envisioned economic revitalization activities. The consultant also conducted a rapid scoping of the national labour market to assess the national context regarding opportunities and gaps in industries.
- **Capacity Building:** In an effort to strengthen the capacity of the Government and other local stakeholders' capacity on labour migration management, IOM conducted a three-day training from 26-28 March 2019. Selebi-Phikwe District Commissioner's Office hosted the training (provided a venue), while IOM covered logistics and refreshments.
- **Labour Migration Trade Mission/Study Tour:** To supplement the three-day training and further facilitate learning, through the sharing of experiences and best practices for labour migration management, IOM supported a select team of relevant officials from Government and other entities on a trade mission/study tour to Mauritius from 5-9 May 2019. The study tour was led by the Office of the District Commissioner, the Botswana delegation comprising of representatives from Statistics Botswana, Ministry of Employment, Labour Productivity and Skills Development, Department of Cooperatives Development under Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry, as well as Selebi-Phikwe Town Council, and managed to have meetings and exchange views and ideas with a number of Mauritius counterparts, such as the Economic Development Board, Human Resource Development Council (HRDC), and Ministry of Tourism.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation has both accountability and learning broad objectives. In terms of accountability the evaluation will ascertain the whether the project delivered what it set out to deliver as stipulated in the approved results matrix. In terms of learning the evaluation will generate key lessons learnt on what worked well, what did not work well and how IOM performance can be improved in future similar projects. In fulfilling the above two broad objectives the following will be the specific objectives of the evaluation:

- Assess how the project performed against key evaluation criteria;
- Gather feedback about IOM's work and quality from project stakeholders and partners and generate lessons for future performance;
- Identify ways through which data generated from the project and knowledge gained through capacity building events have been applied to improve labour migration management primarily in Selebi-Phikwe region and in Botswana in general;
- Assess the extent to which gender mainstreaming and other cross-cutting factors were integrated in project design, implementation and the results this has had.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

To fulfil the above four specific objectives, the evaluation framework is designed around the following evaluation criteria. Under each criteria is a set of broad questions to guide data collection.

1. Relevance

- 1.1. *Was the project design responsive to the needs and priorities of the project's key stakeholders?*
- 1.2. *Were stakeholders involved in the formulation of project objective and outcomes?*
- 1.3. *Is the Theory of Change suited for the context, responsive to the identified challenge(s), and logically linked?*
- 1.4. *Did the project design sufficiently take cross-cutting issues such as gender into account?*

2. Effectiveness

- 2.1. *Are the quality and quantity of the produced results and outputs in accordance with the approved results matrix?*
- 2.2. *Did project activities lead to production of outputs as originally envisaged?*
- 2.3. *Are outputs/products brought about by the project being utilised by the GoL and/or other partners so as to contribute to outcome or impact level results in the long run?*
- 2.4. *What factors enabled or hindered the effectiveness of the project to deliver envisaged activities and outputs?*
- 2.5. *How do project partners stakeholders feel about the quality of IOM's work?*

3. Efficiency

- 3.1. *Were the project expenditures utilized appropriately and/or as planned?*
- 3.2. *Does an assessment of the project results against the human, financial and time investment to the project show value for money? Was human and financial resource allocation and management optimal for the nature of the project?*
- 3.3. *Were activities implemented on time as planned and carried out in a well-organized fashion?*
- 3.4. *How well did the partner contribution/Involvement work?*
- 3.5. *Were challenges in project implementation addressed swiftly and appropriately?*

4. Impact

- 4.1. *Does any evidence exist that significant contribution was made towards the long-term outcome and overall objective results? Do indicators show significant progress towards achieving the project's higher-level objectives?*
- 4.2. *To what extent does/will the project have any indirect positive and/or negative impacts? (i.e. environmental, social, cultural, gender and economic)*

5. Sustainability

- 5.1. *Do stakeholders indicate that project outputs and built capacities will be used in future?*
- 5.2. *Are the conditions in place for the project products and results to continue after the intervention has finished (financial, institutional, legal, technical and political)?*
- 5.3. *Are there indications that the benefits generated by this project continue once external support ceases?*
- 5.4. *What efforts or mechanisms did the project put in place to boost sustainability of results in the long-term?*
- 5.5. *How this project was interlinked with other IOM continuing initiatives?*

4. METHODOLOGY

This will be a qualitative research enquiry and it will draw on the following methods in gathering relevant data:

Document review

Relevant documentation will be reviewed, including the project document, periodic reports, midterm review reports (if available), specific meetings or training reports, published documentation etc.

Key informant interviews

Face-to-face interviews will be conducted with key actors who actively participated in the design and/or implementation of the project including but not limited to IOM project staff in-country and regional level, government and other partner official in Selebi-Phikwe and Gaborone and other relevant actors at country level. A full list will be developed jointly between the evaluator and country team.

5. REPORTING

Following all desk and field research, a final report will be drafted and shared with colleagues and stakeholders (if possible) for comments. The draft document will be submitted to IDF, the country mission, regional office and any other relevant stakeholders for inputs and comments. The final report will be submitted to IDF, the country mission and the regional office for filing with OIG Evaluation office.

6. EVALUATION TEAM & RESPONSIBILITIES

This internal evaluation will be carried out by the Regional M&E Officer based in the RO Pretoria. The respective RTS for labour migration at the regional office will also actively participate in the evaluation as a subject matter specialist to advise on technical thematic aspects and in data collection as may be feasible. He/she will provide technical inputs to the evaluation TOR, data collection plan and tools as well as the draft evaluation report. The IDF team as well as OIG evaluation staff will be requested also to provide input to the TORS and the draft report.

The in-country IOM team will provide logistical support including but not limited to arranging in-country transport and related logistics for the evaluator, arranging for and facilitating appointments for interviews or discussions with key respondents that have been identified as necessary for the evaluation, provide review comments to tools and draft report as well as provide all required documentation and information for the successful data collection.

7. RESOURCES AND TIMING

Expenses for this evaluation will be covered through the budgeted expenses in WBS number **MK.0047.BW10.57.02.002** in the maximum amount of **USD 2484**. Logistical and travel assistance will be provided through existing staff in the country office.

Though the evaluation team will prepare and discuss with the project team a detailed work plan with specific dates for the evaluation, it is planned that this evaluation will be carried out during the month of **February/March 2019**.

8. DELIVERABLES

The evaluation main deliverables will be:

- An Evaluation Execution Plan/brief to guide project teams on the methodology, tools, and logistical preparations that will need to be done in advance of the in-country visit.
- A draft evaluation report utilizing the IOM evaluation format
- A final report (in the same format above incorporating feedback and comments from RTS, IOM in-country staff, IDF and any other relevant source).

6.2 List of documents reviewed

1. Official project proposal and budget approved by IDF.
2. Project Interim reports 1 and 2.
3. Final project report and its eight (8) annexes submitted to IDF.
4. Final Project financial report and checklist to IDF.
5. Report of the monitoring visit by IDF.
6. Selebi-Phikwe Skills Assessment Report by IOM Botswana.
7. Report of the sustainability workshop held on 19th June 2019.
8. Ministry of Investment, Trade and Industry (MITI) request for IOM support, 5th June 2017 and other correspondences by IOM Botswana to MITI.
9. Botswana Investment and Trade Centre (BITC) 2019 Annual Report & various newsletters.

6.3 List of persons who participated in the evaluation

Ministry of Institution	Place	Name
1. Statistics Botswana	Gaborone	Ms. Mavis Mogami
2. Ministry of Employment Labour & Skills Development	Gaborone	Ms. Kebalemogile Mokopi
3. Human Resources Development Council	Gaborone	Ms. Cinderella Mphetolang
4. Department of Immigration	Selebi-Phikwe	Ms. Dinah Kabasia
5. Department of Labour & Social Security	Selebi-Phikwe	Mr. Bumbanani Manewe
6. Department of Labour & Social Security	Selebi-Phikwe	Ms. Thothi Pusompe
7. Department of Labour & Social Security	Selebi-Phikwe	Ms. Dimpoetse Koolefhile

8. Department of Trade & Consumer Affairs	Selebi-Phikwe	Ms. Conny D. Nkobela
9. Office of the Member of Parliament	Selebi-Phikwe	Mr. Nzwaliqwa Nzwaliqwa
10. Selebi-Phikwe Town Council	Selebi-Phikwe	Mr. Senatla Rutherford
11. Selebi-Phikwe Technical College	Selebi-Phikwe	Ms. Laone Lewanika
12. Office of the District Commissioner	Selebi-Phikwe	Mr. Mokgethi Nfila
13. SPEDU	Selebi-Phikwe	Mr. Jalenga Uezeza
14. SPEDU	Selebi-Phikwe	Ms. Baeletsi Mathaka
15. SPEDU	Selebi-Phikwe	Ms. Tankiso Koboyankwe
16. Department of Cooperatives	Selebi-Phikwe	Mr. Lesedi Gaogane
17. IOM Consultant	Gaborone	Ms. Riley Moepswa
18. IOM Botswana	Gaborone	Ms. Kagiso Pelopedi
19. IOM Botswana	Gaborone	Mr. Oaitse Chilume
20. IOM Mauritius	Via Skype	Ms. Celine Lemmel
21. IOM Mauritius	Via Skype	Mr. Kokil Khemraj
22. IOM Regional Office	Pretoria	Mr. Jason Theede
23. Workshop follow up/impact survey	Online	10 individual respondents

6.4 Data collection instruments

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE: *Government officials, CSOs and other key project partners actively involved in the project*

Setting the scene

First: Introduction and explaining about the interview & the evaluation

- *Let's start by you telling me what you do, your work and how you got involved in the IOM project.*
- *What role did you play in the IOM-project? (this is meant to gauge how deeply involved the interviewee was and thus guide on type of questions you can ask him/her)*

Relevance & stakeholder participation

1. In your opinion was the IOM/GOB project addressing the most priority labour migration issue in this region? How could such a project have been designed and implemented differently? **Explain your answer.**
2. To what extent was your department or unit or ministry or organization involved in conceptualizing the project idea: How or who identified the project activities?
3. How were you involved in implementation, monitoring or evaluation of project activities?

4. Were there other key actors that you feel would have made a valuable contribution in design, implementation of the project but were not actively involved in the project? *Which ones and what could have been their role?*
5. All IOM projects consider gender mainstreaming to be a key cross-cutting issue. Did you see aspects of that during project implementation? What could have been done to better mainstream a gender perspective in the project? **(if necessary briefly explain what you mean by gender, as it can be misunderstood)**

Note: Evaluator to triangulate this information against what is recorded in the project's official proposal document and other documents regarding how the project idea was borne, who was involved in implementation, in M&E etc

Effectiveness

1. According to what you know and from your own judgement did the project deliver what it promised to deliver? **Please elaborate your answer.**
2. What according to you were the project's major successes, if any? Basically, what did it achieve? And on the other side what were the major setbacks/failures of the project. **(probe for specifics)**
3. How could the earlier cited weaknesses/failures be avoided in future projects?

Note: evaluator to triangulate this information with what is documented in the project official reports.

Efficiency

1. Reflecting on IOM's coordination role of project activities: what do you feel IOM did very well and what areas do feel were not well done and needs improvement in the future? **(Probe for specifics)**
2. Reflecting on IOM's capacity building role: from what you know what is your overall assessment of the quality and effectiveness of such capacity building events? NB: IOM organized a workshop and a study tour to Mauritius) **Explain your answer**
3. In what ways have you been able to use the knowledge acquired? **If not used, probe further for reasons**

Impact

1. What is the biggest lasting change that you feel the project leaves behind in the area of labour migration management in this region? **(why do you say so (probe for evidences if possible)**
2. Has the government (national or local) implemented any of the recommendations that came from the study tour or the assessment report that you know of? **(if necessary, read out or share the recommendations with them to refresh their minds)**
3. What according to you are the key challenges/barriers that have hindered progress or results? And where there is progress, what has enabled that?
4. How, according to you did the project affect gender roles, gender relations and gender norms? **(Briefly explain these terms).** Are there any positive gender related results that you can cite?

Sustainability

1. What is your government/ministry/agency doing to ensure that some of the positive gains from the project are not lost? Do you have any evidence or document that I can review?
2. According to you, what else could be done and by whom to sustain the positive gains already made?
3. What according to you are the main barriers/challenges that would make the project investment go down the drain? How can these be managed?

4. What labour migration needs in this region still remain that need attention from government and partners?

Ending note: We have come to end of our interview, but I would invite you to give me any further information you may have that you consider relevant for the evaluation. Also, I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE: IOM Staff at Country, Regional Level

Setting the scene

First: Introduction and explaining about the interview & the evaluation

- *Let's start by you telling me what you do, your work and how you got involved in the IOM project.*
- *What role did you play in the IOM-project? (this is meant to gauge how deeply involved the interviewee was and thus guide on type of questions you can ask him/her)*

Relevance & stakeholder participation

1. From what you know how as the project idea/focus identified? To what extent was it an IOM idea, to what extent was it a government idea? Are there any lessons learnt on project conceptualization that future projects could benefit from?
2. How was project implementation, monitoring organised? Who was involved, how could it have been done differently? Any lessons learnt?
3. Looking back at all the key project stakeholders involved in project activities, do you feel that there were key actors that could have been more closely involved and what value could they have brought according to you?
4. All IOM projects consider gender mainstreaming to be a key cross-cutting issue. How did the design and implementation integrate gender? What could have been done to better mainstream a gender perspective in the project? **(if necessary briefly explain what you mean by gender mainstreaming, as it can be misunderstood)**

Effectiveness

5. According to what you know and from your own judgement did the project deliver what it set out to deliver? **Please elaborate your answer.**
6. What according to you is the project's foremost success? And on the other side what was the projects foremost weakness or setback? **(probe for specifics)**
7. How could the earlier cited weaknesses/failures be avoided in future projects?

Efficiency

8. Reflecting on IOM's coordination role: what do you feel IOM did very well and what areas do you feel were not well done and needs improvement in the future? **(Probe for specifics)**
9. Reflecting on IOM's capacity building role: from what you know what is your overall assessment of the quality and effectiveness of such capacity building events? NB: IOM organized a workshop and a study tour to Mauritius) **Explain your answer**
10. Reflecting on the research component: what went well, what could have been done better? **Explain your answer**
11. What is your assessment on the project implementation pace and budget utilization?

Impact

- 12. What is the biggest change that the project brought about and how do you know?
- 13. From what you know has the government (national or local) implemented any of the recommendations that came from the study tour or the assessment report that you know of?
- 14. What according to you are the key challenges/barriers that have hindered and will likely continue to hinder the achievement of impact level results?
- 15. How, according to you did the project affect gender roles, gender relations and gender norms? **(Briefly explain these terms if necessary)**. Are there any positive gender related results that you can cite?

Sustainability

- 16. What are the mechanism that the project put in place to boost sustainability of project results and according to you are they working so far?
- 17. According to you, what else could be done and by whom to sustain the positive gains already made?
- 18. What labour migration issues still need attention from government and partners?

Ending note: We have come to end of our interview, but I would invite you to give me any further information you may have that you consider relevant for the evaluation. Also, I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.
