



International Organization for Migration, Guyana

Ex-Post Evaluation Report

Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement
for Development in the Caribbean

Submitted by: Janet Morgan
4-3-2019

Contents

Executive Summary	3
The Project	3
The Evaluation	3
Conclusions.....	4
Relevance.....	4
Effectiveness.....	4
Efficiency and Cost effectiveness.....	4
Impact	4
Sustainability.....	5
Cross-cutting Themes	5
Summary Matrix of Findings, Evidence and Recommendations	6
Introduction.....	11
Context and Purpose of the Evaluation	12
Context.....	12
Project Activities:	12
Evaluation Purpose	13
Evaluation Scope.....	13
Evaluation Criteria	13
Evaluation Framework and Methodology	13
Data Sources and Collection	13
Interviews	14
Survey	15
Data Analysis.....	15
Sampling	15
Limitations and Proposed Mitigation Strategies	16
Findings.....	17
Relevance.....	17
Effectiveness.....	19
Efficiency.....	29
Impact	31
Sustainability.....	34
Cross-cutting Issues	35
Conclusions / Recommendations / Lessons Learned	35
Annexes	39
Annex I. Terms of Reference of the Evaluation	40
Annex II. Evaluation Plan Matrix.....	50
Annex III. List of Persons Interviewed or Consulted	55
Annex IV. Data Collection Instruments	57

Executive Summary

The Project

This report is an evaluation of the 'Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean' (ESDEDC) project that was implemented during the period 01-07-14 to 31-12-2017 (42 months). The project was implemented in collaboration with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Governments of Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname through their respective Ministries of Foreign Affairs. The project was funded to the tune of US\$280,000 and was commissioned by IOM Guyana, Regional Coordination Office for the Caribbean.

The main goal of the project was to contribute to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities through supporting the identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources of Caribbean expatriates residing in Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. To achieve this goal, the project was piloted in the four Caribbean countries of Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname. The following four project outcomes served as the means to achieve the overall project objective:

1. Government of selected Caribbean countries increase engagement with diaspora in Canada, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and United States
2. A pilot number of Caribbean diaspora members in Canada, the Netherlands, UK and USA are supported to invest in community and entrepreneurial development opportunities in their home countries.
3. Caribbean countries are more equipped to channel remittances to contribute towards development.
4. Participating countries have the tools necessary to encourage the establishment of additional SMEs with the diaspora.

The Evaluation

This ex-post evaluation assessed the project's results based on OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. It will also address relevant cross-cutting themes of gender mainstreaming and right-based approach to programming. The main objectives of the evaluation were to:

1. Assess how the activities have led to the achievement of the project results and objectives.
2. Assist the IOM Development Fund in its decision-making on the use of the Fund as seed funding on project management and to fine-tune interpretation and categorization of the funding criteria and overall disbursement strategies.
3. Provide a clear understanding of whether the project's objectives have been met as well as to measure impact and to identify lessons learnt.

The evaluation was originally scheduled for the period December 5th, 2018 through to February 13, 2019 and had three main stages: inception, data collection and analysis and reporting. However, there was an extension of the evaluation period to March 22, 2019 due mainly to unforeseen challenges encountered during the data collection process as well as the need to make allowances for the holiday season and its impact on government operations across the four countries.

Primary and secondary data were the main data sources considered by the evaluation methodology to reflect the representation of the various stakeholders and beneficiaries. The data sources consisted of project documentation, interviews of key stakeholders and a survey of individuals who participated in the remittances workshop. The data obtained from the desk review, open-ended questionnaire/interviews with stakeholders, and the survey responses were triangulated to provide answers based on the evaluation research questions. An email questionnaire was implemented for respondents who were

unavailable for an interview. The sample size was drawn from the four countries using a purposive sample that targeted those stakeholders thought to have information that will help to achieve the study's aims.

The data analysis and synthesis phase took into consideration the evaluation matrix developed during the inception phase. The synthesis and analysis of both primary and secondary data were then analyzed through the evaluation criteria, responding to the related questions. From this, a set of findings and conclusions were drawn along with a set of lessons learned, recommendations and critical success factors.

Conclusions

Relevance

The relevance of the ESEDC project was endorsed by all the respondents from each beneficiary country. In particular, the responses highlighted the project's work in contributing to national plans and strategies around diaspora engagement, raising awareness around the contribution of remittances towards development, establishing mechanism to promote greater access to and communication with the diaspora, and the development of investment initiatives like ("Go See" visits) to promote investment by the diaspora in their home countries. The project's emphasis on assessment as a tool to establish need in order to provide targeted solutions for each country was an effective strategy to respond to the needs and priorities of each government. However, for those countries that have a more developed relationship with their diaspora, the project outcomes appeared to be more aligned with their government plans, and policies. Additionally, evidence indicated flaws in the project's design that can be attributed to a lack of pre-design analysis that factored in the social and economic differences of the beneficiary countries.

Effectiveness

The ESEDC project was very effective in delivering on some of its key intended results although the level of effectiveness varies according to country due to a variety of contextual issues. The effectiveness of project outcomes may be described as raising awareness, generating motivation around the issue of diaspora engagement, and creating tools where required to bridge the gap and help beneficiary countries engage their diaspora more effectively. Another important outcome for the project is in increasing awareness and cooperation among stakeholder groups around migration, diaspora engagement, remittances, and investment toward development. One unintended outcome for example, is that as a result of the "Go See Visits", Guyana developed a new approach to promoting its agricultural products in Canada and are also making extra efforts to connect with members of the diaspora in the United Kingdom.

Efficiency and Cost effectiveness

This ESEDC project faced many delays and challenges both internal and external to the project. This did not prevent the project from achieving many of its project outcomes. The project manager used a variety of strategies to keep the project on track even though it was evident that the main challenges came from the two smaller countries with less capacity in certain areas to embark on a project of this magnitude. The project used a results matrix to keep track of project activities and there were no cost overruns although there were questions about the distribution of funds without consideration for the different economic standards across countries. This led to inadequate funds assigned to attract high level and professional consultants both in Jamaica and Guyana which in turn impacted the quality of work for the Jamaican consultancy.

Impact

Typically, the question of impact addresses the longer-term results of project outcomes such as more SME initiatives in place to support engagement of diaspora or more government initiatives established to channel remittances. However, the primary long-term impact of the ESEDC project is still under

review until December 2019. However, the project produced some important short-term outcomes such as change in knowledge and perception around the role of remittances towards development, the development of tools that facilitated increased engagement with the diaspora, as well as the development of Government policy and strategy documents to guide ongoing diaspora engagement initiatives. If a policy document was not completed under this project evidence suggest that knowledge gained from the project activities will influence its final development.

An important strategy implemented by the project is the “Go See” visits which has produced some unexpected but positive effects for the country of Guyana. In addition to promoting excitement around, and bringing renewed attention to diaspora engagement, the “Go See” visits may have helped to resuscitate the business of the one visible and successful Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) among its participants. This (SME) has provided early indications of how it can contribute towards the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities in Guyana. Additionally, the Government of Guyana (GoG) has established connections and networks with the diaspora that has prompted changes in the way the Guyanese Marketing Corporation (GMC) markets its products in Canada, opened a new market for the indigenous coconut oil product in Canada and have secured seed funding to promote development of a new product within the agro-processing sector.

Sustainability

This project has some potential for sustainability. This is evidenced by the following factors: i) mechanisms acquired by beneficiary countries to foster diaspora engagement, ii) the development of strategies and policies by some countries to support diaspora engagement over the long term; iii) strong national support for the project outcomes, iv) the strong relationship between IOM and the Governments of the selected countries and v) new knowledge and understanding gained around how to channel remittances to contribute towards development.

However, factors that will impact sustainability are a lack of adequate financing; disconnect between government bodies; lack of capacity in some government organizations, continued contextual issues such as change in governments and staff turnover in many Minister of Foreign Affairs (MFA) ; the lack of Government action to implement strategies, formulate initiatives and maintain the products developed such as the websites and the diaspora investment toolkit.

Cross-cutting Themes

Including a gender mainstreaming approach to project design is more than just including references to sex disaggregated data. The conceptualization of the project can improve its approach to deliberately address gender mainstreaming and a rights-based approach in project design. This may include an emphasis on how the project outcomes may impact men and women or how the concept of empowerment may be measured for men as against women.

Summary Matrix of Findings, Evidence and Recommendations

Findings ¹	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
Project Design		
<p>IOM remains a well-respected and important partner with governments in the Caribbean in managing migration for poverty reduction. This partnership and collaboration with beneficiaries is important especially in helping to build trust between countries and their diaspora as well as influencing policy decisions and helping them to make more effective use of their resources. One member of the diaspora commented that because IOM was involved in the data collection process, it gave the project credibility.</p>	<p>Project Documentation Respondent perception Project Summary</p>	<p>IOM should continue to fund these projects but with more careful attention to the contextual issues that exist in each country in order to maximize project benefits.</p>
<p>The presumed relationship among the overall project objective, its indicator and the target established could benefit from more a critical analysis of impact variables. The impact variable as stated is the establishment and continued operation of 20 SMEs within 2 years after project completion. This longer-term approach runs the risk of diluting project effect and did not seem to take into consideration differences among the countries, or time it would take for significant changes required in policies at the governmental and private sector level to take place. It appeared also that the project analysis did not consider the challenges associated with setting up and sustaining a business for members of the diaspora who do not reside in their home country.</p>	<p>Project documentation Results Matrix Project Summary</p>	<p>Apply a research design to develop well-researched / well designed indicators that identifies medium targets as well as the long-term impacts to achieve the overall project objective.</p>
<p>The targets for some outcomes were overly ambitious and did not reflect the reality of the contextual issues or project conditions evident for each country.</p>	<p>Project documentation Results Matrix Project Summary</p>	<p>It is recommended that the project strengthens the analysis stage of project development to ensure the alignment of outputs, with outcomes and project impact to more closely match project realities.</p>
<p>The overall project objective describes the concept “economic and social empowerment of low-income communities” without any definition, or how this would be measured across the different countries.</p>	<p>Project documentation Results Matrix Project Summary</p>	<p>IOM should consider the feasibility of developing and reporting on measures of economic and social empowerment of low-income communities to support qualitative reports of impact. These should make any distinction necessary among the participating countries.</p>

¹ A finding uses evidence from several sources to allow for a factual statement (UNODC, 2018)

² Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project /programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions (UNODC, 2018)

Findings ¹	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
<p>Outcomes and outputs that refer to capacity building do not identify indicators or learning targets that reference change in knowledge or skills as a result of the intervention. See output 3.1 4.2 and 4.3.</p>	<p>Project documentation Results Matrix Project Summary</p>	<p>IOM should consider the feasibility of developing and reporting on measures of the effectiveness of learning initiatives beyond the number of people participating.</p>
<p>The project’s conceptualization and design process seem to lack adequate input from project partners especially IOM staff from beneficiary countries.</p> <p>Also, IOM staff indicated that they felt rushed to review the project proposal and got the impression that their input was not valued or would be used. IOM staff have the experience and can contribute valuable insight into the initial proposal versus a review of the final draft proposal.</p> <p>Governments may say yes to a project for a variety of reasons, but IOM staff have intricate knowledge of how to manage a successful project such as if a budget is adequate for their conditions.</p>	<p>Project documentation Respondent perception Project Summary</p>	<p>It is recommended that IOM institute a project management process that allows critical staff / project partners time to review a project.</p> <p>Additionally, the implementation of a review checklist to garner comments about critical areas such as budget and the linkages between output outcomes and impact may focus the attention of IOM staff and provide useful information to project developers.</p>
<p>The decision-making process to include countries as project beneficiaries requires review. The current explanation is that it is a matter of quota and obligation to ensure that certain countries are represented on projects. This explanation is inadequate considering the many challenges around readiness and capacity that exist for small countries that either do not have an Head of Office (HOO) or the required staff.</p>	<p>Project documentation Respondent perception</p>	<p>It is recommended that IOM develop and implement a readiness assessment tool that provides comprehensive analysis of a country’s capacity to undertake project activities. Once the gaps are identified, it is easier to make data driven decisions. This assessment should consider the important issue of staffing as well the capacity of staff for project management. As the story of Suriname reveal, it took some time for staff to learn the expectations of what it takes to manage an IOM project.</p>
<p>Project conceptualization seemed to pay little attention to apparent contextual issues within each country. For example, the regional project was approved before the mapping project for Suriname, hence both projects ran consecutively which may have contributed to some of the challenges that Suriname faced. Also, Suriname and Belize both have different relationship with their diaspora or the relationship with their diaspora would have benefitted from first completing their diaspora mapping projects. Also, the budget was developed without multi-country considerations.</p>	<p>Project documentation Respondent perception Regional Workplan</p>	<p>IOM should consider project design that is grounded in careful research and that examines the historical, socio-economic and political contexts of each country to then make data driven decisions about the needs and right strategy required to solve the problem at hand. Also, factor in contextual differences in budgeting decisions.</p>
<p>All the beneficiary countries had disruptive events namely elections, change in government, change in personnel. The larger countries may have the capacity and</p>	<p>Project documentation</p>	<p>Project design should consider some aspect of risk management that includes alternative actions in case of staff turnover due to elections, promotions or migrations and lack</p>

Findings ¹	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
<p>infrastructure to handle unexpected changes. However, for a country like Suriname, the political upheavals are constant and cannot be predicted. Also, for Suriname an additional challenge is that IOM does not have a continued presence in this country.</p>	<p>Respondent perception</p>	<p>of capacity due to the absence of continued IOM presence in a country.</p>
<p>Project conceptualization should set realistic timelines for the completions of complex project outcomes. It takes a lot more time to establish an SME than the project accounted for in its design. The model SME for which we have data, reveals that part of its success was due to family support in Guyana, mentoring, access to the support offered by the GMC along with the background experience of the entrepreneur in key areas like marketing that fostered the business success. Furthermore, this entrepreneur benefitted tremendously from the “Go See” because she already had a functioning business.</p>	<p>Project documentation Respondent perception</p>	<p>It is recommended that long-term outcomes such as 20 SMEs established and maintained within four years utilize a research design that considers the complexities of SMEs development and implementation.</p> <p>Also, the project should consider more rigorous requirements for participation in “Go See” visits.</p>
<p>Project Implementation</p>		
<p>The “Go See” visit is a very good strategy and is a tangible way for Governments to connect with their diaspora to come and invest.</p>	<p>Project documentation Respondent perception</p>	<p>IOM should consider supporting Suriname and Belize to host the “Go See” visits that could not have been completed under the previous project cycle This decision should consider that for these two countries this was a first attempt to engage with their diaspora in a meaningful way. In the case of Belize an analysis of capacity and commitment should be undertaken. Also, these two countries claimed that they have learnt many lessons, completed the ground work and have laid the foundation for this activity.</p>
<p>Diaspora engagement is challenging work for the beneficiary countries that do not have strong relationships with their diaspora. Yet this project managed to contribute to better diaspora engagement, plus change in policies for one of these countries in a more positive direction. Even Guyana had a challenging time setting up “Go See” visits.</p>	<p>Project documentation Respondent perception</p>	<p>Build on this achievement to provide the next level of support for the above-mentioned countries based on ‘need’ rather than to fit into some major goal for IOM around diaspora engagement.</p>
<p>This project had a challenge with funding to attract high level consultants. The result is the already stretched IOM staff sometimes must rework deliverables to get them up to an acceptable standard. The suggestion to double up consultancies did not solve the problem for Jamaica.</p>	<p>Project documentation Respondent perception</p>	<p>Project conceptualizers should consider issues of quality and product to cost ratio issues more closely when creating budgets.</p>

Findings ¹	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
<p>The implementation of level one workshop evaluations can provide information that is useful rather than to have individuals recall information two years hence.</p>	<p>Project documentation</p>	<p>It is recommended that at the minimum, IOM should consider standardizing the use of workshop evaluations to capture initial learnings, future needs and other comments. With some reformatting, the workshop evaluation used by IOM Jamaica can be a useful starting point.</p>

Abbreviations /Acronyms / Definitions

ESDEDC	Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean
GMC	The Guyanese Marketing Corporation
GoB	Government of Belize
GoG	Government of Guyana
GoJ	Government of Jamaica
GoS	Government of Suriname
HOO	Head of Office
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NL	The Netherlands
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
ToR	Terms of Reference
UoG	University of Guyana
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America

Introduction

This ex-post evaluation is for the project entitled '*Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean*'. Funded to the tune of US\$280,000 and implemented during the period July 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017, this project was piloted in the four Caribbean countries of Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, and Suriname. The primary objective of the project was to contribute to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities through the identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources of Caribbean expatriates residing in Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. To achieve this goal, the project targeted activities around increasing diaspora engagement, channeling remittances to contribute toward development, supporting community and entrepreneurial investment opportunities and providing the beneficiary governments with tools to encourage the establishment of additional SMEs with the diaspora.

The following project summary table describes the project governance and the project beneficiaries in more detail.

Project Summary Table

Executing Organization:	International Organization for Migration (IOM)														
Project Identification and Contract Numbers	GY10P0004/CE.0254														
Project Management Site and Relevant Regional Office:	Management Site: Guyana-COCF-Georgetown-GY10 Regional Office: RO San Jose														
Project Period:	01-07-2014 - 31-12-2017														
Geographical Coverage:	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname														
Project Beneficiaries	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Non Migrant Beneficiaries</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Achieved</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Non-governmental organizations</td> <td>1000 (800 Unknown, 200 Other)</td> <td>948 (699 Unknown, 249 Other)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private sector organizations</td> <td>40 (40 Unknown)</td> <td>10 (10 Unknown)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total (Migrant+ Non Migrant)</td> <td>1040</td> <td>958</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Non Migrant Beneficiaries	Target	Achieved	Non-governmental organizations	1000 (800 Unknown, 200 Other)	948 (699 Unknown, 249 Other)	Private sector organizations	40 (40 Unknown)	10 (10 Unknown)	Total (Migrant+ Non Migrant)	1040	958		
	Non Migrant Beneficiaries	Target	Achieved												
	Non-governmental organizations	1000 (800 Unknown, 200 Other)	948 (699 Unknown, 249 Other)												
	Private sector organizations	40 (40 Unknown)	10 (10 Unknown)												
Total (Migrant+ Non Migrant)	1040	958													
Project Partner(s):	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname														
Reporting Period:	From 01 July 2014 to 31 December 2017														
Date of Submission:	14/06/2018														
Total Confirmed Funding:	USD 280,000														
Total Funds Received to Date:	USD 280,000														
Total Expenditures:	USD 202,351														

The next sections of this report include the context and purpose of the evaluation, and a more detailed discussion of the findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and annexes.

Context and Purpose of the Evaluation

Context

For over two decades, IOM has been working with governments in the Caribbean to manage migration through the provision of technical assistance and capacity building. Through its ongoing work with governments, IOM has identified the potential of the diaspora to contribute towards social and economic development. IOM has also supported governments to channel resources more effectively to support development.

It is within this context that the ESDEDC project was established to help the four beneficiary countries “enhance the contributions of their diaspora” and to create a competitive advantage that may counter the “global downturn which challenges their economies”³. The four Caribbean countries identified were Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname. The project summary document declared that the project would build on the efforts made by Guyana and Jamaica to engage their diaspora in a meaningful way through their diaspora mapping initiatives. Additionally, it was believed that with the implementation of this project, the selected countries would be more positioned to tap into the resources available within the diaspora to support community and entrepreneurial development initiatives.

Of note, is that, the economic and historical context of each country around diaspora engagement is different and is reflected in their varying levels of engagement with their diaspora. As such, the countries were at different levels of readiness to engage in the established project activities. For example, project documents indicated that the relationship that Suriname had with its diaspora was a “bit strained” and that the Government of Belize (GoB) was not fully prepared to undertake some of the required project activities. Guyana and Jamaica on the other hand had over time developed stronger relationships with their diaspora and due to the completion of their diaspora mapping initiative, were well poised to fully participate in and benefit from this project.

The overall objective of the project was to contribute to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities in selected Caribbean countries, through the identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources of Caribbean expatriates residing in Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. The project identified the following four project outcomes:

1. Government of selected Caribbean countries increase engagement with diaspora in Canada, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and United States
2. A pilot number of Caribbean diaspora members in Canada, the Netherlands, UK and USA are supported to invest in community and entrepreneurial development opportunities in their home countries.
3. Caribbean countries are more equipped to channel remittances to contribute towards development.
4. Participating countries have the tools necessary to encourage the establishment of additional SMEs with the diaspora.

Project Activities:

The project identified the following five project activities / components to achieve its overall goal:

1. Establishing proper coordination mechanism within each country to support effective implementation of project activities.
2. Identifying Caribbean diaspora organizations within the four targeted destination countries, raising awareness on proposed project services and encouraging assistance from such organizations in the completion of project initiatives. A common website will be developed as a

³ ESDEDC project summary

reference point on community and entrepreneurial development within the four countries of origin.

3. Helping selected Caribbean countries to channel the remittances received through the diaspora by increasing the competencies of government officials and their efforts to address issues of migration and development in beneficiary countries to maximize the potential development of remittances. Financial institutions within host countries will be encouraged to provide viable financial packages and other financial literacy initiatives to attract and channel remittances.
4. Support visits to home countries by 40 Caribbean entrepreneurs who are willing to set up or join existing small business enterprises. Candidates will be mentored in business start-up or management and oriented on the developmental needs, priority sectors and investment opportunities in their home countries.
5. Final Project Evaluation to assess how the activities have led to the achievement of the project results and objectives.

Evaluation Purpose

The main objectives of the evaluation were to:

1. Assess how the activities have led to the achievement of the project results and objectives.
2. Assist the IOM Development Fund in its decision-making on the use of the Fund as seed funding on project management and to fine-tune interpretation and categorization of the funding criteria and overall disbursement strategies.
3. Provide a clear understanding of whether the project's objectives have been met as well as to measure impact and to identify lessons learnt.

The evaluation was originally scheduled for the period December 5th, 2018 through to February 13, 2019 and had three main stages: inception, data collection and analysis and reporting. However, there was an extension of the evaluation due date to March 22, 2019, due mainly to unforeseen challenges encountered during the data collection process coupled with the total shutdown of the government in all countries for the holiday season.

Evaluation Scope

The evaluation assessed the objectives, outputs and outcomes based on the project's reporting period of July 2014 to December 2017 (42 months). The evaluation covered all countries where project activities were carried out, namely: Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, and Suriname.

Stakeholders were consulted including relevant representatives of government ministries, the private sector, diaspora representatives, members of the project's steering committee, and IOM staff who managed the project. The evaluation analysis focused on all project activities, outputs and outcomes, for the whole of the project implementation period (July 2014 through to December 2017).

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation assessed the project's results based on OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. It will also address relevant cross-cutting themes of gender mainstreaming and a right-based approach to programming.

Evaluation Framework and Methodology

Data Sources and Collection

This evaluation is a qualitative study that utilized the following data collection methods:

- a. Desk review (review of project documents, reports and other existing secondary literature);
- b. Semi-structured interviews or open-ended questionnaire where appropriate with representatives of the government, stakeholders including NGO / private sector / academia representatives and entrepreneurs, and with IOM staff responsible for the project implementation;

- c. Survey delivered via an online platform to gather data from project participants who attended remittance workshop.

Since one of the problems this project faced was difficulty getting responses from some stakeholders, the evaluation has suggested a variety of data collection methods to afford flexibility. The open-ended questionnaire was used in situations where it was difficult to conduct an interview or to entice busy stakeholders to respond. Respondents may answer the questions on their own time and then may only be required to respond to a few follow up questions if necessary. The open-ended questionnaire can also be sent as an email attachment or as part of a link from SurveyMonkey.

The evaluator was able to travel to Guyana to collect data where nearly all the interview sessions were face-to-face interactions. There was one other face-to-face interview with IOM staff in Kingston. All the other interviews conducted by the evaluator were via telephone (mobile or WhatsApp) or via Skype.

Interviews

Using an interview selection guide created by the IOM project coordinator, and stakeholder analysis done by IOM staff or focal point for each country, a total of 21 individuals were selected to be interviewed. These key informants represented sectors such as government, civil society, academia, private sector organizations, diaspora entrepreneurs, and IOM staff. Please see annex III for a complete breakdown of the persons who were interviewed, and the organizations or institutions represented. Not all countries had representation from all the sectors and organizations recommended by the project coordinator. For example, since Belize did not undertake some of the project activities, they chose members of the project's steering committee as key informants.

The case of Suriname however is very different. There were multiple attempts to get a list of potential key informants from the focal point to no avail. Anticipating the potential problems with Suriname, the evaluator made sure to make contact in December before the start of the holiday season and immediately after the new year celebrations. Still there was no response on supplying us with a list of potential interviewees. To get some data, an email questionnaire was sent to solicit response. The responses came but the questions answered were different from those sent. In consultation with the project coordinator an attempt was made to request additional information to clarify some of the responses and to ask for some additional information. There was no response. In the end, the evaluator managed to conduct one interview on March 4th, 2019 with a Suriname government representative via WhatsApp.

The regional monitoring and evaluation officer at the Regional Office for Central America, North America and the Caribbean offered to interview the project stakeholders in Belize since this project's data collection process dovetailed with another IOM project. A focus group was proposed and arranged with the members of the steering committee. Only one person showed for the interview. The interviewee tried to reschedule and perhaps went above and beyond to conduct an interview session with the other two participants. Several email attempts were made afterward to encourage the other two participants to agree to a Skype or WhatsApp interview. They were also offered the option to complete an email questionnaire. There was no response. One respondent finally answered the questionnaire after the evaluator created a shorter version of the longer email questionnaire to encourage some response rather than none.

Not surprising, since Guyana was the epicentre of the project and the only country that hosted the "Go See" visits, they scheduled the most interview sessions. Eight of the 10 persons contacted, were interviewed. One of the missing interviewee represented the financial sector and the other was the diaspora entrepreneur that was unsuccessful at establishing an SME. While it was agreed that there was adequate coverage for financial institutions, the project coordinator have made attempts to replace the diaspora entrepreneur without success. Jamaica on the other hand, suggested five key informants to

include one member of the diaspora who participated in developing the investment toolkit. Please see annex IV for general interview questions organized according to evaluation criteria.

Survey

The use of a survey was originally conceptualized to capture information and get feedback from individuals who participated in project activities such as remittance workshops and entrepreneurs who were involved in the “Go See” visits. After reviewing all the constraints, it was eventually agreed to implement the survey with the participants who attended the Belize remittance workshop in August 2015. The focus of the survey was to gauge what the participants learned and how they have applied this information since the workshop. The survey was sent to 18 respondents. Five of the emails bounced and one person opted out. There were only two responses to the survey even after reminders. One respondent indicated that they did not attend the workshop but answered the questions and the other represented academia. Since the comments of this one respondent are not representative, any comments used in the report will be highlighted.

Data Analysis

The data from interviews were coded for themes, and a synthesis of project documentation was done to identify patterns while simultaneously maintaining a focus on the evaluation criteria and questions as well as the objectives, outputs, and outcomes of the project. Explicit connections were made between the themes and the project objectives and questions to ensure that the findings of the data analysis respond to the evaluation criteria and questions. Please see annex II for the evaluation matrix that provides a complete breakdown of the evaluation criteria and questions, indicators, data source, and data collection methods.

Sampling

As in any research study, the target sample size, the number of those to be interviewed depends on time and the resources that are available. A purposive or criterion-based sampling was proposed for this population. A purposive sample comprises those who are deliberately targeted because they are thought to have information that will help to achieve the study’s aims. A purposive sampling attempts to be representative of the population and will usually try to ensure that a range from one extreme to the other is included.

As mentioned before, a stakeholder analysis guide was proposed by the project coordinator to assist with this process. To take into consideration the differences in project activity undertaken by each country, each focal point was asked to use the stakeholder guide to identify key informants. The following table describes the key formants identified and contacted for each beneficiary country. Please note that it was difficult to get information on key informants for the Suriname project.

Key Informant Table				
Institution	Stakeholder	Planned interviews	Achieved	Comments
Government	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Business, Chambers of Commerce	Belize – 3 Guyana - 3 Jamaica -2 Suriname -2	Belize - 3 Guyana - 3 Jamaica -1 Suriname -2	For Belize, there is overlap of government officials and members of the steering committee
Civil Society	Members of steering committees, and participants in remittance workshops and planning sessions	Belize – 12* (for survey) Guyana - 1 Jamaica -2* Suriname -0	Belize - 2 Guyana - 3 Jamaica - 3 Suriname -0	*This 12 represents remittance workshop survey respondents. This is noted here for record keeping purposes. No response received from Suriname on this category. *There were 2 representatives from the same organization
Academia	Universities	Belize - 0 Guyana - 1 Jamaica - 0 Suriname -0	Belize - 0 Guyana - 1 Jamaica - 0 Suriname -0	No response received from Suriname on this category.
IOM	IOM project management staff and Resource Mobilization Officer	Belize - 1 Guyana - 2 Jamaica - 1 Suriname -2*	Belize - 1 Guyana - 2 Jamaica - 1 Suriname -2*	*Suriname and Guyana shared IOM staff
NGO	NGO representatives	n/a	n/a	
Private Sector Organizations	Financial Institutions	Belize - 0 Guyana – 2* Jamaica - 0 Suriname -0	Belize - 0 Guyana - 1 Jamaica - 0 Suriname -0	*Only Guyana had “Go See” visits
Diaspora Entrepreneurs	Entrepreneurs 1 successful participant and 1 unsuccessful participant*	Belize - 0 Guyana - 2 Jamaica – 1* Suriname -0	Belize - 0 Guyana - 1 Jamaica – 1* Suriname -0	*Member of the diaspora that helped to develop the diaspora investment toolkit.
Total interviews		<u>Total Planned</u> Belize - 4 Guyana - 11 Jamaica – 6 Suriname -4	<u>Total Achieved</u> Belize - 3 Guyana - 9 Jamaica – 6 Suriname -3	

Limitations and Proposed Mitigation Strategies

The main challenge for the data collection process was circumventing the communication challenges that were inherent in the project. Data was to be collected from four countries, but project documentation already indicated that it would be difficult to communicate with Suriname due mainly to the absence of an IOM focal point in that country. Additionally, the two countries (Belize & Suriname) that experienced the most challenges completing project activities were also the ones that had the fewest respondents. For example, Suriname and Belize had only one complete interview representing the government sector. In addition, almost all the Guyanese interviews were conducted face-to-face while most of the others were virtual. It is likely that the face-to-face interviews generated more rich and robust data as the interviewer had a better opportunity to develop rapport with the respondents and time to probe responses. The use of the telephone and WhatsApp presented certain constraints on the conversation in terms of call quality especially when the callers are in different countries.

To mitigate, the study intends to use alternate sources of data in the form of interim and formal reports, other project documentation such as proceedings of workshop activities as well online research of related documents and sites to triangulate findings. The study also took steps to ensure that several means were provided for key informant to participate. The stakeholders in Suriname for example were given the opportunity to conduct an interview either via telephone or Skype, or via an email questionnaire. In one case the email questionnaire was even modified as a tradeoff to get some form of response. Where possible in the report of findings, the data will reflect country specific issues and address outliers as necessary especially in the case for Guyana as they generated more data due to the “Go See” visits.

Findings

This section of the report will address findings based on the collected data. The Findings are organized around the evaluation criteria applied to this project. The evaluation criteria are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and cross-cutting issues of gender and a rights-based approach to programming. Each evaluation criteria discussed will reference the relevant evaluation questions.

Relevance

This section of the report addresses the relevance of the project by measuring:

- a) Stakeholders perceptions of the project’s response to their priorities and needs;
- b) The level of alignment between project activities and outputs with intended outcomes and objectives; and
- c) The level of involvement of stakeholders with project design;

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	
Relevance (Assessing the project’s objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified)	1.1	To what extent were stakeholders consulted and involved in designing the project?
	1.2	To what extent did the project respond to the needs and priorities of the Governments of Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname in engaging the diaspora?
	1.3	Were the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objectives?
	1.4	How was this project relevant to the IOM Development Fund’s objectives and IOM’s mandates and strategies?
	1.5	Do the expected outcomes and outputs remain valid and pertinent either in terms of the beneficiary’s and stakeholders’ needs to which the project was designed to respond?
	1.6	What, if any, changes could be made to similar future projects to make it more appropriate and in line with relevant beneficiary concerns and needs?

A review of project documents reveal that the project was designed to address several priority areas and needs related to diaspora engagement and development for the beneficiary countries. These included influencing policy decisions around diaspora engagement and remittances, building trust and closer relationships between Governments and their diaspora, and supporting the diaspora to channel resources more effectively.

The project responded to the needs and priorities of the four beneficiary countries through the following project activities:

Project Area	Project Activity
Assessment	Desk review to determine existing Caribbean Diaspora organizations Rapid assessment to determine the need for national Diaspora Mapping website Rapid assessment to determine priority areas for investment Assessment of needs, and interests to support local initiatives
Capacity Building	Remittances / Financial Literacy Workshop Business introduction workshop for diaspora entrepreneur
Investment Support	Using the strategy of “Go See” and the ‘Diaspora Investment Toolkit’ to support members of the diaspora to invest in their home country and establish SMEs Identifying financial institutions / associations to fund SMEs
Policy / Strategy Development	Development of Diaspora Engagement Strategy – Guyana Development of National Development Framework - Suriname
Regional Cooperation	Development of a Caribbean Diaspora website

The relevance of the ESEDC project was further endorsed by all the respondents. They indicated that the project helped them to:

- better understand their diaspora population
- increase engagement with, and access to the diaspora
- understand new ways to enhance the contributions of their diaspora towards development,
- change their perceptions and knowledge around the role and contribution of remittances towards development
- engage with their diaspora for the first time
- develop governmental policies and strategies to maintain a focus on diaspora engagement
- put diaspora engagement initiatives back in the budget of their ministry
- increase the emphasis placed on diaspora engagement
- broaden their understanding around the migration – development nexus

The following selected respondent comment states clearly how the project responded to the needs and priorities of one beneficiary government:

- *I will say that the intervention that IOM had was much more than I had anticipated. I did not expect to get that much information out of it. I was guided in a way that I didn't see. So, everything that I requested was fulfilled and more. Without the guidance of IOM, I could not have gotten a count of the diaspora abroad. We know their skill set and indication of their willingness to help the country. For the first time we have an official database. This has opened dialogue with the diaspora. (MFA, Belize)*

What follows are summary comments from respondents of all the beneficiary countries. These comments indicate perceptions of the project's response to their priorities and needs:

- *It initiated contact with diaspora at a formal level and offered them the opportunity to give back to their country and communities of origin in a mutually beneficial way.*
- *Addressed the need to collectively engage the larger elements of the diaspora.*
- *Promoted opportunities to network and collaborate on mutually beneficial projects.*
- *Learnt of the strategic value of the diaspora.*
- *Mapping of diaspora organizations served greatly in future initiatives.*
- *Addressed knowledge gaps around remittances and its contribution towards development.*
- *Opened eyes to new ways to channel remittances into small enterprises and taking up a position in the economy where there is a gap and need.*
- *It [remittances workshop] expanded our thinking. Our MFA is still talking with the Central Bank and Western Union etc. Remittances now has the attention of the government.*
- *Raised the profile of the diaspora unit and got us more staff. The diaspora unit has been reinforced.*
-

With regard to relevance in relation to project design, this is an area that requires more careful attention. First, key stakeholders revealed that they were not fully consulted and involved in the design of the project. Second, a review of project documentation suggests a lack of adequate pre-design research and analysis of relevant baseline data to establish realistic and achievable outcomes. Additionally, contextual analysis to address needs that are distinct for each country seemed to be lacking.

The presumed link between some project activities and outputs with the intended outcome is also questionable. For example, a question to be addressed is the need for a regional website for a project of this nature where on one hand countries like Jamaica and Guyana have loyal diaspora and have established means to communicate, while for the other countries they are just beginning to connect with and build trust with their diaspora. The concept of a Caribbean diaspora website is good, and the established purpose is commendable, but it seems that the inclusion of this very expensive project activity was out of focus with the intended outcome, which states in part “a pilot number of Caribbean diaspora members... are *supported to invest* in community and entrepreneurial opportunities in their home countries”. It is questionable whether a website was required for “Caribbean Diaspora have access to information and opportunities for development programs in their home countries” (output 2.2). The fact that Suriname and Belize did not have a website that could be used for this purpose goes back to the issue of project design where this regional project was approved before the completion of the mapping initiative for these countries. The project proposal mentioned how Jamaica and Guyana were naturally poised to benefit from the ESDEDC project because they had completed their mapping projects. As a tool to foster regional cooperation it is a good idea, but it is not clear how the website would as the project summary document states, mobilize the resources of Caribbean emigrants to set up income generating projects for vulnerable communities.

Effectiveness

This section addresses the effectiveness of the project by measuring:

- a) The level of achievement of project objectives and outcomes against indicators as described the results matrix; and
- b) Respondents’ perception of the factors (both internal and external) that contributed to the effectiveness of the project

Evaluation Criteria		Evaluation Questions	
Effectiveness (Assessing the extent to which the project achieved its intended results)	2.1	To what extent were the project results achieved?	
	2.1	What were the internal factors that contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs, outcome(s) and objective results?	
	2.2	How well did project partners perform to deliver project results?	
	2.3	What were the external factors that contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of the output, outcome and objective results?	
	2.4	To what extent has the project adapted to changing external conditions to ensure project outcomes?	
	2.5	What system and tools were in place to monitor and implement the project and what were the challenges experienced in their implementation?	

The project documents identified the following core project activities. These project activities are organized according to the level of involvement by each country to support ease of reference.

Project Area	Project Activity
Assessment	Desk review to determine existing Caribbean Diaspora organizations – Belize & Suriname Rapid assessment to determine development of a national Diaspora Mapping website - Belize Rapid assessment to determine priority areas for investment - Jamaica Assessment of needs, and interests to support local initiatives – All countries
Capacity Building	Remittances / Financial Literacy Workshop – All countries Business introduction workshop for diaspora entrepreneur - Guyana
Investment Support	“Go See” to support members of the diaspora to invest in their home country and establish SMEs - Guyana Diaspora Investment Toolkit’ to support members of the diaspora to invest in their home country and establish SMEs - Jamaica Identifying financial institutions / associations to fund SMEs – Guyana
Policy / Strategy Development	Development of Diaspora Engagement Strategy – Guyana Development of National Development Framework - Suriname
Regional Cooperation	Development of a Caribbean Diaspora website

In summary, the ESDDED project was very effective in delivering on some of its key intended results although the level of effectiveness varies according to country due to a variety of contextual issues. The effectiveness of project outcomes may be described as raising awareness, generating motivation around the issue of diaspora engagement, and creating tools where required to bridge the gap and help beneficiary countries engage their diaspora more effectively. Another important outcome for the project is in increasing awareness and cooperation among stakeholder groups around migration, diaspora engagement, remittances, and investment toward development.

As mentioned previously, this project had one overall objective or goal and four project outcomes. The following tables detail the level of achievement of project outputs, outcomes and performance indicators that were either fully met, partially met, not met, or ongoing. Information for this section was sourced from information provided in the project’s final report.

Objective	Indicator	Target	Level of Achievement
To contribute to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities through supporting the identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources of Caribbean expatriates residing in Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States.	Number of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) established and still in operation in the four selected Caribbean countries within two years after project completion. (to be measured in follow up review 2 years after project completion)	20 small and medium enterprises	Ongoing. This objective is to be assessed in December 2019, two years after project completion. Project report documents indicate that there are currently two SMEs established and in operation in Guyana. One project is from the agro-processing sector and the other is health. The evidence at hand suggest that the project will still be hard pressed to achieve the set target of 20 SMEs. First, Guyana was the only country that hosted “Go See Visits” the primary strategy utilized to encourage investment in community and entrepreneurial development opportunities. The idea behind choosing 20 SMEs, as the target for this objective is that all the countries would have hosted “Go See Visits” and hence would have encouraged and supported members of the diaspora to invest in their home countries through the

			<p>establishment of SMEs. With the funding now gone, it appears unlikely that Suriname and Belize will be able to achieve this outcome. Suriname is already bemoaning the fact that they were on the cusp of executing when the project came to an end as there could not have been any more project extensions. Also, the Government of Jamaica (GoJ) had decided to develop an alternative project to the “Go See Visits”</p> <p>Second, even if the project assessed the tools that participating countries have created to “encourage the establishment of additional SMEs with the diaspora”, the project would still be hard-pressed to achieve this objective since these tools are in various level of readiness for implementation.</p>
--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Outcome #1: Governments of selected Caribbean countries increase engagement with diaspora in Canada, the Netherlands, UK and USA.

Output	Indicators	Target	Level of Achievement
	Number of SMEs initiatives in place to support engagement of diaspora within a year of project completion.	Five SMEs per country (40% female entrepreneurs included)	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>The indicator and targets for this outcome are similar to the overall objective mentioned above which is still under review. Perhaps the indicators and targets should be modified to reflect more closely the nature of the project activities undertaken to achieve this outcome.</p> <p>However, key activities undertaken for this outcome included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) establishment of coordination mechanisms between IOM and the MFAs within the four selected Caribbean countries, b) rapid assessment to develop Diaspora Mapping website, c) desk review of existing diaspora groups and organizations, d) development of regional website e) rapid assessment of needs and interests of diaspora f) rapid assessment of priority areas for investment g) development of a regional website <p>Two key achievements are that the (GoB) now has information for their diaspora mapping website and a database of existing Caribbean diaspora organizations. The MFA focal point</p>

Output	Indicators	Target	Level of Achievement
			<p>from this country describe the benefit of the two products as useful, and as the first time we have an official database. The respondent further stated that <i>“we know their skill set and indication of their willingness to help the country”</i></p> <p>The assessment of needs and interest provided data that supported data driven decisions regarding the choice of project activities to match diaspora needs and government priorities.</p>
<p>1.1 Coordination mechanisms between IOM and selected Caribbean countries established</p>	<p>Focal points within selected Caribbean countries identified and participate in monthly virtual coordination meetings with IOM.</p>	<p>Coordination mechanism in place</p>	<p>Fully met.</p> <p>There is evidence that the coordination mechanism was in place and was very useful in managing project implementation and completion. This even included at some point the use of IOM regional office staff to help support beneficiary countries to set up and manage their project activities. The project coordinator used personal connections and visit to Suriname to get project activities prioritized and workplans agreed on. The start and completion of project activities in Suriname and a lesser extent in Belize is due in part to the tireless work of the project coordinator.</p> <p>However, despite this, the project experienced several implementation challenges. Some of these challenges it could be said are attributable to project design as Belize and Suriname were less prepared to undertake project activities both in terms of the diaspora engagement ground work required and the capacity level of the staff to carry out these activities. As well, there is no IOM mission in Suriname and both the IOM staff in Belize and the focal point for Suriname mentioned that they now understand IOM expectations feel much more capable to manage IOM projects of this nature in the future.</p> <p>Added to this is the fact that not all countries enjoy the same relationship with their diaspora. This probably made the project that more challenging for Belize and Suriname.</p>

Outcome #2: A pilot number of Caribbean Diaspora members in Canada, the Netherlands, UK and USA are supported to invest in community and entrepreneurial development opportunities in their home countries.

Output	Indicators	Target	Level of achievement
	Number of viable entrepreneurial / community development opportunities that exist in each country within a year of project completion.	Five investment opportunities per country (20 total) 40% females included	Ongoing. This indicator and target is similar to project objective and outcome #1. Please see the above comments. It is not clear why this indicator describes entrepreneurial / community development opportunities rather than stating it as SMEs. Project report documentation states that “two female Guyanese entrepreneurs who participated in Go See Visits ventured out on two initiatives including setting up of a small business to purchase and process virgin coconut oil and charcoal for the US market and the training of midwives on maternal and child health practices in Guyana. The capacity of women within rural communities were developed as they were introduced to new techniques to improve the quality of the oil produced. Both the agriculture sector in Guyana and the Ministry of Public Health benefited from these initiatives”.
2.1 Information available on existing Caribbean Diaspora associations in Canada, the Netherlands, UK and the USA.	Desk research undertaken and information available.	Yes	Fully achieved. Each country has a listing of diaspora associations and organizations. During the project, two desk research were conducted for Suriname and Brazil. Guyana and Jamaica completed their desk research as part of their previous mapping project.
2.1 Information available on existing Caribbean Diaspora associations in Canada, the Netherlands, UK and the USA.	Databases on existing Caribbean Diaspora organizations.	Four databases (Excel developed) One per country	Fully achieved. Two databases containing a list of diaspora organizations (109 Suriname and 34 Belize) from North American and the Caribbean were completed during the reporting period. Guyana and Jamaica completed theirs as part of a previous mapping project.
2.2 Caribbean Diaspora have access to information and opportunities for developing	Existence of website targeting diaspora.	Yes	Ongoing. A regional diaspora engagement website was developed. Information on activities were updated for respective countries. Each country was encouraged to share additional information for posting. Facebook account and LinkedIn accounts were registered and supported engagement with the diaspora. Facebook and LinkedIn can be accessed at https://www.facebook.com/thecaribbeanDiaspora/ and https://www.linkedin.com/company/thecaribbeanDiaspora/ .

Output	Indicators	Target	Level of achievement
programs in their home countries.			However, the website is currently off line, and is being revamped. Also, arrangements are underway for the Center for Diaspora Engagement at the UoG to host. This is to support maintenance and sustainability of the product. The viability of this project is discussed elsewhere in this report.
	Number of individuals accessing and requesting information on the website.	200 individuals per country. (Total - 800)	Partially achieved. A stats module was included in the website to track the number of persons who visited the website. The site includes two email addresses that allowed representatives from the diaspora to request information and to support questions through a helpdesk, (info@caribDiaspora.org and support@caribDiaspora.org). Up to the end of the reporting period, a total 350 persons visited the website.

Outcome # 3: Caribbean countries are more equipped to channel remittances to contribute towards development.

Output	Indicator	Target	Level of Achievement
	Number of government initiatives to channel remittances towards development within a year after project completion.	Two per country. (Total – 8)	Ongoing. During the last coordination meeting, the GoG indicated their willingness to explore options for channeling remittance based on the recommendations and best practices shared during the workshop. The Governments of Belize, Jamaica and Suriname promised to explore examples and recommendations shared during the workshops. They also intend to inform the IOM on the development of these channels. IOM will continue to work with the MFA in respective countries in the areas of diaspora engagement and to build on existing recommendations relating to remittance.
3.1 Governments have better understanding about best practices on remittances, including financial literacy initiatives.	Number of workshops on remittances implemented.	One workshop per country. 20% female participants included.	Fully met. Four remittance workshops were held in total, one per participating country (Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname). Each workshop had more than 20% women participating. A total of 22 females and 18 males participated in the remittance workshop in Guyana. 21 participants participated in Belize (four males, 17 females). 14 participants participated in Jamaica’s workshop (nine females and five males), while nine females and 10 males participated in Suriname’s Remittance Workshop.

Outcome #4: Participating countries have the tools necessary to encourage the establishment of additional SMEs with Diaspora members.

Output	Indicators	Target	Level of Achievement
	Additional partnerships established with financial institutions to support SMEs within selected Caribbean countries within a year after project completion.	Five per country (Total – 20)	Partially met. Guyana was the only participating country which completed activities in line with its Go See Visits. As such, five Banking institutions participated in Business Introduction Workshops and Stakeholder Meetings in Guyana to support the Go See Visits. Information was shared on funding options and required documentations for securing loans. MFA and IOM met with representatives from five banking institutions (Republic Bank, Scotia Bank, Guyana Bank of Trade and Industry, Citizen Bank and the Institute of Private Enterprise Development) in Guyana to participate in Stakeholder meetings for the Go See Visits and to explore opportunities for funding small enterprises in Guyana.
4.1 Caribbean entrepreneurs oriented on developmental needs, priority sectors, investment opportunities and viable financial packages for selected Caribbean countries.	Number of Caribbean entrepreneurs who completed orientation sessions.	Ten Caribbean entrepreneurs per country. (Total – 40)	Partially met. A total of ten Guyanese diaspora entrepreneurs (three females and six males) participated in ‘Go See Visits’ in Guyana in May 2017. The participants were selected from diaspora communities in Canada, the United States of America and the United Kingdom.
4.2 Caribbean entrepreneurs have increased understanding about business set up / management.	Number of Caribbean entrepreneurs who completed business management trainings.	Ten participants per country. (40% female participants included)	Partially met. Ten diaspora representatives (three females, seven males) from Canada, the United States of America and the United Kingdom attended the Business Introduction Workshop with a focus on doing business in Guyana held in May 2017. Additionally, the business introduction workshop was attended by 24 representatives from governmental and non-governmental organizations (ten females, 14 males). A total of 34 persons attended. Business Introduction workshops will no longer be executed by the GoJ. Instead, a Business ‘know how’ toolkit was developed to provide information on doing business in Jamaica. Belize and Suriname unfortunately did not host business workshops. This to be considered under future diaspora initiatives.
4.3 Caribbean entrepreneurs	Number of participants in	Ten participants per country	Partially met. Ten diaspora entrepreneurs who attended “Go See Visits” in Guyana participated in a business introduction

Output	Indicators	Target	Level of Achievement
<p>have a better understanding of viable investment opportunities in their home countries.</p>	<p>“Go See Visits.”</p>	<p>(Total – 40)</p>	<p>workshop and benefited from presentations and discussions on viable investment opportunities in Guyana.</p> <p>As part of its diaspora investment toolkit, the GoJ provided information for its diaspora on a guide for investment opportunities, government’s priority areas for investments and available support services in Jamaica.</p> <p>Approximately 200 of these toolkits were distributed by the GoJ to their 23 missions and consulates. The missions report that all the copies were disbursed to members of the diaspora although the original strategy was that they would be resident at the mission for persons to come in and use.</p> <p>There is currently no further feedback, and it was not possible to ascertain any evaluative data on the use of the toolkit as the distribution process was not monitored as hoped.</p> <p>The toolkit is not yet distributed to members of the Jamaican diaspora network as this would be done via the online version.</p> <p>In terms of next steps, the MFA explained that there needs to be changes before the online version becomes available. IOM Jamaica has indicated that although out of current evaluation period, they will ask their media person to upload the online version on the IOM webpage and promote it via social media.</p>
<p>4.4 SMEs identified to be implemented in four destination countries.</p>	<p>Number of SMEs established, or partnerships enhanced.</p>	<p>55 SMEs agreements per beneficiary country. (Total – 220)</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Of the ten SMEs identified for investment in Guyana, one was established after “Go See Visits” were hosted in Guyana. This is the indigenous coconut oil product. Please see additional information addressed under the topic of impact. Also, more information can be found at this website (https://indigenousoconutoil.com/pages/coconut-project)</p> <p>Similar to the overall project objective, IOM recognizes that it may be premature to measure this target during this reporting period. In its work with respective governments, IOM will continue to monitor the establishment of diaspora entrepreneur investments with and will provide updates on progress.</p> <p>For example, IOM has been working in collaboration with the GoG and University of Guyana Diaspora Engagement Centre on other local initiatives and with the MFA on the Global Compact on Migration. Diaspora issues are discussed during meetings.</p>

The following discussion answers the other effectiveness sub-questions.

Project Partners

A project of this magnitude succeeds because of supportive project partners. The use of steering committees provided a broad base of support for all countries. For Guyana, the Ministry of Agriculture though not considered a partner, played a pivotal role in helping to organize the “Go See” visits. The GMC stepped in and provided support for security, extra funding and leadership to ensure the success of the “Go See” visit initiative. Participation from academia from Guyana was “less active and passionate” but the project director indicated that the financial institutions supported the Guyana remittances workshop where the bank presented a policy and guidelines on how they can provide funding for the diaspora which was well received. Importantly the use of steering committees as the coordinating and management strategy for the project, have fostered collaboration and on-going cooperation among stakeholder groups across the private and public sector, NGOs and academia.

Internal / External Factors

As a regional project it is expected that there would be many internal and external factors that contributed to progress and delay in the achievement of the project results. Some of the positive and negative internal and external factors are as follows:

Positive internal / External Factors	Negative internal / External factors
IOM’s strong relationship with partners. IOM is a well-respected organization.	Project took some time before moving forward due to challenges faced with Governments availability for agreeing on the project’s work plan for implementation - Jamaica
Positive staff relationship among individuals in beneficiary countries.	Communication difficulty with beneficiary countries especially Suriname. For Suriname, there was no Focal Point to support project implementation, limited communication between IOM and selected focal point, and lack of capacity to support implementation. However, with the assignment of a new MFA, things began to move.
Decision making to write staff in for Suriname as part of mapping project to solve the staffing problem.	Lack of buy in from Government - Suriname especially.
Strong motivation and good work ethic on the part of IOM staff and project director.	Late start to project in Suriname and Belize. There was no activity in a year. There were elections in Belize. Suriname had issues with government administration and diaspora staff to support the project.
	General elections in three countries. During 2015, the GoG was in preparation for general elections and since activities planned during that period required consultation with key government officials, all activities were put on hold.
Use of the same steering committee from diaspora mapping to diaspora engagement. Seamless flow from diaspora mapping to diaspora engagement – case of Jamaica.	Suriname did not have a change of government, but they changed personnel.
Use of coordination mechanisms between IOM and the selected Caribbean countries. This included some good strategies.	Change of staff and personnel due to change of government. Change of staff in Belize at the government level.
There were tools (results matrix) used in reporting project progress.	Staff turnover with consultants – time and money
	Lack of adequate funding to hire well-qualified consultants. Led to poor deliverables from consultant – case of Jamaica
	Suriname new member of IOM and had several challenges. (see note below)

Positive internal / External Factors	Negative internal / External factors
	Project extensions.

The case of Suriname

Suriname must be mentioned here as a special case as it relates to the progress or delay in the achievement of project activities. Project documents and responses from IOM staff explained that the project in Suriname did not move for a year. Suriname did not have adequate staff at the beginning and when they hired the staff, this staff seemed to lack the capacity to move the project forward. The project manager had to go to Suriname to help move the project forward. Due to a history of good relations with the focal point and the project manager, there was some project activity. Consultants were hired, but this consultant was not able to get the Government of Suriname (GoS) to do anything. Another consultant was hired, and this second consultant was able to get some work done. Once they started showing interest in activities there was active engagement that involved weekly meetings in the Netherlands along with promotion of the diaspora. In the end, Suriname was actively engaging with their diaspora. They are receiving registrations from the diaspora mapping website and are actively pursuing strategic action based on their diaspora engagement framework. Suriname reports that they have also received project proposals from their diaspora in the fields of education, IT, and health.

However, Suriname had serious issues. There is obvious strain between Suriname and the diaspora and they seem to be cautious about communicating with their diaspora. It was evident from the dialogue within the remittances workshop that some respondents still struggle with the definition of diaspora. For Suriname, one cannot have dual citizenship. Once an individual leaves Suriname they must give up citizenship which apparently is upsetting for the diaspora. The focal point in the MFA recently shared that there is now dual citizenship for footballers. However, other Surinamese nationals can obtain a special permit – Permit for People of Surinamese descent (PSA) to stay in Suriname.⁴ Suriname claims that they do have an open policy to the diaspora to come but may need to consider how the economic and political climate is conducive for them to come and do business.

Still with a regional project, with apparent challenges to coordinate the activities in a timely manner and taking into consideration different government realities and the responsibilities of each focal point, it is not surprising that there are complaints regarding timeliness and postponement of project activities.

One respondent mentioned the following observations:

- For a multi-country project there should be more emphasis on regional coordination. Regional meetings are key. There is need to get follow-up and updates on what other countries are doing. For example, one can get recommendation on what worked etc.
- Regional support for project needs to exist for project when it is implemented.
- Communication started out well. There were monthly and quarterly meeting. They were discontinued and heard rarely any info on how the project was doing. The project extended and was not informed about this, and so thought that the project was closed.

⁴ From proceedings Interagency Training Workshop- Migration and Development in Suriname

Efficiency

This section of the report addresses efficiency by measuring:

- a) The level of efficiency related to how resources are converted into outputs.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	
Efficiency (Assessing how well human, physical and financial resources are used to undertake activities, and how well these resources are converted into outputs)	3.1	To what degree were resources (human, goods and services, etc.) provided at planned cost (or lower than planned) to implement the project activities with the same (or better) level of quality expectation?
	3.2	Were the financial resources used (appropriate / proportionate to the results achieved)? Can it be compared to other similar projects implemented elsewhere?
	3.3	Was a workplan and resource schedule available and utilized by the project manager and other relevant parties?
	3.4	Were there synergies of existing coordination and initiatives of other institutions to support the project's ability to achieve its result in an efficient manner?

Despite the many challenges faced during the preparation phase by the project it is commendable that each country was able to move forward and complete a significant number of activities. Project coordination is to be commended in this regard as though there is room for improvement, the manager implemented several strategies to move the project forward. In addition to the coordination mechanism between IOM and MFAs in each country, these included: identification of focal points within each country, coordination meetings with focal points and Government officials, roundtable meetings with MFA and stakeholders to establish support and identification of priority program, monthly virtual meetings, and two visits to Suriname for face-to-face coordination meetings. As an example, the project got going in Belize after a visit from the regional coordinator.

The many challenges faced by the project certainly caused delays but were not necessarily the reason that contributed towards the inability of two countries to host "Go See" visits. Three no-cost extensions were granted to the GoB, GoG, and the GoS to help facilitate time lost for implementation of activities. Still, Belize and Suriname did not get to host "Go See" visits. Evidence indicate that even though the groundwork was laid for visits to happen, the GoB did not have the capacity to take on this activity. In the case of Suriname, the groundwork was done but they were not ready for "Go See" visits in the time frame of the project.

The ESDEDC project was funded to the tune of USD 280,000. The project's budget was as follows:

Budget Categories	USD (YR 1-3)
Office Costs	
Staff Costs	59,400
Office Costs	24,564
Total staff office costs	83,964
Operational Costs	
Establishing Coordination mechanism	6700
Mobilization of Caribbean migrants in Canada, the NL, USA, UK	58,700
Support in channeling / maximizing remittances to the Caribbean	30,336
Assistance to selected Caribbean migrants ("Go See" visits expenses, rapid assessment consultancies, diaspora investment toolkit)	89,000
Final project evaluation	6,000
Total operational costs	190,736
Grand Total	274,700

The final report to project donors reported a total of USD 202,351 of funds expended. There were however a few challenges related to budgeting that may have impacted the project's efficiency. First the budget was designed without sufficient consideration that this was a multi-country project each with very different economic realities. Additionally, each country is responsible to manage their budget and it appears that there are no clear guidelines in place for the revision of budget allocations to meet emerging project needs. As such, adequate funding seemed to be an issue to hire consultants. The IOM Jamaica staff stated that the money allocated was not enough to hire a consultant who would provide high level work. In fact, in the case of Jamaica, the IOM staff decided to use an inhouse solution. They held a working meeting internally to revise and upgrade the final project before submission to the MFAFT.

Additionally, as advised, IOM Jamaica combined the two assessment project activities to attract a better qualified consultant. Also, due to a lack of adequate funding, IOM Jamaica decided not to host "Go See" visits. Instead, armed with data from their rapid assessment exercise, the GoJ made a written request to the donor and then decided to develop a diaspora investment toolkit with a 'how-to' video. It was believed that this would be a better use of the funds. Instead of hosting 10 potential investors, this toolkit could potentially reach hundreds in the diaspora. The IOM project manager further intimated that even in Guyana the consultant who conducted the assessment on needs and interests took less money than they usually charge and there was not enough money allocated for the evaluation, yet money was sent back for this project.

Questions were also raised about the allocation of funds in terms of priority activities. One IOM staff wondered if the website was worth the USD 25,00 spent when other project activities struggled due to inadequate funds to pay consultants. In terms of efficiency, a question to be answered is whether the website was a good return on investment since it is not currently functional as is awaiting legal approval for handover to the Caribbean Diaspora Centre for management. Before this though, the website had to be revamped because it is to be moved to another server, and project staff indicated that the developer did not do justice, and another consultant was paid to have it look the way that it should.

Additionally, the purpose of the website should be reconsidered as it appears that each country has a website to contact their diaspora. None of the respondents interviewed used the website. Also, since the evaluator was not able to review the database developed as part of the website, it is hard to assess cost-effectiveness, but it is telling that the website is not up and running at this time especially since the Biannual Diaspora conference in Jamaica scheduled for June 2019 and the 2019 Diaspora and Entrepreneurial conference in Guyana would be central events to promote the website.

On another note, there was evidence of existing coordination and initiatives that supported the project's ability to achieve its results. One clear example is the use by Jamaica of the same steering committee that supported their diaspora mapping project. This partnership also involves working with the National Working Group for Migration. This approach has implications for ongoing partnership and cooperation and sustainability of project outcomes. For Guyana, there are synergies of existing coordination with the Diaspora Unit, the Ministry of Community Development, and the Centre for Diaspora Engagement located at the University of Guyana (UoG). The Ministry of Agriculture though not considered a partner, played a pivotal role by helping to organize the "Go See" visits. The Ministry of Community Development also helped to promote the project and this partnership needs to be strengthened. However, the relationship with the Centre for Diaspora Engagement needs to be more active. Suriname also has developed a good working relationship with their chamber of commerce and have had participation from the university as part of their steering committee.

Also, the level of human resources assigned to the project, have been insufficient, and have impacted both the management and monitoring of project activities. There were many challenges faced by the

project director some of which could be attributed to project design as the project was assigned to countries that were not ready to undertake the activities required. There is a concern especially for the capacity of small countries without an (HOO) or are understaffed. Adequate staffing should be considered as part of project design, as a means to improve project efficiency.

Impact

This section, encompassing the following questions, addresses how the project activities may have positively or negatively, intentionally or unintentionally influenced beneficiaries (government and diaspora) or contributed to a change in the socio-economic situation of the four contributing countries.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	
Impact (Assessing the positive and negative primary and secondary long-term effects proposed by the project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally)	4.1	How has the project activities influenced beneficiaries (government and diaspora), positively or negatively, intentionally or unintentionally?
	4.2	To what extent has the project contributed to the socio and economic development of participating countries?
	4.3	What was the impact of the project in establishing small and medium enterprises in the four selected Caribbean countries?

At its core, the question of impact seeks to assess the kind and magnitude of change that occur because of project activities. Typically, this addresses the longer-term results of project outcomes such as more SME initiatives in place to support engagement of diaspora or more government initiatives established to channel remittances. However, the primary long-term impact of the ESDEDC project is still under review until December 2019.

In the long run, project impact is measured not in how many people come for “Go See” visits or increased knowledge about remittances best practices. The long-term objective is to know the impact of all these activities on the social and economic empowerment of low-income communities. In this regard, this project is not yet able to measure this long-term impact, and there is early evidence to indicate that it will be a challenge to achieve the targets set. Currently, there is evidence of the establishment of two SMEs as a result of “Go See” visits in Guyana. For various reasons, the Governments of Belize Jamaica and Suriname did not host “Go See” visits. In addition, the tools developed by the beneficiaries during the project, to encourage the establishment of additional SMEs, are at different levels of implementation. For example, the GoG is yet to approve their 5-year diaspora engagement strategy.

However, there is evidence of other positive, unintentional short-term outputs that have been generated by project activities. The remittance workshops have brought together a cross section of public and private sector entities, members of civil society and academia to have dialogue around the contribution of remittances towards development. These workshops were well-received and has changed participant’s knowledge and perceptions around the role of remittances and the strategies that can be implemented to channel remittances towards development.

The following comment is representative of the potential impact of the remittances workshop:

- Information from the workshop will help to inform diaspora policy which is in an advanced stage of review. The situational analysis section of the policy document will reference information from the remittances workshop to inform policy. Elements of the workshop will also be incorporated in the upcoming diaspora conference. (workshop presenter and Director, Diaspora Institute)*

Other main results of project approach and strategy are that all the beneficiary countries benefitted from activities around assessment. This resulted in the development of institutional mechanisms such as the database of diaspora organizations that has allowed countries the ability to engage with their diaspora. Assessment activities have also provided data around the needs, interests, skills gap, as well as priority areas for investment for the diaspora. A major result is that for the first time, the GoB has developed a meaningful relationship with their diaspora.

The following comments from interview respondents are representative:

- *For Belize, this project and especially the diaspora mapping initiative was a first attempt to work with the diaspora. There was no relationship with consular officers and the MFA was left with the responsibility. Now due to the project, IOM and Belize have now established a relationship and a solid network with the diaspora which has opened doors to current initiatives. For example, the consular offices are involved in a recent event being organized to recognize members of the diaspora. (IOM staff)*
- *First the act of reaching out to the diaspora to find out what they want to invest in is a good idea. There is a lot of lack of information in the diaspora about investing and there is no one stop shop – there is a lot of misperception so having a uniform source of information is good. (member of diaspora)*
- *I was never aware of the diaspora and how they are organized to return and get involved in investment. This is not information that is available in the newspapers. I have had a meeting with my management team to help them understand. (member of financial institution)*

There are three important outcomes from the Guyana “Go See” visits that can be classified as positive, indirect, and unintentional. One is that the “Go See” visit was instrumental in resuscitating the indigenous coconut oil business (<https://indigenuscoconutoil.com/pages/coconut-project>) that is now touted as a model of success. Before the visit, this business was on the verge of failure. The entrepreneur explained that the “Go See” visit was timely as at the time she was ‘broke’ and had no money. In addition, the entrepreneur explained that her supplier had messed up and sent a batch of coconut oil that was rancid. The entrepreneur also stated that she thought this was the end of the business, - “this was it.” The visit provided the opportunity to tap into the resources provided by the GoG especially the GMC. She credits the mentorship she received from the GMC leadership as a source of success. She would not have understood the scope of what was possible without the “Go See” visit. She explained further that her participation in this intervention gave her hope and a desire not to give up ever.

Second, the “Go See” visit has facilitated networks and connections that are contributing to the economy of Guyana in unexpected ways. The focal point at the GMC within the Ministry of Agriculture shared that they were able to connect with two “Go See” participants from Canada who are helping them in a positive way to reconfigure the way they introduce their goods into the Canadian market, as well as providing seed money for the development of a product within the agro-processing sector. These connections have also facilitated the successful introduction of the indigenous coconut oil product into the Canadian market. This has the potential to have a “catalytic effect on the indigenous community” that the business works with. Currently the product is sold in the US market, and the entrepreneur has advised that Guyana is her biggest market. The GMC is also helping this entrepreneur to set up a proper value chain for her product where she can work specifically with women and indigenous people that would supply her on a one on one basis. The “Go See” visit and other interactions with the diaspora has also prompted the GoG to budget

monies to improve packaging and labeling for the entrance of Guyanese products into the Canadian market.

Third, the one successful SME to date has contributed to the socio and economic development of Guyana in a small way. In addition to working with indigenous women as suppliers and teaching them new techniques of coconut oil production, a proud milestone for this entrepreneur is that she finally has money in her Guyanese account and is now able to pay her cousin a salary with the opportunity for commission. In addition to the salary, she has taught her cousin (a young 17-year-old woman who was unemployed) how to operate a business and mentored her to become self-confident and believe in herself as a woman. The pictures below depict the indigenous coconut oil product and the entrepreneur Danielle in the field.

Danielle at Pomeroon River with Sharon grating coconut to make her own fresh batch of virgin coconut oil.



Source: <https://indigenuscoconutoil.com/collections/gallery>

The Product: Indigenous Coconut Oil



Source: <https://indigenuscoconutoil.com/>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	
Sustainability (Assessing to what extent the project's results or the continuation of the project's benefits will be maintained for a certain period after the current project is phased out)	5.1	Are the project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) to continue delivering the project's benefits / services?
	5.2	To what extent have governments introduced or modified structures, resources and processes to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?

The findings show that the project interventions may be sustained by the following:

- High level of enthusiasm, support and national ownership for the project.
- The development of diaspora engagement policies and strategies that have benchmarks and plans of action. Other Governments that are reviewing and developing their strategy have indicated that recommendations and knowledge gained from project activities will be incorporated in their diaspora engagement strategy.
- The development of a "Diaspora Investment Toolkit" that has potential for long-term impact in educating the diaspora about investment opportunities for SMEs in Jamaica.
- The availability of tools such as databases that will provide ongoing access and further engagement with the diaspora.
- The preparation work engaged in by the GoB and the GoS for the "Go See" visits have laid the foundation for further meaningful engagement with their diaspora.
- The changes in knowledge and perceptions around the importance and contribution of remittances toward migration and development
- The use of a steering committee by IOM Jamaica that is stable across similar projects and that promotes continuity and the likelihood that some project recommendations may be implemented.
- Better understanding of IOM expectations and developed project management capacity by focal point in Suriname.
- Partnership and cooperation between IOM and government partners in the four selected countries.
- The availability of data about the location, needs, interests of diaspora for the four selected countries

However, some factors that may affect sustainability include:

- Lack of adequate funding by beneficiary countries to maintain interventions or upgrade products that were developed.
- Lack of financing to host "Go See" visits for Suriname and Belize especially.
- Lack of capacity in some government organizations.
- No perceived plan to safeguard against staff turnover, change in governments and other contextual issues.
- For Guyana, especially, there exist a disconnect among the separate governing bodies that concern the diaspora and diaspora engagement. One respondent remarked that many of the non-governmental bodies have much greater interaction with the diaspora than government bureaucrats. The Ministry of communities for example has a very active relationship with the villages and these villages in turn have connections and village associations in the diaspora. In addition, this respondent claim that some of the philanthropic missions call the ministry of communities office and not the MFA to get permission and set up logistics.

Cross-cutting Issues

This section of the report discusses the extent to which the project addresses gender mainstreaming themes and a right-based approach to programming.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	
Cross-cutting Issues (Assessing the extent to which the project addressed gender mainstreaming themes and a right-based approach to programming)	6.1	How was gender considered during the project design, implementation and monitoring?
	6.2	How as the human rights aspect considered during the project design, implementation and monitoring?

Project design does attempt to address one aspect of gender mainstreaming. That is ensuring that there is sex disaggregated data where required. So, baseline data references the percentage of women expected to participate in certain project activities and IOM staff indicated that the project tried to have balanced gender participation in workshops, panels, and selection committees where required.

However, this is a shorthanded view of the issue of incorporating gender mainstreaming themes and a rights-based approach into project design. Gender mainstreaming is about “bringing the experience, knowledge and interest of women and men to bear in all development intervention⁵”. As such, even though there was careful attention to ensure inclusion of women, the following pertinent issues could have been considered as project objectives and outcomes are created:

- Appreciating gendered dimensions to establishing and maintaining SMEs – men and women use different approaches, and there may be the need to use different strategies and incentives;
- Impact of gender mainstreaming on low-income communities; how could the project take advantage of how low-income people organize? were their vulnerabilities considered during the discussion on the establishment of SMEs?
- Did the project pay attention to how gender mainstreaming and similar issues of inclusion play a role in the thinking about the project objective of empowering low-income communities?
- Do men or women from low-income communities require additional protection or are more vulnerable when dealing with potential entrepreneurs?

Conclusions / Recommendations / Lessons Learned

Conclusions

Overall, the *Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean* project has made some important contributions to the four beneficiary countries. It has generated excitement and enthusiasm around the issue of diaspora engagement. Though the success may be moderate, the “Go See” visit intervention has the potential to support investment in one’s home country bringing with it all the attendant benefits of contributing in tangible ways to vulnerable communities. One of the strongest achievement of this project is in helping the countries of Belize and Suriname to bridge the communication, access and trust gap with their diaspora. Additionally, the project has created new knowledge and understanding around the benefits and role of remittances and its contribution to development in the Caribbean.

More importantly, in terms of sustainability, the project has helped one Government to develop a comprehensive diaspora engagement strategy that has an action plan and benchmarks. This policy document will ensure that diaspora engagement remains on the government’s agenda. There are other instances of this happening and evidence that information and knowledge gained from this project will be included in other policy and strategy documents. As well, the use of steering committees as the coordinating and management strategy for the project as well as the conduct of remittance workshops,

⁵ Gender mainstreaming in the work of UNODC, 2013

have fostered collaboration and on-going cooperation among stakeholder groups across the private and public sector, NGOs and academia.

The project however suffers from overly ambitious project outcomes that may need to be revised to fit the contextual realities of the four countries. In addition, challenges of project design may have contributed to project delays and inefficiencies. Pre-design assessment and analysis should become paramount for any multi-country project in the future.

Recommendations

The following list of recommendations is a reproduction from the executive summary and are organized according to project design, implementation and project results:

Project Design

- IOM should continue to fund projects of this kind, but with more careful attention to the contextual issues that exist in each country and employ more attention to the alignment of outputs with outcomes to maximize project benefits.
- Apply a research design to develop well-researched / well designed indicators that identifies medium targets as well as the long-term impacts to achieve the overall project objective.
- It is recommended that the project strengthens the analysis stage of project development to ensure the alignment of outputs, with outcomes and project impact to more closely match project realities.
- IOM should consider the feasibility of developing and reporting on measures of economic and social empowerment of low-income communities to support qualitative reports of impact. These should make any distinction necessary among the participating countries.
- It is recommended that IOM institute a project management process that allows critical staff / project partners time to review a project. Additionally, the implementation of a review checklist to garner comments about critical areas such as budget and the linkages between output outcomes and impact may focus the attention of IOM staff and provide useful information to project developers.
- It is recommended that IOM develop and implement a readiness assessment tool that provides comprehensive analysis of a country's capacity to undertake project activities. Once the gaps are identified, it is easier to make data driven decisions. This assessment should consider the important issue of staffing as well the capacity of staff for project management. As the story of Suriname reveal, it took some time for staff to learn the expectations of what it takes to manage an IOM project.
- IOM should factor in contextual and social and economic differences of countries in project design and budgeting decisions.
- Project design should consider some aspect of risk management that includes alternative actions in case of staff turnover due to elections, promotions or migrations.
- It is recommended that long-term outcomes such as 20 SMEs established and maintained within four years utilize a research design that considers the complexities of SMEs development and implementation. Also, the project should consider more rigorous requirements for participation in "Go See" visits.

Project Implementation

- IOM should consider supporting Suriname and Belize to host the "Go See" visits that could not have been completed under the previous project cycle. These two countries claimed that they have learned a lot from the failure and they have also completed the ground work and have laid the foundation for this activity to occur.

- Project conceptualizers should consider issues of quality and product to cost ratio issues more closely when creating budgets.
- Typically, the IDF focal point in the office ends up managing all the projects (regional or national) which can lead to work overload. Perhaps the IDF should consider funding staff to help with the workload.

Project Results

- It is recommended that at the minimum, IOM should consider standardizing the use of workshop evaluations to capture initial learnings, future needs and other comments. With some reformatting, the workshop evaluation used by IOM Jamaica can be a useful starting point.

Lessons Learned / Best Practices

The major lessons learned with regard to project design, implementation and project results are as follows:

Project Design

- Project design should have comprehensive analysis of small countries to ensure that there is capacity to undertake project activities. It is important to ensure readiness of countries to participate in project activities. A simple readiness survey may gauge the level of motivation and commitment and identify gaps that can lead to inaction or failure to act. For example, is there leadership with capacity available; If there is a change in government is there a plan in place to ensure project continuity?
- In-depth analysis and an understanding of contextual issues would have reduced some of the implementation challenges faced by Suriname and Belize. Suriname did not start their mapping project before the diaspora engagement project. Even though they were run almost simultaneously and shared resources, this decision might have contributed to some of the delays experienced. On the other hand, the Governments of Guyana and Jamaica were enthused about this project because they had just completed the diaspora mapping and saw the diaspora engagement project as a natural next step and good fit for them.
- Align project activities to match output - although this was a multi-country project, the idea of regional cooperation was not one of its strong point. It appears that the creation of a regional diaspora website was the only activity undertaken to demonstrate regional cooperation but “failed to live up to its potential.”

Project Implementation

- The Go See visits provide a tangible way for Governments to connect with and invite their diaspora to invest. However, as the story of Danielle reveals, it took mentoring, family support, strong support from the GMC as well her enthusiasm, work ethic and prior work experience to make her project successful. Any revision of the “Go See” intervention should consider the intangibles that lead to a successful SME.
- Go See visits provide an unusual event for diverse members of the diaspora to converse. There should be more time in the schedule for networking among “Go See” participants and opportunities to meet ahead of time to strategize before “Go See” formalities.
- A respondent indicated that the “Go See” visits provided a great opportunity to document the achievements of the diaspora which could be used as a marketing tool in the future. A respondent indicated that after the “Go See” project ended, there was no communication with the diaspora entrepreneurs – maybe give updates in a newsletter. Providing them a with a mentor would be a good idea.
- Coordinate presentation and participants invitations to workshops so that it is clear to presenters that they are required to remain for the duration of a workshop. In Jamaica, this was not made clear and the workshop suffered from the intellectual drop off in the ongoing discussions.

- It is important to get buy-in from one's steering committee before proceeding with project activities. As well it is important to establish 'strong' steering committees.
- In hind sight "it was a mistake to say yes to this project" as many of the conditions that promote change were absent. This is the reality of an HOO who now feel more equipped to assess project requirements against resources and ability to achieve the desired outcomes. It is so easy to get carried away with the possibility. Assessment should become embedded in all aspects of projects.
- Although Suriname struggled initially to participate in project activities, they learned from the experience and feel better prepared to handle the expectations of an IOM project in the future. They are also asking for additional support in that regard to build capacity around the issue of project management.
- Bring important stakeholders to the table that have direct connection with the diaspora like the Ministry of communities in Guyana.
- The next generation of the diaspora was practically left out of project design and conceptualization. The was an issue raised by several stakeholders.

Annexes



FINAL EVALUATION

EFFECTIVE AND SUSTAINABLE DIASPORA ENGAGEMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE CARIBBEAN

Commissioned by: *IOM Guyana, Regional Coordination Office for the Caribbean.*

Project Identification:	Project Code CE.0254
Executing Organization:	International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Project Management Site and Relevant Regional Office	IOM Guyana IOM Regional Office, San Jose, Costa Rica
Project Period and Overall Duration:	01-07-2014 to 31-12-2017 (42 Months)
Geographical Coverage:	Belize, Guyana, Suriname and Jamaica
Project Beneficiaries:	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Surinam
Project Partner(s):	CARICOM, Compete Caribbean/Inter American Development Bank, World Bank, Ministry of Foreign Affairs from selected Caribbean countries. Private Sector/Non Governmental Organizations /academia from the four target destination countries and the Caribbean
Total Funding:	280,000 USD

Evaluation context

The *Effective Sustainable and Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean* project was implemented during the period 1st July 2014 to 31st December 2017. The project was piloted in four Caribbean countries, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Surinam, with the primary objective to contribute to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities through supporting the identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources of Caribbean expatriates residing in Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Through specific actions, this project targeted the above-mentioned countries to identify, attract and channel remittances from each destination country.

Within the framework of the project, there was collaboration between IOM and key government offices within the four countries to support effective implementation of activities. Through the identification of Caribbean

diaspora organizations within destination countries, the project raised the awareness and encouraged the participation of the diaspora to engage in development initiatives in their home country.

Through the establishment of a common Caribbean diaspora website, participating countries shared their interest and willingness to support through entrepreneurship initiatives that will create employment opportunities within priority sectors. Governments also created the environment for entrepreneurs to learn more about opportunities available within priority sectors in some participating countries.

Government officials within each country received information on channeling remittance towards development within host communities.

Overall, there was much interest and enthusiasm by each participating government to support the engagement of their diaspora. Each country demonstrated its unique relationship and levels of engagement with its diaspora.

There were some challenges as in the case of Suriname, the relationship with Suriname and its diaspora was a bit strained due to past economic, political and historical context of the country. However, this did not hinder the efforts made by the government to bridge the gaps through implementation of the project. However, much effort was made to gain the interest and participation of the Surinamese diaspora in activities. The Government of Belize also experienced some challenges and though there were previous engagements with their diaspora the government was not fully positioned to undertake some of the activities outlined in the project document.

It is within the above context that the *Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean* project is being evaluated to capture the relevance of the project design, the effectiveness and performance of the project, the efficiency of project management and implementation, and the impact and sustainability of the project.

Evaluation purpose

IOM conducts projects and programme evaluations as part of its commitment to improved results-based management. Evaluation results are used to improve decision-making and evaluate performance, and to improve the project and programme design and implementation. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess how the activities have led to the achievement of the project results and objectives by utilizing the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The results will also assist the IOM Development Fund in its decision-making on the use of the Fund as seed funding, on project management and to fine-tune interpretation and categorization of the funding criteria and overall



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

regional disbursement strategies. The evaluation will provide a clear understanding of whether the project's objectives have been met as well as to measure impact and to identify lessons learnt. IOM will use the results of the evaluation to identify and inform future planning of projects to ensure continuation of this project's effort and to ensure that the success of this project is utilized and built upon.

This evaluation will be conducted by an independent consultant who is qualified and experienced in conducting project evaluations, and who is independent from the project formulation, planning and implementation, to ensure independent analysis and findings. The findings of this evaluation will also be useful for IOM offices, including Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and the regional office to support future efforts of project development and to identify best practices and lessons learned during implementation of diaspora projects. The evaluation will also support governments to identify challenges, gaps and strengths that can improve their collaboration with donors and for execution of future diaspora projects. Further, stakeholders will also benefit from the information collected during the evaluation to gather key lessons learned and best practices for collaboration.

Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover a 42 month period of implementation and will include representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and their stakeholders within four participating countries - Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname - and representatives of the diaspora.

All stakeholders will be consulted on the project implementation, results, and their perceptions including IOM staff who managed the project, relevant representatives of government ministries, diaspora representatives and members of the project's steering committee.

As per the geographical coverage of the project, it will cover the four countries where the project has been implemented including representatives from the diaspora.

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation will assess the project's results based on OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. It will also address relevant cross-cutting themes of gender mainstreaming and right-based approach to programming.

Evaluation questions

In order to explain the extent to which the five evaluation criteria were attained, a set of evaluation questions has been proposed which might be supplemented by another set of detailed and specific sub-questions as appropriate and needed in consultation with the evaluator before commissioning the evaluation.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question
<p>1. Relevance: assessing to what extent the project's objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified.</p>	<p>1. 1. To what extent the project responded to the needs and priorities of the Governments of Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname in engaging their diaspora?</p> <p>2. Are the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objective?</p> <p>3. How is this project relevant to the IOM Development Fund's objectives and IOM's mandates and strategies?</p>
<p>2. Effectiveness: assessing the extent to which the project achieves its intended results.</p>	<p>4. To what extent the project's results were achieved?</p> <p>5. What are the internal factors that contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs, outcome(s) and objective results?</p> <p>6. What are the external factors that contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of the output, outcome and objective results?</p> <p>7. To what extent has the project adapted to changing external conditions in order to ensure project outcomes?</p> <p>8. What system and tools were in place to monitor and implement the project and what were the challenges experienced in their implementation?</p>
<p>3. Efficiency: assessing how well human, physical and financial resources are used to undertake activities, and how well these resources are converted into outputs.</p>	<p>9. To what degree were resources (human, goods and services, etc.) provided at planned cost (or lower than planned) to implement the project activities with the same (or better) level of quality expectation?</p> <p>10. Were the financial resources used (appropriate/proportionate to the results achieved? Can it be compared to other similar projects implemented elsewhere?</p> <p>11. Was a workplan and resource schedule available and utilized by the project manager and other relevant parties?</p> <p>12. Were there synergies of existing coordination and initiatives of other institutions to support the project's ability to achieve its results in an efficient manner?</p>
<p>4. Impact: assessing the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects proposed</p>	<p>13. How has the project activities influenced beneficiaries (government and diaspora), positively or negatively, intentionally or unintentionally?</p> <p>14. To what extent has the project contributed to the socio and economic</p>

<p>by the project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally.</p>	<p>development of participating countries?</p> <p>15. What was the impact of the project in establishing small and medium enterprises in the four selected Caribbean countries?</p>
<p>5. Sustainability: assessing to what extent the project's results or the continuation of the project's benefits will be maintained for a certain period of time after the current project phased out.</p>	<p>16. Are the project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) to continue delivering the project's benefits/services?</p> <p>17. To what extent the governments have introduced or modified structures, resources and processes to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?</p>
<p>6. Cross cutting issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gender mainstreaming - Rights-based approach to programming 	<p>18. How gender was considered during the project design, implementation and monitoring?</p> <p>19. How was the human rights aspect considered during the project design, implementation and monitoring?</p>

Evaluation deliverables

The consultant will produce the following:

1. Evaluation data collection tools;
2. Draft inception report;
3. Final inception report;
4. Draft evaluation report;
5. 2-page evaluation brief to summarize key findings, conclusions, and recommendations;
6. Final evaluation report.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation will employ both quantitative and qualitative approaches through a desk review of existing relevant project documents such as project proposal, reports, meeting minutes, project monitoring data, and media, etc. The below methodology is proposed for the evaluator, however this will be reviewed and revised as relevant in accordance with further discussion with the evaluator during the inception phase.

1.1. Data collection and analysis methods

Representatives of the government, stakeholders, including NGO/private sector/academia representatives and entrepreneurs will be identified to participate in one and one interviews and focus group discussions. For the purpose of this evaluation, it is expected that the evaluator will employ the following methods for data collection and analysis:

Data Collection:

- Desk review of relevant project documents (proposal and budget), project interim/final narrative and financial reports, monitoring reports, meeting minutes, IOM strategy papers, publications and other materials identified;
- Key informant interviews and/or focus group discussions with the project stakeholders to document both qualitative and quantitative information; and
- Conduct survey with stakeholders.

Data analysis:

- The evaluator is expected to analyze qualitative and quantitative data.

1.2. Sampling

Below is a sample to be proposed to the evaluator, but this will be reviewed and revised as relevant in accordance with further discussion with the evaluator during the inception phase. The methodology (including data collection tools and sample will be presented by the evaluator in the inception report).

This list below relates to key informant interviews and focus groups:

Institution type	Stakeholders	Number	Methods	Location
Government	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Business, Chambers of Commerce	4 participants per country	Key Informants Interviews /telephone interviews with government representatives	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname
Civil Society	Participants who participated in the steering committee, remittance workshops, and planning sessions.	4 participants per country	1 Focus Group Discussion/one on one /telephone interviews with stakeholders in each country	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname
Academia	Universities	2 participants per country	Focus Group Discussion/one on one interviews - 2 per country	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname
IOM	IOM staff who managed the project, including the project manager and Resource Mobilization Officer.	3 participants per country	Interviews	IOM Belize, Jamaica and Guyana
NGO	NGO representatives	2 participants per country	Focus Group Discussion/one on interviews – 2 per country	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname
Private Sector organizations	Financial Institutions	2 participants per country	Focus Group Discussion/one on one interviews – 2 per country	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname
Diaspora Entrepreneurs		1 successful participant 1 unsuccessful participant	Key Informant Interview – 4 per country virtually	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname

Evaluation Workplan

The detailed evaluation work plan will be agreed upon between the project manager (IOM Guyana) and the consultant. Data collection will be done through key informants from Belize, Jamaica and Suriname. One visit will be made to Guyana by the Consultant to conduct interviews with IOM focal point and key stakeholders. Due to the constraints of scheduling meetings with stakeholders during the Christmas

period in December, the evaluation will take place over two months and a half period maximum, and follow the time frame suggested below:

Time line	Activities	Estimated Days of Completion	Location	Desired outcomes
December 5 th 2018	Initial document review and revision of ToRs	5	Jamaica	The consultant gains sufficient required knowledge of the activities and other.



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

December 6 th 2018	Inception (2 to 5 pages)	1	Jamaica	The consultant presents to IOM a brief including proposed methodology and work plan.
December 7 th – 14 th 2018/Jan 7 th – 15 th 2019	Research tools design and implementation of interviews and meetings to collect data	15	Belize, Guyana, Jamaica & Surinam	Evaluation tools have been implemented.
Jan 25 th 2019	Data analysis	10	Jamaica	Data has been processed and analyzed.
February 1 st 2019	Report drafting	7	Jamaica	Report, based on gathered and processed data, is drafted.
February 6 th 2019	IOM inputs included in draft report	5	Jamaica	Draft report submitted to consultant for finalization.
February 13 th 2019	Final report evaluation and evaluation brief	7	Jamaica	The report is finalized and delivered.

Schedule of events, deliverables and payments:

Payments will be made in two installments according to the following schedule:

Description	Installment	Approximate dates	Payment
Signature of contract and revised TOR		4 th December 2018	



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The UN Migration Agency

Draft inception report	1 st Installment	5 th December 2018	30%
Final inception report		7 th December 2018	
Travel and Field Work - Jamaica and travel to Georgetown, Guyana	(DSA, travel and accommodation)	7 th -15 th January 2019	20% (USD 1,500)
Draft evaluation report		1 st February 2019	
IOM review of draft report and submission of consolidated feedback		6 th February 2019	
Final Evaluation Report and Evaluation Learning Brief	2 nd Installment	13 th February 2019	50%

Annex II. Evaluation Plan Matrix

Evaluation Plan Matrix

Project Objective:	To contribute to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities in selected Caribbean countries, through the identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources of Caribbean expatriates residing in Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
Project Outcomes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Government of selected Caribbean countries increase engagement with diaspora in Canada, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and USA 2. A pilot number of Caribbean diaspora members in Canada, the Netherlands, UK and USA are supported to invest in community and entrepreneurial development opportunities in their home countries. 3. Caribbean countries are more equipped to channel remittances to contribute towards development. 4. Participating countries have the tools necessary to encourage the establishment of additional SMEs with the diaspora. 	

Evaluation Questions		Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Source: Key PP= Project Proposal IR = Interim Report IS = IOM Staff S = Stakeholders
1.	Relevance (Assessing the project's objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified.)			
1.1	To what extent were stakeholders consulted and involved in designing the project?	Level of involvement Stakeholder and beneficiary perceptions	Desk review of secondary data Interview	S – Govt., Civil society PP IS
1.2	To what extent did the project respond to the needs and priorities of the Governments of Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname in engaging the diaspora?	Stakeholders and beneficiary's satisfaction with project outputs, and outcomes	Desk review of secondary data Interviews Survey	S IS PP IR

Evaluation Questions		Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Source: Key PP= Project Proposal IR = Interim Report IS = IOM Staff S = Stakeholders
1.3	Were the project activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objectives?	Level of alignment of project activities with outcomes and objectives	Desk review of secondary data	IR PP
1.4	How was this project relevant to the IOM Development Fund's objectives and IOM's mandates and strategies?	Level of alignment between IOM's objectives, strategies and mandates and project outcomes, frameworks and design. Stakeholder comments	Desk review of secondary data Interviews	PP IR IS
1.5	Do the expected outcomes and outputs remain valid and pertinent either in terms of the beneficiary's and stakeholders' needs to which the project was designed to respond?	Respondent perceptions (Stakeholders and beneficiary's expressed satisfaction with project outputs and outcomes)	Interview	S IR
1.6	What, if any, changes could be made to similar future projects to make it more appropriate and in line with relevant beneficiary concerns and needs?	Respondent perceptions	Interview	S IR
2	Effectiveness (Assessing the extent to which the project achieved its intended results)			
2.1	To what extent were the project results achieved?	Respondent perceptions Level of achievement of project objectives and outcomes against indicators	Interview Desk review of secondary data	S IR IS
2.2	How well did project partners perform to deliver project results?	Level of achievement of project objectives and outcomes against indicators Respondent perceptions	Interviews Desk review of secondary data	S IS IR
2.3	What were the internal factors that contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of the outputs, outcome(s) and objective results?	Respondent perception (internal)	Interview Desk review of secondary data	S IS IR
2.4	What were the external factors that contributed to progress or delay in the achievement of the output, outcome and objective results?	Respondent perception (external)	Interview Desk review of secondary data	S IS IR

Evaluation Questions		Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Source: Key PP= Project Proposal IR = Interim Report IS = IOM Staff S = Stakeholders
2.5	To what extent has the project adapted to changing external conditions to ensure project outcomes?	Level of flexibility and change Respondent perception	Interview Desk review of secondary data	S IS IR
2.6	What system and tools were in place to monitor and implement the project and what were the challenges experienced in their implementation?	Evidence of, and use of monitoring tools Level of effectiveness of program monitoring activities	Interviews	IS IR
3	Efficiency (Assessing how well human, physical and financial resources are used to undertake activities, and how well these resources are converted into outputs)			
3.1	To what degree were resources (human, goods and services, etc.) provided at planned cost (or lower than planned) to implement the project activities with the same (or better) level of quality expectation?	Comparison of planned cost to expected output Level of efficiency – not cost overruns (over or under expenditures)	Desk review of secondary data	IR
3.2	Were the financial resources used (appropriate / proportionate to the results achieved)? Can it be compared to other similar projects implemented elsewhere?	Comparison of resources used with results achieved with this and other comparable projects	Desk review of secondary data Interview	IR IS
3.3	Was a workplan and resource schedule available and utilized by the project manager and other relevant parties?	Evidence of use	Desk review of secondary data Interview	IR IS
3.4	Were there synergies of existing coordination and initiatives of other institutions to support the project's ability to achieve its result in an efficient manner?	Evidence and impact of existing coordination and support initiatives	Interview Desk review of secondary data	IR IS
4	Impact (Assessing the positive and negative primary and secondary long-term effects proposed by the project, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally)			
4.1	How has the project activities influenced beneficiaries (government and diaspora), positively or negatively, intentionally or unintentionally?	Evidence from project indicators 20 SMEs initiatives in place to support engagement of diaspora within a year of project completion 20 viable entrepreneurial / community development investment opportunities that exist in country within a year of project completion	Interview Survey Desk review of secondary data	S IR

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Source: Key PP= Project Proposal IR = Interim Report IS = IOM Staff S = Stakeholders
		<p>8 government initiatives to channel remittances towards development within a year after project completion</p> <p>20 partnerships established with financial institutions to support SMEs within selected Caribbean countries within a year after completion</p> <p>800 individuals accessing and requesting information on the website</p> <p>30 entrepreneurs complete orientation sessions</p> <p>30 entrepreneurs who completed business management training</p> <p>30 participants in “go and see” visits</p> <p>55 SMEs established, or partnerships enhanced</p>	
4.2	To what extent has the project contributed to the socio and economic development of participating countries?	<p>Evidence from project indicators</p> <p>20 SMEs initiatives in place to support engagement of diaspora within a year of project completion</p> <p>20 viable entrepreneurial / community development investment opportunities that exist in country within a year of project completion</p> <p>8 government initiatives to channel remittances towards development within a year after project completion</p> <p>20 partnerships established with financial institutions to support SMEs within selected Caribbean countries within a year after completion</p> <p>4 databases on existing Caribbean diaspora organizations</p>	<p>Interview</p> <p>Desk review of secondary data</p> <p>S</p> <p>IR</p>

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Source: Key PP= Project Proposal IR = Interim Report IS = IOM Staff S = Stakeholders	
	800 individuals accessing and requesting information on the website 30 entrepreneur's complete orientation sessions 30 entrepreneurs who completed business management training 30 participants in "go and see" visits 55 SMEs established or partnerships enhanced			
4.3	What was the impact of the project in establishing small and medium enterprises in the four selected Caribbean countries?	Evidence from project indicators 20 SMEs initiatives in place to support engagement of diaspora within a year of project completion 55 SMEs established or partnerships enhanced	Interview	S
5	Sustainability (Assessing to what extent the project's results or the continuation of the project's benefits will be maintained for a certain period of time after the current project phased out)			
5.1	Are the project partners adequately capacitated (technically, financially and managerially) to continue delivering the project's benefits / services?	Evidence of capacity building indicators	Interviews Desk review of secondary data	S IR
5.2	To what extent have governments introduced or modified structures, resources and processes to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue once external support ceases?	Evidence of capacity building indicators - Adoption of new policies, strategies, legislation - Level of commitment to maintaining project benefits - Examples of leadership and formal and informal relationships - Examples of cooperation and coordination	Interview Desk review of secondary data	S IS IR
6	Cross-cutting Issues (Assessing the extent to which the project addressed gender mainstreaming themes and a right-based approach to programming)			
6.1	How was gender considered during the project design, implementation and monitoring?	Evidence of gender related issues in design, implementation and reporting	Interviews	S IR

	Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Source: Key PP= Project Proposal IR = Interim Report IS = IOM Staff S = Stakeholders
		(examples of this)	Desk review of secondary data	PP IS
6.2	How were the human rights aspect considered during the project design, implementation and monitoring?	Evidence of a rights-based approach in design, implementation and reporting (examples of this)	Interviews Desk review of secondary data	S IR PP IS

Annex III. List of Persons Interviewed or Consulted

List of persons interviewed or Consulted

Total # of Interviews conducted – 18 with 21 individuals participating.

Names with an* denotes those individuals who did not respond to attempts to schedule an interview session or were contacted but were unable to participate.

Name	Position	Organization	Comments
Belize			
Rene Chuc	Head of Office	IOM Belize	
Mrs. Rhea Rogers	Staff Officer	Ministry of National Security	Responded to a short version of interview questions
Mrs. Judith Sandy	Diaspora Desk Officer	MFA	Interviewed by the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
*Gordon Wade	Port Commander	Department of Immigrations and Nationality Services (DINS)	Contacted several times with no response.
Guyana			
Mr. Michael Brotherson & staff	Head of Diaspora Unit	MFA	
Ms. Joann David	Agriculture Business Development Officer	Ministry of Agriculture (NARI)	
Mr. Eugene Gilbert	Head Community Development	Ministry of Communities	
Ms. Hamwanttie Bisesar	Investment Promotion & Facilitation Officer	Guyana Office for Investment (Go-Invest)	
Dr. Fitzgerald Yaw	Head of the Centre for Diaspora Engagement	University of Guyana	
Ms. Eraina Yaw	Project Coordinator	IOM Guyana	
Ms. Deborah Austin & Ms. Diane Wong	Senior Business Counsellor / Field Officer & Entrepreneurial Development Centre Coordinator	Institute of Private Enterprise Development (IPED) Guyana	
Ms. Danielle Hodge	Entrepreneur	Member of the Diaspora	
*Mr. Clifton McDonald	Diaspora Entrepreneur	Member of the Diaspora	This was the male unsuccessful "Go See" candidate.

Name	Position	Organization	Comments
*Mr. Jewsuan Edmondson	Senior SME Officer	Corporate & Commercial Credit Republic Bank (Guyana) Limited	
Jamaica			
Prof. Neville Ying	Executive Director	Jamaica Diaspora Institute	
Mr. Wayne Golding	Jamaican Diaspora Advisory Board Member, Southern USA	Member of Diaspora	
Ms. Keisha Livermore	Head of Office	IOM Jamaica	
Mr. Lincoln Downer & *Ambassador Sharon Saunders	Director (Actg.), Diaspora Affairs Department & Undersecretary – Diaspora and Consular Affairs	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade (MFAFT)	Interview was conducted with Mr. Downer
Ms. Stacy Clarke Callum + 1 other member of staff	Programme Manager	Civil Registration and Migration Policy Unit, Planning Institute of Jamaica	
Suriname			
Ms. Angela Ramkisoen & *Ms. Diana Westfa	Acting Head of the Diaspora Unit	MFA	Ms. Westfa was unable to participate in the interview.
* Jasmine Wijngaarde	Deputy Permanent Secretary	MFA	Additional information was requested from this respondent as the questions answered were dissimilar to the ones sent via email questionnaire. This was not forthcoming.

Annex IV. Data Collection Instruments

Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean

Semi-Structured Interview Guide - General

Contact Sheet

Institution	Department	Interviewee / Position
Date	Time	Location
Other persons present	Team members present	Notes by
Project Focus		

Questions relating to the main evaluation criteria. Please note that questions will be modified as necessary.

Effectiveness

- a. What activities have been undertaken under the IOM project that you are familiar with? What short-term outputs have been produced? What longer term effects were produced?
- b. Were there significant unexpected results or achievements that you know of? What were they?
- c. What has been the scope or reach of the project activities (e.g. diaspora website, remittance workshop, “go & see” visits, diaspora mapping projects, SM? Who has been affected (either positively or negatively)? To what extent were men and women affected differently?
- d. Was the project linked to government activities or other agencies? How well were they coordinated?
- e. Has the project been effective in developing capacities of the participants involved? Please explain.
- f. Has any significant event occurred affecting project outcomes? How well did IOM adapt to these circumstances or changes?
- g. Were the diaspora engagement needs identified for your country? Were some left out?
- h. Has the IOM made a difference due to this project? To whom? In what way?
- i. Please tell us about any factors that hindered the effectiveness of the project.
Please tell us about any factors that assisted the effectiveness of the project
- j. What if any changes could IOM make that would make the project more effective.
- k. From your involvement with the diaspora engagement in your country, please describe for us any unplanned positive effects that you have experienced or observed due to the project
- l. Please identify any negative unplanned effects that this project contributed to.

Relevance

- a. How has the IOM’s project supported or contributed to relevant national policies or strategies related to diaspora engagement for development in the Caribbean? In which areas? Can you provide specific examples of good contributions?
- b. Has IOM followed good practice in the development and implementation of this project? Why or why not? Can you provide specific examples of where IOM approaches were appropriate, well-needed and fit with national efforts?
- c. Did the IOM’s project support your government’s development goals and strategies?
- d. How has the IOM project supported the government’s development goals and strategies for effective and sustainable diaspora engagement?
- e. Is IOM’s project aligned with government plans, procedures and policies?
- f. Did IOM design the right project to meet the needs of the stakeholders? Why or why not? What could have been done differently?
- g. Were there obvious or critical gaps that the IOM project or activities did not address? What were they?
- h. Was the IOM project adequately adapted to changes in local conditions? Provide examples.
- i. Do you believe that you were fully consulted and involved in the design of the project?
- j. What if any changes could the project make, to make it in line with your concerns and needs?

- a. **Efficiency** (Qs for IOM staff)
- b. To your knowledge, how well did IOM use its human and financial resources? Were resources used well? Were funds received on time? Why or why not? Were projects approved and launched in a timely manner? Why or why not? Please provide specific examples.
- c. Were there any unplanned negative effects of the project? Please provide examples.

<p>d. What measures did the project use to mitigate any unplanned impact?</p>
<p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What was the impact of the project in contributing to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities? b. What was the impact of the project in supporting the identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources of Caribbean expatriates to foster social and economic development? c. What was the impact of the project in increasing the competencies of government officials to address issues of migration and development in their respective countries? d. What was the impact of the project on facilitating effective and sustainable diaspora engagement for development in the Caribbean?
<p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Were the project achievements maintained and expanded over time? b. E.g. use and maintenance of diaspora website, databases, diaspora mapping projects c. E.g. structures or policies to mitigate staff turnover, change of government and to ensure continuity d. What lessons have you learned from the IOM assisted project? Have any knowledge and lessons been used? e. Would you say there is a high degree of local / national ownership of this project? Why or why not? f. How could national ownership be improved?
<p>Cross-cutting issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Was the project based on a gender analysis of targets and resources? What effects were realized in terms of gender equality, if any (provide examples)? b. Were women and men distinguished in terms of participation and benefits within specific project activities? Were there clear gender strategies provided and / or technical advice on gender mainstreaming issues? c. How were project activities designed to align with Human Rights issues?

IOM Belize: Best Practices on Remittances and Financial Literacy Workshop Survey

Please take some time to let us understand what you have learned and how you have used the information you acquired as a result of participating in the "Remittances Workshop" held August 2015. Your answers will remain confidential. We appreciate your time. Thank you for your feedback.

1. Please provide the name of your organization/agency
2. Position / Title in your organization
3. Please tell us how your knowledge and understanding of the role of remittances and its contributions to the development of Belize has **changed** as a result of participating in the best practices on remittances and financial literacy workshop held August 2015. Please focus your response on the following topics/issues addressed at the workshop:
 - trends and challenges of migration and development in the Caribbean
 - remittances-led development model
 - trends and challenges of remittances to the development of Belize
 - remittances from a gender perspective
 - migrant investment
 - philanthropic investment in Belize
 - financial literacy for migrants
 - developing projects on remittances
4. Please tell us how you have **used** the information and knowledge acquired from the workshop to channel remittances sent by the diaspora to support local development in Belize. Please provide as much detail as possible describing any new programs, projects, strategies or policies created, or your involvement in any related advocacy activities.
5. If you have developed or created any project, policy or strategies related to engaging the diaspora to support local development, please let us know your strategies for how your project will be maintained over time.
6. As a result of participating in the "Remittances workshop" please tell us of any challenges you have or are encountering to implement any of the best practices learned in the workshop.
7. If you have developed or are involved in any project related to engaging the diaspora to support local development, please comment on its **impact** in contributing to the economic and social empowerment of low-income communities?
8. If you have developed or are involved in any project related to engaging the diaspora to support local development, please comment on the **impact** of the project in supporting the **identification and transfer of skills, funds and other resources** of Belize expatriates to foster social and economic development?
9. Please feel free to provide any other comments you may have related to best practices of remittances and financial literacy initiatives to encourage the channeling of remittances sent by the diaspora to support local development.

Thank you for taking the survey!