IOM
UN MIGRATION

Study on the Use of Evaluation at IOM and Proposals for Evaluation Follow-up Mechanisms

November 2021

IOM Central Evaluation Function

Table of Contents

Glossary

AMRS	Automated Management Response System
APP	Annual Performance Planning (WFP)
AVRR	Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration
BI	Business Intelligence
CoE	Council of Europe
COMET	Country Office Tool for Managing Effectively (WFP)
CoS	Chief of Staff
DIO	Directorate of Internal Oversight (CoE)
DSPOP	Director, Department of Strategic Planning and Organisational Performance
EOC	Evaluation Oversight Committee
EU	European Union
GCU	Gender Coordination Unit (IOM)
HoD	Head of Division
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group (WB)
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office (UNDP)
IAHESG	Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
JIU	Joint Inspection Unit
MAP	Management Action Plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCOF	Migration Crisis Operational Framework
MECC	Migration, Environment and Climate Change
MiGOF	IOM Migration Governance Framework
MOPAN	Multilateral Organisations Performance Assessment Network
ODG	Office of the Director General (IOM)
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Advisory Group
OIG	Office of the Inspector General (IOM)
PARA	Post Arrival and Reintegration Assistance
pm	No value assigned; item to be kept in mind
PRIMA	Project Information and Management Application
RBM	Results-Based Management
RD	Regional Director
ROMEO	Regional Officer for Monitoring and Evaluation
SCPF	Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance (IOM)
SMART	Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNHCR	United National High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNODC	UN Office on Drugs and Crime
WB(G)	World Bank (Group)
WFP	World Food Programme

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

Introduction

The *Study of the Use of Evaluation at the IOM and Proposal for Evaluation Follow-up Mechanisms* (hereinafter the 'study' or the 'assignment') was commissioned by the *Central Evaluation Function* of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and carried out in the period 15 September to 26 November 2021.

The study aimed to: (i) assess the use of evaluation at IOM; and (ii) identify the best possible options for improving the use of evaluation and follow up of evaluation recommendations and management responses. The study approached these aims by:

- tracking the use of a number of recent evaluations and assessing to what extent they were used within the Organisation;
- reviewing existing processes at IOM; and
- identifying good practices and existing mechanisms from other agencies to provide various options for consideration by IOM to develop a fit-for-purpose evaluation follow-up mechanism.

The first two elements were analysed through a **review** of evaluation follow-up practices at IOM. The third element was subject of a **benchmarking** exercise of the follow-up arrangements at seven UN Organisations, as well as those at the Council of Europe (CoE).

The documentation considered by the study encompassed: (i) IOM documents (policies, strategies, briefs and management responses); (ii) a sample of evaluations carried out by or for IOM; (iii) relevant documentation of eight comparator organisations (ILO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIDO, WFP, as well as the CoE); and (iv) salient monitoring and evaluation (M&E) documentation.

A series of interviews with IOM staff and representatives of the comparator organisations yielded more detail on the implementation in practice of the IOM's evaluation use and follow-up, and on the comparator organisations' relevant arrangements and knowledge management (KM) practices.

Review Findings

Like its comparator organisations, IOM subscribes to the UNEG *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*. Its 2018 *Evaluation Policy* explicitly refers to those norms and adopts many standards. Three of its evaluation policy objectives bear directly on the use of IOM evaluations and follow-up.

Until recently however, IOM's organisational culture did not generally value and place importance on policy work and knowledge management and on the contribution of evaluation to these processes. Several reviews in the period 2016-18 came to this conclusion. A 2020 *Institutional Strategy on Migration and Sustainable Development* recognised the need to 'establish ways to ensure that our own data can be used to improve our programming' and for 'developing and defining more robust ways to measure and report on results'. A 2019 assessment by the *Multi-lateral Organisations Performance Assessment Network* (MOPAN) found IOM's evaluation culture to be 'nascent' but judged further work on the M&E coverage and independence to be necessary. It noted that IOM had developed a new project management system to help to identify poor performance, but that those arrangements did not 'allow for the aggregation of project results to the corporate level.' A 'meta-evaluation' commissioned in 2020 identified 'the limited use of a tracking mechanism for existing recommendations' as one of the key factors hampering evaluation use. IOM could enhance evaluation dissemination and use by:

- 'Providing access to a systematic classification of evaluation results, allowing the identification of

key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and good practices to boost their use for decision making and programming.

▪ Continue raising awareness of the utility and uses of evaluation among staff, to build an evaluation culture within IOM.'

The analysis of the MOPAN assessment, of the meta-evaluation and of other reviews on thinking within IOM are also reflected in two key documents: (i) its 2018 Evaluation Policy; and (ii) its M&E Guidelines (2021), which stress evaluation culture and promotion and tracking of evaluation use, with the latter operationalised in the Guidelines as: use and follow-up of evaluation findings and recommendations; internal and external promotion for replication and learning; and use for other purposes, such as synthesis evaluations or meta evaluations. In January 2020, IOM made a formal management response to evaluation reporting mandatory. The management response tool is accorded a key role for promoting *accountability*, as well as integrating evaluation recommendations and *lessons learned* into IOM programming, policies and strategies.

The policy and the guidelines both stress communication and dissemination of evaluation outcomes. They do not emphasise however doing something with those outcomes and there is no formal and structured mechanism proposed for ensuring that: (i) evaluation findings of a higher level enter into IOM's policies and strategies; (ii) lessons learned and best practice developed in one country or region, are both known and adopted in other countries and regions; and (iii) evaluation findings on a relevant number of projects in a country or region are aggregated into management information useful for and accessible to IOM managers for informed decision making.

Most of the IOM evaluation reports sampled for this study did not refer in substance to (the tracking of the) follow-up on evaluation recommendations.

It is thus necessary to develop a follow-up mechanism that emphasises next to 'accountability', not 'learning' by itself, but **learning for decision making for action at all levels of the Organisation**.

Benchmarking Findings

All of the eight organisations and agencies canvassed have a dedicated evaluation unit or department/office, some standing alone, others as part of a larger oversight department.

All organisations have a recent or recently revised evaluation policy in place, mostly accompanied by evaluation guidelines or similar, more or less detailed instructions on how to conduct evaluations and safeguard the quality of evaluation reporting. In most cases, the UNEG norms, standards and guidelines form the basis for these policies and guidelines.

Most organisations carry out, commission and oversee centralised and decentralised, internal (often self-) evaluations, external evaluations, as well as thematic (including country) evaluations.

All organisations make a distinction between audit and evaluation and separate the respective functions. In some cases, evaluation has adopted selected audit features or business processes.

In line with UNEG Guidelines, most organisations' evaluation arrangements encompass some form of management response to the findings and recommendations of evaluations.

Most organisations have a digital database, platform or dashboard in place to store evaluation reports and present the findings and recommendations in some form. UNCHR still has to develop a digital platform, work on which is ongoing in the context of devising a 'light' evaluation system.

All organisations exercise a form of tracking the implementation of evaluation outcomes and recommendations, sometimes using a digital dashboard. Mostly, this tracking consists of periodical reports on follow-up by regional or country personnel, in two cases up to the highest level of the organisation. Some organisations seek formal 'closure' on recommendations after a certain period.

Apart from such reporting, organisations' documentation and interviews with key personnel did not yield specific tools, methods or business processes employed in the case of a lack of follow-up on recommendations. Apart from 'closure', a lack of adequate follow-up on recommendations appears to be a matter for all entities' management to consider and act upon.

Some organisations have recently overhauled or are about to overhaul their knowledge management arrangements, with a focus on digital systems. Amongst the seven canvassed organisations that form part of the UN family, ILO and WFP are considered by their peers to have the most developed evaluation (including follow-up tracking) arrangements, with ILO operating a 'lighter' system than, for instance, WFP.

The organisations' evaluation policies and guidelines do not go into detail on the follow-up on evaluations, 'downstream' from the formal management response.

Seven of the eight organisations have some form of digital arrangement, i.e., a database or platform for monitoring the implementation of recommendations. In the case of five organisations this includes a digital tracking capability, in three cases with automated 'flagging' of delayed or absent follow-up action. Three organisations have such automated digital 'flagging' and reporting on follow-up status under development, while WFP is working on refining its current system.

The table sets out, relevant initiatives at the comparator organisations that IOM could emulate:

Nº	Comparator Organisation	Items for Possible Emulation
1	CoE	▪ Digital platform with two cores: (a) knowledge management and (b) e-learning
2	CoE and UNDP	▪ Evaluation on a sampling basis and keeping the number of evaluations at manageable levels
3	ILO and UNICEF	▪ Digital management platforms (database/dashboard) - ILO (AMRS)
4	UNCHR and ILO	▪ 'Light' version of evaluation and follow-up system [The former is currently development a 'light' system].
5	UNDP and WFP	▪ Aggregation of data from decentralised evaluations
6	UNDP, UNICEF and CoE	▪ 'Flagging' of pending management responses and delayed follow-up action [UNICEF: 'traffic-light' system].
7	UNICEF, UNIDO, CoE	▪ Arrangements for 'closure' on follow-up tracking and reporting.
8	UNICEF and CoE	▪ Specific software for evaluation (accountability and e-learning)
9	UNIDO	▪ Formal Management Action Plan (MAP) for follow-up
10	WFP, UNICEF and CoE	▪ Knowledge management, specifically dedicated staff for the compilation and analysis of 'information from the database with regard to the impact of programmes/projects, especially regarding the extraction of lessons learned' (UNICEF)
11	WFP, UNIDO, UNICEF, UNDP, ILO CoE	▪ (Digital) tracking of follow-up actions.

Evaluation Use and Follow-up
IOM's issues with the use of evaluation and follow-up that need solving, include the need to:
▪ counter limited support up and down the hierarchy of what practical use can be made of evaluation; and the necessary follow-up arrangements for enhancing that practical use;

- ensure that the accountability role of evaluation is limited to mandatory reporting to IOM's donors, and evaluation at large to focus on learning and operational performance;
- ensure that the learning role of evaluation is linked to knowledge management;
- ensure that policy developers, strategy formulators, programme and project design staff and project implementors have easy and continuous access to the information they require; and
- keep evaluation costs as low as available funding – now and in the future – allows, yet ensure an adequate flow of evaluation information.

Considering what IOM could put in place to address these issues by way of a mechanism to follow-up on evaluation findings and recommendations, the good practice guidelines of the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) for evaluation follow-up apply. UNEG distinguishes a number of 'up-stream key factors' for the use of evaluation, one of which is: 'Appropriateness of practices in the management response, dissemination and use of evaluation findings.' UNEG further sees three 'pre-conditions' for effective evaluation management response and follow-up. The first concerns the **management response** to evaluation. The reviewed IOM documentation suggests that the format and content of IOM's management response meets UNEG suggestions. Two other UNEG preconditions, deal with, respectively: (i) **disclosure,** i.e., publication of the evaluation, including management responses, evaluation summaries or other knowledge sharing/learning products: and (ii) **follow-up**, i.e., the processes to promote and verify that evaluation-based learning takes place within the organisation and among partners and inform management on the status of recommendation implementation.

In respect of **disclosure**, it is important to release the evaluation report, management response and plan of action with recommendations to IOM staff, counterparts, stakeholders (donors in particular) in the intervention or thematic area evaluated. It is to be noted that IOM practises this, but with mixed results regarding the finalisation of management responses for publication and related action plans.

Regarding follow-up, UNEG suggests that reporting on the implementation of evaluation recommendations takes place at regular intervals, in line with planning processes. Systematic follow-up had best involve: (i) *electronic platform* to produce disaggregated analyses on evaluation implementation and facilitate access to evaluation information by all stakeholders; (ii) regular *reporting* to Organisation's governing bodies and stakeholders for the purpose of accountability and as a spur to timely implementation of follow-up actions; and (iii) *discussions* with staff, governing bodies, outside stakeholders to ensure awareness, ownership of findings and actions planned/taken.

Recommendations

The review and benchmarking findings suggest the following recommendations:

R1: As IOM's policy and the guidelines stress communication and dissemination of evaluation outcomes more than what to do with those outcomes, IOM is advised to establish a mechanism that ensures that:

- evaluation findings of a higher level enter into IOM's policies and strategies;
- lessons learned and best practice developed by IOM in one country or region, are known and adopted in other countries and regions;
- evaluation findings on a relevant number of projects in a country or region are aggregated into management information for IOM managers for informed decision making.

R2: IOM has designated quality management and better use of evaluation, as well as enhanced follow-up on recommendation as issues requiring attention. Key factors for this are held to be the development of an evaluation culture and enhanced knowledge management within the Organisation. IOM is recommended to continue actively the identification and acquisition of funding for investment in capacity building and tools for information management in respect of M&E.

R3: Information management is part and parcel of effective M&E, with effectiveness depending largely on the ability to enforce management decisions based on M&E findings and recommendations regarding the implementation of IOM policies, strategies, programmes and projects. IOM is recommended to further develop its M&E data management system to enable it to track the implementation of evaluation recommendations in both the short-term (for operational management) and the longer term (for impact assessment).

R4: IOM is engaged in the establishment of a digital platform for M&E data management. Such a system can be 'stand-alone' or linked to existing IOM digital operational systems, such as PRIMA. IOM's digital M&E data management platform might further include managed access by selected stakeholders (both internal and external) to that database and the dashboard. IOM is recommended to seek technical advice on such linkage, access and the necessary information management and content management systems (MIS/CMS) from a reputable firm or consultant.

R5: The design and development of digital systems is difficult at best. Experience suggests that adapting existing systems (such as PRIMA) for a purpose it was not initially designed for, is fraught. Major bottlenecks concern the detailing of workflows and staff responsibilities, as well as levels of access. Relevant experience of other similar organisations is likely to be useful. IOM is recommended to further map the experience of comparator organisations on this issue.

R6: All comparator organisations have something to offer in this regard, especially those with a 'light' tracking system in place (ILO) or under development (UNHCR), as well those with a large number of projects in many countries underway at any one time (CoE). During the study, interlocutors for all organisations indicated a willingness to be of assistance. IOM is recommended to look into the systems of these three organisations in particular.

R7: Any digital system for tracking implementation of evaluation recommendations for the purpose of managerial control and knowledge management chosen, would require detailed 'business processes', detailing the steps to be carried out by the system. IOM is recommended to seek further advice on drawing up such business processes as a necessary start for digital system development.

R8: Business processes (also detailed duties of each actor) would have to be based on a defined follow-up mechanism for channelling M&E information flows. IOM is recommended to consider a follow-up mechanism (and estimated IOM Central Evaluation staff time requirements) set out in Annex 1.

R9: Business processes would include an estimate of the time involved in each task, expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE). IOM is advised that, since the operational costs of the system would mainly consist of human resources, the number of FTEs involved should give a good indication of the mechanism's overall cost (exclusive of investment in system development and maintenance).

R10: IOM is advised that the pre-conditions for drafting the business processes include: (i) the finalised organisational structure for IOM, (ii) the mandates for all IOM departments, divisions and units involved in providing input for and operating the digital M&E system; and (iii) detailed job descriptions for all staff positions concerned.

R11: As to the additional human resources necessary for IOM Central Evaluation and IOM's knowledge management (KM) function to operate the roles in the proposed follow-up mechanism, IOM is advised that four FTE (full-time equivalent) might suffice: (i) one dashboard manager, (ii) one KM officer; (iii) two (junior) officers to prepare extracts, compile findings and recommendations for, respectively: the KM officer, as input for the dashboard manager, and briefs for IOM's hierarchy.

Preamble

The present constitutes the report on the *Study of the Use of Evaluation at the IOM and Proposal for Evaluation Follow-up Mechanisms* (hereinafter the 'study' or the 'assignment') commissioned by the *Central Evaluation Function* (hereinafter 'IOM Central Evaluation') of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM). The work on the assignment started with a kick-of session (by video) held on 15 September 2021.

The report's purpose is to present the findings of the study, and the provisional conclusions and recommendations based on those findings.

The findings are presented in two main sections: (A) the review of IOM's current use of evaluation and follow-mechanisms; and (B) a benchmarking against the follow-up mechanisms of selected comparator organisations.

Preceding the main sections, is an introductory chapter section setting out the context, objectives and methodology of the study.

The report ends with general recommendations and a proposed follow-up mechanism.

1. Introduction

1.1 Context

1   IOM accords increasing importance to evaluation as a tool for internal management and external accountability to donors, Member States and other stakeholders.

2   The use of evaluation was however not well rated within the UN family as noted in a 2014 document analysing the evaluation function in the UN system[1], which observed:

- *The Organizations are not predisposed to a high level of use of evaluation to support evidence-based policy and decision-making for strategic direction setting, programmatic improvement of activities, and innovations.*

- *The use of evaluation reports for their intended purposes is consistently low for most organizations. Even organizations in which the evaluation function is considered to perform well, manifest only an average level of use of reports by the intended audience.*

- *Low level of use is associated with an accountability-driven focus and the limitations noted above on the role of the function in the development of the learning organizations. There is a need to improve the systems in place for assessing the use of evaluation. Likewise, better systems are needed for assessing the impact on organizational effectiveness in using evaluation.*

- *The limited information available on the use and impact of evaluation reports makes it difficult to provide analyses for a full understanding of the overall value of the function.*

- *The United Nations system is, however, not alone in having a low level of performance regarding the use of evaluation to influence decisions and turn learning into action. Prevailing evidence shows that other development partners have the same problem, which suggests that a concerted effort is needed to address the problem and enhance understanding of the value of the function.*

3   The organisations, IOM amongst them, have since then taken steps to improve the situation. The Organisation continues to develop an elaborate monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, based on and laid down in the IOM *Project Handbook* (2017) and the IOM *Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines* (2021). IOM's Central Evaluation has drawn up its *Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy 2021-2023*.[2] *Inter alia* based on the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) *Norms and Standards for Evaluation* (2016), the strategy operationalises the *IOM Evaluation Policy* (2018), which is also reflected in the afore-mentioned M&E guidelines.

4   The above documents show evaluation to be an integral part of IOM's core and managerial functions, with centralised, corporate-level evaluations carried out mainly by IOM Central Evaluation. The latter has a supervisory, design, implementation and capacity building role, also with regard to the use of evaluation findings and recommendations in formulating and adapting IOM policies, strategies, and programmes. It further strengthens the Organisation's evaluation culture, through developing evaluation practice and understanding with a view to improving knowledge management. In spite of the efforts (since late-2016) by IOM Central Evaluation and IOM's *Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officers* (ROMEOs) to provide guidance and support at the Organisation's central level and its country offices, challenges remain. These concern[3]: (i) the lack at IOM of an organisation-wide system for the development of management responses or a timeline for tracking and reporting on implementation of evaluation recommendations; (ii)

---

[1] *Analysis of the Evaluation Function in the United Nations System*, UN, Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), New York, 2014.

[2] Preceded by its *Strategy for the Management of its Evaluation and Monitoring Functions* for the period 2018-20.

[3] As summarized in an IOM *Evaluation Brief* (April 2020) concerning the external *Meta-Evaluation of IOM's Internal & External Evaluations (2017-2019),* commissioned by IOM and completed in April 2020.

a need for additional management and institutional commitment in the promotion and use of evaluation results, (iii) the limited use of tracking mechanisms for existing recommendations, (iv) the reduced engagement of stakeholders during the evaluation for ownership, (v) the scarce resources available for evaluations, and (vi) as yet insufficient internal knowledge management to improve the use and dissemination of evaluation results.

5   These issues have been subject of discussion within IOM and between the Organisation, its Governing Bodies and other stakeholders. The most recent updates in this regard were presented to the 29th Session of IOM's *Standing Committee on Programmes and Finance* (SCPF) held on 26-27 October 2021 in Geneva.

6   On that occasion, the *Standing Committee* discussed an update on the state of reorganization of the Central Evaluation function at IOM, in the context of the ongoing organizational restructuring of IOM. This will likely result in a new positioning of that function within a new Department of Strategic Planning and Organisational Performance reporting to IOM's Director General.

7   Earlier, and specifically with regard to enhancing adequate follow-up on evaluation and findings and recommendations, the Organisation made management responses mandatory for all evaluations in January 2020. IOM's Central Evaluation function is tasked with following up on the submission of the management responses together with the report for publication in close coordination with the ROMEOs.

1.2   Study Purpose

8   IOM commissioned the present study to: (i) assess the use of evaluation at IOM; and (ii) identify the best possible options for improving the use of evaluation and follow up of evaluation recommendations and management responses.

1.3   Approach

9   The approach consisted of the following elements:
- tracking the use of a certain number of recent evaluations and assessing to what extent they were used within the Organisation;
- reviewing existing processes at IOM; and
- identifying good practices and existing mechanisms from other agencies to provide various options for consideration by IOM to develop a fit-for-purpose evaluation follow-up mechanism.

10   The first two elements were investigated in a **review** of evaluation follow-up practices at IOM [**Chapter 3**].

11   The third element was subject of a **benchmarking** exercise of the evaluation follow-up arrangements at seven UN Organisations (ILO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIDO and WFP), as well as those at the Council of Europe[4] [**Chapter 4**].

1.4   Documentation Review

12   The documentation review carried out in the first two weeks of the assignment (the period 15-30 September) concerned some 100 documents grouped in 4 sections [Annex 6].

13   The reviewed documentation was of four types:

---

[4] These organisations were chosen, and contact facilitated because IOM is a member of the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) since its foundation in 2004 and the experience of the older members was deemed to be of relevance for IOM's operational arrangements. The CoE was included in the sample because that organisation, like IOM, has a highly decentralised mode of operations and it relies on project-based external financing.

- IOM documents [policies, strategies, briefs and management responses, including documents related to the IOM Development Fund (IDF)]: 30;
- IOM evaluation reports (covering centralised and decentralised, internal and external evaluation, as well as thematic evaluations carried out or commissioned by IOM headquarters, regional offices and country missions: 20;
- other organisations' documents (including those of the CoE, and seven UN organisations): 29; and
- salient M&E documentation: 21.

14   Together, the documents provided a fair picture of:
- the current evaluation formal follow-up arrangements at IOM;
- the findings and conclusions of a number of external assessments of IOM's M&E system; and
- the formal follow-up arrangements at a number of other UN organisations.

1.5 Interviews

15   In the course of the study 38 interlocutors were interviewed. These included 28 IOM staff members, and 10 representatives of other UN organisations (ILO, UNDP, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIDO and WFP, as well as the Council of Europe (CoE) [Annex 7].

16   Potential interlocutors were proposed by IOM Central Evaluation where IOM staff was concerned and the consultant in the case of staff of other UN organisations and the Council of Europe. The interlocutors at other organisations were approached by IOM's Chief Evaluation, which met with a good and quick response from all entities. Some of those contacted suggested replacements with more immediate knowledge and experience of the subject matter.[5]

17   The IOM staff that agreed to be interviewed for this study represented various levels of the organisation, at headquarters in Geneva, in Regional Offices and in Country Missions. They included department directors, division heads, heads of unit, chiefs of mission, (senior) specialists in various thematic/cross-cutting areas and regional M&E officers.

18   The interviews yielded more detail on the implementation in practice of the IOM arrangements. The interviews with representatives of the seven UN entities and the CoE served to identify their evaluation and knowledge management practices, including follow-up arrangements on which to base options for consideration by IOM with regard to developing a fit-for-purpose evaluation follow-up mechanism.

2. Methodological Challenges

2.1 'Best Practice' Criteria

19   The ToR [Annex 5] did not contain suggestions with regard to what constitutes good practice when it comes to the use of and follow-up on evaluation. The inception report for the study suggested that it should identify criteria that might serve to define 'best practice' in this area.

20   Further consideration did not yield clear criteria for best practice. The interviews conducted and the relevant documentation on comparator organisations reviewed in the course of the study showed that although all have some form of M&E management and follow-up in place, these differ too much to distil good practice. Many differences are due to the systems having grown

---

[5] It is noteworthy, that the Head of the Evaluation Service at UNHCR observed (in an email to IOM's Chief of Evaluation dated 29 October 2021) that the rapid and positive response by other UN organisations to the requests for an interview might indicate that all of them are struggling with the arrangements for the use of and follow-up on evaluation.

'organically' under pressure of the circumstances and needs faced by each organisation.

21   Instead of defining criteria, the study has opted for identifying the lessons that can be learned from each comparator organisation's use of evaluation and follow-up on recommendations [**Chapter 4**].

2.2 Evaluation Report Sampling

22   A particular issue concerned the selection of IOM evaluation reports to be considered by the study, which focuses on the more recent evaluations carried by or on behalf the IOM. The period 2017-2020 produced a total of 197 such reports as included IOM's *Evaluation Repository*. A representative sample of 10% was deemed to serve for the study.

23   The diverse character of the evaluations in terms of evaluator (internal/external), attention area (migration, health, humanitarian assistance …), commissioning entity (IOM headquarters, IOM regional and country offices) and the projectised character of IOM interventions at large, produced a random sample that did not do justice to the diversified character of IOM evaluations.

24   It was therefore decided to apply 'stratified random' sampling. This produced an alternative, more focused (central vs decentralised and internal vs. external) list of 20 evaluations [Annex 4]. The stratification criteria *inter alia* concerned the timing of the evaluation (with a preference for reports for the two-year period 2020-21 and a smaller number for 2018-19). Key to this division was the introduction in January 2020 of the 'mandatory management response' to evaluation outcomes. Other sampling criteria concerned an appropriate mix of central/decentralised, mid-term/final/ex-post and internal/external evaluations.

2.3 Study Questions

25   The ToR [Annex 5] specified a number of questions to be addressed and answered. Not all of these study questions (SQ) concern the use of evaluation and proposals for follow-up mechanisms, the subject of this study, *per se*. Some concern issues of a structural, organisational (staffing and budgeting) and strategic (funding) nature, but which can influence a proper use of evaluations.

26   The study questions are set out in in Annex 2, together with the answers in so far as definite statements can be made on the basis of the findings of the study. The remainder of this report will show whether the study could answer these questions in sufficient depth.[6]

3. Findings A – Review

3.1 Analysis of IOM M&E Documentation

27   The documentation reveals that the subject of M&E and the use of evaluation has been gaining traction in the thinking on IOM's policy and strategy evaluation and the methods to gain insight regarding the extent to which the Organisation achieves the intended outcomes and impact of its efforts.

28   Like other UN organisations, IOM subscribes to UNEG *Norms and Standards for Evaluation* (2016). IOM's *Evaluation Policy* (2018) explicitly refers to those norms and includes an adaption of eleven specific standards included in that document.[7]

29   The Organisation's evaluation policy focuses on and promotes the concept of results-based

---

[6] 'Sufficient' being defined as adding value to the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the 'meta-evaluation', the 'peer review' and the 'MOPAN report' contained amongst the documentation listed in Annex 5.

[7] *Evaluation Policy*, IOM, 2018, pp. 7-8.

management also embraced by other UN organisations.[8]

30   The evaluation policy specifies six objectives of evaluation: (i) satisfy accountability obligations; (ii) assess changes in the implementation context; (iii) inform decision making; (iv) draw lessons learned; (v) contribute to the development of an evaluation culture in IOM; and (vi) guarantee inclusion of cross-cutting issues (gender, accountability to populations).[9]

31   Three of those objectives, I.e., numbers (iii)-(v) have a direct bearing on the use of IOM evaluations and the follow-up thereon.

32   The 2018 evaluation policy formalises the statement in IOM's *Project Handbook*, where it asserts that[10]: 'When using evaluation (project manager and project development officer): prepare and implement a management follow-up response matrix; disseminate evaluation findings, [and] integrate evaluation findings into practice.'

33   The evaluation policy indirectly addresses the outcome of a review[11] commissioned by IOM in 2017 on its policy making capacities, which, *inter alia* assessed: '[the] extent and how IOM's experiences in the field are being/can be translated into policy making and expert advice, and what are the needs of governments.' The review found that IOM's organisational culture did not – until then at least – generally value and place importance on policy work and knowledge management. It also commented on the 'lack of a suitable structure and sustainable funding and resources to support policy work.'

34   In spite of having adopted – in 2013 – its *Strategic Framework on Knowledge Management* 2013-2017, IOM was found by the above-mentioned review to 'lack a knowledge management culture, with officers failing to appreciate the importance to the work of the organization of the consistent and coherent collection of knowledge in an accessible format' [and] 'policy guidance and best practice is collected on an *ad hoc* basis and is poorly documented in a retrievable form', [partly attributable to] officers often [relying] on their networks and local knowledge in an environment where documenting and sharing is encouraged but is not mandatory.'

35   The review yielded 17 detailed recommendations, five of which refer specifically to knowledge management and evaluation (culture):

▪ The Office of the Director General (ODG) should directly oversee development of the new *Knowledge Management Framework* and ensure its ongoing implementation

▪ Relevant guidelines and handbooks, such as the *Project Handbook*, should be updated so that reporting policy developments and examples of best practice is mandatory, not aspirational.

▪ A culture that understands the importance of project evaluations to future policy work should be encouraged.

▪ Evaluations of project outcomes should include looking for whether the project is an example of best practice and whether this has been appropriately reported.

▪ IOM should create a Policy Department in Headquarters, which should include two new Policy Coordination Divisions, a Research Division and a Data Centre, [the latter being] responsible for all data collected and analysed by the organization and should be co-located with the rest of the Policy Department in Geneva). [] Consideration should also be given to including the Monitoring and Evaluation Division in the Policy Department.'

36   These recommendations reflect what IOM had come to recognise earlier. Another 2017 report[12] recommended to: 'take note of previous project reports and reports review, in order to build on

---

[8] Ibid, pp. 2.
[9] Ibid, pp. 3.
[10] *Project Handbook* (2nd edition), 2017, Evaluation Checklist, pp. 452).
[11] *Report on the Policy Capacity of the IOM*, Vicky Parker for IOM/IOG, Geneva, Dec 2017.
[12] *Review of Migration Policy Funded Projects 2007-16*, 2017, IOM, pp. 2

lessons learnt'. Before that, a 2016 review[13] had already recommended: 'Project managers should include proper follow-up and evaluation of training events and community skills activities in the project design in order to ensure the sustainability of these efforts.'

37 This view was reinforced in a 2018 (internal) review[14] of IOM's KM practices conducted by IOM Central Evaluation, that *inter alia* concluded that although the Organisation had extensive knowledge on migration, knowledge- based interventions was uneven; knowledge is 'personalised', not institutionalised; and that there was a need for further systematisation, for both explicit and 'tacit' forms of knowledge. The internal review's recommendations for defining, institutionalising and operationalising knowledge management in the Organization and for promoting organizational cultural change by: (i) establishing a KM policy and strategy with a vision to guide efforts undertaken; (ii) allocating sufficient human and financial resources for implementing KM efforts; and articulating to staff the benefits of KM providing them with the incentives to engage in KM practices; and (iv) increasing the communication and marketing of knowledge, both inside and outside the Organization.

38 Although the late-2017 report on IOM's policy capacity was not formally published, internally IOM thus continued to heed its findings and recommendations, if not to the letter, certainly in the spirit. As an example, the 2nd outcome in IOM's 2018 M&E strategy[15] states: 'OIG, IOM offices and departments use M&E for accountability, organisational learning and decision making.' Furthermore, in guiding the implementation of evaluations, another 2018 document[16] stated: 'After finalizing an evaluation report, IOM promotes the use of a separate summary document called an 'evaluation brief' that can be used to easily share information and results from evaluations and be more accessible to our staff, donors, partners and other stakeholders. Requirement for the brief to be included in evaluation assignment ToR'.

39 Another example is the *Institutional Strategy on Migration and Sustainable Development*[17], which states: 'We will bolster IOM's knowledge management capacities by building on existing IOM tools to facilitate knowledge-sharing so that operational experiences and country successes filter up and successful policy interventions filter down. We will also need to establish ways to ensure that our own data can be used to improve our programming. IOM's strategic vision recognizes the need to reflect more on project experiences and to invest in evaluation capacity [inter alia by] 'developing and defining more robust ways to measure and report on results.'

40 With effect from January 2020, IOM made a **management response** to evaluations mandatory and designed for [18]: 'IOM management, including the ODG, Departmental and Regional Directors (RDs), Chiefs of Missions (CoMs), Heads of Units and Programme or Project Managers (PMs), as well as M&E practitioners to ensure a common understanding of the process for the implementation and follow-up of evaluation recommendations and of what constitutes a management response.'

41 'As an **accountability** mechanism, the evaluation requires an explicit response and action to its recommendations by the staff responsible of the management of the project, policy and/or strategy evaluated. As a **learning** tool, the follow-up process is required for the purpose of integrating evaluation recommendations and lessons learned into IOM programming, policies and strategies.' In the same document[19], the section *Follow-up on the Management Response* describes measures to ensure adequate action by managers and supervisors: 'The ultimate responsibility falls to the Chief of Mission in IOM Country Offices and to the Regional Director in

---

[13] *Review of Migration, Environment and Climate Change (MECC) Projects*, 2008-15, IOM, 2016, pp. 28.

[14] *A Review of Knowledge Management in IOM: Current Status and Future Perspectives*, IOM/OIG, Geneva, 2018, pp. 2-3.

[15] *OIG Strategy for the Management of its Evaluation and Monitoring Functions 2018-2020*, 2018, pp. 5.

[16] *Evaluation Brief – Guidance*, IOM, 2018, pp. 2.

[17] *Institutional Strategy on Migration and Sustainable Development*, IOM, 2020, pp. 31-35.

[18] *Management Response and Follow-Up on IOM Evaluation Recommendations - Guidance Note*, 2019, pp. 2.

[19] Ibid, pp. 5.

the Regional Offices. For Headquarters it lies with the Department Director or a unit Head, as delegated by the Director.'

42 In 2019, the *Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN)* carried out an assessment[20] of IOM's structure, organisational arrangements and operations. On the subject of knowledge management and evaluation, the assessment found that: 'The organisation applies evidence-based planning and programming [key performance indicator (KPI) 8']'[21]:

- 'IOM's evaluation function is nascent. [] The related policy architecture is under development, including a new M&E strategy. Evaluation coverage is patchy, however, and largely dependent on donor interest and willingness to finance evaluations of 'their' funded interventions. The Central Evaluation Function has limited independence. The evaluation policy architecture is under development, but there are no rigorous quality assurance systems in place [and] the evaluative evidence-base to inform planning and design is constrained. The exception is projects that receive funding from the [IOM Development Fund (IDF)], which now includes a mandatory evaluation to generate lessons learned and best practices.'

- The MOPAN assessment further noted[22] that an evaluation culture is emerging [at IOM], but there is limited accountability for follow-up. [Although] IOM has developed a new project management system to help to identify poor performance', [these PRIMA arrangements] 'do not allow for the aggregation of project results to the corporate level', 'knowledge management systems are tacit rather than formalised' and 'evaluations are 'available on request', rather than disseminated through open access.'

43 Shortly after the release of the MOPAN assessment, IOM also learned the outcomes of a 'meta-evaluation' of 88 of its evaluations carried out in the period 2017-2019.[23] The main objectives[24] of the meta-evaluation were to:

- assess the quality and use of internal and external evaluations (centralized and decentralized) [to provide] actionable recommendations to enhance the quality and utilization of evaluations;

- provide IOM staff and partners with feedback on the quality of its evaluations, and determine if capacity-building efforts to support the conduct of evaluations have made a change in its quality; and

- produce a full-fledged meta-evaluation tool in which to base the evolution of IOM´s evaluation quality in the mid and long term.

44 On **evaluation dissemination and use**, IOM recognised[25] that the meta-evaluation had revealed: 'The dissemination of evaluation results has been enhanced recently by introducing some new tools such as the evaluation briefs and the evaluation repository. The key factors identified in facilitating evaluation use are: (i) the institutional efforts made in recent years toward promoting actionability of evaluation recommendations, and (ii) the new PRIMA for all system which was only rolled out in 2019. Key factors hindering evaluation use are: (a) the limited use of a tracking mechanism for existing recommendations, (b) the reduced engagement of stakeholders during the evaluation for ownership and (c) the scarce resources available for evaluations. Additional management and institutional commitment in the promotion and use of evaluation results is required.' Furthermore [26], 'concerning the use of evaluations, there is a need to increase the internal communication and information knowledge management to improve the performance

---

[20] *MOPAN 2017-2018 Assessments: IOM*, MOPAN Secretariat, Paris, Apr 2020.
[21] Ibid, pp. 36-37.
[22] Ibid, pp. 36-37.
[23] *Meta-Evaluation of IOM's Internal and External Evaluations (2017-19)*, April 2020.
[24] Ibid: pp. 16-17.
[25] *Meta-Evaluation of IOM's Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019) – Evaluation Brief*, IOM, 2020, pp 2).
[26] Ibid, pp. 3.

of the use and dissemination of evaluation results.'

45 In respect of enhancing evaluation dissemination and use, IOM noted the assessment's recommendation of[27]: (i) providing access to a systematic classification of evaluation results (recommendations, good practices, lessons learned) in the evaluation repository; (ii) implementing strategies to ensure the inclusion and participation of the target population in the evaluation process, and (iii) continue raising awareness of the utility and uses of evaluation among staff, as another strategy to build evaluation culture within the Organisation. More specifically, efforts should be made to engage management, such as chiefs of mission, regional directors and regional thematic experts.'

46 In its management response to the assessment, IOM took note of the fourth assessment recommendation[28]: **'**IOM would enhance evaluation dissemination and use by considering the following**:**

   ▪ Providing access to a systematic classification of evaluation results in the evaluation repository, allowing the identification of key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and good practices by thematic and geographical areas, type of evaluation, etc. would be key to boost internal evaluation use for decision making and programming.

   ▪ Continue raising awareness of the utility and uses of evaluation among staff, as another strategy to build evaluation culture within the Organization. More specifically, efforts should be made to engage management, such as chiefs of mission, regional directors and regional thematic experts.'

47 In the **suggested response** to these recommendations, IOM stated[29] that: 'Awareness raising on the utility and use of evaluation is central in OIG M&E strategy and initiatives are on-going to continue reinforcing an evaluation culture in IOM and the ROMEOs are actively participating to such initiatives at the regional level. Activities include for instance raising awareness about evaluation through the development of the repository, a growing community of practice and more direct communication with staff worldwide (including the development of a Yammer account). Evaluation has also been fully integrated into the MyIOM Platform being developed by the Office of the Director General's RBM-function. In conjunction, OIG is developing a platform that will integrate all aspects of monitoring and evaluation into one location to ease access for IOM staff. OIG will consider assessing how Directors of Departments, Regional Directors and Chiefs of Missions can be more proactive in the use of the benefits of evaluation as an accountability, learning and promotion tool.'

48 Amongst the key actions adopted in the management response to the meta-evaluation, in respect of its fourth recommendation, IOM included[30]: 'Brainstorm and review good practices **from other agencies** in integration of evaluation findings/recommendations and participatory evaluation practices that could be integrated at IOM.' The present assignment constitutes a follow up connected to that recommendation and key action suggested.

49 The impact of the MOPAN assessment and the meta-evaluation on thinking within IOM has been significant and is reflected in two key documents: (i) IOM's current M&E strategy; and (iii) its new 2021 M&E guidelines.

50 The overarching objective of the current M&E strategy[31] and its three underlying outcomes reflect the essential elements of IOM Central Evaluation [] namely the:

---

[27] Ibid, pp. 4.

[28] *Meta-Evaluation of IOM's Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019) - Management Response Matrix – Final Report*, IOM, 2020, pp 5.

[29] Ibid, pp. 5.

[30] Ibid, pp. 6.

[31] *OIG Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy 2021–2023*, IOM, 2021, pp. 3.

- development of clear, practical policies and guidance;
- provision of and support to staff capacity-building to strengthen the ability of [IOM] as a whole to conduct M&E; and
- furtherance of organizational accountability and learning through the promotion of an **evaluation culture**.

51 The third envisaged outcome of the strategy is of particular relevance for the use of evaluation. Work streams related to this outcome[32], include:
- Promoting the use of evaluation in migration policy and practice;
- Mainstreaming the value of evaluation;
- **Promotion and tracking of evaluation use**; and
- Shared evidence base.

52 The Organisation's current M&E guidelines recognise[33] that: 'A common misconception about managing an evaluation is that the evaluation process is considered finished once the final report is submitted and approved. In fact, the conduct and then approval of the report represent the first two thirds of the process, but the main *raison d'être* and benefit of an evaluation lies within **the final third** of the process, namely the use of the report, its findings and recommendations []:
- Use and follow-up of evaluation findings and recommendations.
- Internal and external promotion for replication and learning.
- Use for other purposes, such as synthesis evaluations or meta evaluations.

53 The Guidelines continue[34]: 'After the final report is approved, the evaluation commissioner or manager should work on the follow- up to the evaluation recommendations, in coordination with senior management and the project stakeholders, as appropriate. The evaluation commissioner and manager should consider and discuss with relevant entities how the findings of the report will be communicated to a broader audience as well. The evaluation manager will then finalize the management response matrix drafted by the evaluator.'

54 The above two sections of the Guidelines may be considered exemplary for the impression created that the IOM M&E Guidelines have a stronger focus on communication and sharing[35], than on tracking implementation and corrective measures should implementation not be happening.

55 This is borne out by the interviews with IOM staff, which highlighted, 'downstream' from the management response to evaluations, the need for effective internal communications and relations with stakeholders. There were few statements on the tracking of evaluation follow-up and suggestions for improving same.

56 As further illustration may serve that a 2021 guidance note[36] on the operations of the IOM Development Fund – by some IOM interlocutors considered the most advanced in terms of evaluation use and follow-up withing the Organisation – contains quite extensive *Stipulations for Project Tracking, Reporting and Management*, which however are limited to the statement that, upon project completion, the 'Final Narrative report must be accompanied by a completed Evaluation Form' and that a post-completion evaluation be carried out.[37]

---

[32] Ibid, pp. 7.
[33] *Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines*, IOM, 2021, pp. 242.
[34] Ibid, pp. 243.
[35] IOM is not the only organisation to which this applies. See for instance, ILO's Guidance Note 5.1 - Enhancing the use and dissemination of evaluation information, which focuses on effective communication of evaluation outcomes, not on best practice with regard to the use in operational terms of evaluation recommendations.
[36] *IDF Guidance Note 2021*, IOM, Office of the Inspector General (OIG), paras 33-42
[37] Ibid, para 33-42.

57   Other than that, there is little mention of or no emphasis on evaluation use. This is borne out by a document on IDF evaluations[38], which is clear on the administrative completion of the evaluation without reference to tracking the follow-up on Its findings. It states[39]: 'A draft copy of the evaluation report, evaluation brief and evaluation management response need to be submitted to the [IDF] within two months of the evaluation start date. The final copy of the evaluation report, evaluation brief and the evaluation management response need to be submitted to [IDF] and [OIG] within two months of completion of the draft report. The evaluation report will then be shared with the relevant IOM mission(s) and governments and will be published on the OIG webpage and evaluation repository.'

3.2 Review of IOM Evaluation Sample

58   To complement the assessment of the current state of IOM's follow-up arrangements for evaluation recommendations, the present study also considered a stratified sample of 20 evaluation reports [Annex 4], eight of which produced in the period 2020-21, ten drawn up in 2017-19, and two dating from 2017.

59   The 20 reports were quite different in character (internal by IOM staff or external by outside consultants), location (centralised, by IOM headquarters or decentralised by IOM's regional offices and country missions) and type (project-related or thematic in scope).

60   Independent of their character, location or type, 13 out of the 20 reports did not contain any reference to arrangements for follow-up on evaluation recommendations, or the methodology for tracking same.

61   In the case of six sampled reports, follow-up on their recommendations was straightforward in the sense that either: (i) the responsible Regional Office or Country Mission could take steps to address the recommendations directly (no tracking necessary for operational purposes); and/or (ii) the recommendations would be useful for the design of IOM projects and other interventions in the future or in other regions.

62   Many of the reports in the sample are evidence that there is work to be done about reporting standardisation and the briefing of evaluators at IOM. The reports differ substantially in approach, structure and format, which makes their content difficult to compile, summarise and analyse for wider project and programme purposes and as input into policy discussions, strategy development, and programme and project design.[40]

3.2 Review Round-up

63   Like its comparator organisations [**Chapter 4**], IOM subscribes to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation.

64   Its 2018 *Evaluation Policy* explicitly refers to those norms and adopts many standards. Three out of the six evaluation policy objectives have a direct bearing on the use of IOM evaluations and the follow-up thereon.

65   As noted [**paras 33-35**, above], the 2017 policy capacity report found that IOM's organisational culture did not – until then at least – generally value and place importance on policy work and knowledge management. IOM was found to 'lack a knowledge management culture, with officers failing to appreciate the importance to the work of the organisation of the consistent and

---

[38] *IDF Project Evaluations*, IOM/OIG, 2021.

[39] Ibid, pp. 4

[40] This applies to the good-quality reports in the sample, as well as those of less quality. This judgement is based on the professional experience of the author, without prejudice to the findings of the quality management review subject of another study commissioned by IOM Evaluation and carried out in the same period.

coherent collection of knowledge in an accessible format.'

66 Other reviews in the period 2016-18, came to the same conclusion, which resulted in a new (2018) M&E strategy that held: 'OIG, IOM offices and departments use M&E for accountability, organisational learning and decision making.' The 2020 *Institutional Strategy on Migration and Sustainable Development* recognised the need to 'establish ways to ensure that our own data can be used to improve our programming' and for 'developing and defining more robust ways to measure and report on results'.

67 In January 2020, IOM made a formal management response to evaluation reporting mandatory. The management response is accorded a key role as a tool for promoting accountability, as well as for learning for the follow-up process that is 'required for the purpose of integrating evaluation recommendations and lessons learned into IOM programming, policies and strategies.'

68 Also in 2020, a MOPAN assessment concluded IOM's evaluation culture to be 'nascent', but judged further work on the M&E coverage and independence to be necessary. It noted that IOM had developed a new project management system to help to identify poor performance', but that those arrangements (PRIMA) 'do not allow for the aggregation of project results to the corporate level.'

> **Box 1: Observation**
>
> All reviews and assessments stress the need for improving IOM's evaluation culture, if not actually instilling it in the first place. It also emerged from the interviews conducted for this study: managers have little idea of and perhaps time for use of and follow-up on evaluation. They tend not to see it as a management tool, but rather as like audit; something that has to be done for reasons of due diligence and accountability to IOM's Administration or Council, but not as a tool for improving interventions in the field. It is not surprising that lower down the hierarchy, at project level, staff and other implementors do not much heed exhortations to 'do better next time.'

69 Yet another review, the 2020 'meta evaluation' identified as one of the key factors hampering evaluation use 'the limited use of a tracking mechanism for existing recommendations.' It stated that IOM could enhance evaluation dissemination and use**:**

- Providing access to a **systematic classification of evaluation results**, allowing the identification of key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and good practices to boost their use for decision making and programming.

- Continue raising awareness of the utility and uses of evaluation among staff, to build **evaluation culture** within IOM.'

70 The analysis of the MOPAN, of the meta-evaluation and of other reviews on thinking within IOM are also reflected in two key documents: (i) IOM's Evaluation Policy ; and (iii) its current M&E Guidelines, which stress evaluation culture and promotion and tracking of evaluation use, with the latter operationalised in the Guidelines as: use and follow-up of evaluation findings and recommendations; internal and external promotion for replication and learning; and use for other purposes, such as synthesis evaluations or meta evaluations.

71 The policy and the guidelines both appear to stress communication and dissemination of evaluation outcomes. They do not emphasise doing something with those outcomes. There appears to be no mechanism for ensuring that:

- evaluation findings of a higher level enter into IOM's policies and strategies;

- lessons learned and best practice developed in one country or region, are both known and adopted in other countries and regions;

- evaluation findings on a relevant number of projects in a country or region are aggregated into management information useful for and accessible to IOM managers for informed decision making.

72 It will therefore be necessary to develop a follow-up mechanism that emphasises next to

'accountability', not 'learning' by itself, but **learning for decision making for action** at **all levels of the Organisation.**

73   Most of the evaluation reports sampled for this study did not contain references to (the tracking of the) follow-up on evaluation recommendations. In a minority of the reports, the suggested follow-up was treated as straightforward: no tracking for operational purposes foreseen or mainly concerning the design of IOM programmes and projects.

4. Findings B – Benchmarking

4.1 Elements

74   The study involved a review of the evaluation policies, guidelines and related organizational arrangements of eight comparator organisations, including seven UN agencies, as well as the Council of Europe, as laid down in relevant documentation [Annex 5, Section 3]. In addition, a series of interviews with representatives of the evaluation function at those organisations were held [Annex 7].

75   This section sets out the findings of the review, by briefly considering the arrangements of each organisation individually. The findings are summarized in Annex 3. The organisations and agencies are presented in alphabetical order.

76   The section concludes with an appraisal of relevant items that IOM could consider for its own options for an evaluation follow-up mechanism. The following elements are considered:
- entity within the organisation that exercises its **evaluation function**;
- 'location' of evaluation, i.e., **centralised or decentralised**;
- type of evaluations: **internal** (**self**-) or **external**;
- employment of **thematic** evaluations;
- relation between **evaluation** and **audit**;
- use of a formal **management response** document or matrix;
- availability of a **digital database/platform/dashboard**;
- application of **follow-up tracking** or similar
- system of **knowledge management** in place; and
- whether there are **system overhauls** planned or ongoing.

4.2 Comparator Organisations

77   The selected comparator organisations included in the documentation review[41] and interview survey during the study are presented below in alphabetical order.

CoE – Council of Europe

78   The Council of Europe is an international organisation established in 1949 for the purpose of upholding human rights, democracy and the rule of law in Europe. Its mandate is largely advisory, with its 47 member states free to adopt any suggested policies and measures.

79   The evaluation function at CoE is carried out by its Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO), in accordance with an evaluation policy adopted in 2019 and based on current United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines. DIO has five permanent and some part-time support staff. The evaluation function is fully separated from the audit function.

---

[41] Separately available.

80   The Directorate commissions, oversees and supports four centralised evaluations (including thematic evaluations) and some 15 decentralised evaluations annually, carried out by its own staff or by external experts. CoE's evaluation guidelines foresee a management response and an action plan after each evaluation[42]; both to be put forward within two months of evaluation completion.

81   DIO maintains a dashboard for the evaluation function. To track the implementation of evaluation recommendations, the dashboard encompasses two types of software. One set, that for decentralised evaluations, bundles the recommendations from each evaluation and follows their implementation as a 'block'. The other set – for centralised evaluations – monitors the implementation of recommendations individually.

82   In the near future, the evaluation function's platform will have two cores. The first is a knowledge management (KM) and e-learning tool, on the basis of existing software[43]. The tool is used to provide staff at headquarters and in the member countries) with M&E training and advice. The second core is for evaluation follow-up and is based on off-the-shelf audit software[44].

83   The follow-up tool establishes workflows/business processes for managers. *Inter alia*, it will be used to go back to earlier recommendations (3 years) and establish the follow-up measures taken in response to evaluations by member state entities.

84   DIO recently established a working group on the follow-up on decentralised evaluations, to assist and coordinate the ongoing consultation process, typically with member states, on the arrangements for this type of evaluation. It is the intention to provide CoE's Secretary General with half-yearly reports, including a list of pending recommendations. The SG's interest is important to get a sense of 'closure' on the process of tracking.

ILO – International Labour Organisation

85   The evaluation function at ILO is carried out by its Evaluation Office (EVAL), under the oversight of an Evaluation Advisory Committee. EVAL, whose Director reports directly to the Director-General, carries out, commissions and oversees both centralised and decentralised evaluations (including thematic evaluations), using own staff and outside expertise. The findings on evaluation are summarised in the form of an *Annual Evaluation Report* for ILO's Board.

86   The organisation's evaluation policy (2016), strategy (2018)[45] and guidelines[46] (2020) require a management response to evaluation outcomes. For this, the Organisation operates an internal *Automated Management Response System* (AMRS), flanked by a public access digital platform, *i-eval Discovery*, introduced in 2016[47].

87   The AMRS replaced manual follow-up tracking through spreadsheets. It contains management and content information (sub-)systems (MIS/CIS). The introduction of the AMRS (2019) raised the completion rate of management responses to nearly 100% and embedded them better in the chain of command. Although evaluation and audit are separate functions, both provide input

---

[42] In practice, the entities to whom evaluation recommendations are addressed are required to prepare the management response and an action plan that describes the activities that they commit to carry out in order to implement the recommendations. DIO follows up on recommendations that have either been accepted or are under consideration. DIO will collect evidence and assess whether completed actions sufficiently address the implementation of recommendations (*Evaluation Guidelines*, CoE, Strasbourg, October 2021).

[43] *StoryLine*, also used by UNESCO, and adapted by DIO with the help of in-house IT-staff and some outside consultancy.

[44] *TeamMate*, acquired by DIO at relatively low cost, since it uses only the one out of its six modules, i.e., that dealing with (originally, audit) follow-up.

[45] *Results-Based Evaluation Strategy 2018-2021*, ILO, Geneva, 2018. As in the case of IOM, the strategy wants to develop ILO's evaluation culture.

[46] *Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluation*, ILO, Geneva, November 2020.

[47] Publicly accessible and constantly updated, it is designed to provide a full suite of evaluation information on a real-time basis, including planned and completed evaluations and related recommendations, lessons learned and good practices.

for ILO's internal 'business intelligence' system.

88   The *i-eval Discovery* platform is currently being overhauled to arrive at a virtual system for evaluation business processes, one that will 'self-generate' ToR for evaluation, evaluation reports and provide follow-up management. This process is expected to be completed in 2023.

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

89   UNDP's evaluation function, defined in its 2019 evaluation policy[48], is carried out by its *Independent Evaluation Office* (IEO), which runs, commissions and oversees centralised and decentralised, internal and external evaluations. It carries out some 20 country and three thematic evaluations annually. The IEO reports to UNDP's Executive Board. That and the increasing attention for reporting quality in recent years has, in IOE's own view[49], increased the quality of M&E reports significantly.

90   According to its guidelines[50], the management responses to evaluation recommendations should include detailed actions and highlight which agency or unit is responsible for each key action by when. A recommendation can be: 'fully accepted', 'partially accepted', or 'rejected'. When recommendations are fully or partially accepted, they require follow-up action. M&E specialists or focal points are responsible for monitoring the implementation of key actions and reporting on achievements through the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) on a quarterly basis and the ERC updated accordingly.

91   An IEO stakeholder survey showed that perceptions around the utility of the IEO's work depend on the quality of its evaluation recommendations.[51] To track the implementation of those recommendations, IEO maintains an internal dashboard as a management tool. The dashboard flags when there has been no management response within six weeks of completing an evaluation and signals when action on evaluation recommendations is overdue. The dashboard is able to store supporting documents.

92   IEO carries out checks on the validity of the evaluation follow-up contained in the dashboard. This concerns about 300 evaluations/year, with an average of 10 recommendations each, and 4-5 action points on each recommendation, i.e., up to 15,000 measures/year. In this context, IEO stresses that validation ultimately depends on the receptiveness, initiative and dedication to action of the project personnel and UNDP managers involved.

93   Evaluation findings are incorporated in UNDP's *Evaluation Resource Centre* (ERD), which platform is also accessible to the public. The ERC is a knowledge management tool, but has no capacity to vet the quality of evaluation reports on an individual, ongoing basis. For that reason, UNDP/IOE is about to launch a review of 100 evaluations[52] to ascertain their quality, in terms of findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as mapping the follow-up. The review is expected to broadcast – internally and externally – the message that the Board pays attention to the outcomes of evaluation.

UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

94   UNESCO has a tradition of project and programme evaluation, as evidenced by several documents[53]. UNESCO's evaluation function is vested in the Evaluation Office (EO) under the Organisation's *Internal Oversight Service* (IOS), which also encompasses its audit function. The EO carries out, commissions and oversees centralised and decentralised, internal and external

---

[48] *The Revised UNDP Evaluation Policy,* UNDP, IOE, New York, July 2019.
[49] Interview with Mr. Richard Jones, Chief, Evaluation Capacity Development, IOE, UNDP, 6 October 2021.
[50] UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, New York, June 2021 (reflecting the UNEG Guidelines to a large extent).
[51] *Annual Report on Evaluation 2020*, UNDP, New York, April 2014, pp. 32).
[52] Akin to the meta-evaluation of 88 IOM evaluations completed in early-2021.
[53] See for example: *Formative Evaluation of UNESCO's Results Reporting* (UNESCO, 2014) and *A Diagnostic Study of Evaluations of UNESCO's Extrabudgetary Activities* (UNESCO, 2013).

evaluations, as well as thematic evaluations.

95 The IOS operates a digital registry and dashboard for the management of and follow-up on evaluations. Because it is not very user-friendly, a recent (2021) internal review suggested further development of both the registry and the dashboard. This is also expected to further raise the quality of the organisation's knowledge management[54].

96 UNESCO's evaluation policy (2014) does not require a standalone management response document.[55] However, it states that: 'UNESCO evaluation reports contain a management response [which] should be submitted no later than one month after the completion of the evaluation [and provides] management's overall view on the report findings and recommendations, including actions to be taken in response to significant recommendations. [] In most circumstances, evaluations are followed by the development of an action plan containing details on how management intends to address individual recommendations.'

97 Evaluation follow-up relies on 6-monthly, *ad hoc* checks by the EO, for a period of up to 2 years from evaluation completion. Responses are entered into the registry and dashboard. At present corrective measures as under preparation to deal with a relatively large number of pending or open evaluation recommendations. The recommendations in UNESCO's evaluation reports are the responsibility of the 'owner', typically a specific UNESCO 'business office'. The reasons for pending/open recommendations are the large number of recommendations of low quality, lack of budget and insufficient action by the EO in case of non-follow-up by business units.[56]

98 Once a year, the EO does a presentation on the status of follow-up on evaluations. Evaluation managers should access the dashboard on any particular evaluation at least every 6 months to be able to keep an eye on developments and update the information.

99 UNESCO's Director is currently considering how to use the dashboard for discussing evaluation and follow-up measures at the Organisation's quarterly Management Meetings.

UNHCR – United National High Commissioner for Refugees

100 The evaluation function at UNHCR is the responsibility of its *Evaluation Service* (ES), currently with 11 staff. It runs, commissions and oversees centralised and decentralised, internal and external evaluations, as well as thematic evaluations. UNHCR's evaluation policy (2020) sees evaluation as 'distinct from yet complementary to other functions in the oversight spectrum such as audit and inspection. It makes use of findings from those mechanisms as part of the broader evidence base needed to assess the achievement of both expected and unexpected results.'

101 The organisation's current evaluation arrangements include a formal management response (in tabular form) to the key findings and recommendations put forward in evaluation reports, within two months from the date of dissemination of the report. Although not yet in use, it is in the process of design, with detailed evaluation guidelines under preparation.[57] A theory of change in the organisation's Evaluation Strategy (2017) expects that by 2022 evaluation findings and recommendations are consistently and appropriately used to strengthen strategies, policies, programming and practices in UNHCR; and by 2027 that the use of evaluative evidence, along with other types of evidence, is habitual and normative in designing, targeting and delivering strategies, policies and programmes that provide protection, assistance and solutions to persons of concern to UNHCR.

---

[54] Which at present largely relies on the *StoryLine* e-learning tool also adopted by the CoE, but which – according to the internal review – could be improved.

[55] *Evaluation Policy 2014-20*, UNESCO, Paris, 2014, pp. 16.

[56] Often due to a lack of 'buy-in' on the part of business units, especially in cases where they are not involved in the formulation of an evaluation's recommendations. Another factor is that typically ad hoc follow-up tracking by the Evaluation Office at present has to rely on a registry system that is not well-suited to this purpose.

[57] In line with *Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations - Guidance Document*, UNEG, New York, 2010.

102 UNHCR's management response will be the responsibility of the organisation's Senior Executive Team for central evaluations (including country and emergency programme evaluations). Directors of Regional Bureaux, Divisions and Representatives are expected to:[58]

- For centralised evaluations: 'Ensure that required input for the 'management response' is submitted in a timely manner, and take steps to implement and support follow-up actions to the agreed recommendations.'

- For decentralised evaluations: 'Ensure that a management response to key findings and recommendations in an evaluation report is issued within two months of its dissemination; and [] take steps to implement and support follow-up actions to the agreed recommendations.'

103 The organisation does not as yet operate a dedicated platform or dashboard for tracking the follow-up on evaluation recommendations, but also this is at the design stage.

104 The development of evaluation arrangements currently underway are partly the result of a growing awareness of the importance of evaluation for organisational learning (as opposed to mere accountability). The organisation wishes to establish an organisational evaluation culture built on confidence and ownership of results.

105 UNHCR is opting for a relatively 'light' system for tracking evaluation follow-up, one more resembling that of ILO than the ones in use at UNICEF and WFP (see below). Under such a light system, follow-up tracking would be limited to 2 years, with information gathering at the end of the first and second years from evaluation completion. It will take some time before the arrangements now under design will be operational.

UNICEF – United Nations Children's Fund

106 UNICEF's *Evaluation Office* (EO) is tasked with implementing the organisation's evaluation function, regulated by a recently revised updated evaluation policy[59]. It carries out, commissions and oversees 10-15 centralised and 120 decentralised evaluations/year (some internal, other external assessment), as well as thematic evaluations. UNICEF's country missions with a budget of more than USD 10 million have to produce one evaluation report/year. Those with a smaller budget must produce one evaluation report every 2 years.

107 For the past 10 years, the organisation has operated an SAP-based digital database/dashboard for its evaluations (including follow-up tracking), with direct access and input rights for EO staff and – *inter alia* – the organisation's regional officers.

108 UNICEF's key performance indicators for evaluation include the requirement to complete a management response form. Typically, the management response to an evaluation is produced within 60 days[60]. The dashboard – which includes 'traffic-light' notifications – produces reminders in cases where a management response is not available within the stipulated period. The same applies to follow-up action on evaluation recommendations. The 'flags' are summarised in 3 monthly reports to the Executive Director. Some aspects of evaluation response tracking have been borrowed from the organisation's audit function.

109 UNICEF considers[61] enhancing the use of evaluations [] a central element of its evaluation policy: 'Heads of Offices are to plan for the use of evaluations even as these are being designed. The Director of Evaluation, working with Heads of Offices should invest in innovative technologies to advance the use evaluations, including platforms for connecting evaluators with users of evaluation evidence.'

---

[58] *Evaluation Policy*, UNHCR, 2020, pp. 12-13.
[59] *Revised Evaluation Policy*, UNICEF, New York, 2018.
[60] Because of the Covid-19 circumstance, this period is currently 90 days.
[61] *Procedure on the Implementation of the 2018 UNICEF Evaluation Policy*, New York, 2018.

110 UNICEF's system of *Evaluation Management Response Action Implementation* requires 'closure' of recommendations, i.e., a clear indication of whether follow-up action on has taken place and the reason why if it has not. The dashboard notifies when closure has not been attended to.

111 At present, some 15% of required closures are and have been outstanding for 2 years. The rest has been dealt with within that mandatory period. Follow-up on recommendations and tracking actions is the responsibility of Regional Advisors employed in each of UNICEF's regions.

112 For the purpose of knowledge management, dedicated personnel (some 15 staff) compile and analyse information from the database with regard to the impact of programmes/projects, especially regarding the extraction of lessons learned. In this capacity, they are tasked with establishing the quality of the follow-up on evaluation recommendations with a longer perspective.

UNIDO – United Nations Industrial Development Organisation

113 UNIDO's evaluation function is the responsibility of its *Internal Evaluation Division* (IED)[62], which currently 5 staff (three permanent staff, one assistant and one 'long-term consultant'). IED's evaluation arrangements have been in place (with several revisions) for more than 15 years. An overhaul of these arrangements is under preparation and is expected to be launched in 2022.

114 IED carries out centralised evaluations of larger projects. Projects with a budget of less than USD 2 million are subject to self-evaluation overseen by IED. UNIDO has no real functioning core evaluation system for the evaluations carried out at project level (self-evaluations). The planned overhaul foresees independent evaluations for projects and programmes with a budget larger than USD 3 million and for stratified (by sector/theme) samples of smaller projects. From 2022 also, self-evaluations will be more independent, but based on a template, criteria and other procedures, drawn up by IED and to be adhered to by project management. It is expected that there will 25 self-evaluations per year of projects with a value over USD 2 million. IED carries out or commissions 2-3 thematic evaluations annually.

115 The division does not yet operate a full-fledged digital evaluation dashboard.

116 UNIDO's evaluation policy employs a management response sheet[63] to evaluation findings and recommendations, to be drawn up immediately upon evaluation completion and after one year: *This sheet enables tracking for each recommendation that covers the comments of acceptance or non-acceptance of evaluation recommendations, the deadlines, and action taken by those responsible for follow-up. UNIDO line managers ensure that those responsible for follow-up, keep information in each MRS up to date.*[64] IED tracks the management responses for that one-year period. Responses lacking after that are tabulated and reported but typically not pursued further, mainly as a result of the limited number of IED staff.

117 Part of the system overhaul will be that evaluations should include a Management Action Plan (MAP), in addition of the recommendations. The MAP is discussed between the project and IED.[65] The MAP will be linked an IED database, which would exercise a 'closing function' once it establishes that at all issues contained in the MAP have been dealt with, at project and higher level. Some of the techniques under the new system have been obtained through closer contact in recent years with UNIDO's internal audit function, with some processes copied. The MAP-

---

[62] 'The [responsible] Director reports to the Director General and shall oversee the work of the two oversight entities (IED and Internal Oversight Division (IOD), which – by virtue of their responsibilities – shall remain independent of each other.' In: *Evaluation Policy – Director-General's Bulletin*, UNIDO, Vienna, 2018, pp. 7.

[63] *Evaluation Manual*, UNIDO, Vienna, 2018.

[64] Ibid, pp. 53.

[65] IED is aware that this carries a risk of compromising its own independence and that of the evaluations/evaluators).

process will also apply to internal self-evaluations[66] if the relevant project concerns with strategic issues.

WFP – World Food Programme

118 The evaluation function (which is separated from the audit function) at WFP is performed by its *Office of Evaluation* (OEV), which reports to the organisation's Chief of Staff, but is otherwise independent. It operates under an evaluation policy dating from 2015 and currently under revision for release in November 2021.[67] OEV exerts influence through assuring the input of evaluation findings in the organisation's periodical *Country Strategy Plans* (CSP).

119 OEV carries out, commissions and oversees both centralised and decentralised evaluations. These can be both internal or external with no difference in purpose or methodology.

120 The preparation of CSPs typically and largely systematically uses the outcome of country strategy evaluations. Workshops are held to discuss the strategy plans and evaluation outcomes with stakeholders in a country. Vision workshops are held between WFP staff prior to the start of the CSP preparation work. OEV reviews draft CSPs before their finalisation. OEV's thematic evaluations likewise are used to influence CSP and WFP operations at large.

121 OEV also reviews decentralised evaluations for the purpose of influencing the quality of follow-up measures.

122 The reports of the (mainly thematic) central evaluations reach top management for the purpose of strategy refinement and development. The reporting on decentralised evaluations is submitted to management in aggregated form, including an OEV summary highlighting key points, also for the purpose of influencing the quality of follow-up measures. The – typically limited number of – decentralised evaluations are generally donor-driven for the purpose of accountability. Each country office has to carry out one evaluation for every four-year strategy period. The decision as to sector or project is up to the country office in cooperation with stakeholders. Not all countries heed the requirement to file such reports. The quality of these decentralised evaluation reports differs, but OEV does keep an eye on that.[68]

123 WFP's evaluation arrangements include a management response. Those responses, together with the relevant evaluation reporting and other documentation of interest to management, WFP's Board and stakeholders, are kept in a central repository. OEV tries to avoid that follow-up tracking is reduced to a matter of 'ticking the boxes', but is aware that this requires dialogue with management, as well as attention to the use of evaluation[69].

124 OEV operates a digital database/dashboard in the form of its *Country Office Tool for Managing Effectively* (COMET), a system for tracking implementation that has been rolled out but requires continued development. WFP is preparing that tool in its *Annual Performance Planning* (APP)

---

[66] Some self-evaluations are reported as already now of high quality, sometimes better than those carried by IED itself. This is often the result of a sincere interest on the part of project management and their ability to identify and find budget for good evaluators in their field. Good reports are often the basis for quality self-analysis and follow-up action.

[67] Influenced *inter alia* by a *Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the World Food Programme*, OECD/DAC, Paris, 2021. The peer review noted that (i) *…a significant proportion of staff and country offices see evaluation as a bureaucratic burden to be endured* (pp. 14), and *'…WFP has had weak systems to track the implementation of agreed evaluation recommendations but that a new system (the Risk and Recommendation Tracking Tool, or 'R2' system) should enable more efficient tracking* (pp. 16).

[68] In this connection, OEV refers to UNEG's *Group on Evaluation Use* and its 2021 report *Evaluation Use in Practice*. This lists the various levers for enhancing the use of evaluation by and on behalf of stakeholders. It also includes an inventory of the flow of information generated by evaluation to management and stakeholders.

[69] As stated in the *Annual Evaluation Report 2020*, WFP, Rome, pp. 46): *As part of corporate efforts to increase the use of evidence, OEV and regional evaluation units continued to promote the use of evaluative evidence at the global, regional and country levels. A range of initiatives was undertaken, including with regard to norm setting, mapping, tagging, summarizing, disseminating and convening*.

process. Other database tools – perhaps including tagging – are under preparation.

125 OEV and WFP at large engage in knowledge management, for which it has a specific digital tool (*WeLearn*). An extensive overhaul of the knowledge management system is under preparation.

4.3 Benchmarking Round-up

126 In summary, it can be observed that:

- All of the eight organisations and agencies canvassed have a **dedicated evaluation unit** or department, some standing alone, others as part of a larger oversight department.

- All organisations have a recent or recently revised **evaluation policy** in place, mostly accompanied by evaluation **guidelines** or similar – more or less – detailed instructions on how to conduct evaluations and safeguard the quality of evaluation reporting. In most cases, including the Council of Europe, the UNEG norms, standards and guidelines form the basis for these policies and guidelines.

- Most organisations carry out, commission and oversee **centralized** and **decentralized**, **internal** (often self-) evaluations, **external** evaluations, as well as **thematic** (including country) evaluations.

- All organisations make a distinction between **audit** and **evaluation**, and separate the respective functions although – in some cases – evaluation has adopted selected audit features or business processes.

- In line with UNEG Guidelines, most organisations' evaluation arrangements encompass some form of **management response** to the findings and recommendations of evaluations.

- All organisations have a **digital database**, **platform** or **dashboard** in place to store evaluation reports and present the findings and recommendations in some form. UNCHR still has to develop a digital platform, work on which is ongoing in the context of devising a 'light' evaluation system.

- All organisations exercise a form of **tracking** the implementation of evaluation outcomes and recommendations, in some cases through a digital dashboard. In most cases this tracking consists of reports of periodical follow-up by regional or country personnel, in two cases up to the highest level of the organisation. Some organisations seek formal 'closure' on recommendations after a certain period.

- Apart from such reporting, organisations' documentation and interviews with key personnel did not yield specific tools, methods or business processes employed in the case of a **lack of follow-up on recommendations**. Apart from 'closure', a lack of adequate follow-up on recommendations appears to be a matter for all entities' management to consider and act upon.

- Some organisations (CoE, UNICEF and WFP) have **knowledge management** arrangements in place. The software used by CoE and UNICEF for e-learning may be of interest to IOM for the same purpose.

- All organisations have recently overhauled or are about to **overhaul** those arrangements, with a focus on digital systems. Amongst the seven canvassed organisations that form part of the UN family, ILO and WFP are considered by their peers to have to the most developed evaluation (including follow-up tracking) arrangements, with ILO operating a 'lighter' system than, for instance, WFP.[70]

- There would be advantages for IOM (perhaps together with UNHCR) to take note of the steps currently taken by and under preparation at ILO, with its AMRS platform/dashboard system development being of special interest. The software module for follow-up tracking under

---

[70] This is a widely held view amongst the staff interviewed for this study.

establishment at CoE and in use at UNICEF, might also be of interest to IOM.

127 Finally, it would appear that:

- The organisations' evaluation policies and guidelines do not go into detail on the follow-up on evaluations, 'downstream' from the formal management response.[71]

- Seven of the eight organisations have some form of digital arrangement database or platform for monitoring the implementation of evaluation recommendations . In the case of five organisations (CoE, ILO, UNICEF, UNIDO and WFP), this includes a digital tracking capability, in three cases with automated 'flagging' of delayed or no follow-up action.

- Three other organisations have such automated digital 'flagging' and reporting on follow-up status under development, with WFP working on refining its current system.

128 These, as well as other relevant initiatives at the comparator organisations that could be emulated by IOM are summarised in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Comparator Organisations – Items for Emulation by IOM

Nº	Comparator Organisation	Items for Possible Emulation
12	CoE	▪ Digital platform with two cores: (a) knowledge management and (b) e-learning
13	CoE and UNDP	▪ Evaluation on a sampling basis and keeping the number of evaluations at manageable levels
14	ILO and UNICEF	▪ Digital management platforms (database/dashboard) - ILO (AMRS)
15	UNCHR and ILO	▪ 'Light' version of evaluation and follow-up system [The former is currently development a 'light' system].
16	UNDP and WFP	▪ Aggregation of data from decentralised evaluations
17	UNDP, UNICEF and CoE	▪ 'Flagging' of pending management responses and delayed follow-up action [UNICEF: 'traffic-light' system].
18	UNICEF, UNIDO and CoE	▪ Arrangements for 'closure' on follow-up tracking and reporting.
19	UNICEF and CoE	▪ Specific software for evaluation (accountability and e-learning)
20	UNIDO	▪ Formal Management Action Plan (MAP) for follow-up
21	WFP, UNICEF and CoE	▪ Knowledge management, specifically dedicated staff for the compilation and analysis of 'information from the database with regard to the impact of programmes/projects, especially regarding the extraction of lessons learned' (UNICEF)
22	WFP, UNIDO, UNICEF, UNDP, ILO CoE	▪ (Digital) tracking of follow-up actions.

---

[71] This is not altogether surprising since, for instance, also UNEG's *Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations* (2010) focus on pre-conditions and good practices in a general sense, without specifying in the practical application of the several mechanisms for systematic follow-up that are considered good practice, as listed in that document.

5. Follow-up Mechanism

129 It is worthwhile to take a look at IOM's issues with the use of evaluation and follow-up that need solving. These include the need to:

- counter limited support up and down the hierarchy of what practical use can be made of evaluation; and the necessary follow-up arrangements for enhancing that practical use;

- ensure that the accountability role of evaluation is limited to mandatory reporting to IOM's donors, and evaluation at large to focus on learning and operational performance;

- ensure that the learning role of evaluation is linked to knowledge management;

- ensure that policy developers, strategy formulators, programme and project design staff and implementors have easy and continuous access to the information they require; and

- keep evaluation costs as low as available funding – now and in the future – allows, yet ensure an adequate flow of evaluation information.

130 Considering what IOM could put in place to address these issues by way of a mechanism to follow-up on evaluation findings and recommendations, one might start with UNEG's good practice guidelines for evaluation follow-up[72] and then apply these to the organisational structure and business processes of IOM.

131 UNEG distinguishes a number of 'up-stream key factors' for the use of evaluation, three of which deal with the quality of evaluation and its timing.[73] The fourth factor is: 'Appropriateness of practices in the management response, dissemination and use of evaluation findings.'

132 UNEG sees five 'pre-conditions' for effective evaluation follow-up and management response.[74] The first two deal with, respectively, the planning and implementation of evaluations, which are not subject of this study since they belong to the realm of evaluation quality management.

133 The third 'pre-condition' is the management response to evaluation. Judging by the documents reviewed in the course of the study, the format and content of **management response** at IOM meets UNEG suggestions.[75] These include:

- clearly defined roles and responsibilities in dealing with management response and follow-up to be communicated to all key evaluation stakeholders, including managers, officers and governing bodies;

- an agreed deadline to be established by which management or other key stakeholders should provide their formal response to the evaluation;

- a focal point to be nominated by management to coordinate the management response;

- if managers lack experience in preparing a management response, the evaluation unit to provide support;

- management responses to indicate whether recommendations are accepted, partially accepted or rejected. In case of the latter, the reason(s) for the rejection to be provided. If not included (as should be) in the recommendation itself, the response matrix to set out the action to be taken, the responsible entity and the time frame; and

- management responses to be disclosed in conjunction with the evaluation.

---

[72] *Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations*, UNEG, New York, 2010.
[73] Ibid, pp. 2.
[74] Ibid, pp. 3.
[75] Ibid, pp. 78: 'elements for good practice for management responses' in UNEG Good Practice Guidelines, pp. 7-8.

134 The last two UNEG preconditions[76], deal with, respectively:

- **Disclosure,** i.e., the disclosure and publication (electronic or printed) of the evaluation, including management responses, evaluation summaries or other knowledge sharing/learning products.

- **Follow-up**, i.e., formal and informal processes to promote and verify that evaluation-based learning takes place within the organisation and among partners; management reports on the status of implementation of recommendations.

135 In respect of **disclosure**, it is important to release the evaluation report, the management response and a plan of action with regard to the recommendations to IOM staff, counterparts, and other stakeholders (donors in particular) in the intervention or thematic area evaluated. Release of evaluation reports to project/programme beneficiaries, the media and the public may be useful or meet with interest in some cases.[77] This practice is currently in place, however with mixed results regarding the publication of management responses and action plans.

136 UNEG holds that transparent management response and follow-up processes increase the implementation rate of the recommendations.[8] UNEG Standard 1.5 requires the evaluation function to ensure that follow-up and regular progress reports are compiled on the implementation of the recommendations emanating from the evaluations already carried out, to be submitted to the Governing Bodies and/or Heads of organizations. While this may not be the practice for all evaluation functions in the UN system, all evaluation functions should consider implementing mechanisms that facilitate follow- up of evaluation recommendations.

> **Box 2: Follow-up Basics**
>
> The first thing about follow-up is: carry out what evaluations recommend. Objective evaluators with professional standards, good-quality reporting (see separate quality management study), and proper canvassing of all key stakeholders, yields evaluation recommendations that are SMART (i.e., specifically targeted, measurable during follow-up, achievable, relevant and time-bound). SMART recommendations, once adopted by management response, should subsequently be implemented and tested in practice. Without this mindset, there is no need for the Organisation to evaluate at all, other than for purposes of funding acquisition.
>
> The second thing about follow-up is enforcement. Although not specifically an IOM problem, many evaluation recommendations are not implemented because they do not suit staff, counterparts or other stakeholders for one reason or another, without them being called to task on it. This is not a matter of 'accountability' *per se*, but one of good management practice.

137 Regarding follow-up, UNEG considers it necessary for reporting on the implementation of evaluation recommendations to take place at regular intervals, in line with planning processes. Systematic follow-up had best involve:

- *Electronic platforms* able to generate reports and complete disaggregated analyses on the implementation across the organization, and facilitate access to evaluation information by all stakeholders.

- *Reporting* to the organisation's governing bodies and stakeholders on an annual or biannual basis for the purpose of accountability and as a spur to timely implementation of follow-up actions.

- *Discussions* with (staff, governing bodies and outside stakeholders) to ensure awareness of the findings and the actions planned or taken, build internal ownership and solicit stakeholder suggestions. Discussion will enable stakeholders to provide comments and suggestions for moving forward.

138 To facilitate learning and knowledge management UNEG considers as best practice: (i)

---

[76] UNEG holds that transparent management response and follow-up processes increase the implementation rate of the recommendations (Ibid, pp. 8).

[77] Obviously, release for public information purposes requires a management decision and careful handing by management, communications staff and the evaluation function.

dissemination of knowledge products such as actual evaluation report, an evaluation brief, an e-newsletter with a short summary, or other products; (ii) meetings and workshops to share tacit (or implicit) knowledge from evaluations; and (iii) communities of practice to create an enabling environment for the use of evaluations.

6. Recommendations

139 The conclusions set out in the Review Round-up (**Section 3.3**) and the Benchmarking Round-up (**Section 4.3**), as well as consideration of the demands on a follow-up mechanism suggest the following recommendations:

R1: As IOM's policy and the guidelines stress communication and dissemination of evaluation outcomes more than what to do with those outcomes. IOM is advised to establish a mechanism to ensure that:

- evaluation findings of a higher level enter into IOM's policies and strategies;
- lessons learned and best practice developed by IOM in one country or region, are both known and adopted in other countries and regions;
- evaluation findings on a relevant number of projects in a country or region are aggregated into management information useful for and accessible to IOM managers for informed decision making.

R2: IOM has designated quality management and better use of evaluation, as well as enhanced follow-up on recommendation as issues requiring attention. Key factors for this are held to be the development of an evaluation culture and enhanced knowledge management within the Organisation. IOM is recommended to continue actively the identification and acquisition of funding for investment in capacity building and tools for information management in respect of monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

R3: Information management is part and parcel of effective monitoring and evaluation, with effectiveness depending largely on the ability to enforce management decisions based on M&E findings and recommendations regarding the implementation of IOM policies, strategies, programmes and projects. IOM is recommended to further develop its M&E data management system to enable it to track the implementation of evaluation recommendations in both the short-term (for operational management) and the longer term (for impact assessment).

R4: IOM is engaged in the establishment of a digital platform for M&E data management. Such a system can be 'stand-alone' or linked to existing IOM digital operational systems, such as PRIMA. IOM's digital M&E data management platform might further include managed access by selected stakeholders (both internal and external) to that database and the dashboard. IOM is recommended to seek technical advice on such linkage, stakeholder access and on the necessary information management and content management systems (MIS/CMS) from a reputable firm or consultant.

R5: The design and development of digital systems is difficult at best. Experience suggests that adapting existing systems (such as PRIMA) for an additional purpose it was not designed for, is fraught. Major bottlenecks concern the detailing of workflows and staff responsibilities, as well as levels of access. Relevant experience of other, similar organisations is likely to be useful. IOM is recommended to further map the experience of comparator organisations on this issue.

R6: All comparator organisations included in the study have something to offer in this regard, especially those with a 'light' tracking system in place (ILO) or under development (UNHCR), as well those with a large number of projects in many countries underway at any one time (CoE). During the study, interlocutors for all organisations – including these three – indicated a willingness to be of assistance. IOM is recommended to look into the systems of these three organisations in particular.

R7: Any digital system for tracking implementation of evaluation recommendations for the purpose of managerial control and knowledge management chosen, would require detailed 'business processes', laying down the detailed steps to be carried out by the system. IOM is recommended to seek further advice on drawing up such business processes as a necessary start for digital system development.

R8: The business processes (also detailing the duties of each actor) would have to be based on a defined follow-up mechanism for channelling M&E information flows. IOM is recommended to consider the follow-up mechanism (including estimated IOM Central Evaluation staff time requirements) set out in Annex 1.

R9: The business processes would include an estimate of the time involved in each task expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE). IOM is advised that, since the operational costs of the system would mainly consist of human resources, the number of FTEs involved would give a good indication of the mechanism's overall cost (exclusive of investment in system development and maintenance cost).

R10: IOM is advised that the pre-conditions for drafting the business processes include: (i) the finalised organisational structure for IOM, (ii) the mandates for all IOM departments, divisions and units involved in providing input for and operating the digital M&E system; and (iii) detailed job descriptions for all staff positions concerned.[78]

R11: As to the additional human resources necessary for IOM Central Evaluation and IOM's knowledge management (KM) function to operate the roles in the proposed follow-up mechanism in the proposed follow-up mechanism, IOM is advised that 4 FTE (full-time equivalent) might suffice: (i) one dashboard manager, (ii) one KM officer; (iii) two (junior) officers to prepare extracts, compile findings and recommendations for, respectively: the KM officer, as input for the dashboard manager, and briefs for IOM's hierarchy.[79]

---

[78] Although defining business processes could be done by a single person, such would not be ideal. Better would be to establish a team of three persons: (i) an IOM staff member with knowledge of the Organisation's internal functioning and HR management; (ii) an IT-system developer specialised in MIS/CMS; and (iii) a person with a background in public admin/civil service reform and experience of vetting/drawing up unit mandates and staff job descriptions.

[79] This estimate assumes that the staff running PRIMA would agree to take on some additional tasks related to linkage with the M&E platform's MIS/CMS arrangements.

Annex 1: Proposed Follow-up Mechanism

Legend: **CoM** [Chief of Mission]; **(D)CoS** [Chief of Staff], **DSPOP** [Director, Strategic Planning and Operational Performance]; FTE (Full-Time Equivalent: 50 weeks @ 40 hours); **HoD** (Head of Division); HR (Human Resources); **pm** (pro memoria); **RD** [Regional Director]; Regional M&E Officers (ROMEO).

Nº	Item	Type of Evaluation	Timing	Action	HR (in FTE)[80]	Quality Control	Endorsement	Option 2 – No Digital M&E Platform	Option 3 – [Option 1 amended]
1	Formal Entry of final version of Evaluation Report into digital platform[81]	All	Day 0	IOM Central Evaluation[82]	200	IOM Central Evaluation	n/a	Formal Entry of final version of Evaluation Report into Evaluation Repository	
2	Management Response – Draft	Centralised[83]	Day 30	IOM Central Evaluation	500	IOM Central Evaluation	DSPOP		
		Decentralised (internal)		CoM, RD	pm	ROMEO/IOM Central Evaluation	CoM/RD		
		Decentralised (external)		CoM, RD	pm	ROMEO/IOM Central Evaluation	CoM/RD		
3	Management Response – Approval	All	Day 45	(D)CoS	pm	n/a	n/a		
4	Dissemination (via digital platform) of evaluation report, management response, and follow-up instructions to stakeholders (with access), including	All	Day 50	IOM Central Evaluation/ROMEO/CoM	700	n/a	DSPOP/RD/CoM	Dissemination (by email) of evaluation report and management response to all stakeholders, including EOC	

---

[80] Estimate: for IOM Central Evaluation only. One FTE = 2,000 hours/year (50 working weeks @ 40 hours).

[81] It is assumed that a platform (database/dashboard) exists, either as an expansion of PRIMA or as a new standalone evaluation platform. It is further assumed that all the steps and evaluation reporting, including comments on draft reports, before adoption of the Final Evaluation Report have been entered into the digital platform. Business processes to be developed by the M&E Unit, endorsed by the Director, Strategic Planning and Operational Performance and approved by the (D)CoS.

[82] It is assumed that the M&E Unit will include a knowledge management (KM) function. If not, review by the KM officer will have to be inserted as a separate flow element.

[83] It is assumed that all thematic evaluations are centralised, and if not, require the fiat of the M&E Evaluation Unit. It is further assumed that all centralised evaluations are undertaken by independent, external evaluators.

Nº	Item	Type of Evaluation	Timing	Action	HR (in FTE)[80]	Quality Control	Endorsement	Option 2 – No Digital M&E Platform	Option 3 – [Option 1 amended]
	Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC)[84]								
5	Dissemination (by email) of evaluation report and management response to stakeholders (without access to digital platform)	All	Day 50	IOM Central Evaluation/ROMEO/CoM	800	n/a	DSPOP/RD/CoM		
6	Digital reminder of follow-up instructions to stakeholders (with access)	All	Day 80	IOM Central Evaluation/ROMEO/CoM	700	n/a	DSPOP/RD/CoM	By email: Reminder of follow-up instructions to stakeholders	
7	Request for Input for Half-yearly Report on the status of follow-up on evaluation recommendations	All	By 24 December and 30 June yearly	HoDs, CoMs and RDs, as appliable	pm	n/a	n/a		
8	Half-yearly Report on the status of follow-up on evaluation recommendations: ▪ Accepted: underway/planned ▪ Implemented ▪ Obsolete: overtaken by events ▪ Closed	Centralised	By 30 January and 30 July yearly	Responsible HoD, aggregated by IOM Central Evaluation	pm	Central Evaluation	DSPOP		
		Decentralised (internal)		Responsible CoM, through Regional Office, aggregated by IOM Central Evaluation	pm	Central Evaluation	DSPOP		Compilation by Regional Office (ROMEO); approval RD
		Decentralised (external)		Responsible RD, aggregated by IOM Central Evaluation	pm	Central Evaluation	DSPOP		
9	Comments (including 'traffic light flagging') on Half-yearly Reports to	All	By 31 March and 30 September yearly	Central Evaluation	1,300	n/a	DSPOP	Comments (incl. flagging) by email (to IOM Directors, RDs and CoMs	

---

[84] It is assumed that the evaluation process is overseen by an Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC), consisting of ranking IOM staff and reporting to the DG. The Head, M&E Unit to act as secretary of the EOC.

№	Item	Type of Evaluation	Timing	Action	HR (in FTE)[80]	Quality Control	Endorsement	Option 2 – No Digital M&E Platform	Option 3 – [Option 1 amended]
	digital platform (for stakeholders with access)								
10	Aggregation Report on outstanding 'flagged' recommendations to DG	All	30 days before each (normal) IOM Council Session	IOM Central Evaluation	1,800	DSPOP	(D)CoS		
11	Evaluation Summary Report to IOM Administration	All	60 days before each (normal) IOM Council Session	IOM Central Evaluation	1,500	DSPOP	(D)CoS		Inclusion of Evaluation Summary Report in other reports to IOM Council
12	Closure of recommendation follow-up monitoring	Centralised	Day 730	IOM Central Evaluation	500	n/a	DSPOP		
		Decentralised (internal0	Day 550						
		Decentralised (external)	Day 730						

NB: Diagram overleaf

Proposed Follow-up Mechanism – Diagram

1
Formal Entry of final version of Evaluation Report into digital platform

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Day 0	M&E Unit	M&E Unit	n/a

2
Management Response – Draft

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Day 30	M&E Unit	M&E Unit	DSP&OP
	CoM, RD	M&E Unit	DSP&OP
	CoM, RD	M&E Unit	DSP&OP

3
Management Response – Approval

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Day 45	(D)CoS	n/a	n/a

4
Dissemination (via digital platform) of evaluation report, management response, and follow-up instructions to stakeholders, including EOC

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Day 50	M&E Unit	n/a	DSP&OP

5
Dissemination (by email) of evaluation report and management response to stakeholders (without access to digital platform)

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Day 50	M&E Unit	n/a	DSP&OP

6
Digital reminder of follow-up instructions to stakeholders (with access)

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Day 80	M&E Unit	n/a	DSP&OP

7
Request for Input for Half-yearly Report on the status of follow-up on evaluation recommendations

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Yearly, by 30 /01 & 30/06	(D)CoS	n/a	n/a

8
Half-yearly Report on the status of follow-up on evaluation recommendations

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Yearly, by 30 /01 & 30/06	Resp. HoD	M&E Unit	DSP&OP
	Resp.CoM, via RO	M&E Unit	DSP&OP
	Resp. RD	M&E Unit	DSP&OP

9
Comments (including 'traffic light flagging') on Half-yearly Reports to digital platform (for stakeholders with access)

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Yearly, by 31/03 & 30/09	M&E Unit	M&E Unit	n/a

10
Aggregation Report to on outstanding 'flagged' recommendations to DG

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
30 days before each (normal) IOM Council Session	M&E Unit	DSP&OP	(D)CoS

11
Evaluation Summary Report to IOM Administration

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
60 days before each (normal) IOM Council Session	(D)CoS	DSP&OP	(D)CoS

12-14
Closure of recommendation follow-up monitoring

TIMING	ACTION	QUALITY	ENDORSE
Day 730	M&E Unit	n/a	DSP&OP
Day 550	M&E Unit	n/a	DSP&OP
Day 730	M&E Unit	n/a	DSP&OP

Annex 2: Study Questions

The study ToR [Annex 5] specified a number of issues to be addressed and questions to be answered. These study questions and the related answers and observations are set out below.

№	Study Questions as per ToR	Answers/Observations
SQ1	What constraints hamper applying evaluation recommendations and findings in general?	The 2019/20 meta-evaluation identified: ■ lack of management and institutional commitment in the promotion of the use of evaluation; ■ lack of tracking mechanisms for the implementation of 'existing' recommendations; ■ reduced ownership of stakeholders during evaluations; and ■ scarcity of resources for evaluations. The 2019 MOPAN report on IOM found that: ■ IOM's evaluation function is nascent; ■ the central evaluation function has limited independence; ■ evaluation policy architecture is under development, but there are no rigorous quality assurance systems in place; ■ the evaluative evidence-base to inform planning and design is constrained; ■ evaluation culture is emerging, but there is limited accountability for follow-up; ■ knowledge management systems are tacit rather than formalised. The study found all these constraints to apply
SQ2	Can these constraints be ranked in terms of severity and frequency of occurrence?	1. The lack of an evaluation culture must be rated the single most important factor. Most of the interviews with IOM staff referred to this feature as an important reason for the limited accountability for follow up. 2. The lack of funding is the second most important issue, also because it can be seen as reflecting a lack of appreciation of the role of IOM in the management of migration word-wide. Member states should make evaluation part of IOM's core budget. To defray the cost of evaluation of donor-funded projects for accountability reasons, donors allocating a fixed percentage of the project budget for evaluation does not consider the reasonable minimum effort necessary for evaluators to form a picture of a project. Evaluation reports on individual projects are not cost-effective and invite subjective assessment. 3. Quality assurance of evaluation is the third most important issue. Sub-standard evaluation reporting invites contempt and management indifference to follow-up. It also yields insufficient return on the (considerable) cost of evaluation. 4. The quality of evaluation reporting is the fourth constraint. It affects the quality of the evaluative evidence-bases for planning and design. Without prejudice to the separate quality management study, formalisation of evaluation reporting (templates) and in-house knowledge management should offer remedies. The nascent character of IOM's evaluation function, the degree of its independence and the lack of a tracking mechanism for recommendations are not constraints as such, but temporary framework parameters that can be resolved.
SQ3	Does the fact that 90% of evaluations has been decentralised make a big difference in the eyes of implementors/managers?	It seems to do so, where headquarters staff is concerned. That factor is not important in the eyes of regional and country mission personnel that were interviewed. That said, this aspect is also faced by other organisations who have addressed it by introducing mandatory, standardised ToR

Nº	Study Questions as per ToR	Answers/Observations
		and reporting formats/templates (e.g., the European Commission and the Council of Europe).
SQ4	Does the sample of evaluations carried out in 2019/20 show much variation in the way their findings/recommendations were used?	The limited time available for the study and the typical duration of interviews conducted did not allow a detailed exploration of the actual follow-up given to findings/recommendations.
SQ5	If so, can these various ways be grouped in a meaningful way in terms of distilling best practice?	Not on the basis of available information gathered through documentation review and interviews conducted in the course of the study.
SQ6	To the extent that management responses (mandatory since Jan 2020) were prepared, have these indeed been used for programming and project design?	According to ranking interlocutors interviewed for the study, evaluation has produced more information for policy development, programming and design, since the introduction of the management response. The evidence for this is anecdotal rather than solid.
SQ7	If so, at what level predominantly: central, regional or country?	The study did not yield sufficient evidence to answer this question.
SQ8	How have the management responses contributed to increased institutional knowledge and learning?	The study did not yield sufficient information to formulate an answer to this question.
SQ9	Can examples of this be cited?	Idem
SQ10	Are IOM staff currently more aware of IOM's evaluation arrangements and tools than 2 years ago?	Without a survey (by e-mail) of IOM staff opinion, the present study cannot answer this question. The author is happy to conduct a survey amongst IOM staff, should this be deemed necessary.
SQ11	Has the introduction of the management response tool contributed to this greater awareness?	Idem
SQ12	Has the introduction of the management response tool resulted in specific instructions to staff/stakeholders at respectively, regional and country level?	None of the regional and country staff interviewed for the study referred to such instructions.
SQ13	Can examples be cited?	Not applicable (please see the answer to SQ12)
SQ14	In view of the projectised nature of IOM and the majority of evaluations being at project-level, how should the follow-up on evaluations take place (viz. steps in implementation and knowledge management at institutional level)?	Because of the relatively high fixed cost of evaluation of the typical IOM project, funded from a percentage of the project budget, evaluation of individual projects, is not tenable, also given the limited yield in terms of information for programme and project design. Decision making and follow-up could more fruitfully served by aggregated data at project level, fed by evaluation of a limited sample of projects.
SQ15	What are the ways in which to improve communication on evaluation in order to enhance use?	Please refer to Sections 6 and 7 of the present report, for recommendations on follow-up management.
SQ16	Thirty (30) % of evaluations in the period 2017-20 were ex post evaluations. Can it be determined to which extent the findings and recommendations of those evaluations have been applied in similar projects that came after those evaluated?	The study's revies of a sample of 20 evaluation reports [**Annex 4**] from the period 2017-2020, reviewed for this study contained little or no references to earlier evaluations.
SQ17	How can OIG/Evaluation, as is, realistically follow-up on all evaluations?	The total number of evaluation in the period 2017-2020 was just under 200 or 50/year. With a digital platform, consisting of data management and content management systems (MIS/CMS), a unit of 7 full-time personnel should be able to follow 50-60 evaluations/year at half-yearly intervals for up to 2 years from report completion. Estimated effort: 3 FTE. Base of estimate: UNICEF evaluation function.

Nº	Study Questions as per ToR	Answers/Observations
SQ18	Should there instead be a distinction between central level and decentralised evaluations?	It would seem more logical to distinguish between a limited number of report types: sector, thematic, programme and project. This applies if the individual decentralised projects can be evaluated on a sampling basis.
SQ19	Which, in that case, should be the steps at central level?	Please refer to Sections 6 and 7 of the present report.
SQ20	And which those regarding decentralised evaluation?	Please refer to Sections 6 and 7 of the present report.
SQ21	What can IOM learn from other organisations with similar structures?	▪ Evaluation on a sampling basis and keeping the number of evaluations at manageable levels [CoE and UNDP]. ▪ Digital management platforms (database/dashboard) [ILO (AMRS) and UNICEF]. ▪ Digital platform with two cores: (a) knowledge management and (b) e-learning [CoE]. ▪ Specific software for accountability and e-learning [CoE and UNICEF]. ▪ Aggregation of data from decentralised evaluations [UNDP and WFP]. ▪ 'Light' version of evaluation and follow-up system [ILO and UNCHR. The latter is currently development a 'light' system]. ▪ Knowledge management system [CoE, UNICEF and WFP] ▪ Arrangements for 'closure' on follow-up tracking [CoE and UNICEF]. ▪ Ensuring evaluation credibility and follow-up through quality management of evaluation reporting [UNDP]. ▪ 'Flagging' of pending management responses and delayed follow-up action [UNDP and UNICEF (traffic-light system].
SQ22	What may be expected of the follow-up on recommendations on IOM projects addressed to other stakeholders (other IOM departments/offices, donors, governments, beneficiaries, migrant communities))?	IOM management and the evaluation function already in place should be able to follow and influence the degree of follow-up on recommendations with a measure of control. Where donors, beneficiaries and migrant communities are concerned, follow-up management can only be advisory in nature. This advisory impact depends to a large extent on the evolution of IOM as the UN body with agenda setting and migration management authority, as opposed to an emergencies-oriented organisation.
SQ23	What should be the ways of reporting on evaluation recommendations in a transparent, simplified way?	Please refer to Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the present report.
SQ24	What should the various roles and responsibilities within the follow-up mechanism – considering those existing – where OIG/Evaluation, ROMEOs, programme and evaluation managers, knowledge management hubs and evaluation steering/management committees are concerned?	Please refer to Sections 6 and 7 of the present report.

Annex 3: Benchmarking Summary

The following table summarises an assessment of the evaluation use and follow-up mechanisms in place at eight comparator entities (seven UN organisations and the Council of Europe. The information summarised in the table emanated from interviews with leading M&E staff at the various entities, as well as documents such as evaluation policies and guidelines published by those organisations.

Nº	Item	Comparator Organisations							
		CoE	*ILO*	*UNDP*	*UNESCO*	*UNHCR*	*UNICEF*	*UNIDO*	*WFP*
1	Evaluation function	DIO	EO	IEO	IOS	ES (12)	EO	IED	OEV
2	Centralised and decentralised evaluations	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both
3	Internal (Self-) and external evaluations	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both
4	Thematic evaluations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Relation evaluation to audit	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Some	No
6	Digital database/platform/dashboard	dash	Yes	ERC + dash	Yes	Not yet	Yes	Yes	COMET/APP
7	Management response	Yes	Yes	No	No	Preparation	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Follow-up tracking	Yes (TeamMate)	AMRS	Yes	Yes	Preparation	MRAI	MAP	Dialogue
9	Knowledge management	StoryLine	Yes	Yes	StoryLine	Design	Team (15)	Yes	WeLearn
10	System overhaul planning/ongoing	Yes (TeamMate)	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (2022)	Yes
	Remarks	UNEG Guidelines; off-the-shelf software	Internal AMRS; public i-eval Discovery	Follow-up tracking self-assessed as quite good	Evaluation and audit under IOS; platform under development	Opting for a light system [ILO, similar for IOM?]	Some audit procedures; EASY dashboard	MAP tracking under preparation	Platform and KM under overhaul

Legend:

AMRS – Automated Management Response System (ILO)

BI – Business Intelligence

COMET/APP – Country Office Tool for Managing Effectively (too)/Annual Performance Planning (WFP)

MRAI – Management Response Action Implementation (UNICEF)

Annex 4: Sampled Evaluation Reports

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
1	*Beyond Bentiu Protection of Civilian Site (POC) Youth Reintegration Strategy* – Final Evaluation (internal)	RO Nairobi, IOM and UNDP, Dec 2019	▪ *Project objective*: Complex project/objectives, linked to youthful IDP integration in South Sudan communities. ▪ *Findings*: Report heavy on evaluation procedure. Evaluation included quite a large survey of beneficiaries. Well-presented 'key lessons', some of which may be useful, also outside the RO Nairobi region. ▪ *Recommendations*: Nine recommendations of a – *prima facie* – somewhat abstract nature. None of the recommendations are specifically targeted or time-bound, which makes follow-up difficult. The recommendations may be useful at a higher level, and in the design by RO Nairobi of future, similar activities in this area. ▪ *Follow*-up: No statements as to the tracking of implementation of the evaluation's recommendations.
2	*Combating trafficking in human beings in Burkina Faso through the strengthening of the national framework and capacities in identifying victims and improving data collection* – Mid-term Evaluation Report (internal)	RO Dakar, IOM Burkina Faso, Nov 2017	▪ MTE, conducted by the RO Dakar M&E Officer. **Focus**: effectiveness, based on an assessment of the intervention logic through interviews in the capital. Intervention logic of good quality content-wise, unusual presentation. ▪ *Objective*: To contribute to IOM project team's strategic approach by providing them with a critical, external assessment looking at the quality and extent of the results achieved so far. ▪ Somewhat confused presentation of findings, conclusions and recommendations. E.g., 2 of 3 conclusions are really recommendations formulated in a general way. ▪ *Recommendations*: Four in total, none of them timebound, although 2 are addressed to the project team to be dealt with before project's end. The other 2 recommendations are specific, but not time-bound, and concern project design issues for follow-up by RO Dakar and IOM hq. ▪ *Follow-up*: No statements on the tracking the implementation of evaluation recommendations after closure of the project.
3	*Consolidate Protection Assistance Services to Vulnerable Migrants Along Migratory Routes in Egypt (Case)* – Dec 2017 - Dec 2019 (external)	RO Cairo – Pugh, Sarah Dr, Jul 2020	▪ External evaluation of an EU-funded, IOM implemented project on AVRR, with beneficiaries in Egypt and Sudan. ▪ *Project objective*: To strengthen and develop third countries' institutional capacity to provide adequate reception and international protection and manage mixed migration flows along migratory routes in Egypt.. ▪ *Evaluation objective*: To assess if the project has achieved the intended results by analysing project objectives, results and activities, with considerations to the overall objective of the project. ▪ *Recommendations*: At total of 15, none of which specifically targeted or time-bound. Seven recommendations address M&E issues (logframe, indicators, etc.). The remainder concern plausible efficiency and effectiveness related issues. ▪ *Follow-up*: The follow-up of the recommendations should be able to be dealt with by RO Cairo, with support from IOM hq (available finance). **Note**: The report is well-written and presented, and meets the quality standards for EU-financed projects, with the exception of the requirements with regard to recommendation targeting and timing.
4	*Consolidation of Sri Lanka Biometrics Project: Biometrics Phase 3* – Project	RO Bangkok - ROMEO, Jun 2018	▪ *Project objective*: To support the improvement of the previously introduced systems and procedures in identity management, ▪ *Evaluation Purpose*: 'The findings and recommendations are intended for use by the project and senior management of IOM Sri Lanka, IOM Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP), and the Government of Australia. These findings and recommendations will be used for similar project design and implementation in the future.' **Project objective**: support the

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
	Evaluation Report (internal)		improvement of the previously introduced systems and procedures in identity management (a critical issue in Sri Lanka border management that has received IOM support (three phases, of which the present project is third, since 2013). ▪ **_Findings and conclusions_**: Very good to excellent scores on all 5 main criteria and one additional one criterion (connectedness). ▪ **Recommendation**s: At total of 3, all addressed at IOM Sri Lanka, without time-bounds. All recommendations are of a practical nature the follow-up of which can be done by the CoM. The first recommendation is of interest to other IOM-implemented projects of a similar nature elsewhere.

5	_Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean_ – Ex-Post Evaluation Report (internal)	RO San José – Morgan, Janet, Mar 2019	▪ **_Project objective and purpose_**: 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.
			   ○ Government of selected Caribbean countries increase engagement with diaspora in Canada, the Netherlands, United Kingdom and United States
			   ○ 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.
			   ○ Caribbean countries are more equipped to channel remittances to contribute towards development.
			   ○ Participating countries have the tools necessary to encourage the establishment of additional SMEs with the diaspora.
			 ▪ **_Evaluation objective_**: The main objectives of the evaluation were to:
			   ○ Assess how the activities have led to the achievement of the project results and objectives.
			   ○ 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.
			   ○ Provide a clear understanding of whether the project's objectives have been met as well as to
			   ○ measure impact and to identify lessons learnt.
			 ▪ **_Findings_**: Generally positive assessment of the project, based on the five main criteria, plus cross-cutting issues. However, this positive picture (with some negative aspects) is not reflected in the large number of very detailed recommendations/lessons learned.
			 ▪ **_Recommendations_**:
			   ○ 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 match project realities more closely.
			   ○ 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.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			o 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.
			o 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.
			o IOM should factor in contextual and social and economic differences of countries in project design and budgeting decisions.
			o Project design should consider some aspect of risk management that includes alternative actions in case of staff turnover due to elections, promotions or migrations.
			o 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.
			o 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 groundwork and have laid the foundation for this activity to occur.
			o Project conceptualizers should consider issues of quality and product to cost ratio issues more closely when creating budgets.
			o 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.
			o 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**
			o 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?
			o 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.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			o 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.' o 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. o 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. o 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. o 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. o 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. o In hindsight '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. o 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. o Bring important stakeholders to the table that have direct connection with the diaspora like the Ministry of Communities in Guyana. o The next generation of the diaspora was practically left out of project design and conceptualization. The was an issue raised by several stakeholders. ▪ *Follow-up*: there are no indications as to follow-up with regard to implementation of evaluation recommendations, which are detailed, but not specifically targeted or time-bound. **Note**: This – and other reports in the sample – makes clear that there work to be done about reporting standardisation and the briefing of evaluators. It is doubtful that an evaluation of such detail is useful for policy makers/Chiefs of Missions. However, for the interested IOM staff there are a lot of pointers for project design.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
6	*Enhancing capacities to fight trafficking in persons in Niger* – Final Evaluation Report (internal)	RO Dakar – IOM Niger, Feb 2021	■ *Project objectives*: to contribute to enhance and strengthen the Government of Niger' capacities to fight human trafficking and to improve comprehensive services for victims of trafficking (VOTs). The revised specific objectives of the Project were to: 　○ Improve comprehensive services for VoTs in Niger through the establishment of a shelter (revised) for VOTs in Zinder. 　○ Strengthen anti-trafficking in persons legal framework by developing a Referral Mechanism, followed by trainings of key stakeholders. Establish regulations and monitoring committees. 　○ Increase awareness of human trafficking and risk factors among target populations. ■ *Evaluation purpose*: to assess the progress of the project towards achieving its objectives and expected results in terms of support to the Government of Niger in the strengthening the national institutional framework for identification and assistance to victims, as well as awareness of the general population to the risks of human trafficking. ■ *Findings and conclusions* (summary): 　○ The project clearly supported national strategies and contributed to the achievement of key elements of the National Action Plan to combat human trafficking 2014-2018. 　○ The MRRM contributed to a greater coherence between various projects implemented by IOM Niger in terms of capacity-building, protection and counter-trafficking. 　○ The PMU was able to adopt effective strategies to implement the project in coordination with the ANLTP/TIM. 　○ The resources used have been adequately converted into results. 　○ The impact of the assistance provided to beneficiaries in the shelter and/or reintegration was direct and tangible. 　○ The impact of the assistance provided to beneficiaries in the shelter and/or reintegration was direct and tangible. 　○ The new synergies and collaborations documented through the evaluation demonstrate that the project has fostered durable linkages with and between local partners and structures. ■ *Recommendations* (for IOM Niger): 　○ During the project design phase, actively engage state partners in the development of the proposal, workplan, and budget, and strengthen the results matrix by including qualitative indicators for the outcomes. Furthermore, plan mitigation measures to avoid delays in delivery, and develop a formal accountability framework for project partners. Finally, integrate a sustainability strategy/handover as integral parts of the of the project workplan. 　○ During the implementation phase, prioritize activities and methodologies designed to capacitate the partners durably. To ensure that key deliverables are maintained on track, and key mechanisms, such as the committees, continue to perform as planned, consider deploying a technical advisor or a liaison officer to provide ongoing support and monitoring. Finally, maintain full oversight of financial monitoring and expenditures, and support state partners in acquiring accounting, monitoring and project management capacities. 　○ Discuss with other partners the necessity to respect existing compensation grids, and communicate these guidelines to the state partners prior to the start of the project. Ensure that compensations are understood, by transparently divulging the information prior to the project start, and integrating it as part of the project budget and accountability framework. 　○ To strengthen project's governance and root it into local structures, support multi- stakeholders/multi-disciplinary governance models (e.g., mixed committees with state and non-state members, representatives of various NGOs and groups including vulnerable and at-risks persons). Similarly, privilege community-led sensitization approaches.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			○ Adopt a more holistic approach regarding direct assistance and reintegration assistance within projects, to provide a continuum of services to VOTs who return to the region Zinder. Consider working with communities most at risks, as well as humanitarian and relief partners present in those communities, to develop livelihood projects that will help VOTs return with dignity, and stabilize communities by offering viable alternatives to migration.
			▪ *Recommendations* (for counterpart entity):
			○ Acknowledge the synergies between projects implemented by different partners (e.g., IOM, UNODC, UNICEF and others) and proactively divulgate information regarding projects supporting the ANLTP/TIM to avoid duplications, surprises, or confusion among partners.
			○ Assign adequate human resources to the implementation of project activities to ensure that results are delivered. For instance, ensure that the committees are functioning and provide the level of oversight for which they were created. Should concerns emerge regarding the capacity of the Agency to deliver on simultaneous projects, discuss these concerns with partners to rapidly adapt the workplan or obtain additional support.
			○ Prioritize community-led awareness raising activities, and if possible, use the DRPE village committee structure to conduct sensitization campaigns and activities in the future.
			○ Inform IOM and other partners of the resource mobilization efforts made to achieve the objectives of the National Action Plan against trafficking in persons, and ensure that the lessons learned during the implementation of the 2014-2018 National Action Plan are well integrated into the planning of the next Plan.
			▪ *Follow-up*: Most recommendations relate to the design of future projects. No indication of tracking of follow-up on these recommendations.
7	*Enhancing the Migration Evidence Base for the Development of Tanzania* – Final Evaluation Report (internal)	IDF – RO Nairobi – Sanga, Luhuvilo, Dar es Salaam, undated	▪ *Project objective*: To remedy the challenge of lack of data on current migration patterns for evidence-based policy making in Tanzania, through better understanding and increased knowledge on Tanzania's migration.
			▪ *Evaluation objective*: to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its results in relation to the targets set out in the project documents: 5 main criteria; but no info on impact and lessons learned.
			▪ *Scope*: the whole duration of project implementation, including no-cost extensions (2013 – 2017); activities in Tanzania, Kenya and the United Kingdom; respondents: government stakeholders, private sector, academia, research institutions civil society and DPs.
			▪ *Conclusions*:
			○ Relevance: good – concept and planning
			○ Effectiveness: largely good – with some outputs not contributing to planned outcomes
			○ Efficiency: adequate
			○ Impact: not covered in conclusions
			○ Sustainability: promoting national ownership and building national capacities
			▪ *Recommendations* for IOM:
			○ Baseline survey to be conducted before the start of any project; this will enable the IOM to set realistic targets for any upcoming project.

№	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			o Define deliverables and impact (objective) indicators in terms of submission rather than approval.
			o The anticipated risk should be incorporated in project design to enable effective implementation of the project and achievement of intended deliverables.
			▪ *Recommendations* for the Government:
			o Accelerate the process of taking over more responsibilities as a service provider, with the IOM working as a supporting partner, increasing own budgets, especially for updating the migration profile and for launching the web portal.
			o Undertake a review of experience accumulated to date in developing the migration profile to obtain greater understanding of factors at play in the successes and shortcomings: what motivates the diaspora and how to improve the engagement of diaspora and other stakeholders.
			▪ Recommendations appear plausible, but are not time-bound. Follow-up should be possible in the case of all 5 recommendations. Onus: RO Nairobi and CoM Tanzania.
8	*Extracting Learning from Evaluations of Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVR(R)/PARA) Projects and Programmes –* Synthesis Evaluation (internal)	IOM/OIG Evaluation – IHESG, Jul 2020	▪ *Overall objective of the study*: to examine the evolving knowledge on and operational base of the AVR(R)/PARA interventions in terms of institutional approaches, evidence collection and analysis, including good practices and recommendations, with particular attention to the following objectives:
			o To strengthen evidence-based learning in AVR(R)/PARA,
			o To determine whether the strategic efforts and tools put in place by the AVRR Unit address the most frequent evaluation recommendations, and
			o To inform the AVRR Unit about possible programming adjustments based on common trends, gaps, lessons learned, and good practices identified.
			▪ *Specific study objectives*:
			o Identify trends and gaps in terms of relevance and effectiveness of the assistance provided that appear in most of the reviewed evaluations related to AVR(R)/PARA approach including at the level of findings and recommendations,
			o Capture knowledge, lessons learned, and good practices identified across the evaluations,
			o Identify design and implementation weaknesses in AVR(R)/PARA programmes and key factors that may explain them with regards to either return or reintegration,
			o Make recommendations on how to improve evaluations of AVR(R)/PARA programming, and
			o Provide key recommendations to improve programming based on the synthesis in terms of project development and resource mobilization.
			▪ *Scope*: a total of 63 AVR and AVRR reports published since 1987 it was decided that a sample including 40 of the most recent reports would be sufficient, thereby covering the period 2008–2020. Two reports published at the start of the exercise were then added, bringing the total up to 42 reports
			▪ *Findings*:
			o Relevance: the different types of support provided by IOM under the AVRR projects are relevant to the needs of the returning migrants, as well as those of the donors who fund these projects.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			o Effectiveness: From a global perspective and considering the entire scope covered by each report, IOM has achieved a good level of effectiveness, higher than the overall average suggests. o Efficiency: he majority of reports (55 per cent) have therefore a rating of less than two, indicating that they only address partially the question related to efficiency o Sustainability: the issue of sustainability has probably been the most challenging aspect of the reintegration process. On one hand, some reports address the fact that there was no accepted definition of sustainability before the issuance of the recent guidelines, while other reports (from donors) looked at the sustainability of return (and avoiding re-migration) instead of looking at the sustainability of the reintegration process. o Impact: Generally, the impact is positive for the overall AVRR process, and sometimes it is critical and clearly lifesaving. Given the variety of situations and contexts, the impact is widely positive. ▪ **Overall Conclusion**: o The reports show a constant evolution in both the concepts related to AVRR, but also in the operationalization of AVRR. With an increasingly complex international scenario regarding migration, IOM has shown a good level of flexibility and adaptability and has been responding well to the evolving needs of the new complex migration environment. In recent years however, a strong push for the institutional reinforcement of AVRR has led to the publication and roll-out of critical guidance such as the Integrated Approach to Reintegration, the Framework for AVRR and the Reintegration Handbook o Most of the groundwork towards defining conceptually sustainable reintegration, developing the related policy, providing the tools to establish an evidence base of results, and supporting management functions at the M&E level appear to be gradually put in place for AVRR. There is no doubt that IOM is not the organization it was ten years ago, and it has adapted its work in the field of AVRR accordingly as illustrated in this synthesis report. Institutional changes by joining the UN, the approval of the Global Compact for Migration, an evolving and intensifying migration scenario across a wider range of countries, and a more mature reflection on the nature, mandate and objectives of the Organization have allowed IOM to be well positioned to advocate for harmonization of the AVRR procedures with the international community while at the same time providing operational guidance to further enhance its performance in providing AVRR services. o Certainly, there remain a number of challenges, including the difficult balance between the donor-driven supply side approach to AVRR and the migrants' needs-driven, demand side for sustainable reintegration, which will hopefully become an increasingly accepted model for AVRR. Critical partnerships will need to be established to collectively contribute to the objectives of AVRR for the assistance to migrants across the many contexts and countries in the world. IOM has the tools and experience to address the challenge of a new generation of increasingly complex and sophisticated AVRR/PARA interventions and maintain the adequate balance between high-level advocacy and flexible and effective field-based operations. ▪ **Follow-up**: Not applicable (no recommendations).
9	*Improving Labour Migration Management in Belize* – Ex-Post Evaluation Report (internal)	RO San José, - ROMEO, Feb 2019	▪ **Project objective and outcome**: The project's overall objective was to contribute to improved labour migration management in Belize. The Government of Belize (GoB) has taken steps to implement the Temporary Work Permit Programme (TWPP) framework that promotes labour migration in the agriculture sector in Belize. ▪ **Evaluation Objective**: To determine whether the project has achieved its intended outcomes and outputs, as described in the results framework [based on the five main criteria + cross-cutting: gender and human rights-based approach). Targeted audience: **IOM Belize** and **IDF**.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			▪ *Findings*: The project did not achieve its intended outcome (effectiveness, impact) and sustainability is questionable. Efficiency of implementation encountered challenges. Limited mainstreaming on gender. Positive contribution to human-rights promotion. In summary: ○ stakeholder engagement in the implementation largely secured the project accomplishments ○ the GoB did not develop a TWPP; ○ limited dissemination of project publications; and ○ the project addressed a need, but not necessarily a GoB priority. ▪ *Recommendations*: ○ **The IOM Mission to engage with the GoB to promote the development of a TWPP**. This project experience confirms the fundamental interest in the agriculture sector and need for a TWPP. This can be best harnessed in the policy options document. Current and future projects should build upon it to develop a TWPP. ○ **Improve dissemination of project** publications. For future projects, it is recommended to consider a strategic and efficient distribution plan of project publications, ensuring that key government officials, as well as other stakeholders, involved in the development receive a copy of each publication. ▪ *Follow-up*: No indications regarding follow-up tracking, but suggestion that the evaluation recommendations may be of use to future projects in this field. **Note**: This evaluation was carried out 20 months after project completion, with many relevant potential interlocutors no longer available.
10	*Improving Information Management and Planning Capacities of Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and Migration* – Final Evaluation Report (external)	RO Vienna – IOM Serbia, Mar 2020	▪ *Project objective*: To contribute to improving access to Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and Migration (SCRM) services through strengthening the monitoring, coordination and planning capacity of SCRM, both at the central and the local level through the enhanced information management system. Budget: CHF 70,000, funded by the Swiss State Secretariat for Migration (SEM). ▪ *Evaluation objective*: To assess the processes, products and achievements made to draw lessons that will inform the development of the next phases of similar projects. Moreover, this evaluation aims to assess how sustainable the achievements of this intervention are likely to be in reaching its outcomes and the objectives. The donor will use the findings of the evaluation to assess results achieved and value for money, and IOM will use the results to inform future programming [five main evaluation criteria + crosscutting (gender and human rights). ▪ *Findings*: Overall positive, with malfunctions in the Beneficiaries Database. Gender mainstreamed to some extent and beneficiary institution reporting now contributing to human rights of asylum seekers. ▪ *Recommendations*: ○ To strategize on how best to proceed with the development of the Beneficiaries Database based on the SRS document, considering the information generated from the previous work and the malfunctions of the previous version (e.g.: correcting programme codes from the previous version might not solve the malfunctions and could take much more time than creating new codes and version of the database). ○ The developed Beneficiaries Database within a fully functional SCRM IMS should be is in line with relevant EU and national legislation on data protection principles.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			- Organising a coordination meeting with the participation of SCO, EU representative, IOM and SCRM in order to present the achievements made under this initiative and the way it contributed to wider EU-funded initiatives. - Organising of broader array of capacity building activities on both central and local level on the provision of protection-related services and pertinent reporting through unified SCRM IMS (from local-level data entry, its processing etc.) is highly recommendable. ▪ *Follow-up*: No indication with regard to follow-up tracking.
11	*Increasing National and Local Capacity for Peace Implementation in Colombia* – Final Results Evaluation Report (external)	RO Buenos Aires – González Torres, Paola A., Nov 2019	▪ A very detailed, but inaccessible, too long, wordy report (Google Translate?). No ExSum. Detailed recommendations for the six evaluation criteria. Summary recommendations towards report's end. ▪ **Objective**: Peacebuilding pro-jects to increase GOC presence in the territories and preparedness for the post- conflict period, implemented with technical assistance to the HCPC related to coordination and M&E. ▪ **Conclusions**: *Relevance*: 'the purpose of the initiative was fully established, the medium-term objectives (2), the short-term ones (3), the expected products (7), and by way of proposal the 11 provisional activities that would allow to achieve the 7 planned products were indicated.' (pp. 19). '..the activities of the project and their results are consistent with what was initially planned.' (pp. 20). The project responds effectively to the needs identified and the institutional demand. (pp. 21) *Effectiveness*: 'it is concluded that the project is effective with a high-performance level' – [9.2 on a ten-point scale] (pp. 44): '113% of the product goals are achieved, [as are] on average a 125% [of] outcome goals immediately.' (pp. 44). '.. expected immediate objectives are achieved.' (pp. 52). *Efficiency*: the project was moderately efficient (several reasons). Of note: The midterm evaluation carried out in April 2018 generated 5 recommendations and there is no evidence that measures have been proposed to incorporate them into the execution of the project as of that date (pp. 31). *Sustainability*: 'the project could be moderately sustainable with medium performance level' (pp. 47) *Transversal* (cross-cutting) issues: 'From the planning the relevance of the differential approach was raised. There is full evidence that at least 80% of supported lines benefited women, children, adolescents and young people, work issues with LGTBI community were incorporated and initiatives with indigenous communities were prioritized.' (pp. 50). Still, medium-level score on this criterion (pp. 53). ▪ **Recommendations** for IOM (pp. 54): 'About the theory of change and the logical model: implement one of the methodological guides available for its formulation, strengthen the identification of endogenous and exogenous conditions that are key to define the premises and assumptions, design the project risk matrix and to establish mitigation measures and select outcome indicators according to the defined objectives and population differential indicators. - Review the nature of the normative work of the United Nations System and based on this, strengthen the articulation and the level of achievements of this type of interventions. - To limit the transitory actions that are supported and define the moment in which the intermediate and final objectives are expected to be achieved, will allow to specify the appropriate moment to assess them. Establish as a commitment of the

№	Title	Provenance	Key Points

			government partners and especially in the face of government changes, that the sub-activities that arise on demand are duly supported and planned and that progress, products and results be reported periodically to IOM to facilitate control work.
			
			   ○ Design and implement the PM&E FC per project, which incorporates useful and practical tools facilitating periodic systematization and information analysis, additionally, establishing and complying with an archiving protocol and generating and updating the stakeholder matrix. Propose in the project proposal actions that guarantee management that are effectively achievable and guarantee continuity in the monitoring work and implement a tool to manage the actions for the fulfilment of the objectives.'
			
			▪ **Recommendations** for Government (pp. 54):
			   ○ 'Ensure the permanence of professionals until the knowledge generated is effectively transferred or establish and implement knowledge management strategies and institutionalize the actions.
			   ○ Incorporate activities of use and appropriation in information systems. Fulfil the purpose of SIIPO as a social control tool as planned in its design. To be continue with the strategy of incorporating territorial entities in the execution of local initiatives since it was a success factor.
			   ○ Incorporating private companies and universities into the initiatives that are being carried out could improve sustainability, insofar as they are less exposed to political fluctuations.
			   ○ It must be ensured that all documents produced by methodologies effectively developed are of a public nature to be used.
			   ○ Strengthening the harmonization between National and Local governments when there are changes, can improve the probability of success and sustainability.
			   ○ Establish conditions that guarantee the continuity of the actions given that the support granted by international governments is temporary and therefore must be conducive to a sustainable result.
			   ○ Include in the reports the information disaggregated by age, disability, displacement, ethnic origin, gender, belonging to a vulnerable group, rural area nationality or any social condition that is important to highlight. Strengthen the communications issue to massively disseminate the achievements made with the interventions, socialize the message and the progress in the implementation of the agreement.'
			
			▪ **Recommendations** for the Donor (pp. 54):
			   ○ 'Continue supporting the Implementation of the Peace Agreement in Colombia in the points of the agreement where the new government has effectively shown its commitment and where the sum of efforts is required because they are determinants of the conflict in Colombia: Integral Rural Reform, social, economic reinstatement and politics, Consumption with a focus on public health and in the Comprehensive System of Truth, Justice, Reparation and Non-Repetition (JEP and CEV especially).'
			
			Follow-up: No indications as to follow-up arrangements and the tracking of same.

12	*Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation of the Response to Cyclone Idai in Mozambique* (external)	IOM/OIG Evaluation – RO Pretoria, Dec 2020	▪ **Project Objective**: To support and complemented the GoM's efforts during the disaster preparedness, coordination, management and response to Cyclone Idai. ▪ **Assessment Objective and Scope**: Independent assessment of the collective humanitarian response to communities impacted by Cyclone Idai in Mozambique. The IAHE primary focused on the scale-up activation period 22/03-0/06/2019. ▪ **Assessment Methodology**: Four-weeks field visit to Mozambique and subsequently visited regional offices in Kenya and South Africa during September 2019. The evaluation used quantitative and qualitative methods; these included desk reviews,

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			interviews and direct observations. Total of 175 interviewees and a desk review of policy and strategy documents, evaluations, reviews, studies and relevant databases. Survey of 505 households
			Conclusions: Joint preparedness by the international agencies and INGC helped ensure that the immediate humanitarian needs were accurately anticipated. The initial assistance provided was relatively timely, despite delays in reaching many affected communities due to the weather conditions, the scale of needs, and difficulties accessing some of the most affected areas. Joint preparedness by the international agencies and INGC helped ensure that the immediate humanitarian needs were accurately anticipated. The initial assistance provided was relatively timely, despite delays in reaching many affected communities due to the weather conditions, the scale of needs, and difficulties accessing some of the most affected areas. The GoM geared up its response even before Cyclone Idai made landfall on March 14 and appealed for external support on March 19 after declaring a state of emergency. The international community responded with a Scale-Up activation, which proved to be a key contribution that helped to save lives and mitigate suffering for many of the estimated 1.85 million people who needed assistance. The rapid deployment of human resources and funding resulting from the scale-up activation provided the necessary additional response capacity.
			Recommendations
			o for *Mozambique Humanitarian Country Team*:
			R1: further improve preparedness, early warning and anticipatory action by supporting INGC, other government ministries and CSOs to strengthen capacities at national and community levels.
			R2: develop and implement an engagement and capacity-building strategy for civil society stakeholders to enable them to play a more effective role in humanitarian action.
			R3: use the results of this IAHE, and other relevant lessons learned, to inform advocacy and resource mobilization strategies during future disaster responses to help ensure that the humanitarian community is supporting the priority needs of affected communities.
			o for *Emergency Directors Group*:
			R4: improve information management and communication systems for the assessment and monitoring data needed to provide a real time overview of the priority needs of affected communities.
			R5: ensure that there is an adequate roster of cluster coordinators and information management staff with the necessary skills, gender balance, experience and language abilities. Suitable incentives in place, so these personnel are available for a deployment duration that ensures adequate continuity and optimized value-added for clusters.
			R6: improve coordination and engagement with the private sector with the timely deployment of a private sector coordinator having relevant experience in large- scale disasters. This should be supported by a roster of staff members who are trained and experienced individuals.
			R7: strengthen and improve the decentralized humanitarian leadership coordination model to provide more effective support during a large-scale disaster event. This is especially critical in such countries as Mozambique, in which the government typically decentralizes decision-making to the affected areas during a disaster response.
			o for *IASC Operational Policy and Advocacy Group*:
			R8: capture and share lessons for clusters and replicate as appropriate (including in other clusters) to improve preparedness and achieve a more consistent and integrated performance.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			R9: require each global cluster to carry out After-Action Reviews within six months of the Scale-Up activation. These AARs should systematically consider the users' (cluster members, HCT) feedback and generate an action plan that promotes continuous improvement using the lessons learned. Similar inter-agency learning reviews should be routinely conducted for inter-agency assessment coordination cells.
			R10: improve the relevance and value of future IAHEs of Scale-Up activation responses. Improvements could include the systematic inclusion of household surveys to assess the collective outcomes and give a meaningful voice to affected communities; assessing anticipatory actions; and using proxy indicators to assess cost effectiveness to better understand options for prioritizing limited resources.
			○ For *Emergency Relief Coordinator*:
			R11: develop guidance for Humanitarian Country Teams, supported through the deployment of technical specialists, to help with the development of multi-sector performance benchmarks for responses when there is a Scale-Up activation. This will help track overall performance and better inform decision-making.
			R12: ensure that humanitarian and early recovery needs are adequately analysed and communicated in a timely way so that support by the international community is adapted to priorities of affected communities during successive phases of the response. Based on lessons learned from the response to Cyclone Idai, improvements are needed more at the multi-sectoral level than at the level of individual clusters.
			○ For *Global Protection Cluster*:
			R13: use the launch of its revised global strategic framework to clarify its role in responding to varying disaster scenarios, including sudden-onset natural disasters.
			Follow-up: No indications as to follow-up arrangements and the tracking of same.
13	*IOM's Migration Crisis Operational Framework (MCOF) – Thematic Evaluation (internal)*	IOM/OIG, Mar 2019	▪ **Project objective**: The MCOF was developed based on IOM's operational experiences, in particular the Libyan crisis response in 2011, and in compliance with IOM's mandate, the 12-point strategy, and other internal policies, frameworks, strategies, guidelines and standard operating procedures (SOPs).
			▪ **Evaluation objective**: assesses the International Organization for Migration's (IOM) overall performance in applying the Framework in crises with mobility dimensions, explores the development of IOM's technical expertise for managing it, analyses MCOF's relevance to IOM's mandate, operational responses and to new developments in the humanitarian and development fields, and examines the internal synergies and institutional steps taken for an effective and sustained use of this Framework as a key decision-making and management tool for the Organization's comprehensive response to crises (before, during and after). The evaluation also explores the challenges of applying the MCOF, and lessons learned and best practices. The evaluation highlights the strategic, institutional and operational relevance of the MCOF for IOM at the global, regional and national levels.
			▪ **Conclusions**: 'The MCOF remains an institutionally and strategically relevant document for the Organization. While the Framework has been found to be an effective tool in the few cases where it has been applied, greater efforts are still required to increase its operational use, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcomes and impact.'
			▪ **Recommendations**: 'Moving forward, this evaluation recommends a reflection around two options that emerged from the global MCOF analysis and the two cases studies (Libya and South Sudan). **Option one** is, in consultation with ROs and DOE (Department of Operations and Emergencies), to require COs, within a specific timeframe, to develop or adapt existing strategic plans for crisis response informed by the application of the MCOF. **Option two** is to maintain the MCOF mainly as an institutional tool/reference

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			guide for comprehensive, coherent and synergetic operational responses and strategic planning, and for other purposes, including donor relations. Once updated, the MCOF should be shared and discussed with Member States, as appropriate.' **Note**: The paper does not indicate a preference for either of these two options.
			▪ **Follow-up**: 'Given the evolvements internationally in the humanitarian and developments fields, such as IOM joining the UN system in 2016 and the current changes underway in how the UN development system works, as well as IOM's commitments since the adoption of the MCOF, this internal reflection and update of the Operational Framework is needed. This is especially the case if the Organization is to continue being at the forefront of operational, research, policy and advocacy efforts when it comes to addressing the mobility dimensions of crises.'
14	*National Disaster Consortium Programme Evaluation Report (2015-2019)* (external)	RO Bangkok – NDC, Mar 2020	Final evaluation report covering a DfID-funded programme (Multi-year Humanitarian Programme for Natural Disaster Preparedness, Response in Pakistan), started in Dec 2014 and at the time writing scheduled to end in Sep 2020 (6 years).
			▪ **Project Purpose**: Both immediate relief and early recovery interventions for shelter, food, non-food items, water and sanitation, livelihood and protection needs, depending on the emergency. [In addition] support developments in the UN and local civil society required for humanitarian responses to be more locally owned and effective in future, as well as effective monitoring and evaluation, targeted active research and piloting
			▪ **Evaluation objective**: Examine preparedness, emergency response and recovery interventions of the Natural Disaster Consortium (NDC) conducted under [this multi-organisation programme, led by IOM]. NDC being one of the largest pillars under programme, DFID intends to use the programme evaluation as knowledge base for future programming.
			▪ **Findings and conclusions**: High (75%) degree of satisfaction amongst beneficiaries with the support received.
			▪ **Recommendations**: A total of 15, based on 12 plausible lessons learned and well-described evaluation findings. All recommendations are addressed at IOM (RO Bangkok), IOM's consortium partners, the Pakistan authorities, as well as DfID, in one combination or another. The recommendations are not time-bound.
			▪ **Follow-up**: No statements as to the tracking of implementation of evaluation recommendations.
15	*On Shelter Interventions in Anbar Governorate, Iraq –* Evaluation Report (internal)	RO Cairo – MEAL, Mission Coordi-nation Unit, Nov 2018	Evaluation report prepared upon project completion by the IOM Iraq MEAL Unit, on behalf of the Shelter Team; beneficiary survey-based.
			▪ **Project objective**: he overall shelter objective in this project was to improve the living conditions of IDPs, returnees and Host-communities (HCs) through the rehabilitation and upgrade of critical shelters in informal sites.
			▪ **Evaluation objective**: To measure the level of satisfaction on shelter interventions in Anbar governorate. It documents lessons-learned for future interventions, primarily, for the USAID/OFDA 2018/19 project cycle.
			▪ IOM's shelter assistance is generally provided to individual households and entails the repair or construction of existing dwellings.
			▪ **Findings and conclusions**: general satisfaction with the quality of the support provided by IOM.
			▪ **Recommendations**: At total of 7, not specifically targeted or time-bound, all of a practical nature and with relevance for the design of future, similar projects providing shelter (in kind or cash).
			▪ **Follow-up**: No reflection on methods to track the implementation of the evaluation's recommendations.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
16	*Preventing Unsafe Migration from Albania towards EU Member States - Campaign 'Choose Opportunities: not Irregular Migration!'* (external)	RO Vienna – Nepravishta, Rea, Jul 2018	▪ ***Project objective***: continuation of a series of initiatives implemented by IOM Albania which aimed to inform and raise awareness among the public in Albania on the following issues: risks deriving from irregular migration, improve awareness on asylum, enhance information on the visa liberalization rules, and focus on alternatives to irregular migration. ▪ ***Evaluation objective***: To determine the extent to which the objectives of the campaign have been met, likelihood of sustainability, IOM´s institutional strengths and weaknesses, as well as need for further information and awareness campaigns in the future. ▪ ***Findings***: the project achieved the foreseen results and had a considerable effectiveness both in quantitative and qualitative terms. ▪ ***Recommendations***: ○ Create new programmes of regular migration that are beneficial for both migrants and States, including dedicated programmes for young people that want to study abroad. The condition to turn back in Albania upon completion of studies could be an option. ○ Promote and inform the wide population on existing ways to immigrate regularly. This serves to prevent irregular migration from the start, or reintegrate those people who have returned in the country after a negative experience. ○ Interviewees refer that administrative procedures for migrating regularly in the EU countries, especially for work reasons, are quite laborious and difficult to access. The same as in the German case, it is recommendable to provide administrative facilitations for the citizens coming from EU candidate countries, especially those with high migration rates. Bilateral agreements between countries could be one option ○ Demonstrating which are the available services and employment opportunities in the country which often are hard to be accessed by people living in remote and rural areas particularly stroke by poverty and unemployment; ○ There is still a need to continue conveying messages of self-commitment of the population on two sides: firstly, unlike common stereotype, European countries are not providing 'miracle' treatment to deprived people; and secondly, the country cannot develop if the people decide to leave and not concentrate the efforts herein. ○ Building hope inside the country: one way could be by showing positive stories of former migrants having returned in the country and started up initiatives or new businesses ○ To design reintegration programmes for returnees so that upon return people are not left alone and retry migration by all means. Reintegration programmes are highly recommendable in these cases, especially those targeting the most vulnerable groups ○ The upcoming National Strategy for Migration should be carefully coupled with a reasonable budget. If Albania is constantly losing its human capital, policies should focus on how to re-gain it. EU countries could also contribute to this process as part of the EU adhesion process ▪ ***Follow-up***: There are suggestions in the recommendations for follow-up, without specifying how. Most recommendations concern design of future campaigns or similar programmes in Albania and elsewhere.
17	*Preventing Unsafe Migration from Albania towards the EU*	RO Vienna – IOM Tirana, Dec 2020	The report concerns a follow-up on the previous project, carried out in the course of 2020.

№	Title	Provenance	Key Points

	Member States - Follow Up Campaign – Final Evaluation Report (external)		▪ **Project objective**: supporting information dissemination and awareness-raising on visa-free regime movement, risks and consequences of unsafe migration, as well as encouraging youth to benefit from sustainable self-development opportunities, which increase their employability as a secure path for a better future.
			
			▪ **Evaluation purpose**: To (1) determine the extent to which the objectives of the information and awareness-raising campaign have been met and assess the likelihood of sustainability upon campaign completion; (2) identify IOM's institutional strengths and weaknesses in implementing the campaign; and (3) identify needs for further information and awareness-raising activities on prevention of irregular emigration from Albania.
			
			▪ **Findings**: The project was a successful one not only in terms of achieving its outcomes and meeting the objective, but also due to the fact that during a pandemic situation, it was flexibly managed and engaged a large number of public institutions in charge making them skilful to sustain this type of campaigns in the future.
			
			▪ **Recommendations**:
			
			  o Advocacy with government ministries, to allocate a budget line specific for the awareness raising on migration issues, especially in MoI, MESY and MEEA. Albania is continuously losing its human capital and policies should focus on how to prevent and how to re-gain it. EU countries could also contribute to this process as part of the EU adhesion process.
			
			  o Further promotion and information of the wide population on updated opportunities to immigrate regularly. In focus could also be the available services and employment opportunities within the country which often are hard to be accessed by people living in remote and rural areas.
			
			  o Creation of reintegration programs for returned migrants especially for the most vulnerable groups, to prevent their further tentative for continuous irregular migration.
			
			  o Projection of direct activities outreaching in the field the students who are the final beneficiary of the messages of the campaign. During the campaign of 2017-18 was not possible due to closing of schools' season and during the actual campaign it was not possible to do these activities due to pandemic restrictions. The multiplier effect works, but it would have a much bigger effect if the students [were] reached directly.
			
			  o In accordance with the Ministry of Education, Sports and Youth to sign an agreement on lecturing at least once per year as an extracurricular topic the Migration Issues in high schools and Universities, as a specific module (lecturing program) on regular migration including options and opportunities.
			
			  o Preparation of a migration guide module also for teachers, university professors and school psychologists.
			
			  o Consideration of the mass media TV channel as one of the most effective ways of reaching massive target audience. It is usually very costly, but if well managed in very short video spots not longer than 0.5 minutes tackling specific topics can be also efficient in terms of awareness gaining. For example, one video spot can de dedicated for the study issues, another short one for the work opportunities abroad, another one for sharing figures on irregular migrants returned etc. Some can be aired through national TV and others through local TV's. According to IOM's Global Migration Data Analyses Centre (2018) the most successful tools in campaign are the workshops and TV media.
			
			  o Other very effective tools to be considered in the future: Interviews in TV or social media from experts of migration, for example on VET, on working abroad or also inviting as speaker returned migrants, which shares with the audience its own unsafe migration experience or otherwise the successful regular migration. This can boost the optimism of living in Albania

№	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			and convey the message of finding the best option within the country, resulting in the decrease of irregular migration in overall. ○ Direct activities with community centres with students and parents as well, are strongly advised especially in the regions where the migration issues are a big problem such in the North Albania ○ Meetings with potential migrants and representatives of National Employment Services need to be organized also in remote areas to help youth gain an insight about professional education, training, employment prospective in the country and labour market demands. ○ Written media should also be considered as an awareness-raising tool through articles writing reflecting the risks associated with irregular migration in EU Member States, highlighting the reinforcement of travel rules. ▪ *Follow-up*: No suggestions for follow-up tracking. All recommendations focused on future, similar activities in the area of migration management, addressed to IOM at large and the GoA in particular.
18	*Project External Final Evaluation: Strengthened Capacities for Improved Coordination, Protection, and Prosecution on Trafficking in Persons in Madagascar –* Evaluation Report (external)	RO Pretoria – CD-BE, Jun 2020	▪ **Project objective**: To contribute to the Government of Madagascar (GoM) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) efforts to improve national capacity in coordinating anti-trafficking responses, protecting Victims of Trafficking (VoTs) and prosecuting traffickers. (pp. 6-7). Duration: Oct 2016 – Aug 2020. Linked to: Malagasy Government's National Action Plan (NAP) in the fight against human trafficking (2015-2019). (pp 7-8). Funding: USD 750,000 ▪ **Evaluation objective**: Not stated explicitly. It 'analyses the intervention through five evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.' And, [it] 'highlights the findings and best practices implemented in the framework of the project, as well as the recommendations to be followed in view of possible future action.' ▪ **Conclusions**: ○ Relevance: meets the national and international commitments made by the GoM to fight against trafficking in persons and strengthen relevant GoM capacity. Good partnership with the National Bureau, no good link with partnership GoM and NGOs, relatively low gender integration. (pp. 6-8) ○ Efficiency: successfully implementing the majority of planned activities, while guaranteeing the coherence of the intervention logic, despite contextual difficulties causing delays and preventing fulfilment of some of the expected outcomes in results 2 and 3. Training target reached, victim assistance target exceeded, limited gender inequality reduction. (pp. 8-9) ○ Efficiency: good budget utilisation, flexible implementation by project team in response to GoM wishes and judiciary requirements on trafficking (Anti-Corruption Court, PAC), low quality of indicators hampering monitoring (pp. 7-8) ○ Impact: good progress against specific objectives; subsequent statements detract from this somewhat (no clear conception of impact, since expressed largely in terms of output. (8-9) ○ Sustainability (here termed 'durability': optimistic statements, linked to training, contacts with GoM, inclusion of trafficking in Police/Gendarmerie schools' curriculum. ▪ **Recommendations** for IOM: ○ IOM to consider projects to combat trafficking in persons as projects essentially aimed at combating gender inequalities (label 1), which would make it possible to integrate the **gender approach** at all levels of the intervention, bearing in mind the following cause and effect relationship on the phenomenon of trafficking in persons: the decline in gender inequalities implies a reduction in the number of cases of trafficking, with women and girls being the main victims.

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			▪ **Recommendations** for Government:
			○ Continue efforts to improve the response to trafficking in Madagascar by working in an integrated manner, by tackling parallel prevention and victim protection, prosecution of trafficking cases, and coordination, through strengthening the partnership component and with the aim of producing results and a lasting impact. This should all be done keeping in mind the new NAP.
			○ strengthen interventions in the field of *prevention* through advocacy, to combat the root causes of the phenomenon of trafficking and to carry out awareness-raising actions aimed at populations, especially in the regions most affected and where traditional practices that constitute cases of trafficking (e.g., child labour or child marriage) are most prevalent.
			○ In terms of the *pursuit* component, it is essential to continue trainings that should be replicated in other regions, following the methodology developed during the project. Continue the work of strengthening the new PAC members, by ensuring their continuous training and by initiating actions to promote international police and judicial cooperation.
			○ **modify the working approach** in the field of *protection* so that assistance is provided by structures and via already existing circuits, and intervention in support of women and child victims of violence. The specific circumstances of each victim of trafficking to be considered, whilst avoiding dependence on IOM or the creation of parallel intervention circuits remains crucial for the various cases of trafficking. Follow a protection approach based on strengthening the local protection system, which considers the other strategies in this area. Implementation of the National Strategy to Combat Gender-Based Violence and the National Policy to Combat Human Trafficking opens a window of opportunity and represents a chance to strengthen the system of protection of survivors of trafficking, the majority of whom are women.
			○ continue **strengthening the leadership of the BNLETH** and supporting actions on advocacy. The BNLTEH (with the support of IOM) will need to ensure integration of the phenomenon of trafficking in all projects combating violence against women and children carried out in Madagascar. Conversely, identify and strengthen CSOs working with vulnerable women, and/or children, and potential victims of trafficking at the national, and/or transnational level.
			▪ **Follow-up**: No reference to tracking the implementation of the evaluation's recommendations.
19	*Promoting Ethical Conduct and Professionalising the Recruitment Industry in Sri Lanka'* – Final Evaluation Report (external)	RO Bangkok – CDRI, Jul 2019	▪ *Project*: (06/2016-12/2018), implemented by IOM is a component of the ILO project 'Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Up scaling and Consolidation – Phase III', funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC). 'The primary audiences of the report are the **IOM staff** who have been involved in managing and implementing the project components and activities as well as **IOM's senior management**.'
			▪ *Evaluation purpose*: To provide information on the extent to which the project contributed to the main goal of fostering ethical and fair recruitment practices and processes in a rights-based and migrant-friendly manner.[Examine] the best practices; issues and challenges; assessment of areas for institutionalization; and [] provide IOM and the project stakeholders with recommendations for future action.
			▪ *Findings and conclusion*: 'Overall, the project has successfully completed its relevant outputs and outcomes and achieved its overall objective.' (**NB**: Reading between the lines, the findings and conclusions appear too positive. Perhaps for political reasons?)
			▪ *Recommendations*: A total of four recommendations of a primarily design/operational nature, but in the case of at least one recommendation with policy/governance implications, addressed at both the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) and IOM managers (hq, RO and CoM).

Nº	Title	Provenance	Key Points
			▪ **Follow-up**: Monitoring of the follow-up on the recommendations is relatively straightforward since most the measures proposed could be tracked in RO and CoM reporting, taken advantage of GoSL sources. **Note**: This report is one of the several in the sample that do not follow any standard template (with the exception of the main evaluation criteria). The reporting – and the follow-up – would be much improved by a more standard and more tabular approach. This would make it easier for ROMEOs to compile comparative reports, with recommendations sorted by country and themes. There are dangers in standardisation (e.g.: 'ticking boxes'), but given the large number of relatively short projects, some is unavoidable.

20	*The Impact of Mobile Cinema Events on Potential Migrants in Guinea* – Impact Evaluation Report (internal)	RO Brussels – IOM's Global Data Analysis Centre, 2020	▪ **Project objective**: *CinemArena* is an IOM-managed mobile cinema and community discussion initiative that aims to raise awareness about the possible dangers of migrating among potential migrants and share information about safe alternatives to irregular migration.
			
			▪ **Evaluation objective**: To test whether attending *CinemArena* awareness-raising events in Guinea had a measurable effect on potential migrants' knowledge, risk perceptions and intentions regarding irregular migration. The impact study is based on a total sample of 2,825 potential migrants in 63 villages in 4 Guinean regions.
			
			▪ **Findings**: The causal impact estimate difference-in-difference (DiD) shows that participating in *CinemArena* film and discussion events:
			  o Increases awareness of the dangers of irregular migration by 10 per cent;
			  o Increases the percentage of people with knowledge of the financial costs related to irregular migration by 23 per cent;
			  o Reduces stated intentions to migrate to Europe without a visa (i.e., irregularly) by 10 per cent; and
			  o Increases positive perceptions of future economic opportunities at home by 19 per cent.
			  o Attending the event did not improve how well potential migrants self-assess their knowledge about migration to Europe.
			
			▪ **Recommendations**:
			  o Participating in discussion immediately after the documentary screening improved the perception of future economic opportunities **at home**. Future campaigns can build on this unexpected result by providing further information and tools on how to best invest in the local community.
			  o Some films screened at the event were not based in Guinea, not available in local languages or subtitled only in French. Only 54 per cent of the baseline study sample reported that they spoke French. Campaign impacts may be amplified by relying on local content and local field teams.
			  o An overwhelming majority of potential migrants who attended the CinemArena events said they would like to receive more information. Future campaigns could invest in ways to continue the conversation beyond one-off events and allow potential migrants to submit follow-up questions and access reliable information more easily.
			
			▪ **Follow-up**: No indication in operational terms. Essentially a scientific study, with suggestions for additional research.

STUDY ON THE USE OF EVALUATION AT IOM AND PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP MECHANISMS

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Background

Evaluation is an important learning and accountability tool on which there is an increasing emphasis both within the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and externally by donors, Member States, and key stakeholders. Evaluation is an integral part of the Organization's core and managerial functions. Centralized, corporate-level evaluations are carried out by the Office of the Inspector General's Central Evaluation function (OIG/Evaluation), which undertakes and promotes evaluations of IOM policies, strategies, and programmes and encourages the use of evaluation findings and recommendations in formulating them. Along with its mandate of overseeing the evaluation function in IOM, OIG/Evaluation develops and adjusts evaluation guidelines and methods throughout the Organization and supports the strengthening of evaluation culture and use, as well as the inclusion of an evaluation component in the Organization's programmes and projects. OIG/Evaluation also implements internal capacity building programmes to ensure IOM evaluation managers and evaluators understand and apply the up-to-date evaluation techniques and practices.

Given the decentralized nature of the Organization,[85] most programme and project evaluations are managed at the Country or Regional Office (CO/RO) levels. These evaluations may be undertaken by IOM staff referred to as "internal evaluations"[86] and/or by external consultants, referred to as "external evaluations". Evaluations at IOM can also be "mixed evaluations", conducted by internal and external evaluators. One challenge among others raised by the 2019 Multilateral Organization Performance Network (MOPAN)[87] assessment (3.0) was the lack of an organization-wide system for the development of management responses or a timeline for tracking and reporting on implementation of evaluation recommendations (p37 MOPAN).

Changes are underway for the reinforcement of evaluation in IOM and further efforts are being made to continue building a culture of evaluative understanding and practice, particularly given the increased acknowledgment of the importance of evaluations for reporting on project results and accountability, for identifying innovative and replicable practices and for lessons learning and knowledge management.

Since late 2016, eight out of nine IOM Regional Offices have Regional Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officers who provide guidance, capacity building and technical assistance to COs in their respective regions. In parallel, the OIG/Evaluation team has grown to continue providing additional support to and continuity across the regions. In 2018, OIG/Evaluation launched the IOM internal evaluator training aimed at contributing to the creation and development of a pool of internal

---

[85] Headquartered in Geneva, IOM's structure is highly decentralized with 97% of the organization's 11,000 staff members (as of December 2017) based in 412 field locations. Its field structure consists of 9 Regional Offices, two Administrative Centres (Manila and Panama), two Special Liaison Offices (Addis Ababa and New York), 9 Country Offices responsible for resource mobilization and coordinating functions, the Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) in Berlin and (as of September 2018) 393 Field Offices including Country Offices and Sub-Offices.

[86] Headquartered in Geneva, IOM's structure is highly decentralized with 97% of the organization's 11,000 staff members (as of December 2017) based in 412 field locations. Its field structure consists of 9 Regional Offices, two Administrative Centres (Manila and Panama), two Special Liaison Offices (Addis Ababa and New York), 9 Country Offices responsible for resource mobilization and coordinating functions, the Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) in Berlin and (as of September 2018) 393 Field Offices including Country Offices and Sub-Offices.

[87] http://www.mopanonline.org/assessments/iom2017-18/

evaluators[88] and a facilitator e- learning course on M&E that contains important elements for the management and conduct of evaluations, including also sessions dealing with data collection, theory of change and norms and standards.

In 2019/2020, IOM commissioned a meta-evaluation on the quality of evaluations recorded in OIG/Evaluationdatabase[89] fortheperiod2017-2019. Theobjectiveofthisevaluationwastoassessboth the quality and use of internal (centralized and decentralized) and external evaluations, with the aim of providing actionable recommendations to enhance the quality and utilization of evaluations. According to the meta-evaluation, the key factors identified hindering evaluation use are the need for additional management and institutional commitment in the promotion and use of evaluation results, the limited use of tracking mechanisms for existing recommendations, the reduced engagement of stakeholders during the evaluation for ownership and the scarce resources available for evaluations. There is also a need to increase the internal communication and information knowledge management to improve the performance of the use and dissemination of evaluation's results.

In January 2020, IOM instructions made management response mandatory for all evaluations. OIG/Evaluation follows up on the submission of the management responses that are then subsequently made available in the Evaluation Repository[90] together with the evaluation report and related deliverables.

Objective of the Study

OIG/Evaluation is commissioning this study to a) assess the use of evaluation at IOM and b) identify the best possible options for improving the use of evaluation and follow up of evaluation recommendations and management responses. The approach will consist of:

a) Tracking the use of a certain number of recent evaluations (see section below) and assessing to what extent they were used within the Organization.

b) Reviewing existing processes at IOM, of interviewing relevant staff.

c) Identifying good practices and existing mechanisms from other agencies to provide various options for consideration by IOM to develop a fit-for-purpose evaluation follow-up mechanism.

Points of consideration for the study

The development of a follow-up mechanism should take into consideration the decentralized nature of evaluations at IOM (90% are decentralized in the last five years)[7], the projectized nature of the organization as well as limited funding usually provided to evaluation. The study is expected to propose cost-effective and adequate mechanisms referring also to existing mechanisms of other agencies and considering the IOM contexts and possible constraints. The study should present various options for consideration by IOM in consultation with other IOM staff and not focus only on one follow-up mechanism.

Methodology

The study will utilize various methods to meet its two objectives. Building from the meta-evaluation that looked partly at evaluation use, this assessment will select a sample of evaluations undertaken recently in 2019/2020 to determine how they were used at IOM; identify the constraints in applying

---

[88] By the end of this course, the participants are expected to be able to: a) define the purposes of evaluation, as well as the types and approaches to evaluation relevant to IOM; b) distinguish between the main stages of an evaluation process and demonstrate the necessary skills and confidence in practicing them; c) explain the logic of and reproduce the structure of an evaluation report, as well as follow the advice to write a clear, logical, and learning-oriented evaluation report; and, d) appreciate and stimulate the use of evaluation results for IOM's learning. Participation is free and the duration of the training is 4 days (face-to-face).

[89] EvaluationRepository|Evaluation(iom.int) [6] EvaluationRepository|Evaluation(iom.int)

[90] A dashboard of all evaluations can be found here: https://evaluation.iom.int/repository-dashboard

the recommendations and/or the evaluation findings in general, to what extent the management response matrix were used and followed up by the programmatic team; and finally, how this may have contributed to increasing institutional knowledge and learning.

The selection of samples will also pay attention to how these evaluations and related material (evaluation brief, evaluation summaries and management responses) were being disseminated to stakeholders (including beneficiaries[91]) and what were the communication strategies and learning exercises (such as debriefings or dissemination workshops). This part of the study will be done mainly through in-depth interviews and document review. A sample of evaluations done before 2019 will be considered to see long-term use if any. The selection will be done by OIG/Evaluation in collaboration with IOM Regional M&E Officers and will be fine-tuned with the consultant.

In order to identify the most relevant evaluation follow-up mechanisms given IOM's context, the consultant will review IOM existing processes and guidance and tools, and the processes of other agencies that could be used as inspiration and adapted for IOM. The consultant will also be able to access evaluations and their management responses through the Evaluation Repository. The study will include interviews with key IOM staff as well as staff from other UN agencies to better understand the approaches and lessons learnt in follow-up processes and any recommendations they may have. IOM will provide the consultant with:

a) All guidance developed related to evaluation, including existing quality control tools and systems in place in Ros and Cos as part of their evaluation management practice and the training materials that are related to strengthening evaluations.

b) 2020 Meta-evaluation and its management response.

c) The UNEG OECD/DAC Peer Review.

d) The evaluation reports and related materials.

e) The MOPAN report.

IOM will be able to put the consultant in touch with potential UN agencies to discuss their systems, remaining open to the consultant's own knowledge and experience in developing such systems.

Points of consideration for the follow-up mechanism:

A few points of consideration in developing analysis and options for a follow-up mechanism deserve to be highlighted:

a) *In light of the projectized nature of IOM and that the majority of the evaluations are project related, how does follow-up of evaluations take place (steps in the process) to report back on the implementation of recommendations and on the use of lessons learned at an institutional level?*

b) *What are the ways to improve communication on evaluations in order to enhance use?* OIG/Evaluation is putting together ideas for decentralized evaluations under the responsibility of IOM offices to be shared in an appropriate, useful manner to encourage use and follow-up.

c) *How can OIG/Evaluation, given its current resources and structure be able to realistically do follow-up on all evaluations? Is that a right approach? Should distinct mechanisms be discussed for the follow-up on central evaluations and of decentralized evaluations identifying where responsibilities lie?*

d) *What can IOM learn from other agencies with similar structures?* OIG/Evaluation is also cognizant that many of the evaluations (about 29% of all evaluations from 2017-2021) are ex-post evaluations, which means that projects may have completed and it is not always known for instance whether similar projects have already been undertaken with the

---

[91] The meta-evaluation indicated as a finding that the evaluations were not being shared with beneficiaries.

recommendations being used. The study will examine if a specific way of follow-up is needed for such evaluations.

e) *Given that some recommendations may be directed to other stakeholders (donors, governments, other departments or offices), how does the follow-up of these recommendations realistically take place?* The follow-up process of recommendations for other stakeholders is not always clear to evaluation managers. Guidance for management response[92] acknowledges this challenge and further guidance is needed to improve on this.

f) *What are the ways of reporting on evaluation recommendations in a transparent, simplified way?* Discussions with other UN agencies highlighted the difficulty of reporting on implementation of recommendations and the mechanisms that exist to ensure it is evidence-based. Good practices and lessons learnt for reporting in a simplified manner is welcome to facilitate this process and make it less cumbersome.

g) *Defining roles and responsibilities:* the study should consider the various roles required within the follow-up mechanism takinginto account existing roles and responsibilities of OIG/Evaluation, the Regional M&E officers, the programme and evaluation managers, knowledge management hubs or other stakeholders such as evaluation steering/ management committees.

Ethics, norms and standards

IOM abides by the Norms and Standards of the UNEG and expects all stakeholders to be familiar with the Ethical guidelines for evaluation of UNEG and the consultant with the UNEG code of conduct for evaluation in the UN System as well. UNEG documents are available under IOM Evaluation Webpage www.iom.int/evaluation. The UNEG Norms and Standards will also be a key component of the quality management system.

Workplan

The work should be planned for a maximum duration of 20 working days and consist of the documentation review including the work done by other agencies (8 days), consultation with UN Agencies, interviews inside IOM (6 days) and drafting and writing of the study (6 days). The report should not exceed 20 pages (without annexes).

Below is an indicative work plan for the study.

Activity	Timeframe	Working Days for Consultancy	Responsibility
Document review	August 2021	8 days	Consultant
Consultation/Interviews	Mid-August 2021	6 days	Consultant
Analysis and report drafting	September 2021	4 days	Consultant
Report editing and finalization	September/October 2021	2 days	Consultant
TOTAL WORKING DAYS		20 days	

Consultant expertise

The selected consultant should have broad experience, at least 15 years, in evaluation, systemic reviews and designing follow-up mechanisms, with an advanced degree in social and political sciences or related fields.

---

[92] Management Response and Follow-up on IOM Evaluation Recommendations, December 2019.

The study requires the consultant to propose several systems as specified in the objective above so at least 5 years professional experience working with government/private/non-government agencies on follow-up mechanisms is an asset. The selection of the consultant for the study will also consider the extent to which the same consultant may develop any of the systems discussed in the study; a sample of a similar work of establishing and or designing follow-up mechanisms is welcome. The consultant must have excellent analytical, writing and communication skills in English language.

Submission of application

IOM is looking for proposals from individual consultants to deliver the outlined products. The consultant is requested to submit the following:

- A brief proposal/cover letter explaining interest in the assignment, with description of the approach, methodology, activities, workplan, deliverables and consultant experience and expertise.
- At least and if possible to share, one example of similar work.
- Three references.
- A daily fee and total budget in USD based on the estimated working days for all deliverables specified for this consultancy.
- An indicative cost can be included for potential travel to Geneva for presenting the findings, but the organisation of the visit will be dependent on COVID-19 restrictions. Candidates not sending any of the requested information will be disqualified.

Contract period: August to November 2021.

Any potential conflict of interest should be declared of conducting IOM evaluations and reviews in 2020- 2021.

Only shortlisted candidates will be notified. IOM reserves the right not to accept any tenders submitted. Proposals must be submitted via email sent on or before **midnight 3 August 2021 (Geneva time)** to the following email address eva@iom.int.

Should you need any additional information, please send your queries in writing to eva@iom.int.

Annex 6: Documentation

Section 1: IOM Documents

№	Title	Provenance	Date
1	*A Review of Knowledge Management in IOM: Current Status and Future Perspectives*	IOM.OIG, Geneva	May 2018
2	*Evaluation Policy*	IOM, Geneva	Sep 2018
3	*Evaluation Repository*	IOM, Geneva	Ongoing
4	*Institutional Strategy on Migration and Sustainable Development*	IOM, Geneva	2020
5	*IOM Management Response to the MOPAN Assessment*	IOM, Geneva	Jul 2019
6	*Meta-Evaluation of IOM's Internal and External Evaluations (201-2019) – Evaluation Brief*	IOM, Geneva	Apr 2020
7	*Meta-Evaluation of IOM's Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019) – Management Response Matrix - Final Report*	IOM, Geneva	2020
8	*Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines*	IOM, Geneva	2021
9	*Project Handbook (2nd edition)*	IOM, Geneva	Jul 2017
10	*Strategic Vision – Setting a Course for IOM*	IOM, Geneva	2019
11	*Meta-Evaluation of IOM's Internal and External Evaluations (2017-19)*	IOM, Geneva/Artival, Madrid	Apr 2020
12	*Prioritization Process*	IOM/IDF	Undated
13	*Results Matrix Toolkit*	IOM/IDF	Undated
14	*Review of Migration Policy Funded Projects 2007-16*	IOM/IDF	2017
15	*Gender Mainstreaming Tips for Migration Management Projects*	IOM/IDF, GCU, May 2016	May 2016
16	*Review of Migration, Environment and Climate Change Projects, 2008-2015*	IOM/IDF, Geneva	Aug 2016
17	*OIG Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy 2021–2023*	IOM/OIG	2021
18	*Evaluation Brief – Guidance*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	2018
19	*IOM Gender and Evaluation - Tip Sheet*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	May 2016
20	*IOM Gender Marker's History*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	Undated
21	*Guidance for Addressing Gender in Evaluations*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	May 2018
22	*IDF Guidance Note 2021*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	2021
23	*IDF Project Evaluations*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	2021
24	*Management Response and Follow-Up on IOM Evaluation Recommendations - Guidance Note*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	Dec 2019
25	*OIG Strategy for the Management of its Evaluation and Monitoring Functions 2018-2020*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	2018
26	*Review of the Implementation of Recommendations from the 2017 Evaluation of IOM Gender Equality Policy and MOPAN Assessment*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	Sep 2021
27	*Review of the Implementation of Recommendations from the 2017 Evaluation of IOM Gender Equality Policy and MOPAN Assessment – Evaluation Brief*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	Sep 2021
28	*Review of the Implementation of Recommendations from the 2017 Evaluation of IOM Gender Equality Policy and MOPAN Assessment – Action Plan on the Follow-up Recommendations*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	2021
29	*Evaluation of IOM's Institutional Response to Address Migration, Environment and Climate Change Nexus*	IOM/OIG, Geneva	May 2021
30	*Report on the Policy Capacity of the IOM*	IOM/IOG, Geneva	Dec 2017

Section 2: IOM Project, Programme and Thematic Evaluation Reports – Sample

Nº	Title	Provenance	Date
1	*Beyond Bentiu Protection of Civilian Site (POC) Youth Reintegration Strategy* – Final Evaluation Report	RO Nairobi, IOM and UNDP	Dec 2019
2	*Combating trafficking in human beings in Burkina Faso through the strengthening of the national framework and capacities in identifying victims and improving data collection* – Mid-term Evaluation Report	RO Dakar, IOM Burkina Faso	Nov 2017
3	*Consolidate Protection Assistance Services to Vulnerable Migrants Along Migratory Routes in Egypt (Case)* – Dec 2017-Dec 2019	RO Cairo, Pugh, Sarah Dr	Jul 2020
4	*Consolidation of Sri Lanka Biometrics Project: Biometrics Phase 3* – Project Evaluation Report	RO Bangkok – ROMEO	Jun 2018
5	*Effective and Sustainable Diaspora Engagement for Development in the Caribbean* – Ex-Post Evaluation Report	RO San José – Morgan, Janet	Mar 2019
6	*Enhancing capacities to fight trafficking in persons in Niger* – Final Internal Evaluation Report	RO Dakar – Durocher, Joanie Ms, M&E Officer, IOM Niger	Feb 2021
7	*Enhancing the Migration Evidence Base for the Development of Tanzania* – Final Evaluation Report	IDF – RO Nairobi	Undated
8	*Extracting Learning from Evaluations of Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVR(R)/PARA) Projects and Programmes* – Synthesis Evaluation	IOM/OIG – ISHEG	Jul 2020
9	*Improving Labour Migration Management in Belize* – Ex-Post Evaluation Report	RO San José	Feb 2019
10	*Improving Information Management and Planning Capacities of Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and Migration* – Final External Evaluation Report	RO Vienna, IOM Serbia	Mar 2020
11	*Increasing National and Local Capacity for Pease Implementation in Colombia* – Final Results Evaluation Report	RO Buenos Aires – González Torres, Paola Andrea	Nov 2019
12	*Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation of the Response to Cyclone Idai in Mozambique*	IOM/OIG – RO Pretoria	Dec 2020
13	*IOM's Migration Crisis Operational Framework (MCOF)* – Thematic Evaluation	IOM/OIG	Mar 2019
14	*National Disaster Consortium Programme Evaluation Report (2015-2019)*	RO Bangkok, NDC	Mar 2020
15	*On Shelter Interventions in Anbar Governorate, Iraq* – Evaluation Report	RO Cairo, MEAL, Mission Coordination Unit	Nov 2018
16	*Preventing Unsafe Migration from Albania towards EU Member States - Campaign 'Choose Opportunities: not Irregular Migration!'*	RO Vienna – Nepravishta, Rea	Jul 2018
17	*Preventing Unsafe Migration from Albania towards the EU Member States - Follow Up Campaign* – Final Evaluation Report	RO Vienna, IOM Tirana	Dec 2020
18	*Project External Final Evaluation: Strengthened Capacities for Improved Coordination, Protection, and Prosecution on Trafficking in Persons in Madagascar* – Evaluation Report	RO Pretoria, CD-BE	Jun 2020
19	*Promoting Ethical Conduct and Professionalising the Recruitment Industry in Sri Lanka'* – Final Evaluation Report	RO Bangkok, CDRI	Jul 2019
20	*The Impact of Mobile Cinema Events on Potential Migrants in Guinea* – Impact Evaluation Report	RO Brussels, IOM's Global Data Analysis Centre	2020

Section 3: Comparator Organisation Documents

Nº	Title	Provenance	Date
1	*Evaluation Policy*	CoE, Strasbourg	Nov 2019
2	*Evaluation Guidelines*	CoE, Strasbourg	Oct 2020
3	*Guidelines on Linking Planning/Programming, Monitoring and Evaluation*	European Commission, Brussels	Oct 2019
4	*Tool 49 - Staff Working Document for Evaluation*	European Commission, Brussels	Undated
5	*Evaluation Policy*	ILO, Geneva	2017
6	*Results-Based Evaluation Strategy 2018-2021*	ILO, Geneva	2018
7	*ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluation: Pillar 5: Use and Dissemination of Evaluation Findings*	ILO, Geneva	Nov 2020
8	*Guidance Note 5.1 - Enhancing the use and dissemination of evaluation information*	ILO, Geneva	Jun 2020
9	*Guidance Note 5.4: Management follow-up to recommendations from independent project evaluations*	ILO, Geneva	Jun 2020
10	*Results-Based Management Handbook*	ILO, Geneva	Oct 2011
11	*Analysis of the Evaluation Function in the United Nations System*	UN (JIU), Geneva	2014
12	*Annual Report on Evaluation 2020*	UNDP (IEO), New York	Apr 2021
13	*UNDP Evaluation Guidelines*	UNDP (IEO), New York	Jun 2021
14	*The Revised UNDP Evaluation Policy*	UNDP (IEO), UNDP, New York	Jul 2019
15	*Synthetic Review of Evaluations 2021*	UNESCO, IOS/Evaluation Paris, Paris	2021
16	*Policy on Evaluation*	UNHCR, Geneva	2016
17	*Evaluation Strategy 2018-20*	UNHCR, Geneva, 2017	2017
18	*Evaluation Policy*	UNHCR, Geneva, 2020	2020
19	*Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations – Guidance Document*	UNHCR/UNEG, Geneva, New York	2010
20	*Revised Evaluation Policy*	UNICEF, New York	2018
21	*Procedure on the Implementation of the 2018 UNICEF Evaluation Policy*	UNICEF, New York	Oct 2018
22	*Evaluation Policy – Director-General's Bulletin*	UNIDO, Vienna	Jun 2018
23	*Evaluation Manual*	UNIDO, Vienna	2018
24	*Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the World Food Programme*	WFP (UNEG/OECD/ DAC), Rome, New York	May 2021
25	*Annual Evaluation Report 2020*	WFP, Rome	2021
26	*Annual Report 2020 for the Strategic Advisory Panel on Impact Evaluation at WFP*	WFP, Rome	Jun 2021
27	*Annual Evaluation Report for 2020 – Management Response*	WFP, Rome	May 2021
28	*WFP Evaluation Communications and Knowledge Management Strategy (2021-2026)*	WFP, Rome	May 2021
29	*WFP Evaluation Policy 2016-21*	WFP, Rome	Nov 2015

Section 4: Salient Literature on Evaluation

Nº	Title	Provenance	Date
1	*Use of Evaluations and the Evaluation of their Use*	Feinstein, Osvaldo, Complutense, Madrid	2002
2	*Institutional Practices for Management Response and Evaluation Follow-Up – Review and Proposal of Good Practice Standards*	Feinstein, Osvaldo, UNEG EQE Taskforce, Rome	Mar 2009
3	*Checklist for Evaluation Recommendations*	Feinstein, Osvaldo, W. Michigan University	2019
4	*MOPAN 2017-18 Assessments: WFP – Organisational Performance Brief*	MOPAN Secretariat	Feb 2019
5	*MOPAN 2017-18 Assessments: WFP (revised)*	MOPAN Secretariat	Apr 2019
6	*MOPAN 2017-18 Assessments: IOM – Organisational Performance Brief*	MOPAN Secretariat, Paris	Apr 2019
7	*MOPAN 2017-2018 Assessments: IOM*	MOPAN Secretariat, Paris	Apr 2019
8	*MOPAN 3.0 – Methodology Manual*	MOPAN Secretariat, Paris	Jul 2019
9	*Pathways to use of communication campaigns' evaluation findings within international organizations*	O'Neill, Glenn and Bauer, Martin, in *Evaluation and Program Planning*, issue 69	2018
10	*Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*	OECD/DAC, Paris, 2010	2010
11	*Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*	OECD/DAC, Paris	2019
12	*Evaluation Criteria*	OECD/DAC, Paris	2019
13	*Strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives – Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services*	UN, New York	2021
14	*Evaluation Use in Practice – A Review of UNEG Members' Practices to Boost Evaluation Use*	UNEG (UNEG Interest Group on Evaluation Use), New York	2020
15	*Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations*	UNEG, New York	2010
16	*Guidelines for the Evaluation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework*	UNEG, New York	Sep 2020
17	*Norms and Standards for Evaluation*	UNEG, New York	2016
18	*Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports*	UNEG, New York	2010
19	*UNEG Strategy 2020-2024*	UNEG, New York	Oct 2019
20	*Peer Review of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) Evaluation Function*	UNEG/OECD, New York/Paris	May 2021
21	*Managing Evaluations: A How-to Guide for Managers and Commissioners of Evaluations*	World Bank, IEG (IEG), Washington DC	2015

Annex 7: Persons Consulted

Nº	Name	Position	Entity	Mail	Date
1	Ahmad, Zahoor Mr	Regional Office M&E Officer (ROMEO), Core Evaluation Team (CET)	IOM, RO Cairo	zahmad@iom.int	04/10/21
2	Akerman Borje, Eva Ms	Senior Policy Advisor, Policy Hub Team, ODG, Director *ad interim*	IOM Geneva	eakerman@iom.int	22/10/21
3	Balic, Elma Ms	Oversight Officer, Central Evaluation	IOM, Geneva	ebalic@iom.net	Throughout
4	Boers, Karel Mr	M&E Officer, Central Evaluation	IOM, Geneva	kboers@iom.int	Throughout
5	Botero, Andres Mr	Senior Oversight Officer, Central Evaluation	IOM, Geneva	abotero@iom.int	22/11/21
6	Carini, Francesca Ms	Consultant, Evaluation Service	UNHCR, Geneva	carini@unhcr.org	07/10/21
7	Casagrande, Margaux Ms	Senior Programme Assistant, IOM Development Fund	IOM, Geneva	mcasagrande@iom.int	27/09/21
8	Castelfranco, Alessia Ms	Administrator, IOM Development Fund	IOM, Geneva	acastelfranco@iom.int	27/09/21
9	Dobinger, Johannes Mr	Chief, Independent Evaluation Division	UNIDO, Vienna	j.dobinger@unido.org	04/10/21
10	El Bah, Ahmedou Mr	Principal Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office	UNESCO, Paris	a.el-bah@unesco.org	07/10/21
11	Forster, Florian Mr	Former Head, Immigration and Border Management Division, Chair, Global Staff Association Committee	IOM Geneva	fforster@iom.int	22/10/21
12	Franzetti, Christophe Mr	Chief, Central Evaluation	IOM Geneva	cfranzetti@iom.int	28/09/21 22/11/21
13	Goracci, Monica Ms	Director, Migration Management Services	IOM Geneva	mgoracci@iom.int	25/10/21
14	Graviano, Nicola Mr	CoM/Senior AVRR Specialist, CoM, El Salvador	IOM, RO San Jose	ngraviano@iom.int	21/10/21
15	Harris, Sarah Lynn Ms	ROMEO (CET)	IOM, RO Vienna	sharris@iom.int	12/10/21
16	Hattori, May Ms	Project Officer, former Gender Coordination Unit	IOM Geneva	mhattori@iom.int	26/10/21
17	Ionesco, Diana Ms	(former) Director, Migration Management Service	IOM, Geneva	dionesco@iom.int	19/10/21
18	Jeffers Draschtak, Kelly Ms	Gender Specialist, former Gender Coordination Unit	IOM, Geneva	kdraschtak@iom.int	26/10/21
19	Jones, Richard Mr	Chief, Capacity Development Section, IEO	UNDP, New York	richard.jones@undp.org	06/10/21
20	Labovitz, Jeffrey Mr	Director, Department of Operations and Emergencies	IOM Geneva	jlabovitz@iom.int	22/10/21
21	Larmoyer, Aurelie Ms	Knowledge Management Expert, Office of Evaluation	WFP, Rome	aurelie.larmoyer@wfp.org	05/10/21
22	Lukovic, Teodora Ms	Senior Evaluator, Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO)	CoE, Strasbourg	teodora.lukovic@coe.int	08/10/21

Nº	Name	Position	Entity	Mail	Date
23	Luzot, Anne Claire Ms	Head, Office of Evaluation	WFP, Rome	anneclaire.luzot@wfp.org	05/10/21
24	Manke, Marina Ms	Director, Labour Mobility and Human Development Division	IOM Geneva	mmanke@iom.int	13/10/21
25	Marques Pereira, Manuel Mr	Head, Migration, Environment and Climate Change	IOM Geneva	mpereira@iom.int	21/10/21
26	Maskun, Izora Mutya Ms	Head, former Gender Coordination Unit	IOM Geneva	imaskun@iom.int	26/10/21
27	Mcauliffe, Marie Ms	Head, Research and Publications Division	IOM Geneva	mmcauliffe@iom.int	11/10/21
28	Medina, Fernando Mr	Head, Transition and Recovery Division	IOM Geneva	fmedina@iom.int	19/10/21
29	Melde, Susanne Ms	Regional Knowledge Management Officer	IOM, RO Buenos Aires	smelde@iom.int	29/09/21
30	Murawski, Janette Ms	Communications and KM Officer, Evaluation Office	ILO, Geneva	murawski@ilo.org	06/10/21
31	Mutie, Rogers Mr	ROMEO (CET)	IOM, RO Pretoria	rmutie@iom.int	27/09/21
32	Rey, Jhonn Mr	ROMEO (CET)	IOM, RO Buenos Aires	jrey@iom.int	29/09/21
33	Riallant, Cécile Ms	Head, Migration and Sustainable Development Unit	IOM Geneva	criallant@iom.INT	13/10/21
34	Sabatini, Fabio Mr	Chief, Evaluation Capacity Development	UNICEF, New York	fsabatini@unicef.org	26/10/21
35	Schmitt, Martin Mr	ROMEO (CET)	IOM. RO San Jose	mschmitt@iom.int	12/10/21
36	Staiger, Angela Ms	Senior Humanitarian Policy Advisor	IOM Geneva	astaiger@iom.int	18/10/21
37	Suter, Theodora Ms	Former Head, former Gender Coordination Unit	IOM Geneva	tsuter@iom.int	18/10/21
38	Traoré Chazalnoel, Mariam Ms	Senior Policy Officer, Policy Hub Team, Office of the Director General	IOM Geneva	mchazalnoel@iom.int	19/10/21
39	Vaca, Vanesa Ms	Senior Knowledge Management Officer	IOM, RO San Jose	vvaca@iom.int	12/10/21
40	Wall, Colin Mr	Director, Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO)	CoE, Strasbourg	colin.wall@coe.int	08/10/21
41	Wambanda, Angeline Ms	ROMEO (CET)	IOM, RO Bangkok	awambanda@iom.int	06/10/21