

INDEPENDENT MID- TERM JOINT EVALUATION OF THE SOUTHERN AFRICAN MIGRATION MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Version 2 November 2022

Project Title:	Southern African Migration Management Project (SAMM)
Project Code	FED/2019/413-278
Implementation agencies	International Labour Organization (ILO) lead agency, International Organisation for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).
Administrative Unit	ILO Regional Office for Africa
Donor	European Union
Budget	25,675,395 EUR
Implementation period	Start date: 01 January 2020 End date: 31 December 2023
Coverage	Southern African Region, targeting 16 countries: Angola, Botswana, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, the Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe
Type of evaluation	Independent Mid-term Evaluation
Date of the evaluation	Mid-January – May 2023
Evaluation Management Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ricardo Furman Reg. Senior M&E officer for ILO Africa – lead (ILO) • Rachael Tembo, Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (IOM) • Fiona Wambui Gatere (UNHCR) • Katherine Aston, Deputy Chief of Independent Evaluation Section (IES); Moritz Schuberth, Associate Evaluation Expert (UNODC)

1. Background

The Southern Africa Migration Management (SAMM) project is a four-year project that aims to improve migration management in the Southern African and Indian Ocean region. The project duration is 4 years, running from January 2020 to December 2023. The SAMM project is a model of a ONE-UN approach with collaboration between four UN agencies: The International Labour Organization (ILO) as the lead agency, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). The SAMM project is funded by the European Commission and forms part of the European Union Regional Indicative Programme (11th EDF RIP) for Eastern Africa, Southern Africa, and the Indian Ocean (2014–2020) which includes among its objectives the facilitation of safe, orderly, and regular migration and the prevention of irregular migration. It focuses on

South-South migration flows, identifying positive spill-over effects of international migration on regional integration and regional economic development.

2. The Project Objective

The SAMM Project's overall objective is to improve migration management in the Southern African and Indian Ocean region guided by, and contributing to the realisation of, the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, especially Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 on decent work and economic growth and SDG 10 on reducing inequalities.

The project comprises of two main project components: 1. Labour Migration; and 2. Mixed Migration. The first component supports the implementation of the UN Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) and the second one the application of the UN Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), as well as of the GCM.

The specific objectives (SO) and key results areas (KRA) of this intervention are:

SO1: Improved policy environment for labour migration across the region and improved access to legal and efficient means of labour mobility for (prospective) labour migrants.

KRA1.1: Rights-based legal and efficient channels of labour migration and mobility (including appropriate protection measures for migrant workers) promoted and put in place in the Southern Africa / Indian Ocean region.

KRA1.2: A Southern African and Indian Ocean migration observatory established and fully operational.

SO2: To strengthen informed decision-making on and management of mixed migration flows, including improved protection of vulnerable migrants in the Southern African and Indian Ocean region.

KRA2: Evidence-based management strategies and policies to address mixed migration challenges, including assurance of appropriate protection frameworks for vulnerable migrants, are formulated and implemented.

3. The Targeted Countries and Project Stakeholders

The project focuses on the Southern African Region, and targets the following 16 SADC countries: Angola, Botswana, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, the Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The key SAMM project stakeholders are:

- Governments of the 16 supported countries
- Regional Economic Commissions' secretariats
- National administrations of the targeted member states of Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), Indian Ocean Commission (IOC) and Southern African Development Community SADC regions
- UN Agencies particularly ILO, IOM, UNODC and UNHCR
- Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA) and the COMESA Regional Consultative Process on Migration (RCP) are mechanisms to strengthen policy dialogue on the areas and issues addressed by the programme.
- Academic institutions, research think tanks, other relevant non-state actors and International Cooperating Partners involved in migration, migration research and transnational crime
- Civil Society Organizations
- Workers' organizations and their members
- Employers' organizations

4. Institutional and Management Arrangements

The project is led by a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), responsible for overall project management based in Pretoria, South Africa. The CTA is supported by a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Communication Officer, a Finance Officer and an Administrative Assistant.

At the country level, there are two National Project Coordinators (Seychelles and Zambia). The implementing agencies are ILO, IOM, UNHCR and UNODC. Each agency has a National Project Coordinator based in Pretoria, South Africa.

The project management includes a Technical Working Group comprising of project staff members from all four partner agencies that meets once weekly. Other representatives and technical experts from the respective agencies attend as well, depending on the topics for discussion.

Furthermore, the Technical Implementation Committee (TIC) is in place and meets at least twice a year. Its overall objective is to provide strategic guidance and support on the implementation of the project as well as to review project documents such as the progress narrative and financial reports, M&E systems and Communications. Participation in the TIC includes representative from COMESA, IOC and SADC and the EU.

Above and beyond this, the project also has a Project Steering Committee (PSC) in place which also meets twice a year, its overall objective is to act as a governing body and provides strategic leadership, general policy and overall guidance and oversight on the implementation of the project. It also provides recommendations regarding the focus, agenda, and outcomes of the SAMM project based on the changing external factors.

5. Evaluation Background

The implementing agencies considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. Evaluation should be conducted for the purposes of accountability, learning, and planning and building knowledge. Evaluation is conducted based on the context of the criteria and approaches for international development assistance as established by the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard and UNEG, including the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

Regarding the SAMM project two independent joint evaluations, ILO-led, are planned: the mid-term (MTE) and the final evaluation. The mid-term evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation management committee (EMC) integrated by the evaluation managers of the Participating United Nations Organizations (PUNOs) who are not involved in the implementation of the joint programme. The EMC will be led by the ILO evaluation manager as the lead agency.

The evaluation will follow the United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, including the UNEG guidance on Joint Evaluation, the Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management developed by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC), the UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations guidance (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616>) and the UNEG Guidance on Disability Inclusive Evaluations <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/3050>. The ILO Evaluation Office (ILO/EVAL) evaluation policies and technical guidance will guide the process (<https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/lang--en/index.htm>), while the evaluation policies of PUNOs will be considered as required.

The evaluation process will be participative and will involve all relevant programme's stakeholders and partners. The evaluation results will be disseminated among government, development partners, civil society, and other stakeholders. A management response will be produced by each UN agency upon completion of the evaluation process and will be made publicly available according to each PUNO policy.

The evaluation will be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the UNEG joint evaluation guidelines, as well as ILO Evaluation guidelines ones and those of the other partner UN agencies. This evaluation will follow the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation; and the ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklist 3 "Preparing the inception report"; Checklist 4 "Validating methodologies"; Checklist 5 "Preparing the evaluation report" and Checklist "6 Rating the quality of evaluation report".¹

For all practical purposes, this ToR and ILO Evaluation policies and guidelines define the overall scope of this evaluation. Recommendations emerging from the evaluation will provide clear guidance to stakeholders on how to address the gaps and recommendations.

¹ Available at www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/lang--en/index.htm

The project conducted an Evaluability Assessment in accordance with ILO policy governing technical cooperation projects. The assessment was conducted between October-November 2021 to support results-based management of ILO projects and programmes. The process helped to refine the project Comprehensive M&E Strategy (CMES) to address its purposes of supporting accountability, management, learning and building knowledge.

Furthermore, the EU commissioned a Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Mission that took place in October-November 2021 focusing on a sample of 5 countries (Mauritius, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe) out of the 16 supported countries to assess:

1. REC's involvement in the country: the intensity of relations of respective agencies with RECs in and for the specific country.
2. Budget priority: the importance of the country for each agency in terms of committed and planned budget.
3. Strategic priority: additional to the budget, these criteria ascertain the existence of other relevant factors of the work of the agencies in this country.
4. Results already achieved: consideration of the activities already implemented and the results whether output or outcomes level.
5. Type of beneficiaries: the variety of actions addressed at different target groups (government officials, CSOs, targeted populations, etc.)

The recommendations of the ROM Mission have been/are being addressed in preparation for the mid-term evaluation.

6. Purpose and Objectives of the Mid-Term Independent Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation of the SAMM project has a primary formative focus and secondary summative one with the overall objective of reviewing the implementation of the project to identify strengths and weaknesses, lessons, and good practices to be learned, and provide practical recommendations for improvements.

Specifically, this evaluation will:

1. Assess the relevance and coherence of project's design to the country needs across the region and how the project is perceived and valued by the target groups, including the contributions of the project on Labour Migration and Mixed Migration regarding SADC and national policy frameworks such as National development plans and DWCPs, the UNSDCFs, the SDGs targets, and the PUNOs strategic frameworks.
2. Analyse the implementation strategies of the project regarding their potential effectiveness in achieving the project outcomes and impacts, including unexpected results and factors affecting project implementation and results (positively and negatively)
3. Asses the implementation efficiency of the project.

4. Review the institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms inter-agencies and with other stakeholders and the use and usefulness of management tools including the project M&E methodology.
5. Analyse the planned strategies for outcomes' sustainability and orientation to impact.
6. Review the impact of knowledge management (KM) and communication strategy in raising the profile of the project within the countries and among the cooperating partners.
7. Examine the project's response to the restrictions imposed by COVID-19 on repurposing project funds or activities, how the project pivoted or dealt with the restrictions on project activities, if any.
8. Identify lessons learned and potential good practices for key stakeholders.
9. Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to improve attainment of project outcomes and impacts.

7. Scope of the Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will cover the period from January 2020 to October 2022. The evaluation will cover all countries and regional planned outputs and outcomes under the project, with particular attention to synergies between the components and contribution to continental and national policies and programmes. All PUNOs' activities and results will be included.

The evaluation will assess how the project is addressing the cross-cutting themes including human rights, gender equality and inclusivity (i.e. people with disabilities), social dialogue and tripartism, international labor standards and fair transition on environment, human rights concerns and other relevant areas as outlined by the project document.

The evaluation criteria on impact will be limited to the progress towards impact, taking into account that this is a mid-term evaluation. The project impact is still a longer expected result. Therefore, the evaluation will focus on the "orientation to impact" dimension.

The evaluation will seek to establish how and why the project has achieved or not achieved the intended results and other unexpected ones that could have arisen.

8. Clients

The primary clients of the evaluation are the national and regional stakeholders, implementing PUNOs (ILO, UNHCR, UNODC, IOM), the donor as well as other relevant stakeholders.

The Office and stakeholders involved in the execution of the project would use, as appropriate, the evaluation findings, recommendations, lessons learnt and good practices, and lessons to be learned identified. The PUNOs will address, each one and in a coordinated manner as applies, the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

9. Review Criteria and Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation should address the overall OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2020 4th edition

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

The evaluation will cover the following evaluation criteria:

- i) Relevance,
- ii) Coherence,
- iii) Effectiveness,
- iv) Efficiency,
- v) Impact orientation
- vi) Sustainability

The evaluation will be conducted following UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) standards and norms and the glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management developed by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC)².

In line with the results-based approach applied by the ILO, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation criteria and the achievement of the outcomes/ objectives of the project using the indicators in the logical framework of the project, but not limiting to them.

The evaluation should address the questions depicted below. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluator in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with the evaluation manager. Any fundamental changes to the evaluation criteria and questions should be agreed between the EMC and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report.

Analysis of gender-related concerns will be based on the UNEG and ILO Guidelines. The evaluation will integrate gender equality and inclusivity³ as a crosscutting concern throughout its deliverables and process. Furthermore, it should pay attention to issues related to social dialogue, international labour standards and fair environmental transition.

Moreover, the impact of the COVID19 on the implementation and results of the project will be considered. The evaluator during the development of the inception report will integrate questions on these cross-cutting issues where necessary.

² https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm

³ This dimension includes all vulnerable groups such as women , migrants, youth, cultural-ethnic groups, etc.

9.1 Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluator shall examine the following key areas:

1. Relevance

1. To what extent is the project based on clearly identified needs and challenges of/for the target groups regarding migration in the Southern Africa and Indian Ocean region (considering key stakeholders' involvement in the formulation and implementation)
2. To what extent the TOC express the project's contribution to achieve its objectives through a logical linkage between the outputs, outcomes and impacts and the environment in which the project is settled (assumptions and risks?).

2. Coherence (internal and external)

1. To what extent is the project coherent with the SADC and Governments objectives, National Development Frameworks, UNDSCFs and DWCPs, ILO Programme and Budget 2018-21, beneficiaries' needs (i.e., men and women, boys and girls and other vulnerable groups), and does it support the targets of the relevant SDGs and AU action plan?
2. How does the project complement and fit with other on-going PUNOs programmes and projects in the countries? What links have been established so far with other activities of the UN or other cooperating partners operating in the Countries in the area of Labour Migration and Mixed Migration?
3. To what extent has the project integrated UN cross cutting themes (such as human rights, gender equity, inclusiveness of people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, climate change) as well as those specific to the PUNOs in the design and implementation?

3. Project effectiveness

1. What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes and what have been the main contributing and challenging factors it?
2. What, if any, unintended results of the project have been identified or perceived?
3. To what extent has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically internally (among PUNOs) and with all key stakeholders and partners in targeted countries, UN agencies and the donor to achieve project objectives? Does this governance structure take gender and inclusivity dimensions into consideration?
4. How has the COVID-19 pandemic influenced the project results and effectiveness and how the project has addressed this influence and is ready to adapt to changes for the rest of the project life?

4. Efficiency of resource use

1. To what level has the project allocated resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) strategically and operationally in terms of expected outputs, outcomes, and impact, including performance?
2. To what extent are the project's activities/operations and the disbursements and project expenditures in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and original (and subsequent) work plans?
3. To what level have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to address UN cross cutting themes (such as human rights, gender equity, inclusiveness of people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, climate change), as well as those specific to the PUNOs towards the project outputs and outcomes? What are the risks for the project in terms of efficiency and the achievement of its objectives on time due to COVID 19 so far and potential public health new challenges in future?

5. Impact orientation

1. What level of influence is the project having and can be expected to have on the labour migration and mixed migration and other related cross cutting areas on policies and practices at national and sub national levels at those UN cross cutting themes (such as human rights, gender equity, inclusiveness of people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, climate change), as well as those specific to the PUNOs?
2. Is the project contributing to expand the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project outcomes and impacts? If so, how is such knowledge managed, made available to others in an effective and efficient manner?

6. Sustainability

1. Is the project strategy and project management steering towards sustainability? Does the project implement systematically an exit strategy?
2. How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected by the Covid19 situation in context of the national responses and how has the project and stakeholders responded on moving forward with the project results appropriation and how should be adapted towards the end of the project?

10. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will comply with evaluation UNEG norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

The evaluation is an independent evaluation, and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Management Committee (EMC).

The evaluation will apply a Theory of change-based approach. It will be conducted using mixed methods, including triangulation to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings, engaging with key stakeholders of the project, as much as feasible, at all levels during the design, data collection and reporting stages. The evaluators will seek to apply a variety of evaluation techniques – desk review, electronic surveys, meetings with stakeholders, focus group discussions, and observation during the field visits as applicable. Other innovative evaluation techniques can be integrated. Triangulation of sources and techniques should be central.

Due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on migration, this evaluation will be conducted in the context of criteria and approaches outlined in the ILO internal guide: Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal Guide on adapting to the situation (version March 25, 2020).⁴

An evaluation team of 3 team members, with one of them as the team leader will conduct the evaluation. Due to the high number of countries covered, it is suggested that field visits will be conducted only for 4-6 countries and other countries will be analyzed through desk review, virtual interviews, and surveys. Annex 1 presents a table with level of effort of the project dedicated to each country. The final decision on the methodology including countries selection will be competed at the inception phase.

Depending on the COVID-19 pandemic situation and adjustments, the methodology may be discussed between the Evaluation Management Committee and the Evaluators during the inception phase. Upon approval of the inception report, the data collection will begin. After the data collection phase, a project level stakeholders' workshop (virtual and face-to-face combined) will be conducted to present preliminary results and recommendations, with participation of key stakeholders of the different countries and regional stakeholders.

The draft ToRs, after approval by the EMC, will be shared with the key stakeholders (the Evaluation reference group) for comments. These comments will be then addressed in the final report.

10.1 Desk Review

The Desk review will include the following information sources:

- Project document.
- Monitoring and Evaluation Related Project Documents (Theory of Change, Log Frame, M&E Strategy, Annual Work Plan).
- Evaluability Assessment Report.
- Project monitoring plans and tools
- Progress reports.

⁴ https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_749261.pdf

- Project budget and related financial reports.
- Reports and products from various activities (including trainings, workshops, task force meetings, video conferences etc.).
- Communications Plan.
- Others as required.

All documents will be made available by the Project CTA, in coordination with the evaluation manager, in a drop-box (or similar) at the start of the evaluation.

During the inception phase in addition, the evaluation team will conduct initial virtual interviews with the project staff, UN agencies and the donor. The objective of the consultation is to reach a common understanding regarding expectations and available data sources.

The inception report will cover status of logistical arrangements, project background and materials, key evaluation questions and evaluation indicators, evaluation matrix, detailed work plan, list of stakeholders to be interviewed, outline of the stakeholders' workshop and of the final report, and all data collection tools following EVAL Checklist 3 (see Annex 1). The inception report will operationalize the ToRs and should be approved by the evaluation manager before moving to data collection at field level.

The evaluation team leader will receive a list of key stakeholders from the Project CTA if the Evaluator requires contacting other stakeholders, beyond the list, this can be discussed with the Evaluation Manager during the preparation of the inception report.

The Inception report draft will be reviewed methodologically by the EMC that must approved it to move to the data collection phase. SAs part of the EMC review the draft inception report will be shared with the project team and the donor for quick feedback.

The evaluator is encouraged to propose alternative mechanism or techniques for the data collection phase. These will be discussed with the project and the evaluation manager at the inception phase. Any alternative should be reflected in the inception report.

10.2 Data Collection/Field Visits

COVID-19 pandemic might restrict mobility for country and field visits at the time of the evaluation. In line with these restrictions, the evaluation data collection methodology will combine remote/virtual and fieldwork data collection. Regarding field visits, regulation to UN officers will apply to the consultants in terms of allowing field visits Should UN staff not be allowed to undertake field visits in any place, same applies to the consultants and those visits would be replaced with virtual interviews. This will require enhanced engagement and collaboration with the project team in terms of organizing the contact with stakeholders.

The evaluators will undertake group and/or individual discussions during field visit when necessary and feasible. The project will provide all its support in organization of these virtual interviews to the best extent possible. The evaluators will ensure that opinions and perceptions of women are equally reflected in the interviews and that gender-specific questions are included.

The field visits should consider a qualitative representative number of countries proposed under the framework of the number of working days proposed in the section 12.4 below, and the intensity of work of the project in countries presented in Annex 2. The evaluators' technical proposals should include suggested selection criteria and countries to consider during the evaluation with different emphasis in data collection. The selection may include criteria such as presence of the different PUNOs, cases with value for learning from work conducted by the project, strategic balance in the selection, value per se of field visit versus virtual data collection, etc.

A stakeholders' workshop will be conducted by the evaluators with the participation of the ERG and the EMC members to discuss initial findings and complete data gaps. The workshop will be facilitated by the EMC. It will be logistically supported by the project implementing agencies and programmatically managed by the evaluation team. The evaluation team leader will conduct the workshop virtually or based in Pretoria (HQ of the project). The details of it should be stated clearly in the Inception report for further preparation during the data collection phase.

10.3 Report Writing

Based on the inputs from desk review, interviews with key stakeholders, electronic questionnaires and other data collection tools applied crosschecked through triangulation, the evaluation team will draft the evaluation report.

The initial/zero draft evaluation report will be shared with the EMC for a methodological review. Once the EMC has approved it, it will be shared with the ERG for 10 working days for clarification and factual errors related comments. After that, the EMC leader will consolidate the comments and share them with the evaluators. Then, the evaluators will develop the final version of the report. This version will be shared with the EMC for a final review, and upon addressing any further comments from the EMC, a final version will be developed. This final version should be approved by the PUNOs Evaluation offices. Later on, beyond it the PUNOs will produce a management response on all recommendations linked to the PUNOs interventions.

11. Deliverables

1. Inception report (not more than 20 pages excluding the annexes) with detailed work plan and data collection instruments following EVAL Checklist 3 – see annex).
2. Presentation of preliminary findings at the stakeholders' workshop.

3. A concise draft evaluation report in English language (maximum 30 pages plus annexes and following EVAL Checklists 5 and 6 -see Annex) as per the following proposed structure:
 - Cover page with key project and evaluation data (using ILO EVAL template)
 - Executive Summary
 - Acronyms
 - Description of the project
 - Purpose, scope, and clients of the evaluation
 - Methodology and limitations
 - Clearly identified findings for each criterion (integrating questions per criterion)
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations (10-12 maximum in total, per each one: for whom, priority, timing and resources)
 - Lessons learned and good practices (briefly in the main report, and under ILO EVAL template in the annexes)
 - Lessons to be learned
 - Annexes:
 - TOR
 - Evaluation questions matrix
 - Data Table on Project Progress in achieving its targets by indicators with comments
 - Evaluation schedule
 - Documents reviewed
 - List of people interviewed
 - Lessons learned and good practices (using ILO-EVAL template)
 - Any other relevant documents
4. Final evaluation report (same outline that the draft report) and a log on how the comments received have been addressed.
5. Evaluation Summary using the ILO/EVAL template.

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data, as applicable, should be provided to the evaluation manager in electronic version compatible with Word for and are copyrighted by ILO.

12. Management Arrangements, Work Plan and Timelines

12.1 Composition of the Evaluation Team

As mentioned above, the evaluation will be conducted by an evaluation team that would include two to three international team members with one of them to be the Team Leader who will be the point of contact with the EMC through the ILO Evaluation Manager, and the person responsible for the report. The evaluation team will agree on the distribution of work and schedule for the evaluation.

The role of the Team Leader will consist of:

- Initial familiarization with the project through briefing with Evaluation Manager and project staff.
- Further familiarization through project and background documents.
- Development of inception report, sharing with Evaluation Manager for approval.
- Communication with Evaluation Manager about practical arrangements and progress.
- Division of roles and responsibilities with the other team members.
- Leadership throughout the evaluation process.
- Responsible for the development the draft report and sharing with the ILO.
- Responsible for the development of the final report.

12.2 Evaluation Management

The evaluation team leader will report to the Evaluation Management Committee (EMC) led by the ILO evaluation manager and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with them, should issues arise.

The EMC is composed by an evaluation officer from each agency, not linked to the programme and led by ILO. All officers will have evaluation background and work on this area in the agency they represent. The officer can be based anywhere, as the work will be virtual. The ILO evaluation manager, with support from ILO/EVAL, will provide the highest quality control, using ILO/EVAL checklists (see section 13).

The EMC function is to take full responsibility for the supervision of the evaluation teamwork, particularly the deliverables and assure a good relationship between them and the programme, acting as broker between both key actors for the evaluation. A major role is the approval of the programme deliverables (inception report, draft report, and final report) following UNEG and UN agencies evaluation standards and making sure to receive feedback from the Evaluation Reference Group (see below). The EMC assures the independence, credibility and transparency of process and its outcome. The EMC is the highest evaluation decision body, under the supervision of the UN agencies evaluation offices.

The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support of the programme staff led by the Project CTA, with the administrative support of the ILO Country Office in Pretoria (with support from the other UN agencies as necessary). The EMC, particularly through the ILO lead evaluation manager, will oversight the administrative and logistical support.

The evaluation process has two big phases: a) the implementation of the evaluation that ends with the final evaluation report approved by PUNOs Evaluation offices; and b) Management response and use of the evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons, and good practices. The first phase is under management of the EMC. The second phase is under management of the PUNOs (the project implementation units and the Evaluation Offices) as per internal procedures.

The selected company may be contracted under 2 or more contracts with the UN agencies participating in the project. This will be discussed at the time of the start the contracting process.

12.3 Evaluation Reference Group

The PUNOs and key project stakeholders (such as national and RECs stakeholders, implementing partners, etc.) integrate the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). These stakeholders ERG members have been identified at the planning step of this evaluation. The draft ToRs have been shared with all of them for their comments. The ERG has no management role. Its function is to provide technical advice to the EMC and through them to the evaluation team to improve the quality of the evaluation based on their knowledge of the context and the programme. In detail the ERG has the following functions:

Planning

- Review draft TORs and provide feedback ensuring that the TOR leads to a useful evaluation output and provide any additional key background information to inform the finalization of the ToR.
- Identify source documents for the evaluation team.

Data Collection

- Act as key informants during the data collection stage. Assist the evaluation team by providing sources of the information and facilitating data access.
- Attend the end of data collection workshop to discuss preliminary findings.

Data Analysis and Reporting

- Review and comment on the draft evaluation report, specifically focusing on accuracy, quality, and comprehensiveness of the basis against which the findings are presented, and conclusions and recommendations are made.
- Particular attention should be given to ensuring that the recommendations are relevant, targeted, realistic, and actionable.
- The ERG must respect the decision of the independent evaluators regarding the extent of incorporation of feedback provided to them by the ERG and other stakeholders, as long as there is sufficient transparency in how they have addressed the feedback, including clear rationale for any feedback that has not been incorporated.

Disseminate and Follow-up Phase (led by project management)

After the EMC lead deliver the final evaluation report to the PUNOs,

- Disseminate the final evaluation report internally and externally, as relevant.
- Share, as relevant, evaluation findings within the respective units, organizations, networks and at key events.
- Provide input to the PUNOs management response and its implementation as appropriate by each PUNO.
- Apply the learning extensively as appropriate.

12.4 Work Plan and Timelines

The total duration of the evaluation process is estimated to 49 working days for the team leader and 41 for the team member.

N.	Activity	Responsible	Team leader No days	Team member No days	Team member No days	Dates
1	<p><u>Evaluation process planning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies designate Evaluation Management Committee (EMC) members and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) List of stakeholders to share the TORs draft for comments Draft ToR shared with ERG and EMC, the donor, and other parties as relevant, for feedback and finalization 	Evaluation Management Committee - EMG	0	0	0	August – November 2022
2	<p><u>Selection and contracting of evaluation team:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publication of the Call for expression of interest Selection Contracting process 	EMC	0	0	0	November-2022-January 2023
3	<p><u>Evaluation process:</u></p>					
a	Briefing to the Evaluator	EMC	1	1	1	Mid-January 2023
b	Desk-review phase and Inception report development	Evaluation team (ET) with project support	12	10	10	January 2023

c	Approval of the Inception report	EMC	0	0	0	Early February 2023
d	Data collection (virtual and face-to-face)	ET with programme support	20	20	20	Early February-March 2023
e	Stakeholders' workshop (preliminary findings and recommendations and fill information gaps)	ET with programme support	1	1	1	March 2023
f	Draft report development	ET	10	7	7	April 2023
g	Methodological review and approval of the draft before circulation	EMC	0	0	0	April 2023
h	Circulate the draft report to ERF	EMC	0	0	0	April 2023
i	Consolidate comments from stakeholders and share with the Evaluator	EMC	0	0	0	May 2023
j	Incorporate comments from programme team and stakeholders	Evaluation team	3	2	2	May 2023
k	Review by EMC and UN agencies evaluation offices	EMC/EML	0	0	0	May 2023
l	Finalization of the report according to comments by EMC and UN agencies evaluation offices	Evaluation team	2	0	0	May 2023
m	Approval of the evaluation by PUNOs evaluation offices	EMC	0	0	0	May 2023
4	<u>Dissemination:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upload the report in the ILO/EVAL public website and other PUNOs Management response 	PUNOs and Project management	0	0	0	May-June 2023

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UN agencies and other stakeholders learning use of the evaluation report 					
Total number of days for evaluators			49	41	41	

12.5 Evaluation team responsibilities

Evaluation team leader responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Desk review of programme documents b. Briefing with EMC c. Preliminary interviews with the UN agencies and programme officers d. Development of the inception report including the evaluation instrument e. Undertake interviews with stakeholders (virtual) f. Facilitate the virtual stakeholders' workshop g. Draft evaluation report h. Finalise evaluation report

Evaluation team member responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Support the desk review of programme documents b. Undertake interviews with stakeholders c. Support the facilitation of the stakeholders' workshop d. Provide inputs in the draft and final evaluation reports

12.6 Resources

Estimated resource requirements at this point:

- Evaluator consultancy fee for 49 working days for the team leader consultant and 45 for each of the two team members consultants.
- Field missions as per ILO travel regulations (DSA and travel support).
- Translation and interpretation (this could be eventually supported directly by the project).
- Stakeholders' workshop (interpreters if need).

12.7 Calendar of payment

- Approval of the inception report 20%
- Presentation of the preliminary findings (PowerPoints at the stakeholders' workshop) and approved draft report 40%
- Final report approved 40%

12.8 Qualifications and Experience

Team leader

1. Master's degree in social sciences, Monitoring and Evaluation, Development Studies or related field.
2. A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating multi-country and regional development initiatives and programmes (as team leader in some cases), preferable in Africa; and comprising human rights, gender, and inclusiveness.
3. Proven experience with logical framework and theory of change approaches and other strategic planning approaches on M&E methods, information analysis and report writing. extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research methodologies.
4. Evaluation experiences in labour migration, mixed Migration, and/or refugee's fields on institutional settings and capacity building will be an asset.
5. In-depth knowledge of the local context, national policies in terms of development and existing national and international support programs the in the Southern Africa region countries covered by the project.
6. Knowledge and experience of working with the UN System will be an asset.
7. Excellent communication and interview skills.
8. Demonstrated excellent report writing and speaking skills in English. French and Portuguese will be an asset (it may be complemented by the team members).
9. Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.
10. No prior involvement with this project.

Evaluator team members 1 and 2

1. Degree in Social Sciences, Development studies, or related graduate qualifications.
2. A minimum of 7 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating multi-country and regional development initiatives and programmes, preferable in Africa; and comprising human rights, gender and inclusiveness.
3. Experience in Labour Migration and/or Mixed Migration field and/or Migration and refugees, including evaluation, on institutional settings and capacity building will be an asset (the evaluation team leader and/or the evaluation team member should have this experience).
4. Proven experience with logical framework and theory of change approaches and other strategic planning approaches on M&E, information analysis and report writing. extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies.
5. In-depth knowledge of the local context, national policies in terms of development and existing national and international support programs in the Southern Africa region countries covered by the project.

6. Knowledge and experience of working in the UN System will be an asset.
7. Excellent communication and interview skills.
8. Demonstrated excellent report writing and speaking skills in English. French and Portuguese and other national and local languages in the region will be an asset will be an asset.
9. Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.
10. No prior involvement with this project

Note: The consultants can propose other team arrangements that address the above requirements.

13. Evaluation process and criteria

The companies should apply as per instructions in the invitation documents.

The criteria to assess the received proposals are the following:

1. Technical and methodological approach and understanding of the terms of reference: 20 points

- Demonstration of understanding of the purpose of the assignment
- Demonstrated experience with logframe approaches, theory of change, M&E methods and approaches, and information analysis
- Extensive knowledge and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research methodologies

2. Specific experience and relevant expertise of the firm in connection with the mission: 20 points

- Description of skills, qualifications and experience of the firm showing suitability for the assignment.
- Demonstrate the expertise and capacity of the firm to conduct the project evaluation, particularly within the United Nations system and/or with international development organizations.

3. Specific experience of the evaluation team and relevant expertise related to the mission: 15 points

- Evidence of qualification/certification of proposed staff
- Evidence of previous work experience and good performance in similar assignments for the ILO or UN agencies or multilateral and bilateral organizations.
- Evidence of previous experience of the proposed team in evaluating similar project preferably in Southern Africa
- Solid experience on issues related to migration management policies in Africa, as well as in human rights-based programming and results-based management will be an asset.

4. Relevance of the engagement implementation and management plan: 15 points

- Does the implementation plan include all deliverables with a tentative timeline?
- Are the number and responsibility of key personnel involved in the mission defined?
- Does the proposed number of people and the implementation plan allow the consultant to complete the work within the timeframe?

Technical Score Total: 70 points

Financial score: 30 points

Annexes

Annex 1 Relevant Documents and Tools on the ILO Evaluation Policy

1. Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluator)

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

2. Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

3. Checklist 5 Preparing the evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

4. Checklist 6 Rating the quality of evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

5. Template for lessons learned and Emerging Good Practices

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm

6. Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

7. Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

8. Template for evaluation title page

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

9. Template for evaluation summary:

Annex 2 Current SAMM project implementing agencies active work by country

COUNTRY	ILO	IOM	UNODC	UNHCR
Angola	x	x	✓	x
Botswana	x	✓	✓	✓
Comoros	x	x	x	✓
DRC	x	x	✓	x
Eswatini	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lesotho	✓	✓	✓	✓
Madagascar	x	x	x	✓
Malawi	x	✓	✓	✓
Mauritius	✓	✓	x	✓
Mozambique	x	✓	✓	x
Namibia	✓	✓	✓	✓
Seychelles	✓	✓	✓	✓
South Africa	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tanzania	x	x	x	x
Zambia	✓	✓	✓	✓
Zimbabwe	x	✓	✓	✓

✓ Country in which the PUNO work is more intense.

x Country in which the PUNO work is less intense.

Annex 3 Project Theory of Change

Project vision: “Migration management in the Southern Africa and Indian Ocean Regions is strengthened to protect the rights of migrants and persons of concern* to fully enable them to contribute to and benefit from national, regional and global development policy agendas”

Key assumptions within the Theory of Change of the proposed project:

1. Rapid recovery from Covid-19 impacts leads to removal of restrictions on movement and public engagements.
2. Low level of disruption associated with conflict and disaster-related risks in SAMM project countries.
3. Continuous political buy-in and commitment from partner countries and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) to Labour Migration (LM) and Mixed Migration (MM).
4. Sufficient human and financial resources from partners and institutions, RECs, national government agencies, private sector, civil society and local communities.

Intervention logic for attaining SOIs

SO1: Progressive change in legislations and implementation of evidence-based policies at RECs and national level will stimulate/facilitate an enabling policy and legal environment for Labour migrants/migrant workers to effectively exercise their rights and pursue economic and development opportunities.

SO2: The development and implementation of evidence-based policies on MM at RECs and national level, will gradually address the legal and socio-economic barriers that hamper the protection of migrants and persons of concern* and enhanced management of mixed flows.

Intervention logic for realizing KRAs

Key result area 1.1: Effective implementation of LM legislations and policies at regional and national level, will enhance the ability of relevant institutions to provide opportunities for efficient channels and protection measures that incrementally reduce the incidence of rights abuses and non-compliance to international and regional standards with regard to migrant workers.

Key result area 1.2: The provision of quality data and knowledge products on LM will enable better implementation and monitoring of policies, as well as effective reporting on international and regional standards, thus facilitating decisions about which migration management strategies protect the rights of migrants and persons of concern*

Key result area 2.1: The generation, analysis, dissemination and utilization of data on effective mixed migration management strategies and policies, will provide opportunities for appropriate protection frameworks, targeted at migrants and persons of concern*.

Overarching Challenges for Managing LM and MM in SA & OI Region

- RECs have distinct refugee/migration regimes and integration models.
- Few countries have systematic legislations on LM and MM aligned to international and regional frameworks.
- Significant incidence of trafficking, illegal migration and smuggling of migrants, particularly vulnerable women and girls.
- Lack of harmonized data collection for LM and MM flows
- Informal labor migration flows with no social protection framework.
- National restrictions on LM and MM increase migrant's vulnerabilities.

ToC Diagram



