The Global Migration Group (GMG) is currently undertaking an inventory of impact assessments of international migration projects and programmes carried out by its 16 member agencies.

This is still very much work in progress and responses are beginning to come in.

I would like to share with you the process, our plans and what we have learned from the responses so far.

**Background**

To undertake this inventory, three agencies of the GMG’s Working Group on Data and Research – UNDESA, UNFPA and IOM - designed a brief questionnaire that was sent to all GMG agencies with the request to collect information on impact assessments that agencies have carried out or which are planned - at headquarters, regional and country levels, as applicable. UNFPA is taking the lead in compiling the information.

The purpose of this exercise is to raise awareness of the importance of assessing the impact of migration projects and programmes, thereby enabling GMG agencies to work more strategically in the area of migration and development at country and regional levels.

Once all responses are received, a final document will be prepared and shared as a GMG input to the Global Forum on Migration and Development process. The plan is to present the final analysis in a guide describing available processes, outcomes, and impact indicators, and providing recommendations for good practices in assessing the impact of migration projects and programmes on development.
Again, this exercise is still work in progress. So far, we have received responses from only a handful of GMG agencies. However, the responses refer to joint collaborations with other GMG agencies, including those which have not yet replied, so we are actually covering the activities of more agencies.

The questionnaire focused on projects/programmes on international migration implemented (completed or on-going) in the last five years. As expected, the IOM reported the largest number of migration projects, with other GMG agencies having a few projects each. (Over 2,700 projects were reported (completed or still ongoing) in the last five years.) Agencies that submitted responses reported only on the five most significant projects or programmes they conducted in the last five years. Most projects relied on joint collaboration between GMG agencies, governmental institutions, NGOs and national statistical offices as well as other UN agencies such as UNAIDS and UNV.

The projects addressed a wide range of migration issues, including

1. Labour Migration
2. Temporary Migration
3. Circular Migration
4. Return and Reintegration
5. Highly Skilled Migration / Brain Drain
6. Costs of migration (financial, social, etc.)
7. Diaspora Engagement
8. Refugees, Reintegration and Resettlement
9. Remittance transfers
10. Combating Human Trafficking
11. Migrant Integration
12. Migration Statistics

Agencies were asked if the projects were subject to an evaluation and/or to an impact assessment and to provide more detail concerning both. Evaluations review how migration related projects and programmes have been implemented, assessing, for example, the generation of planned...
outputs, project management, evaluation of target number of beneficiaries, etc. They are often referred to as “monitoring and evaluation” or M & E.

**Evaluations**
Most agencies conducted evaluations of their projects. Often monitoring and evaluation was part of the logical framework or donor reporting. Agencies provided information on the objective of the project with its respective M&E indicators, data sources and information regarding the frequency for data collection.

Where migration projects were evaluated less often than other projects, the reasons given included difficulty in evaluating, political sensitivity, and a lack of resources. Only the IOM reported a specialized internal unit for M&E; most agencies relied on external expertise for this.

Some GMG agencies submitted project documents and materials produced as a result of the project. We will be reviewing all documents and publications to help better understand the process and learn from the experience.

What did we learn? We need to do better in identifying indicators to measure the desired outcomes. This is an issue GMG agencies should address and improve upon to ensure proper M&E.

**Some Examples of Evaluations:**

**UNITAR/UNFPA/IOM/MacArthur Foundation Migration and Development Seminar Series** – evaluated after every seminar

**Indicators for Evaluation:**

Attendance and active participation in seminars
Level of participation within the Permanent Missions
Feedback from evaluation; questionnaires
Feedback on substantive reports
Number of hits/visits to the UNITAR “Key Migration Issues” website
Feedback from financial report
Implementation and use of knowledge tools; expansion of partnerships within and outside the UN
Soliciting of the Series’ organizers for information and assistance by Member States, other UN entities and civil society actors
Visits to the UNITAR “Migration and Development Series” website and Migration Capacity Development Portal

WHO

Development of the 2010 WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel
In the context of the WHO Global Code of Practice, the World Health Assembly (WHA) should periodically review the relevance and effectiveness of the Code (Art. 9.5). Also, Member States’ reports on the monitoring of the implementation of the Code will be provided to WHO and serve as a basis for the WHO Director General’s report on the monitoring of the implementation of the Code to the World Health Assembly (every 3 years).

UNFPA


Objectives: design state programme for prevention, sanction, protection and assistance to human trafficking victims; sensitize and train government officials on the prevention, protection, and assistance to victims of trafficking; compile and systematize national data on trafficking; design and distribute materials on trafficking.
**M&E Indicators**

State Programme for prevention, sanction, protection, attention, and assistance to human trafficking victims designed and approved

Workshop for government officials designed, tested, and implemented

Vulnerability analysis on human trafficking designed, implemented and analyzed

Human trafficking perception survey designed, conducted and analyzed

State of law at the national and local level elaborated

Media guide designed, approved and presented

**Impact Assessments**

GMG agencies were asked whether they conducted impact assessments of their migration projects and programmes. Impact assessments go beyond the implementation process and examine the effects of migration-related projects or programmes on development. Assessments show whether or not key development variables were affected by the project. For example, if more migrants were able to attain labour rights as a result of the project, if children left behind were more likely to attend school, or if incomes of migrant families were raised.

We found that very few projects underwent an impact assessment. We received detailed information from very few projects that were assessed based on the impact they have on the targeted aspect of international migration.

**IOM**

**Information Campaign to Combat Trafficking in Women and Children in Cambodia**


**Desired Impact**

To raise awareness of levels of target audiences on essential aspects of trafficking
To encourage community organization and mobilization to combat trafficking

To change attitudes towards trafficking

**Indicators**

Increased awareness of dangers of blind migration
Increased awareness of precautions to protect oneself
Increased awareness on means of self-protection
Awareness of where participants are most at risk of being trafficked
Increased knowledge of trafficking hotline
Increased willingness to report trafficking
Increased confidence in authorities to act upon a report of trafficking
Increased understanding of trafficking (definition)
Negativity of attitude towards trafficking
General change in attitude and behaviour
Increased awareness of illegality of trafficking
Negativity of attitude towards blind migration

In this example, the impact assessment included a control group (a group that did not benefit from the project).

**Methodology of the Impact Assessment**

Individual interviews were designed for a sample of 120 respondents group from the IC group and 100 respondents from VBA, with a control group made up of 180 respondents from the same six provinces, this group did not participate in the activities. Focus Group Discussions were held with local authorities from district to village level. Participants included village chiefs, commune chiefs, police and local government workers who participated in the IC and VBA.

The raw data from the field survey were compared with the baseline data from a 2004 stakeholder analysis to look for a significant difference. In general, the impact assessment for the
information campaign has shown significant improvement in awareness in both groups of participants (IC and VBA), compared with the baseline data from early 2004.

Another IOM project in Mali (2003-2004) aimed at “guaranteeing child victims of human trafficking an effective assistance in reintegration and rehabilitation”. Indicators included 1) Increase beneficiary revenue, 2) Beneficiaries are reintegrated and do not leave again, 3) Families recognize the value of their children’ new activities, 4) Girls work in activities traditionally reserved for men, 5) Beneficiaries are informed of risks of international trafficking, were applied; increased family revenue, improvement of quality of life of the family.

An evaluation of IOM’s programme MIDA Grands Lacs Phase III (Africa Great Lakes Region) contained the following description of desired outcomes/impacts and indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of desired outcomes/impacts</th>
<th>Description of indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Economic, social and cultural stability and human development favoured through intervention of diaspora | • Number of thematic groups created by the diaspora  
• Number of support projects comprising several experts |
| Diaspora members contribute to education sector | • Number of assistants trained  
• Shortening of university cycle  
• Improvement of pedagogical equipment and other resources |
| Diaspora members contribute to health sector | • Number of new techniques used in the absence of an expert thanks to the provision of equipment  
• Improved Effectiveness of services (number of patients treated, number of difficult cases tended to) |
Diaspora members contribute to rural development

- Implementation of strategic plans and reforms
- Implementation of proposed work

An initial desk review analysed the information from experts in the field. At the same time, interviews with experts in Brussels who went on missions under MIDA III were conducted. These were followed by field missions to the three partner countries in order to meet with national authorities, beneficiary institutions, direct beneficiaries, experts and other stakeholders. A survey of the physical transfers of remittances was conducted. To finalize the visits, focus groups were conducted with expert members of the Congolese, Rwandese, and Burundian diaspora.

**ECLAC – Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean** - Partnering with Regional Commissions and the United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs

**Strengthening National Capacities to Deal with International Migration: Maximizing Development Benefits and Minimizing Negative Impact (2010-2011)**

An impact assessment is planned at the end of the project.

**Indicators**

Records of government staff attending technical workshops on migration topics organized in the context of the project. The information will be gathered by project staff during the technical workshops

Legal instruments of national development policies and programmes incorporating international migration issues

New, updated and expanded databases. The relevant information will be collected by assessing how these information tools are being used for research purposes
Formal commitment from statistical and migration authorities to provide information to the network

Records of relevant entities participating in activities related to the network. The information will be collected by project staff from participants’ lists during the different activities of the project

Number of visits to the project website, downloads of documents and online consultations. These data will be collected automatically using special software of the project website

It is important to note that most agencies conducting impact assessments reported taking the recommendations of the assessment into account in future planning.

Issues

Some agencies found it difficult to say exactly how many migration projects they had because migrants are considered part of “vulnerable populations”. For example, WHO reported that there are few stand alone “migrant health” programmes.

What does not always become clear is the difference between impact and M&E indicators. In one assessment, these were used interchangeably. Here GMG agencies need to improve in order to ensure that the impact assessment actually does assess the desired outcome.

Next Steps

Cultivate a culture of evaluation and assessment. Plan and budget for them early in the process – when formulating the project proposal
Conduct more impact assessments to examine the effect projects are having on development. Do our projects make a difference? Is this the best use of limited resources? Is this the way we should be going?

Come up with solid indicators. They should be measurable, and data should be available, reliable and timely

Results should be shared in order to learn from each other’s experience

Recommendations should be taken into account in future planning