

## ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Cooperation on Partnership and Migration for Sustainable Solutions (COMPASS) Initiative –

#### Final evaluation

##### Evaluation Context:

Cooperation on Partnership and Migration for Sustainable Solutions (COMPASS) is implemented by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands (MFA). The programme aims to ensure that migrants of all gender and diversity groups have access to protection sensitive pathways and are empowered to contribute to sustainable development outcomes in their communities.

COMPASS foresees an ecological approach, involving responses at the: i) individual and household; ii) community, and; iii) structural levels.

The Dutch MFA has contributed a budget of 55,150,000 EUR for a period of three years from 01 January 2021 to 31 March 2024. COMPASS is currently implemented in 14 countries and focuses on the following intervention areas for people on the move:

- migrant protection (including combating trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, and promoting safe and dignified return and sustainable reintegration);
- community-level programming aimed at preventing unsafe and irregular migration and improving sustainable reintegration outcomes;
- focus on policies and legal frameworks to enable a conducive environment for migrant protection;
- partnerships, with a focus on coordination, information sharing and learning.

Prominent in the design of the COMPASS programme is an ecological approach intended as the recognition that individuals are part of a broader social dynamic. They interact and rely on their families, their communities, and the broader society governed by the State. The idea of a whole-of-society approach is one of the core messages coming out of the processes behind the development of the two Global Compacts as well as of the IMRF. It recognises the shift towards a more holistic approach to better respond to needs and uphold rights.

The 14 participating countries are: Afghanistan, Algeria, Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan and Tunisia.

##### Evaluation purpose

The final evaluation will look at the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability of the programme<sup>1</sup>. To this end, the evaluation will assess the achievements of the programme against its key objectives, including re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and of the design. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives.

The donor, IOM HQ, ROs involved in the COMPASS and the implementing IOM Country Offices as well as the Governments involved, project beneficiaries and implementing partners are the main audience for this evaluation and will use the lessons learned to improve quality of response for upcoming programmes. Lessons learned, recommendations and best practices will be also shared with involved partners, beneficiaries and stakeholders at country, regional and HQ level.

---

<sup>1</sup> In line with adapted OECD DAC evaluation criteria, 2019.

To date, there have been a range of monitoring and evaluation activities implemented under the COMPASS. The evaluation is intended to consolidate the findings and lessons learned that have been identified where applicable.

### **Evaluation scope**

The evaluation will make use of four case studies, chosen to represent different types of programme activities - two in-person case studies are Morocco and Nigeria with Iraq and Ethiopia to be conducted remotely. The period under review will cover the whole programme period, from start of implementation in January 2021 till end of March 2024.

### **Evaluation Criteria and Questions:**

The evaluation questions below, based on the OECD/DAC criteria represent a provisional and indicative list of questions to be reviewed and refined by the evaluation team in the scoping and inception phase of the evaluation process. The questions will be tailored to the primary areas of focus, and will examine the role of the country offices, the ROs in Cairo, Dakar, Bangkok, and Nairobi, as well as HQ in the programme implementation.

#### **1. Relevance/Appropriateness:**

1. How appropriate are programme activities to the declared migrant, returnee and community needs?
2. Whether the capacity building component corresponds to the declared needs of the local and national governments in the area of protection, return and reintegration?
3. In what ways has the affected population<sup>2</sup> and relevant stakeholders been involved in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the programme?
4. To what degree have gender, disability, ethnicity and protection issues been included in the programme?
5. Is the programme viewed by stakeholders and beneficiaries as “Doing the right thing”?
6. Has the programme design reflected the priorities of Government of the Netherlands articulated as “protecting human rights, reducing irregular migration, preventing human trafficking and people smuggling, ensuring better border controls and encouraging the return and reintegration of migrants.”

#### **2. Effectiveness:**

1. Have all the programmatic and operational commitments been delivered?
2. To what extent have the envisaged outcomes been reached / have the outputs contributed to achieving the outcomes?
3. Are there any unintended outcomes that can be identified?
4. Did the programme create any substantial unintentional outcomes?
5. Has the programme defined and administered appropriate, coherent, and consistent ways of screening migrant vulnerabilities (both before and after return)? To what extent was eligibility to receive assistance from the programme determined by vulnerabilities?
6. Have all reasonable efforts been taken by the programme and its implementing partners to reach and remain in contact with beneficiaries?
7. Have extra measures been put in place to reach and remain in contact with the most vulnerable individuals?
8. How cross cutting themes and intersectionality were addressed by the programme?

---

<sup>2</sup> Migrants (in host/transit countries who would like to return or those already in their country of return, stranded migrants, plus potential migrants), host and transit communities, societies in the target countries of the region with a particular focus on youth, EU Member States, national stakeholders part of the EU-IOM Joint Initiative in the Horn of Africa, African Union Commission and Regional Economic Communities.

### **3. Efficiency:**

1. Were the programme activities designed and implemented in an economic and timely way<sup>3</sup>?
2. What are the internal and external constraints that need to be accounted for in the future programming to avoid budget overruns and programme delays?
3. What are the main reasons for delays in assistance provision? Has the programme addressed them appropriately? Were the most efficient modalities of assistance deliverance chosen out of the options available?
4. To what extent has the programme tapped into existing services provided by referral actors (who are not receiving funding by the programme for the services they provide)?
5. To what extent the COMPASS design allowed IOM to respond quickly and adapt to changing contexts.

### **4. Coherence:**

1. How has the programme increased the availability of protection, return and reintegration services for the beneficiaries?
2. How well was the programme coordinated with other interventions, both internal to IOM and external? Have all the opportunities been used to integrate/expand the assistance provided by the programme with other initiatives?
3. How well has the programme involved the private sector in building engagement through available opportunities? If so, which sectors have been engaged?
4. To what extent has the programme engaged government entities/institutions? What are the possible opportunities/ resources to further this engagement?
5. What are the outcomes of incorporating cross cutting themes into the programming such as Gender mainstreaming, MHPSS, Localization, green initiatives etc.

### **5. Sustainability:**

1. Was the support provided to beneficiaries sufficient to achieve sustainable reintegration as per IOM's definition of sustainable reintegration.
2. Was the reintegration counselling process participatory, comprehensive and flexible enough to find a combination of assistance suitable to achieve sustainable reintegration?
3. Has ownership of Migrant Resource Centers (MRCs) by government authorities increased thanks to and during the programme?
4. How sustainable are programme reintegration results at an individual- and community-level?
5. Has the programme put in place measures to mitigate any major constraints for community-based projects to continue generating benefits after the programme closure?
6. How was Government/Community ownership promoted in the area of return and reintegration?
7. How sustainable are programme results on the structural and government levels?
8. What long term formal and informal partnerships (beyond project implementation period) were established to support programme results, including new partnerships established between IOM's implementing partners with other local entities?
9. To what extent lessons learned from earlier programmes have been incorporated into the programme design

The Final Evaluation will identify the most important results, lessons learned and best practices to be considered for future programming in the recommendations/next steps section.

---

<sup>3</sup> Where "Economic" is the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context, and "Timely" delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context.

## Evaluation Methodology

In order to help gather as much insight as possible, the methodology should seek to maximize efficiency in generating insight and minimize disruptions to the programme workflows, at a critical phase during which programme staff deals with prolonged effects of national emergencies and imminent closure of the programme operations, the evaluation will follow a phased approach, which will allow time for reflection and real-time feedback. The evaluation aims to be participatory in its approach, to ensure ownership and promote interaction with the IOM teams in the country offices, Regional Offices, relevant staff at IOM HQ, and relevant state and non-state IOM partners.

The Evaluation will to the extent possible, consult the following stakeholders:

- Migrants and returnees
- Community members
- Implementing partners and other relevant actors (e.g., NGOs, UN agencies, private sectors, migrant community associations, etc.)
- Government partners and departments
- IOM staff including programme field staff, RO staff, HQ staff

The Evaluation will employ mixed methods with a particular focus on case-based approaches to triangulate qualitative and quantitative data and reach findings and conclusions in each phase, as outlined below. Data collection will be conducted In Person in Ethiopia and Morocco, and remotely for other locations to ensure a comprehensive and inclusive analysis.

**Phase 1: Scoping and Inception Phase** – The first phase involves rapid desk review of key documents provided by IOM’s country offices and HQ and identifying success cases for the case based approach - IOM will provide the evaluation team with all relevant documentation and information, including programme documents, Framework AVRR SOPs, internal and external reports, mid-term evaluation, needs assessments, research outputs, and survey reports as well as other documents that will be considered relevant.

IOM will also discuss and agree with the evaluation team on timelines of key milestones and provide a list of key informants from IOM, beneficiaries, and other partner organizations and stakeholders to be interviewed.

The main output of the scoping and inception phase will be an Inception Report, to be approved by IOM.

**Phase 2: Structured Field Work Phase** – In the second phase, the evaluation will employ a mixed-method approach entailing data collection, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data to put together a comprehensive and credible evidence base to assess programme implementation. At the end of the data collection a short report with preliminary findings will be presented.

**Phase 3: Report Preparation Phase** – This phase of the evaluation will include the drafting and finalization of the final report, based on the analysis of data and information gathered in Phase 1 and 2, which will provide a comprehensive assessment of the COMPASS programme.

**Phase 4: Dissemination** – The evaluation team will conduct a final debrief to communicate the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation, and to facilitate strategic reflection and uptake of useful lessons and recommendations.

The evaluation must follow the IOM Data Protection Principles, United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards for evaluations, as well as relevant ethical guidelines.

Bidders are invited to elaborate in their Technical Proposals on the intended approach(es) to data collection and the targeted amount of data to be collected: e.g., for qualitative data collection, the minimum number of

Key Informants Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) to be conducted; for quantitative data collection, the targeted sample size and the sampling methodology envisaged.

Respondents, Informants and FGD participants will be selected in close coordination with IOM, based on relevance and other methodological or protection-related considerations. The Service Provider is also responsible for the definition of appropriate data collection tools, which will be reviewed by IOM before their deployment.

### Ethics

This assignment will entail data collection from different subject which may include vulnerable individuals and households. It is essential that data collection is conducted in full compliance with recognised ethical standards. This includes the need to obtain and record the informed consent of the respondents/participants prevent or avoid situations where the respondents/participants may suffer (directly or indirectly) any damage by making themselves available to the research. Perspective Service Providers are invited to elaborate on the ethical and methodological standards envisaged for data collection activities. During the assignment, the Service Provider is required to apply the data collection guidelines, protocols and the consent formulae suggested by IOM.

Perspective Service Providers are also invited to demonstrate a clear understanding of IOM Data Protection principles in their proposals, and to elaborate on how these are incorporated in their proposed approach and plans.

### Evaluation Deliverables

The evaluation team will generate the following major outputs in English language that will be reviewed by relevant IOM staff and the Reference Group. These include:

1. **An inception report** of maximum 15 pages (not including annexes). The inception report is intended to outline the evaluation team's understanding of the COMPASS programme. It will include a proposed methodology and workplan as well as data collection tools (i.e., interview guide for KIIs, focus group discussion guides, questionnaires for consultations with beneficiaries, etc.) to be used during the evaluation.
2. **Report (Preliminary Findings)** of maximum of 10 pages at the end of the data collection phase.
3. **Draft Evaluation Report** that outlines clear evidence-based findings, conclusions, and specific recommendations.
4. **Final Evaluation Report** with a clear Executive Summary of no more than 10 pages.
5. **Abridged report** of no more than 30 pages.
6. **Power-point Presentations** that will be used by the evaluation team to present the findings at the final debriefing.
7. **Learning brief** of no more than 5 pages that outlines key methodology, findings, and conclusions as well as recommendations to be used for dissemination.

### Timeframe

IOM expects the assignment to be fully completed by the **30 September 2024**.

### Desired Qualifications of the service provider

The Evaluation team should consist of a minimum of five well-qualified experts whose collective expertise covers evaluation techniques, experience with UN/IOM programmes and policies, and thematic knowledge pertinent to the MTR, including migration/forced migration, protection/human rights, multi-sectoral coordination, gender, localisation, and MHPSS. Additionally, the team is also expected to bring extensive experience in conducting evaluations in fragile contexts or developing countries, particularly within the regions addressed by the COMPASS programme. The evaluation will be executed by a core team, augmented by a specialist in MHPSS to ensure a thorough and context-sensitive assessment.

#### **Pricing Schedule:**

The IOM preferred payment modality is upon the successful submission of the deliverables, as per the below pricing schedule:

- 30% after submission of the inception report
- 30% after submission of the preliminary analysis
- 20% after submission of the first draft report
- 20% after submission of the final report and the presentation

