

3/3/2017

Migration and Development Civil Society (MADE) Network: External Evaluation



MADE

Migration and Development
Civil Society Network

Sarah Pugh, PhD
ACACIA DEVELOPMENT CONSULTING
CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA

VERSION: FINAL

Executive Summary

Projects Under Evaluation

This evaluation focuses on the work of the MADE Network, through two core European Commission-funded projects held by the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC): “IMPACS Migration and Development (Improving Migration and Development Partnerships and Action with Civil Society)”¹ and “ENGAGE – Strengthening the GFMD Civil Society Network on Migration and Development.”² The total eligible costs of IMPACS and ENGAGE combined was €3,303,635.86, out of which the total EC contribution was €2,576,087.00. Both projects required co-funding, with ICMC Europe responsible for 20% of co-funding for IMPACS, and 25% for ENGAGE. Co-funding for both projects totalled €727,548.56, including €70,552.53 from MADE partner contributions. The remaining €656,996.03 consisted of funding from various governments (including Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates), as well as contributions from other donors such as the Open Society Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation and Bancomer.

IMPACS focused mainly on the activities meant to strengthen civil society’s thematic knowledge and expertise, and to enhance civil society’s capacity at both a regional and global level to engage with external actors (e.g. policy makers, governments, multilateral and international organisations), particularly in the context of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). ENGAGE, in turn, focused on building the capacity of civil society organisations, within and amongst themselves, through the creation of the MADE network. ENGAGE activities focused largely on enhancing the capacity, representation, geographic spread, effectiveness and sustainability of civil society, globally, in both framing and following up on the practical recommendations of the GFMD. Both IMPACS and ENGAGE were designed around the engagement of core regional partners in Chile, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Senegal, and the UK, whose activities fed into the logical frameworks of IMPACS and ENGAGE, and followed the same logic of strengthening external and internal civil society capacity and engagement. Core regional partners included Fundación Scalabrini in Chile, the International Network on Migration and Development (INMD) in Mexico, the Migrant Forum in Asia in the Philippines, Caritas Senegal, and Cordaid in the Netherlands. Initially, the African Diaspora Policy Centre (ADPC) was also a partner, but a mutual decision to terminate this partnership was taken after one year. Following this, the African Foundation for Development, known widely as AFFORD, in the UK, was brought on as a partner from July 2015.

Purpose of the Evaluation

In accordance with the ToR, this evaluation was conducted as a final evaluation for IMPACS and ENGAGE. As outlined in the ToR, the first objective of this evaluation was to gather lessons learned and suggestions for the future of MADE from MADE partners on the achievements of the two projects of MADE. The second objective was to gather lessons learned and suggestions for the future of MADE from other stakeholders (governments/other

¹ Contract number: DCI-MIGR/2013/334-176

² Contract number: EuropeAid/131140/C/ACT/Multi

CSOs/international organizations (INGO's, UN agencies)/private sector), particularly those that have worked with MADE in some capacity (see Annex 2).

Methods

The Evaluator was contracted by the ICMC following a selection process in December 2016. The contract was for 25 days, between January 2 and Feb 28, 2017. The evaluation ToR are included as Annex 2.

The Evaluator selected a range of evaluation tools with which to conduct this work, with the aim of cross-checking information sources, triangulating data, and matching the time and cost constraints of the evaluation. Data was collected through a desk phase (for a list of documents reviewed, see Annex 1) along with inception meetings in Brussels. The Field Phase included key informant interviews with MADE/ICMC staff and former staff, MADE regional partners, donors, international organisations, governments and other NGOs working in the field. A total of 31 key informant interviews were held. A 1.5 day-long participatory evaluation workshop was also held in Brussels with key MADE and ICMC staff; along with partners from Belgium, Mexico, New York (representing Fundación Scalabrini in Chile), the Philippines, Senegal, Switzerland and the UK. This consisted of presentations by regional partners; a presentation of preliminary findings by the Evaluator followed by facilitated discussion and validity-testing; and one-on-one key informant interviews with partners. For evaluation questions, see Annex 4.

Data was collected with attention to the prevention and correction of confirmation and empathy biases, along with awareness of potential self-censorship, and the potential strategies of interviewees. The Evaluator attempted to improve the reliability of data by asking open questions, mixing positive and negative questions, focusing on facts, and respecting anonymity. A combination of strategies of analysis were employed in this evaluation, including change analysis (comparing indicators over time and/or against targets), meta-analysis (extrapolating findings of other evaluations and studies), attribution analysis (comparing with a “policy-off” scenario), and contribution analysis (confirming or disconfirming cause-and-effect assumptions through a chain of reasoning). Data was compiled and analysed during the synthesis phase, which included the writing of the Draft Report, the circulation of the Draft Report for comment, and subsequent revisions leading to the Final Report.

Key Conclusions

Overall, MADE's work since its launch in 2014 has made an important contribution to regional and global migration and development processes and debates. In many ways, MADE's role has been one of a catalyst, identifying, sparking and bolstering existing capacities and potentials within civil society.

The work of MADE and its partners has been highly relevant in both its form and focus, with issues related to migration featuring high on the political priority list of many governments and regions. Critically, its ongoing relevance also stems from the continued challenges, risks, and often life-threatening circumstances that continue to be faced by migrants, refugees and asylum seekers globally. Stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation argued that there was a continuing need for the kind of civil society coordinating and information-sharing role that ICMC has taken on through the years, and which has comprised a substantial component of the work of MADE, particularly through IMPACS and ENGAGE. MADE's contribution in the

field was described in terms of its importance as “a facilitator,” an “information sharer,” a “coordinator,” a “convener” and “a bridge.” Some argued that MADE has helped fill a gap in global advocacy. One of the key factors contributing to achievement is the good reputation, trust and respect afforded to ICMC, and to MADE, by many civil society and government actors. This was a strong theme across most stakeholder interviews, including donors, government actors, and civil society stakeholders. Government stakeholders highlighted ICMC and MADE’s capacity to engage with global processes, and facilitate information-sharing and dialogue between civil society actors and government actors, in a professional and “smart” way.

MADE’s thematic and regional programming, along with its global engagement, has also been very effective. A key strength of MADE’s regional work was the flexibility cited by partners to define and pursue regionally relevant priorities and activities, within the MADE framework. At the global level, MADE and its partners demonstrated a capacity to respond to emerging priorities and processes (for example, MICIC and the 2016 UN High Level Summit Addressing Large Movements of Migrants). MADE and its partners have also demonstrated a strong capacity to work effectively in cooperation with other stakeholders and organisations in the field, for example through its co-organising work around the 2016 UN High Level Summit. Some challenges were acknowledged around continent-wide network-building in Africa, different capacities of different partners, a lack of clarity in MADE’s identity, and some questions of ownership. Regardless, MADE effectively carried through its core activities and produced outputs aligned with the overall and specific objectives of both IMPACS and ENGAGE.

Given the nature of these projects and interventions and the lack of baseline data, definitively determining the impact of MADE’s work is challenging. However, all indications are that this work has indeed had some important impacts, particularly at the macro- and meso-levels. These impacts are demonstrated, for example, in increasing opportunities for civil society engagement both with each other and with external stakeholders (including governments) in regional and global forums and processes. They are also demonstrated through the uptake of MADE’s research and thematic reports, and in shifts in discourse around migration within global processes (e.g. in governments’ shifts towards the language of “migrants’ rights”). Internal and external stakeholders also suggest that MADE’s work has played a contributing role in the unprecedented explicit inclusion of migration in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The MADE programme operated efficiently, overall, with sufficient capacity in the Coordinating Office and with sufficient funding to match the expected activities and outputs of both IMPACS and ENGAGE. Budgets were clearly presented and updated with donor approval when required. Donors report satisfaction with the timeliness and professional standards of ICMC staff in their engagements throughout the projects. There were some administrative and logistical challenges related to the simultaneous administration of two such closely-linked EC projects, along with some challenges related to staff turnover and capacity in the Coordinating Office and with some regional partners. However, these did not substantially impact the efficiency of these projects.

This evaluation has found that MADE’s work demonstrates a high level of coherence, and that the value-added through EC funding has been substantial. Many contributions of the MADE programme are expected to have impacts that will continue long after the end of IMPACS and ENGAGE. MADE’s regional partners will continue their work, regardless of the end of

IMPACS and ENGAGE. However, unless alternative sources of funding are found, it is unlikely that the same degree of civil society engagement in regional and global processes will be sustained. The extent to which MADE thematic working groups will be able to continue their work is also questionable. It would have been beneficial for transition planning for the next phase of MADE to have occurred earlier in the projects' cycle, and there remain important questions about the future shape, form and focus of MADE.

Lessons Learned

In terms of project design, this evaluation highlights that project planning for inputs and resources for regional activities in Africa would have benefited from a more robust assessment of existing capacities and civil society activities in West Africa and other sub-regions of the continent. The logical framework for ENGAGE would also have benefitted from being much clearer and more concise in both wording and presentation, and logical frameworks for both projects could have been better monitored and regularly updated to ensure they were living, usable documents. Enhanced monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guidance from the Coordination Office for core partners might also have been helpful, in terms of ensuring alignment with IMPACS and ENGAGE outputs and objectives.

Projects could have benefitted from the direct engagement and involvement of project partners at the conceptualisation and design phase. If this was not possible, a clear and transparent selection process of partners may have helped to ensure that the most effective and appropriate partners were at the table, and may have helped dispel potential negative feelings from other civil society actors. More regional meetings of partners could have been helpful to increase inter-regional activities, and to strengthen knowledge and collaboration in relation to thematic areas. Some stakeholders suggested that it might have been added benefit to have more than one partner in each region, to promote engagement, provide support for each other, and to strengthen the regional networking component.

While steps to this effect are now underway³, effective strategic planning with core partners around the future shape and focus of MADE, along with sustainability planning, would have been helpful earlier in the projects' life span, to help ensure a smooth transition and continuity.

This external evaluation also finds that MADE could have derived benefit from an enhanced media presence and greater visibility generally, in terms of pro-actively promoting project achievements to audiences beyond those with an existing interest in issues of migration and development. Communication bridges with other NGOs or networks, particularly in the development sector, could also potentially have been stronger.

Although MADE is the Migration and Development Civil Society *Network* there was little clarity from internal and external stakeholders regarding how best to understand the "network" component of the programme, or whether this was the best way of presenting and continuing the work of the programme moving forward. For external stakeholders, the "network" label causes some confusion regarding issues such as who is a member, what being a member entails, and the relationship between this network and the ICMC.

³ For example, as part of the workshop in Brussels on Feb 1st 2017, MADE's regional partners undertook a half-day session focused on the future of MADE, discussing what has worked and what might be done differently in future.

While unclear about the “network” identity of MADE, almost all stakeholders were clear about MADE’s important contribution in the field as a facilitator, coordinator, convener, bridge, and information-sharer. A widely-shared perspective amongst stakeholders was also that whatever the future structure of MADE, it should involve identifying and strengthening mechanisms to link the local to the global, and to be able to channel and translate information in both directions.

There can be little doubt that the regional work of MADE has helped to increase civil society representation in the regions, in both regional and global migration and development processes. The regional activities and outputs of MADE also generally allowed for regional partners to pursue issues and activities deemed to be of most relevance to regional priorities, undoubtedly contributing to the effectiveness of the programme. Some stakeholders, however, noted that there were also continuing gaps in civil society coverage in some regions (such as the Gulf/Arab region, the Pacific regions, parts of South and Central America, and much of the African continent).

With funding for IMPACS and ENGAGE ending, the wide scope of activities and outputs made possible through this EC-funding will no longer be possible, and the ICMC and MADE will need to carefully identify its future strategic priorities. Diverse opinions from stakeholders speak not only to different perspectives on where MADE has been the most successful and where it ought to continue to focus, but also to the importance of undertaking a formal, externally facilitated strategic planning process to help determine the future shape and form of MADE.

Recommendations

1. Consider undertaking a formal, externally facilitated Strategic Planning process as soon as possible for the MADE programme, engaging MADE's core partners.
Strategic planning should:
 - a. Address the current lack of clarity around MADE's identity (e.g. as a network or a programme);
 - b. Further define the relationship between ICMC and MADE, moving forward;
 - c. Take a strategic decision regarding the future physical location of the MADE office (e.g. Brussels, Geneva, or elsewhere);
 - d. Identify MADE's core functions and priorities, moving forward;
 - e. Include a strong media-engagement and outreach strategy to improve the visibility of the work of MADE and its partners;
 - f. Consider the development of projects and mechanisms to strengthen collaboration and engagement between MADE network core partners;
 - g. Consider the need for MADE to retain enough flexibility to continue being responsive to new and shifting regional and global priorities, as they arise.
2. Core partners should be involved at all stages of future conceptualisation and planning, as well as implementation.
3. In future, a MADE Coordinating Office or Secretariat should consider developing clear monitoring and evaluation tools and processes to help guide the work of regional and thematic partners in relation to the core project.
4. Future logical frameworks should be accessible, useful, relevant, valid, and updated through a regular process of internal monitoring.
5. Ensure that partner selection processes are as clear and transparent as possible.
6. Ensure the availability of adequate training, support and capacity building for all partners regarding budgeting and reporting.
7. Review processes to help ensure that any future co-funding obligations from partners can be met without detracting from other areas of a partner's work.
8. Building on its successes, ICMC/MADE should take further steps to identify and strategically engage with other key stakeholders and networks, working across issues of migration (including asylum seeker and refugee issues) and in the development and humanitarian sectors.
9. Continue working towards more reliable and multi-year funding.
10. Work towards identifying and strengthening mechanisms to link the local to the global, and to be able to channel and translate information in both directions in future work.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table of Contents	7
List of Acronyms	9
Introduction.....	10
Projects and Programme Background.....	10
Figure 1: Overall and Specific Objectives, IMPACS and ENGAGE.....	12
Methods.....	13
Evaluation Background and Methodology	13
Challenges and Limitations.....	14
Evaluation Criteria	16
Findings.....	17
Relevance	17
Effectiveness	20
GFMD Civil Society Coordination	20
Regional Networks.....	21
Thematic Working Groups	22
Media, Communication and Networking.....	23
Agenda-Setting and Advocacy	24
General factors contributing to achievement and non-achievement.....	25
Impact	27
Macro-level impacts.....	27
Meso-level impacts	28
Micro-level impacts	29
Efficiency.....	29
Sustainability.....	31
Coherence	32
Community Added Value	33
Conclusions, lessons and recommendations	35
Conclusions.....	35
Lessons Learned.....	36
Project Design and Partner Engagement.....	36
Structure of MADE.....	37
Focus of MADE.....	37
Recommendations.....	39

Annexes.....	40
Annex 1: List of Documents Reviewed	40
Annex 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference.....	41
Annex 3: List of Interviews	45
Annex 4: Evaluation Questions	48
Annex 5: MADE Organisation Chart (most updated)	51

List of Acronyms

ADPC	African Diaspora Policy Centre
AFFORD	African Foundation for Development
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
HLS	High Level Summit
HR	Human Resources
ICMC	International Catholic Migration Commission
ICVA	International Council of Voluntary Agencies
INMD	International Network on Migration and Development
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ISC	International Steering Committee
JMDI	Joint Migration and Development Initiative
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MADE	Migration and Development Civil Society Network
MICIC	Migrants in Countries in Crisis
MFA	Migrant Forum in Asia
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCE	No Cost Extension
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
RCP	Regional Consultative Process
ROM	Results Oriented Monitoring
SOV	Source of Verification
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations

Introduction

Projects and Programme Background

The International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) is a registered non-profit organisation, founded in 1951. Its mission is “to protect and serve uprooted people, including refugees, asylum seekers, internally displaced people, victims of human trafficking, and migrants – regardless of faith, race, ethnicity or nationality.”⁴ Originally, the ICMC focused on protecting and serving refugee populations, but in the late 1990s, the ICMC’s governing committee decided to broaden the organisation’s focus to include wider migration issues.

By the early 2000s, migration policy engagement had become one important feature of ICMC’s work. This engagement also corresponded with an increasing global interest in the linkages between migration and processes of development, or what is sometimes referred to as the migration-development nexus. In 2006, ICMC was engaged with, and selected to present at, the first UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development, out of which came the impetus for the creation of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). The GFMD was intended as a new informal, voluntary and non-binding government-led process and forum for UN Member States to engage with questions of migration and development in practical and action-oriented ways. ICMC was both a participant and part of a larger Steering Committee convened by host governments for civil society engagement through the first years of the GFMD, which was first hosted in 2007 in Brussels, Belgium. ICMC was also engaged in running thematic sessions at these GFMDs.

Leading up to the GFMDs in 2010 and 2011, the governments of Mexico and Switzerland (hosts of the 2010 and 2011 GFMDs, respectively) approached the ICMC to take the lead around organizing civil society engagement at these events, a role which ICMC accepted, and which has subsequently continued. Partially in response to these expanded responsibilities, ICMC began to seek new funding sources both to continue and expand its civil society coordination work around the GFMD, and to increase resources for civil society partners to maximize their involvement in GFMD processes and related activities. To that effect, proposals for IMPACS and ENGAGE were submitted separately, in response to two different European Commission calls for proposal. These were “IMPACS Migration and Development (Improving Migration and Development Partnerships and Action with Civil Society)”⁵ and “ENGAGE – Strengthening the GFMD Civil Society Network on Migration and Development.”⁶

After being reserve-listed in the first instance, both 36 month projects were approved in late 2013, and finalized in early 2014.⁷ ICMC then worked with both units of DEVCO to ensure correct process was followed in delineating the activities, budgets and reporting structures for the two projects, which were integrated under the MADE programme, with joint staff, communication, outreach and advocacy. Both IMPACS and ENGAGE were geared towards developing and enhancing the effectiveness of civil society in the arena of migration and

⁴ <https://www.icmc.net/about/vision-and-mission>

⁵ Contract number: DCI-MIGR/2013/334-176

⁶ Contract number: EuropeAid/131140/C/ACT/Multi

⁷ Project duration was increased by 3 months with a no cost extension in late 2016, extending the projects to the end of March 2017.

development, particularly through civil society engagement with the GFMD and subsequent follow-up on recommendations and the strengthening of knowledge and research in key thematic areas.

Despite the common goals, the two projects attempted to retain two different but complementary areas of focus. IMPACS focused mainly on the activities meant to strengthen civil society's thematic knowledge and expertise, and to enhance civil society's capacity at both a regional and global level to engage with external actors (e.g. policy makers, governments, multilateral and international organisations), particularly in the context of the GFMD. ENGAGE, in turn, focused on building the capacity of civil society organisations, within and amongst themselves, through the creation of the MADE network. ENGAGE activities focused largely on enhancing the capacity, representation, geographic spread, effectiveness and sustainability of civil society, globally, in both framing and following up on the practical recommendations of the GFMD. Both IMPACS and ENGAGE were designed around the engagement of core regional partners in Chile, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Senegal, and the UK, whose activities fed into the logical frameworks of IMPACS and ENGAGE, and followed the same logic of strengthening external and internal civil society capacity and engagement.

Core regional partners included Fundación Scalabrini in Chile, the International Network on Migration and Development (INMD) in Mexico, the Migrant Forum in Asia in the Philippines, Caritas Senegal, and Cordaid in the Netherlands. Initially, the African Diaspora Policy Centre (ADPC) was also a partner, but a mutual decision to terminate this partnership was taken after one year, with the ICMC in its 2014 IMPACS Interim Report recounting human resource challenges, staff turn-over, and diverging strategic approaches. Following this, the African Foundation for Development, known widely as AFFORD, in the UK, was brought on as a partner from July 2015. Partners were previously known to ICMC through existing advocacy and organising relationships, particularly through organisations' membership in the International Steering Committee of the GMFD. Like the ICMC, Fundación Scalabrini, Caritas Senegal, and Cordaid are also linked to the Catholic church.

The total eligible costs of IMPACS and ENGAGE combined was €3,303,635.86, out of which the total EC contribution was €2,576,087.00. Both projects required co-funding, with ICMC Europe responsible for 20% of co-funding for IMPACS, and 25% for ENGAGE. Co-funding for both projects totalled €727,548.56, including €70,552.53 from MADE partner contributions, and €656,996.03 in contributions from various governments (including Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates) towards GFMD organising, as well as contributions from other donors such as the Open Society Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation and Bancomer. Memoranda of Understandings (MOU) with core regional partners also stipulated co-payment amounts from the partners themselves, in relation to their specific engagement with either IMPACS or ENGAGE, or with both projects.

IMPACS and ENGAGE identified the following as their overall objectives and specific objectives:

Figure 1: Overall and Specific Objectives, IMPACS and ENGAGE

	OVERALL OBJECTIVE	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE
IMPACS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To foster the links between migration and development and promote due consideration of migrant rights by strengthening the capacity of civil society organisations directly involved in migration and development policies to constructively engage with governments at the regional and global levels in the context of the GMFD, with the final aim to change policies for the wellbeing of migrants and their communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project will strengthen and expand existing regional, thematic and global civil society networks, to increase civil society’s impact on the governmental GFMD Agendas
ENGAGE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase the representativeness and effectiveness of global GFMD civil society networking and engagement, among themselves and with governments, in framing and following-up on practical recommendations of the GFMD with the ultimate objective of maximizing positive developmental impacts of migration while mitigating its negative impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To strengthen and expand these existing regional networks, and also achieve greater global coverage, by filling gaps in civil society engagement within and across countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America/the Caribbean, ultimately to increase impact on the government and the multilateral GFMD agenda.

To achieve these objectives, IMPACS and ENGAGE were integrated under one programmatic structure, the Migration and Development Civil Society Network (MADE), with an office in Brussels, Belgium, within ICMC Europe. Together with ICMC’s co-funding, IMPACS and ENGAGE funded joint staff, communication, outreach and advocacy approaches under the broader MADE structure. The decision to house MADE in Brussels, rather than in Geneva at the headquarters of the ICMC, where ICMC did most of its migration and development work in prior years and where most of the global migration agencies and processes are centred, was in alignment with EC funding criteria, given that Switzerland is not an EU Member State.

The work of MADE, particularly through IMPACS and ENGAGE, was designed to include global, regional and thematic components, with the intent that the different aspects of the projects feed into and reinforce each other, particularly in regards to strengthening and deepening the capacity of civil society within and across regions to contribute meaningfully and effectively at the level of the GFMD. As both projects were designed, this work is closely linked and aligned to civil society’s 5-year 8-point Plan of Action, which global civil society

adopted in 2013 as its agenda for change and collaboration, including with governments.⁸ It is important to note that MADE also engaged with relevant global processes and initiatives⁹ that arose throughout the lifespan of the project, but which were not explicitly part of the initial logical framework activities for either IMPACS or ENGAGE (both projects retained separate logical frameworks).

With the 5-year 8-point Plan of Action guiding priorities, key activities by MADE have included the provision of more opportunities for increased civil society participation and coordination in regional and global migration and development-related processes and forums such as the Valetta Summit; the 2016 United Nations General Assembly High-Level Summit to address large movements of refugees and migrants; the Global Forums on Migration and Development; and the Migrants in Countries in Crisis initiative. Regional networks have been strengthened through regional conferences and advocacy activities. MADE's thematic working groups have made substantive contributions across themes of labour migration and recruitment; migrants and the diaspora in development, and the global governance of migration and development. Some highlights from the work of these groups include, respectively, the development of the labour migration and recruitment network, campaign and website www.recruitmentreform.org; the organisation and hosting of the first-ever Global Diaspora Day; and work towards the inclusion of migration in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. MADE's 2016 Movement Report has helped to move forward debates around defining and measure progress against the themes of the 5-year 8-point Plan of Action, with a second Movement Report expected to be published shortly, at the time of this report.

Methods

Evaluation Background and Methodology

The Evaluator was contracted by the International Catholic Migration Commission following a selection process in December 2016. The contract was for 25 days, between January 2 and Feb 28, 2017. The evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) are included as Annex 2.

As outlined in the ToR, the first objective of this evaluation was to gather lessons learned and suggestions for the future of MADE from MADE partners on the achievements of the two projects of MADE. The second objective outlined in the ToR was to gather lessons learned and suggestions for the future of MADE from other stakeholders (governments/other CSOs/international organizations (INGO's, UN agencies)/private sector), particularly those that have worked with MADE in some capacity (see Annex 2).

To meet these objectives, the Evaluator selected a range of evaluation tools with which to conduct this work, with the aim of cross-checking information sources, triangulating data, and matching the time and cost constraints of the evaluation. Data was collected through the:

- **Desk Phase.** This included document collection and review, as well as inception meetings in Brussels, Belgium with core ICMC and MADE staff (see Annex 1 for a list of reviewed documents);

⁸ http://madenetwork.org/sites/default/files/PDF/2013_5year_8point_Plan%20of%20Action.pdf

⁹ For example, the Migrants in Countries in Crisis initiative, the 2016 UN High Level Summit (HLS) Addressing Large Movements of Migrants and Refugees, and the 2016 Global Forum on Migration and Development in Bangladesh, which had originally been scheduled for 2017.

- **Field Phase.** This included:
 - Key informant interviews conducted in person, by telephone, or via Skype with MADE/ICMC staff and former staff, MADE regional partners, donors, international organisations, governments and other NGOs working in the field. A total of 31 key informant interviews were held. For evaluation questions, see Annex 4. In terms of representation, the Evaluator attempted to select as wide a representation of stakeholders as possible, while keeping with the parameters of the ToR. See Annex 3 for a list of those interviewed;
 - A 1.5 day-long participatory evaluation workshop held in Brussels with key MADE and ICMC staff; along with MADE partners from Belgium, Mexico, New York (representing Fundación Scalabrini in Chile), the Philippines, Senegal, Switzerland and the UK. This consisted of presentations by regional partners; a presentation of preliminary findings by the Evaluator followed by facilitated discussion and validity-testing; and one-on-one key informant interviews with partners.

Data was collected with attention to the prevention and correction of confirmation and empathy biases, along with awareness of potential self-censorship, and the potential strategies of interviewees. The Evaluator attempted to improve the reliability of data by asking open questions, mixing positive and negative questions, focusing on facts, and respecting anonymity. A combination of strategies of analysis were employed in this evaluation, including change analysis (comparing indicators over time and/or against targets), meta-analysis (extrapolating findings of other evaluations and studies), attribution analysis (comparing with a “policy-off” scenario), and contribution analysis (confirming or disconfirming cause-and-effect assumptions through a chain of reasoning).

Data was compiled and analysed during the synthesis phase, which included the writing of the Draft Report, the circulation of the Draft Report for comment through the contracting organisation, and subsequent revisions leading to the Final Report.

Challenges and Limitations

This evaluation faced several methodological challenges and limitations. One challenge was that due to the long-standing and pre-existing work of the ICMC in global processes and migration-related events, particularly in relation to the GFMD, some stakeholders were more familiar with the work of ICMC more broadly than with the specific work and structure of the MADE programme specifically, through its IMPACS and ENGAGE projects. For some stakeholders, including some governments, the work and reputation of the MADE programme and the work and reputation of the ICMC were to various degrees interchangeable, creating attribution challenges in the analysis. Given the history of the ICMC and the nature of the work of both IMPACS and ENGAGE, this is to be expected. These attribution challenges were mitigated by clearly explaining to key informants the nature and scope of the evaluation, and consistently assessing during interviews the degree to which this conflation appeared to exist.

Another methodological challenge of this evaluation was the interconnectedness and complementarity of IMPACS and ENGAGE, which together comprise most of the funding of the MADE programme. While IMPACS and ENGAGE are separate EC-funded projects, the two are closely linked, with many of the same partners and tightly linked objectives. For

evaluation purposes, particularly in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and impact, the separation of the two projects is in many respects unfeasible. In interview discussions and subsequent assessments related to the MADE programme more broadly, including lessons learned and possible future directions for MADE, this evaluation considers IMPACS and ENGAGE together.

A further methodological challenge for this evaluation, particularly regarding the analysis of effectiveness and impact, is the difficulty of separating the achievements of MADE's regional partners in and of themselves, as individual and autonomous civil society actors, from the achievements by these partners that have been made possible explicitly *because* of MADE programming and support. This challenge is, in many ways, a reflection of the positive synergies of the programme, yet it does create attribution challenges for evaluation purposes. To help address this challenge, core partners were asked specific questions about the value added to their work through MADE, and about what a hypothetical end of the MADE network would mean for their organisation and its work. It is important to note in the reading of this report that the achievements of MADE are in many respects shared achievements amongst ICMC and its core regional partners.

One limitation of this evaluation was that interviews and discussions were held consistently in English, while for some partners and stakeholders, French or Spanish were the individual's first language. This created a challenge in terms of communication with some stakeholders via Skype or telephone. In one in-person interview, where the interviewee was not comfortable with English, independent translation assistance was brought in. Another potential limitation of this evaluation is that it was conducted quite soon after the European Commission's own internal Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) evaluation for IMPACS, the field phase of which was conducted from late June to early August 2016. Inevitably, many of the key stakeholders approached for this evaluation had also been approached for the ROM evaluation. While many stakeholders responded readily to interview requests for this evaluation, it is possible that some may have not clearly understood the difference, or may have been unwilling to participate in two evaluation processes, so close together.

Evaluation Criteria

The following OECD/DAC and EC evaluation criteria have been used to guide this evaluation:

EVALUATION CRITERIA

RELEVANCE	Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and EC's policies
EFFECTIVENESS	Extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance
IMPACT	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
EFFICIENCY	Extent to which the outputs and/or desired effects have been achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).
SUSTAINABILITY	Extent to which the benefits from the development intervention continue after termination of the external intervention, or the probability that they continue in the long-term in a way that is resilient to risks.
COHERENCE	Extent to which activities undertaken allow the European Commission to achieve its development policy objectives without internal contradiction or without contradiction with other Community policies. Extent to which they complement partner county's policies and other donors' interventions.
COMMUNITY VALUE ADDED	Extent to which it can reasonably be argued that changes are due to EC intervention, rather than any other factors.

Findings

Relevance

MADE's thematic focus of migration and development remains highly relevant. In recent decades, the complex interconnections between processes of migration and processes of development have been well-recognised by international organisations and institutions such as the United Nations, the IOM (which has recently become the UN migration agency), the World Bank, and by UN Member States, as evidenced by events such as the UN High Level Dialogues on International Migration and Development in 2006 and 2013, and by the ongoing interest and participation in global processes such as the Global Forum on Migration and Development since 2007. These interconnections have also been recognised by a wide range of non-state actors, including NGOs, development and human rights actors, researchers and academics, and by migrants and members of the diaspora. As a thematic focus, the migration-development nexus remains timely and relevant, at local, national, regional and global levels.

The overall and specific objectives of IMPACS and ENGAGE (presented above in Table 1) were highly relevant at the time of the projects' design, and remain highly relevant, with the GFMD continuing to represent the most significant regular global process on migration and development for states. Beyond the GFMD, however, a range of other international, regional, national and local debates and processes relating to migration and development also highlight the continued relevance of these issues. Some examples (among others) include the Migrants in Countries in Crisis (MICIC) initiative, ongoing Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) around migration, the Valetta Summit, the 2016 UN High Level Summit (HLS) Refugees, and the ongoing discussions Addressing Large Movements of Migrants and towards the development of two new Global Compacts (one on Safe and Orderly Migration, and a second on Refugees).

The work of MADE aligns well with the mission and mandate of the ICMC which, importantly, includes both migrants and refugees within its scope. This differs from most international NGOs, which tend to maintain a separate focus on issues of refugees and asylum seekers, or on issues of migration. Further, while many organisations integrate migration or refugee issues into their broader programmes, the ICMC maintains migration as its core focus. This has positioned ICMC and the MADE network well in a global context in which there is a growing recognition that many individuals increasingly migrate with mixed motivations, which may often include protection needs alongside a desire for a better future, economic or otherwise.

Almost unanimously, stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation argued that there was a continuing need for the kind of civil society coordinating and information-sharing role that ICMC has taken on through the years, and which has comprised a substantial component of the work of MADE, particularly through IMPACS and ENGAGE. MADE's contribution in the field was described in terms of its importance as "a facilitator," an "information sharer," a "coordinator," a "convener" and "a bridge." Some argued that MADE has helped fill a gap in global advocacy. Most stakeholders, including civil society and government actors, commented positively on the role MADE has played in maintaining and expanding the space

MADE's contribution in the field was described in terms of its importance as a facilitator, an information sharer, a coordinator, a convener and a bridge.

for a range of civil society actors to engage with governments around issues of migration, particularly in a global context in which many civil society actors perceive that such spaces are, in many respects, shrinking. Examples include expanded opportunities for engagement with governments at the GFMD civil society days; the facilitation of the participation of new civil society organisations from different regions at the GFMD; facilitating civil society input into MICIC processes, and civil society contributions at the 2016 HLS.

MADE's activities in response to emerging priorities (such as its organising work around civil society engagement in the 2016 HLS, MICIC and the Valetta Summit) were also perceived by most stakeholders to be highly relevant to broader goals of strengthening organisation and engagement both amongst civil society actors, as well as between civil society and governments. It is important to note, however, that some stakeholders were unclear as to what extent these engagements were "MADE" engagements, and to what extent they were ICMC engagements, noting a lack of clarity in their understandings of the relationship between ICMC and MADE (this will be further discussed in the following section on effectiveness).

One thread of concern throughout interviews with stakeholders, regarding broader questions of project and programme relevance, was the worry that these high-level processes remain generally disconnected from the day-to-day, on the ground realities faced by asylum seekers, refugees and other migrants. Some noted a global migration context in which conditions for many migrants seem to be worsening, rather than improving, through issues such as increased securitisation, border closures, xenophobia, and rights violations. Some internal as well as external stakeholders raised questions about the continued relevance of the current, non-binding format of the GFMD's government meetings, with a particular concern that the recommendations stemming from the GFMD government processes seldom seemed to translate into tangible practices that genuinely improved the lives of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants. Given the voluntary and non-binding nature of governments' participation in the GFMD, alongside questions of political will, this concern is valid.

However, stakeholders also spoke about the continued importance of events such as the GFMD, as a "central moment" around which civil society could rally and organise, and most argued that despite these concerns, there have nonetheless been significant advances made by civil society through engagement in the GFMD and other global processes (for example, a shift in governments' use of language towards a recognition of

“migrants’ rights,” and the inclusion of migration in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development). Rather than disengage with high level processes, those who spoke of these concerns highlighted the need to ensure that projects were relevant not just at the global level, but also at the regional, national, and local level. A widely-shared perspective amongst stakeholders was that ensuring continued relevance would mean identifying and strengthening mechanisms to link the local to the global, and to be able to channel and translate information in both directions.

Regional partners all expressed that MADE’s work has been relevant through the past three years, though the degree of the relevance of MADE to the work of these partners has varied across the regions. Some regional partners, at the time of becoming involved with MADE through IMPACS and ENGAGE, were already a strong and established regional voice and actor in migration and development. Regardless of their strength or how well-established each partner already was, partners expressed that their affiliation with MADE has allowed for the deepening and strengthening of local and regional work, and for expanding and enhancing participation within the regions in regional and global migration debates and processes. One partner stated that MADE enabled them, as an organisation, to look for such relevant processes and to be able to engage with them. Some partners also suggested that their affiliation with MADE had enhanced their own organisational visibility, credibility, and relationships with other stakeholders. To illustrate, the INMD highlighted that through some of their project work related to issues of women and migration in Mexico, the organisation could form a stronger linkage with UN Women. Importantly, most partners noted that the projects allowed them sufficient flexibility in shaping the required activities and outputs to make the work relevant and meaningful in relation to local and regional priorities.

Government representatives interviewed for this work were unanimous in the view that the work of the MADE network (and more broadly, the work of ICMC) had continuing relevance. Several spoke very positively of the ICMC and MADE’s role in coordinating civil society engagement around the GFMD, but there was also a recognition from some of MADE’s wider involvements around advancing the 5-year 8-point plan of action, its work around the HLS, its newsletters and communications, and its role in the inclusion of migration in the SDGs (though it was also recognised that this was the work of a wide range of civil society actors, and not just those affiliated with MADE). For governments, the ongoing relevance of MADE (and ICMC’s related work) was closely linked to its being viewed as a constructive voice, with a strong reputation, earned trust. They highlighted ICMC and MADE’s capacity to engage with global processes, and facilitate information-sharing and dialogue between civil society actors and government actors, in a professional and “smart” way. One government actor, for example, noted that while the diverse voices and experiences of grassroots and other civil society organisations were of great importance, it was unfeasible that all organisations could come to the table and engage in high level policy processes and forums. The relevance of MADE, from this perspective, was linked to its ability to organise and help “channel” these voices and concerns into high level processes, and its skill and knowledge in effectively working at this level. Another government actor voiced appreciation for an advocacy approach that did not attempt to “corner countries” or “aggressively push agendas,” yet which remained firm on the agenda of promoting migrants’ rights.

For other stakeholders, perceptions of the relevance of MADE were more mixed. Some key external stakeholders recognised MADE as an important player on the landscape, believing it to play a complementary role to existing stakeholders in the field. Importantly, others expressed uncertainty about the structure and organisational model and sustainability of MADE. Some

stakeholders, while recognising some of MADE's achievements, were simultaneously unsure of how it functioned as a "network," and were unclear as to the source of its mandate. Some expressed confusion about who comprised the membership of the network and what being a member entailed. Some stakeholders indicated they were aware of what was referred to as a potential sense of "competition," "jealousy" or "resentment" amongst some civil society actors in the field, related to the central role ICMC and the MADE network were perceived to play in these high-level processes. Some respondents also recognised that these dynamics are often present within civil society much more broadly, regardless of issue area. Another important question raised by some internal and external stakeholders alike was whether MADE had managed to engage enough with already existing networks and key stakeholders, not only in the field of migration, but also from within the development sector.

Effectiveness

Overall, MADE has been effective in terms of producing the key outputs of IMPACS and ENGAGE. Further, these outputs align with the realisation of the two projects' overall and specific objectives. Interim Narrative Reports for both IMPACS and ENGAGE, for the years 2014, 2015 and currently in draft for 2016 comprehensively document the work of MADE and its partners, with the inclusion of detailed annexes to verify achievements. Donors speak very highly of the professionalism of MADE's work, the quality and timeliness of its reporting, and the quality of communications and working relationships with the ICMC.

This evaluation draws on the logical frameworks of both projects to consider effectiveness across the following key areas of work, followed by an analysis of general issues affecting achievement and non-achievement: 1) GFMD Civil Society Coordination; 2) Regional Networks; 3) Thematic Working Groups; 4) Media, Communication and Networking; and 5) Agenda-Setting and Advocacy.

GFMD Civil Society Coordination

MADE's organisation and coordination of civil society activities at the GFMD has been a core element of its work in 2014, 2015 and 2016. This aspect of ICMC and

For governments, the ongoing relevance of MADE (and ICMC's related work) was closely linked to its being viewed as a constructive voice with a strong reputation, and earned trust.

MADE's work is well-known and well-respected amongst stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation. This is evidenced by the fact that ICMC's Coordinating Office has been confirmed to serve as the Coordinating Office for the GFMD Civil Society Days by the German and Moroccan Co-Chairs for the 2017-2018 GFMD.

Through IMPACS and ENGAGE, ICMC and MADE have been able to significantly increase civil society engagement and participation in the GFMD's Civil Society Days. National and regional consultations in preparation for the GFMD, organised by MADE partners, also provided grassroots organisations with the opportunity to be informed about global processes with an impact on national policies, and enabled civil society organisations to engage and prepare their national representatives to the GFMD. By 2016, MADE's International Steering Committee (ISC) for the GFMD had expanded to 37 members (three more than in 2015), including MADE's core regional partners. The number of civil society organisations applying and able to participate in civil society activities of the GFMD has increased considerably since 2012. In 2012, for example, there were 563 applicants, and 140 actual participants. In 2016, over 700 applications were received, with approximately 350 selected to participate. In 2016, 85/97 (88%) participating organisations who filled out the Civil Society Days evaluation form rated the event as either "good" or "excellent."

Stakeholders from both governments and civil society commented on the sense of increasing space for interaction between civil societies and governments at the GFMD throughout the years, despite a general sense that this space was not yet sufficient. As well as the Common Space events, concrete examples included the participation of government representatives as panellists in Civil Society Day activities, and breakfast meetings that included both governments and civil society actors.

Regional Networks

The effectiveness of MADE's regional network activities varied across the regions. Stakeholders spoke highly of many of the achievements of MADE and its partners in the regions, but were also aware of important challenges and differences between the regions.

Regional activities were organised around regionally strategic priorities, and in alignment with the 5-year 8-point Plan of Action. Activities included, amongst others, the organisation of regional civil society meetings and conferences, and the development of advocacy papers, webinars, newsletters and external communication campaign. MADE and its partners also played an important role in regional coordination, the facilitation of consultations, and information-sharing around key regional and global processes such as the GFMD, MICIC and the SDGs, enabling knowledge transfer and providing national civil society organisations with accurate and timely information with which to engage their own governments. Regional consultations also provided civil society organisations and stakeholders with the opportunity to jointly discuss priority issues, and to plan coordinated strategic engagement with these regional processes. These activities were well-documented and reported upon. At times, there were delays in receiving reports from different regional partners, though these delays did not have a significant impact on the projects.

MADE's regional partners also assisted in the selection and administration of MADE's "Pilot Fund" projects. With this funding, six small projects were selected from over 50 NGO applicants for projects that would engage directly with national or city governments on changes to policies and their implementation, to improve the well-being and protection of migrants and

communities. The projects were selected in conjunction with MADE's regional partners, and were undertaken in Honduras, Costa Rica, Sri Lanka, Cambodia, Morocco and Senegal.

Most MADE regional partners spoke positively about the flexibility allowed by the projects in ensuring that the required activities and outputs could be shaped to meet locally relevant priorities, although one partner noted that the structure of MADE challenged their usual way of working, in terms of attempting to be responsive to opportunities and rapidly shifting contexts. Priority issues in the different regions were generally quite different from each other. These different focuses could create challenges for global advocacy ambitions, but stakeholders also noted that this created opportunity for learning across regions. Despite regional differences, for example, MADE partners in Asia and Africa agreed that there was much of value to be shared between the two regions regarding issues of migrant labour and recruitment.

Regional partners had different pre-existing capacities and networking structures in place in their regions, ahead of MADE's regional network-building activities. This factor had an impact on the effectiveness of the various regional components of the overall programme, and in interviews, there was a recognition of inconsistencies in the quality of reporting and outputs from different regions. In cases where regional partners were already strong and pre-existing networks were in place to various degrees, the regional networking aspect of MADE programming was reported as having allowed for a strengthening and deepening work. Some stakeholders also suggested that these differences in existing organisational development and strength may also have led to different levels of identification and buy-in as "partners" under the MADE umbrella.

In the case of the regional network in Africa, there was little existing structure in place. Some stakeholders and donors felt that efforts towards the building of a civil society network in Africa was one of MADE's most important contributions. However, it is clear (and openly acknowledged) by programme leaders that in the project design, the existing capacity of civil society and the investment that would be required to build such a network in Africa had been underestimated, and the regional, sub-regional and continental context not well enough understood. Factors complicating the development of a civil society network in Africa include, amongst others: the complexity of migration issues across the very culturally, linguistically and historically diverse countries and sub-regions of Africa; differences in sub-regional priorities; a lack of civil society engagement in migration issues in many countries (with exceptions); a lack of social and political space for relevant civil society activism in some countries; and a lack of resources and funding opportunities in many countries. While important work was done in challenging circumstances, MADE's Africa regional network has largely remained a sub-regional network, with a West African focus.

Thematic Working Groups

The work of all three of MADE's Thematic Working Groups aligned closely with the priorities of the 5-year 8-point Plan of Action, and in turn aligned with the overall and specific objectives of both IMPACS and ENGAGE. Governments and donors reported a positive impression of the substantive work of MADE and its partners, in terms of its thematic contributions and reports. One government actor stated, "they seem to know the core issues," while another indicated that the work of ICMC and MADE helps "to give governments a very good idea of what civil society issues are."

The MADE Working Group on the Global Governance of Migration and Development, coordinated by Cordaid, made important contributions towards the inclusion of migration into the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda

The MADE Working Group on the Global Governance of Migration and Development, coordinated by Cordaid, made important contributions towards the inclusion of migration into the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, through activities such as direct lobbying, information-sharing amongst civil society organisations, and the collection of over 300 civil society signatures in support of the “Civil Society Stockholm Agenda on Migrant and Migration-related Goals and Targets.” One of the highlights of the Working Group on Diaspora and Migrants in Development, coordinated by AFFORD-UK (taking over from the work of the ADPC), was the organising of the first-ever “Global Diaspora Day,” an online event coordinated by Working Group members, with communications support from MADE’s Coordinating Office. The increased visibility of AFFORD through its partnership with MADE may have also been a contributing factor in AFFORD being invited to present at the Third Mayoral Forum in Quezon City, in September 2016. One highlight of the work done by the Open Working Group on Labour Migration and Recruitment, coordinated by the MFA, is its highly active recruitment reform campaign (see <http://www.recruitmentreform.org>). This working group also opened engagement with the private sector as a stakeholder. For example, its capacity building programmes enabled civil society organisations and the private sector to come together and engage in dialogue on issues affecting migrant workers. While all Working Groups made significant contributions in affiliation with MADE, it remains to be seen what form and shape they will take, if any, with the end of EC funding. The Working Group on the Global Governance of Migration and Development, for example, ceased to operate at the end of its MoU with MADE in April 2016.

Media, Communication and Networking

MADE has effectively grown its database to over 3,000 contacts from 117 countries, including detailed profiles of nearly 1200 migration and development experts and practitioners around the world. MADE maintains an online presence through its website and social media sites such as Twitter and Facebook. The website receives an average of 1,316 visitors per month, with over 13,000 unique visitors since it was created in May 2015. In addition, MADE’s logo is present on websites such as www.recruitmentreform.org (although not on the home page) and the website of Fundación Scalabrini. Some stakeholders, including governments, report drawing on MADE newsletters for information, particularly around the time of the 2016 UN HLS. The online event “Global Diaspora Day,” co-organised between AFFORD UK

with technical support from the MADE Coordinating Office is a good example of successful outreach and communication.

In terms of communications, the MADE coordinating office focused largely on social media, and to good effect. However, it may have derived benefit from an enhanced media presence and greater visibility generally, in terms of pro-actively promoting project achievements to audiences beyond those with an existing interest in issues of migration and development. To that end, a media strategy for the next phase of MADE should be designed in conversation with all relevant stakeholders, to ascertain the best approach with the available resources.

Throughout the projects, MADE built strong and effective connections with a wide range of organisations. Some stakeholders indicated that it would be beneficial to build even stronger internal communications links and bridges with other NGOs or existing networks, particularly in the development sector, to help ensure that work was coordinated across the migration, refugee, humanitarian and development sectors.

Agenda-Setting and Advocacy

The work of MADE and its partners around global advocacy and the coordination of civil society input into emerging global processes has been effective overall. Some internal and external stakeholders identified this capacity for coordination and joint advocacy as MADE's key strength. Key processes in recent years to which MADE and its partners have contributed through civil society coordination activities include MICIC, the 2016 UN HLS, and the Valetta Summit. One donor highlighted the importance of MADE's work in terms of enabling increased engagement between African and European stakeholders.

In the case of the MICIC civil society consultations, partners and other stakeholders noted that initially, there was very little room in the design of the state-led process for the inclusion of civil society voices. MFA played a particularly important role in ensuring that space was opened in MICIC processes for civil society, through its advocacy efforts in the Philippines. In partnership with the Global Coalition on Migration, MADE and its regional partners organised a series of parallel MICIC civil society consultations in late 2015 and early 2016.

MADE's coordination work around the 2016 UN HLS was highlighted in interviews as being particularly effective, with the ICMC, along with the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) and the NGO Committee on Migration, co-convening a Civil Society Action Committee consisting of 22 NGOs. This work demonstrated an important capacity for coordination and cooperation at an international level, and rapid organising, and MADE's networks and databases were useful assets in mobilising civil society organisations globally around this HLS. However, again, stakeholders described some confusion regarding the role and identity of MADE in this work, particularly in delineating the relationship between the MADE network and the ICMC.

Also important is MADE's continued advocacy of civil society's 5-year 8-point plan of action, and its publication of the 2016 "Movement Report" as a step towards being better able to quantitatively define and measure progress and impact in the implementation of the 5-year 8-point plan. A second "Movement Report" is currently being finalised, at time of writing. However, one concern noted in an interview was that in the present migration context, many civil society organisations may be overwhelmed with immediate needs, and may lack the time, resources or capacity to engage in activities around defining and measuring progress.

General factors contributing to achievement and non-achievement

This section explores some of the general factors that are identified in this evaluation as contributors to achievement and non-achievement of outputs and objectives across the various elements of MADE programming.

One of the key factors contributing to achievement is the good reputation, trust and respect afforded to ICMC, and to MADE, by many civil society and government actors. This was a strong theme across most stakeholder interviews, including donors, government actors, and civil society stakeholder. Governments particularly highlighted the role that this good reputation and trust played in opening space for civil society organisations and governments to engage.

Some partners also emphasised the important role played by the Coordinating Office in supporting their work and projects at the regional levels, citing excellent working relationships with Coordinating Office staff. Regional partners largely expressed a sufficiently clear understanding of the role of Coordinating Office. There was, however, some degree of confusion reported regarding staff turnover in the MADE Coordinating Office, and the changing personnel and roles within the office, although these changes happened only in the third and final year of this funding to MADE. There were also concerns expressed from some staff that MADE's role might have been misconstrued at times as that of a funder, or donor. While the ideal role for MADE was as a coordinating partner, rather than lead, in the implementation of the two projects, this dynamic was sometimes difficult to maintain given ICMC's responsibilities as principal applicant for IMPACS and ENGAGE.

Factors relating to non-achievement can largely be linked to challenges of project design. Some of these issues include: an unclear logical framework for ENGAGE; concerns around the clarity of MADE's identity; considerations around partner selection processes; and lack of partner inclusion in the project design.

As noted above, logical frameworks exist for both IMPACS and ENGAGE. This evaluation found that the two logical frameworks differed considerably in terms of clarity and straightforwardness, with the logical framework for IMPACS being considerably more accessible, updated, and well-presented than that for ENGAGE. The IMPACS logical framework was significantly adapted in 2016, and included input from the ROM 2016 evaluation. Some of the sources of verification (SOV) in the ENGAGE logical framework may not have been feasible or realistic. For example, one SOV for the overall objective of ENGAGE is a "quantitative and qualitative analysis of number of references to the Network and its products," while another SOV under the Expected Result 1 ("Strengthened GFMD Civil Society Network") calls for a "quantitative and qualitative analysis of references to the Network Charter." The logical framework provided to the Evaluator for ENGAGE is dated 2010, and there are indications that it has not been effectively updated in the intervening years. For example, one of the objectively verifiable indicators of achievement, under Expected Result 1, is the creation of a Network Charter and its endorsement by at least 200 organisations. As the project took shape, the idea of a Network Charter was set aside, with a valid and considered logic in relation to the project, yet it remains in the logical framework, and is included in the project's SOVs. The lack of a Network Charter does not deduct from the projects' many successes, but its inclusion in the logical framework is just one example that

suggests room for improvement in internal processes of monitoring and project management, in relation to the design and usage of the logical framework.

General concerns regarding the unclear identity of MADE as a network, and in its relationship with ICMC, are also raised in the section discussing relevance. However, this lack of clarity must be considered also in this section on effectiveness, as some stakeholders expressed the opinion that this lack of clarity may be confusing for both partners and external stakeholders, and may have created some questions amongst existing organisations or networks around issues such as representation, mandate, and organisational structure. For example, one external stakeholder spoke about feeling unclear and tentative regarding whether they ought to be engaging with the MADE network or with ICMC, and who, if anyone, MADE represented. Another government actor spoke about how, with the development of the two Global Compacts underway, other major international NGOs were now increasingly engaging in global migration debates and processes, meaning clarity about roles and representation would be even more important than ever. There is no evidence that these issues directly impeded the effectiveness of MADE in terms of meeting the objectives of IMPACS and ENGAGE, yet they remain important to acknowledge and address to assist MADE in reaching its potential.

Other concerns were raised by some stakeholders regarding the selection process for regional partners. Some noted they were aware of the perception amongst some civil society actors that the way in which partners were selected for the two projects was unclear, as well as a perception that partners had been selected based on their affiliation with the Catholic Church, rather than necessarily being the best-positioned or most-experienced organisation for the tasks. This perception may be fed by the fact that ICMC and 3 of the other 6 core partners in MADE are Catholic NGOs. However, as internal stakeholders explained, when the IMPACS and ENGAGE concepts were submitted to the EC in late 2011 and early 2012, partners were chosen for their reputation, expertise, scope of work and ongoing engagement within these global migration and development processes at that time. For example, the Scalabrinians were thought to be the strongest and widest civil society network with both operations and advocacy in Latin America and the only one that also extended to the Caribbean; Cordaid was the only development NGO directly involved in these specific

At the macro-level, MADE's work, through IMPACS and ENGAGE appears to have had impacts in terms of issue-framing, agenda-setting and policy influence.

global migration and development processes with whom ICMC had a working relationship, and Caritas Senegal, within the Caritas Africa umbrella, was the only one of the two pan-African platforms identified that was registered in the EC's PADOR system.

Impact

In the absence of concrete baseline data against which to quantitatively measure impact, this section employs strategies of attribution analysis (a counter-factual, or “policy-off” scenario that considers likely outcomes in the absence of the intervention), and contribution analysis (which attempts to confirm or disconfirm cause-and-effect assumptions through a chain of reasoning). It remains difficult, however, to definitively and fairly attribute impacts to any one project or programme in this field, given the complexities of the systems and the diversity of actors involved in migration and development globally. With the project ending in March 2017, this evaluation is also unable to analyse any longer-term impacts of the work of MADE and its partners, which may be important. While acknowledging these challenges, this section presents probable impacts at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels.

Macro-level impacts

At the macro-level, MADE's work, through IMPACS and ENGAGE appears to have had impacts in terms of issue-framing, agenda-setting and policy influence.

Some stakeholders, including governments, noted that there had been significant discursive shifts in government policy debates and processes around migration and development, including the GFMD and other relevant high-level state-led processes, in response to civil society advocacy and lobbying. For example, stakeholders highlighted that there has been an increasing recognition of a human rights-based approach, and an uptake in the language of “migrants' rights” at the GFMD.

There also appear to have been some impacts in agenda-setting. One government actor noted that civil society activism and organising has had an impact in encouraging governments to work on topics that they otherwise might not have focused on, or to broaden the scope of such discussions. One example provided is governments' integration of “reintegration” into their returns policies and processes, following pressure from civil society. Another government actor suggested that ICMC and MADE's activities have made it “more difficult for governments to dismiss civil society perspectives.” Further, MADE programming has enabled increased civil society participation, and has added depth and diversity to this participation. It has also enabled new and emerging issues to be highlighted from within and across regions. Stakeholders identified ISC and MADE Thematic Working Group involvement in the selection of civil society delegates to participate in the GFMD as an important factor in enhancing the diversity and inclusivity of civil society day participation, across regions and thematic issue areas.

Policy influence at global and national levels is particularly difficult to demonstrate, yet there are strong indications that the work of MADE and its partners have had impacts on such policies. One key example is the work of the Working Group on the Global Governance of Migration and Development toward ensuring the explicit inclusion of migration in the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). While difficult to attribute definitively, a wide range of internal and external stakeholders noted that the campaigns, lobbying and advocacy efforts of the Working Group helped to galvanise civil society support and energy towards this end.

The unprecedented inclusion of migration in the SDGs positions migration as an integral component of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The work of MADE and its partners, through the organisation and coordination of civil society input to the MICIC initiative, also had some probable impacts on both the process and the outputs to date. As noted earlier, MFA played a particularly important role in ensuring that space was opened in MICIC processes for civil society, through its advocacy efforts in the Philippines. Parallel civil society consultations resulted in a civil society report that was fed into the formal government process, and a small number of civil society organisations were also awarded participation rights. While some suggest that civil society inputs were not translated upwards as effectively as possible into the state-led processes, others suggest that civil society organising around MICIC helped raise additional issues into the state-led processes, including an insistence on an approach built on migrants' human rights and an emphasis on ensuring migrants have capacity and agency to help themselves in times of crises. This work has also likely led to the greater inclusion of civil society in MICIC processes going forward.

Many stakeholders, including governments and civil society actors, spoke about ICMC and MADE's role in recent years in helping to facilitate more structured and reliable civil-society engagements in global processes, and in helping to create more space in these processes for state-civil society interaction (examples include the GFMD, the 2016 UN HLS, civil society organising around Valetta, and MICIC).

Some governments interviewed for this work described having drawn on MADE resources and outputs, and highlighted the importance of ICMC and MADE in helping them understand the issues of importance to civil society. One concrete example given was the participation of the Governments of Switzerland, Sweden and Bangladesh on a panel at the GFMD Civil Society Days in 2015, which resulted in the government of Sweden representative returning to the government process with direct inputs from civil society. Importantly, one government actor explained that while civil society outputs like the 5-year 8-point Plan of Action, research reports, and other materials may not be directly quoted in government policies or positions, they are often in fact used in more indirect ways.

Meso-level impacts

Feeding into more macro-level impacts, MADE's programming at the regional and thematic levels have also led to some discernible impacts at the meso-level.

Regional civil society meetings were highlighted by some as being particularly effective, as a space where existing networks and civil society organisations of the region could converge, and where advocacy strategies were developed and strengthened. The impact of MADE, in this sense, was perceived to be not only in the strengthening and expanding of networks, but also in the diversification of advocacy spaces and strategies. The sharing of information that occurred through MADE's regional activities helped to directly inform migrants and grassroots organisations about regional and global processes, and allowed for valuable experiences and information to be fed upwards into these processes. For example, in Asia, migrant organisations worked closely with governments to address the concerns of stranded migrants, and those who were repatriated, in the aftermath of the Arab Spring. These same organisations then participated in discussions and civil society consultations related to the MICIC process, allowing their own, direct experiences to inform the process.

Overall, the MADE programme operated efficiently, with sufficient capacity in the Coordinating Office and with sufficient funding to match the expected activities and outputs of both IMPACS and ENGAGE.

While difficult to attribute policy shifts directly to the work of MADE and its partners, the Open Working Group on Labour Migration and Recruitment appears to have had a significant impact in terms of raising the profile of these issues through advocating for recruitment reform. Prior to this work, there was no regional network focusing on issues of recruitment, despite the centrality and relevance of the issue in the region.

While the impacts varied from region to region, MADE programming also contributed to the enhanced capacity of regional partners. Some regional partners reported that their affiliation with MADE improved their organisation's visibility and enhanced credibility, allowing for new or increased opportunities for engagement, funding, and collaboration.

Another impact of MADE's programming has been the support of a new civil society network in Africa, although as discussed above, this has met with some ongoing challenges stemming from both design and implementation factors, and has largely been limited to the building of networks in West Africa.

Micro-level impacts

One of the most consistent concerns for stakeholders relates to questions of programme and project impact as experienced on the ground, by migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, their families, and both sending and host communities. Given the nature of the project design and the level of its interventions, this is unsurprising.

One exception might be the work done by MADE's "Pilot Fund," or seed-funding project recipients. However, while one evaluation was done for the project in Honduras by the MADE Program Coordinator in Chile, there is presently too little information available for the external evaluator to accurately assess the impact of these projects.

Efficiency

Overall, the MADE programme operated efficiently, with sufficient capacity in the Coordinating Office and with sufficient funding to match the expected activities and outputs of both IMPACS and ENGAGE. Budgets were clearly presented and updated with donor approval when

required. Donors report satisfaction with the timeliness and professional standards of ICMC staff in their engagements throughout the projects. A request for a No Cost Extension (NCE) was sought through correct processes by the ICMC in October 2016, for an additional 3 months, extending the projects to the end of March 2017.

Stakeholders identified three key issues that may have created some efficiency challenges in the delivery of the two projects, though none of these significantly affected the overall achievements of the MADE programme. These three areas include human resources (HR) challenges in both the Coordinating Office and amongst regional partners; challenges related to the budgeting, financial monitoring and reporting around the implementation of two such tightly-linked projects; and challenges related to donor requirements around financial reporting, particularly amongst regional partners without prior experience with EC funding.

In general, there was sufficient staffing in the Coordinating Office to meet the projects' activities, outputs and objectives. While capacity was sufficient to meet the projects' requirements, some stakeholders expressed that the work load could be very heavy at times in the Coordinating Office, particularly around the time of GFMD organising. Some felt that additional staff could have helped to maximize the potential of the two projects, for example, through being able to further identify and help take forward programmatic synergies between regional partners. It was also noted that limited staffing in the Coordinating Office created some challenges in MADE's capacity to be responsive to new and emerging priorities, such as the 2016 High Level Summit, while continuing to meet the deliverables of IMPACS and ENGAGE.

Both internal and external stakeholders also commented on the staffing and structural changes that occurred within the Coordinating Office throughout the project. These changes were considered and logical in their response to staff turn-over, and there remained significant continuity throughout the project in terms of staff and management. However, the structural changes, along with staff turn-over and the inevitable adjustment periods of new staff members was noted by some as a challenge for the projects' efficiency. There were also some similar difficulties in staffing and turnover amongst regional partners, with some impacts on efficiency. For example, the departure of an English-speaking staff member at Caritas Senegal significantly impacted the organisation's capacity to effectively communicate and network with non-Francophone Africa countries.

Minor challenges also existed in having MADE housed at the Brussels office of the ICMC, rather than the ICMC office in Geneva, as Geneva is where many of the key international organisations stakeholders and mechanisms of state related to the GFMD are based. Moving forward, it has not yet been decided where the MADE office and staff will be located.

The different capacities of different regional partners were discussed above in relation to questions of effectiveness. These differences were also experienced in relation to questions of technical skills around budgeting and financial reporting, and staff reported that different degrees of inputs and assistance were required from the Coordinating Office by regional partners. It was also noted that while there were many challenges in working with partners, particularly around the specific requirements of EC funding and reporting, this was a "learning curve for all," and things did improve throughout the duration of the project. Staff noted that there were sometimes also language challenges or barriers experienced between some partners and the Coordinating Office, in regards to financial monitoring and reporting, and other aspects of operations.

Challenges were also experienced in the financial administration of the two separate but often tightly linked projects and activities of IMPACS and ENGAGE, which entailed separate project and budget design, management, monitoring and reporting. This created some initial confusion and often duplicate work for some project staff and for partners, but staff noted that this also improved as the project unfolded.

Attaining the necessary co-funding for both IMPACS and ENGAGE was also highlighted as a challenge for staff, though the projects were successful in this regard. The co-funding obligations of regional partners also caused some difficulties. One regional partner reported that due to an inability to source the resources required to meet their co-funding obligations through their MOU with the ICMC, they ultimately utilised money that had previously been allocated in their budget to another project. The initially budgeted project then did not go ahead.

Finally, some stakeholders believed that donor administrative and reporting requirements represented a significant burden for those involved in the projects, citing the staff time entailed in meeting such requirements and the difficulties involved for some regional and grass-roots partners in meeting those requirements. Some staff expressed concern that this may have led to tensions or miscommunications with some partners, who may have initially perceived that the administrative and reporting requirements were those of MADE/ICMC.

Sustainability

Through IMPACS and ENGAGE, the MADE programme has undoubtedly contributed to the building of networks, programmes of work, and relationships that will continue beyond the EC funding of these projects. Network-building at the regional level has brought new actors, voices and issues into regional and sometimes global processes relating to migration and development. Relationships have also been formed, or strengthened, between civil society actors and other stakeholders, including international organisations and governments. Increased, and progressively professional, civil society engagement and organisation around regional and global processes such as the GFMD, the Valetta Summit, the 2016 UN HLS and the MICIC initiative may contribute to the effectiveness of civil society organising and coordination in future global processes and initiatives,

Network-building at the regional level has brought new actors, voices and issues into regional and sometimes global processes relating to migration and development.

such as forthcoming processes around the development of the two Global Compacts, upcoming GFMDs in Germany and Morocco, and efforts towards the implementation and monitoring of the migration-related aspects of the SDGs.

While the capacity of MADE's regional partners varied substantially, as discussed earlier, some reported that being part of the MADE network strengthened their organisations by enhancing their profile and visibility. For some, capacity around technical skills such as budgeting and reporting was also enhanced.

However, there are concerns expressed by stakeholders, both internal and external, that some of the positive impacts of MADE's work may not be sustained if funding for the programme were to cease with the end of IMPACS and ENGAGE. Without ongoing funding, for example, regional activities and meetings organised by MADE partners are unlikely to continue, and many of the new civil society organisations and voices that have been brought into the GMFD process through MADE's programming are unlikely to be able to continue their engagement. In some cases, contracts have ended for staff hired by project partners for the implementation of MADE programming, with such individuals taking with them valuable experience and connections built throughout the projects. It is, however, important to recognise that the work of most regional partners long pre-dated IMPACS and ENGAGE, and their core work will continue regardless of funding from these projects.

Sustainability may also be affected by issues of "ownership," and the degree to which different partners and stakeholders affiliate with being a driver of MADE. This may be affected both by initial project design (for example, one partner spoke of feeling that throughout the project, they were "living in someone else's house"), and by the way in which strategic planning for the next phase of MADE takes place.

Although there have been some ongoing discussions within ICMC around the future of MADE, the ROM evaluation recommendation in 2016 that a "concrete exit strategy on the future institutional and financial sustainability of the MADE Programme" has not yet resulted in concrete decisions or agreements regarding the future of MADE. Important steps were taken in this regard during the Workshop with core MADE partners from January 31 to February 1st, 2017 in Brussels.

MADE, particularly through IMPACS and ENGAGE, has made much headway in enhancing opportunities for civil society engagement in global migration and development-related processes, and in adding depth, dimension and quality to those engagements. However, it is also important to recognise that in 2017, sustainable source of funding for the organisation, coordination, and enhancement of civil society's GFMD activities remains an ongoing challenge.

Coherence

Coherence is the extent to which activities undertaken allow the European Commission to achieve its development policy objectives without internal contradiction or without contradiction with other Community policies. It is the extent to which they complement partner country's policies and other donors' interventions.

IMPACS and ENGAGE, and the broader work of the MADE network, is coherent with the EU's focus on issues of migration, and its identified priorities of: saving lives and providing

humanitarian assistance; enabling migrants and refugees to stay closer to home; and helping the development of third countries in order to address in the long term the root causes of irregular migration.¹⁰ For EU Member States, issues of migration have become increasingly central to social, economic and political agendas in recent years, with large numbers of migrants arriving in the EU from countries such as Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Nigeria. The EU reports that more than €15 billion of its budget in 2015 and 2016 has “been mobilised to enhance its action on migration both inside the European Union and beyond its borders, in support of our partners.”¹¹

EU Member States are closely involved with processes related to the GFMD, with Germany hosting the 2017 GFMD and co-hosting the 2018 GFMD with Morocco. Member States have also been integral in global work around the development of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, in which migration explicitly features. The focus now has turned the implementation and monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals. The work of IMPACS and ENGAGE has contributed substantially to these processes through the strengthening and expansion of civil society input and engagement at these levels. Similarly, the work of MADE has also added civil society voices to EU-Africa processes such as the Valetta Summit, and to other migration-related global processes of relevance to EU Member States, such as MICIC and the 2016 UN HLS.

Migration is included in the European Union “Global Strategy,” and a new EU Migration Partnership Framework has been launched, to build on the European Agenda on Migration, and on the Valetta Summit Agreement around enhanced cooperation with African partners. The EU has also set up a €1.8 billion Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, which attempts to address stability and the root causes of irregular migration and forced displacement.

Inevitably, there are differences of opinion amongst stakeholders regarding the best ways in which to manage or facilitate migration, while ensuring that the rights of migrants are protected (for example, perspectives on the desirability and effectiveness of agreements such as the EU-Turkey Statement of 2016 vary considerably, and are often the subject of substantial critique from civil society). Many within civil society perceive that conditions for migrants in the EU (and beyond) are becoming increasingly restrictive and exclusive, with migration and development debates and initiatives being somewhat side-lined amidst the political, social and security tensions of the day. Some respondents expressed concern about the increasingly difficult and often dangerous situations faced by migrants, amidst an increased emphasis on exclusion and security by EU Member States.

Community Added Value

Community Added Value is the extent to which it can reasonably be argued that changes are due to EC intervention, rather than any other factors.

EC support through IMPACS and ENGAGE has been essential to the creation and operation of the MADE network, and to the achievement of its outputs and objectives. MADE regional partners’ engagement in migration and development advocacy pre-dated EC funding, and in will continue beyond this funding, but IMPACS and ENGAGE has allowed for the effective deepening and strengthening of this work, for the building and strengthening of civil society

¹⁰ https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/1_eu_migration_policy_at_glance_-_fact_sheet_2016.pdf

¹¹ https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/1_eu_migration_policy_at_glance_-_fact_sheet_2016.pdf

The issues addressed by IMPACS and ENGAGE remain pressing and important, globally and more specifically in the context of the EU.

networks, and for the enhancement of civil society participation in multiple regional and global processes related to migration and development. Thematic knowledge has been strengthened, and new opportunities for civil society engagements with each other, with governments, and with other international organisations and stakeholders have been created. The achievements and impacts of these two projects, as outlined in the findings above, are substantial, and many of these achievements are highly unlikely to have been achieved in the absence of sufficient funding for these projects. The scale of funding necessary to achieve these objectives would have been unlikely to come from individual Member States, and given the political and diplomatic weight of the EU, the receipt of EC funding for these two projects has likely contributed to enhancing the credibility and reputation of MADE and its regional partners. This may lead to important future opportunities for funding and further collaborations.

The issues addressed by IMPACS and ENGAGE remain pressing and important, globally and more specifically in the context of the EU. As discussed above, migration issues have become increasingly central in the EU agenda, and continued action at the EU level is essential for efforts towards meeting the protection needs and human rights of all migrants, and towards facilitating the potential of migration as a contributor to processes of development. Given the global dynamics of international migration and development, the EU has an important and continued global role to play in advancing issues of migration and development at regional and sub-regional and local levels as well. Ensuring that the diverse voices and experiences of civil society organisations working on the ground are represented and heard in global processes around migration and development is critical to ongoing and forthcoming work, such as the development of the two Global Compacts and ongoing processes around the implementation and monitoring of the migration-related SDG goals, targets and indicators. While global advocacy work will undoubtedly continue, the end of these two EC-funded projects will be significant for the global migration and development civil society community, with fewer opportunities for strengthening local and regional networks and advocacy, and for connecting those regions to a global platform through the GFMD and other high level processes.

Conclusions, lessons and recommendations

Conclusions

Overall, MADE's work since its launch in 2014 has made an important contribution to regional and global migration and development processes and debates. In many ways, MADE's role has been one of a catalyst, identifying, sparking and bolstering existing capacities and potentials within civil society.

The work of MADE and its partners has been highly relevant in both its form and focus, with issues related to migration featuring high on the political priority list of many governments and regions. Critically, its ongoing relevance also stems from the continued challenges, risks, and often life-threatening circumstances that continue to be faced by migrants, refugees and asylum seekers globally. MADE's thematic and regional programming, along with its global engagement, has also been effective to a large degree. Some challenges were acknowledged around continent-wide network-building in Africa, different capacities of different partners, a lack of clarity in MADE's identity, and some questions of ownership. Regardless, MADE effectively carried through its core activities and produced outputs aligned with the overall and specific objectives of both IMPACS and ENGAGE.

Given the nature of these projects and interventions and the lack of baseline data, definitively determining the impact of MADE's work is challenging. However, all indications are that this work has indeed had some important impacts, particularly at the macro- and meso-levels. These impacts are demonstrated, for example, in increasing opportunities for civil society engagement both with each other and with external stakeholders (including governments) in regional and global processes. They are also demonstrated through the uptake of MADE's research and thematic reports, in shifts in discourse around migration within global processes (e.g. in governments' shifts towards the language of "migrants' rights") and are likely to have played a contributing role in the unprecedented explicit inclusion of migration in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The MADE programme operated efficiently, overall, with sufficient capacity in the Coordinating Office and with sufficient funding to match the expected activities and outputs of both IMPACS and ENGAGE. Budgets were clearly presented and updated with donor approval when required. Donors report satisfaction with the timeliness and professional standards of ICMC staff in their engagements throughout the projects. There were some administrative and logistical challenges related to the simultaneous administration of two such closely-linked EC projects, along with some challenges related to staff turnover and capacity in the Coordinating Office and with some regional partners. However, these did not substantially impact the efficiency of these projects.

This evaluation has found that MADE's work demonstrates a high level of coherence, and that the value-added through EC funding has been substantial. Many contributions of the MADE programme are expected to have impacts that will continue long after the end of IMPACS and ENGAGE. The work of MADE's regional partners will continue, regardless of the end of IMPACS and ENGAGE. However, unless alternative sources of funding are found, it is unlikely that the same degree of civil society engagement in regional and global processes will be sustained. The extent to which MADE thematic working groups will be able to continue their work is also questionable. It would have been beneficial for transition planning for the

next phase of MADE to have occurred earlier in the projects' cycle, and there remain important questions about the future shape, form and focus of MADE.

Lessons Learned

This section presents some of the lessons learned as highlighted through this evaluation process across three key areas: project design and partner engagement; considerations regarding the structure of MADE; and considerations regarding the focus of MADE.

Project Design and Partner Engagement

Some aspects of project design are highlighted in this evaluation as yielding potential lessons learned for MADE and its regional partners.

This evaluation, like the ROM evaluation, highlights that project planning for inputs and resources for regional activities in Africa would have benefited from a more robust assessment of existing capacities and civil society activities in West Africa and other sub-regions of the continent.

The logical framework for ENGAGE would also have benefitted from being much clearer and more concise in both wording and presentation. While presently the IMPACS logical framework is clear and presentable, changes were made to the logical framework only in 2016 suggesting that internal processes to monitor and regularly update the logical frameworks to ensure they were living, usable documents may not have been as strong as possible. Enhanced monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guidance from the Coordination Office for core partners might also have been helpful, in terms of ensuring alignment with IMPACS and ENGAGE outputs and objectives.

Projects could have benefitted from the direct engagement and involvement of project partners at the conceptualisation and design phase. While ICMC clearly put thought and care into the selection of effective partners, a clear and transparent selection process of partners may have helped to ensure not only that the most effective and appropriate partners were at the table, but also that any potential negative feelings from other civil society actors were dispelled. More regional meetings of partners could have been helpful to increase inter-regional activities, and to strengthen knowledge and collaboration in relation to thematic areas. Some stakeholders suggested that it might have added benefit to have more than one partner in each region, to promote engagement, provide support for each other, and to strengthen the regional networking component.

Effective strategic planning with core partners around the future shape and focus of MADE, along with sustainability planning, would have been helpful earlier in the projects' life span, to help ensure a smooth transition and continuity. This transition is particularly important given stakeholders' emphasis on not losing current momentum and visibility at the global level, in current and future global migration and development processes. A meeting of core partners in Belgium on February 1, 2017 to discuss the future of MADE was an important step in this regard.

This external evaluation also concurs with the ROM evaluation that MADE could have derived benefit from an enhanced media presence and greater visibility generally, in terms of proactively promoting project achievements to audiences beyond those with an existing interest in

issues of migration and development. A media strategy for the next phase of MADE should be designed in conversation with all relevant stakeholders, to ascertain the best approach for the project, in alignment with the available resources. Throughout the projects, MADE built strong and effective connections with a wide range of organisations. Some stakeholders indicated that it would be beneficial to build even stronger internal communications links and bridges with other NGOs or existing networks, particularly in the development sector to help ensure that work was coordinated across the migration, refugee, humanitarian and development sectors.

Structure of MADE

Although MADE is the Migration and Development Civil Society *Network* there was little clarity from internal and external stakeholders regarding how best to understand the “network” component of the programme, or whether this was the best way of presenting and continuing the work of the programme moving forward. One common perspective was that MADE has been most effective as a networking platform, rather than as a network, in and of itself. For external stakeholders, the “network” label causes some confusion regarding issues such as who is a member, what being a member entails, and the relationship between this network and the ICMC. One donor also suggested that sustaining a network with so many diverse projects and interests can be difficult, noting that most successful networks operate around one specific project or issue.

While unclear about the “network” identity of MADE, almost all stakeholders were clear about MADE’s important contribution in the field as a facilitator, coordinator, convener, bridge, and information-sharer. A widely-shared perspective amongst stakeholders was also that whatever the future structure of MADE, it should involve identifying and strengthening mechanisms to link the local to the global, and to be able to channel and translate information in both directions.

Focus of MADE

There can be little doubt that the regional work of MADE has helped to increase civil society representation in the regions, in both regional and global migration and development processes. The regional activities and outputs of MADE also generally allowed for regional partners to pursue issues and activities deemed to be of most relevance to regional priorities, undoubtedly contributing to the effectiveness of the programme. Some stakeholders, however, noted that there were also continuing gaps in civil society coverage in some regions (such as the Gulf/Arab region, the Pacific regions, parts of South and Central America, and much of the African continent).

With funding for IMPACS and ENGAGE ending, the wide scope of activities and outputs made possible through this EC-funding will no longer be possible, and the ICMC and MADE will need to carefully identify its future strategic priorities. MADE’s thematic component was seen by many stakeholders as particularly strong in its capacity to unite different stakeholders, across countries and regions (recognising, however, that migration and development priorities often differ from region to region), suggesting that the continuation and refinement of MADE’s thematic work is one possible option for moving forward. Others saw MADE’s work in assisting with the emergence of a migration and development civil society network in Africa, and the fostering of EU-Africa civil society connections, as being amongst its most important priorities moving forward. Still others thought that the focus of MADE should continue to be around civil society coordination and organisation within global processes such as the GFMD.

Another view was that the seed-funding component of MADE's work should be expanded, as should MADE's engagement with local authorities. These diverse opinions speak not only to different perspectives on where MADE has been the most successful and where it ought to continue to focus, but they also speak to the importance of undertaking a formal, externally facilitated strategic planning process to help shape these decisions.

Recommendations

<p>1. Consider undertaking a formal, externally facilitated Strategic Planning process as soon as possible for the MADE programme, engaging MADE's core partners. Strategic planning should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Address the current lack of clarity around MADE's identity (e.g. as a network or a programme);Further define the relationship between ICMC and MADE, moving forward;Take a strategic decision regarding the future physical location of the MADE office (e.g. Brussels, Geneva, or elsewhere);Identify MADE's core functions and priorities, moving forward;Include a strong media-engagement and outreach strategy to improve the visibility of the work of MADE and its partners;Consider the development of projects and mechanisms to strengthen collaboration and engagement between MADE network core partners;Consider the need for MADE to retain enough flexibility to continue being responsive to new and shifting regional and global priorities, as they arise.
<p>2. Core partners should be involved at all stages of future conceptualisation and planning, as well as implementation.</p>
<p>3. In future, a MADE Coordinating Office or Secretariat should consider developing clear monitoring and evaluation tools and processes to help guide the work of regional and thematic partners in relation to the core project.</p>
<p>4. Future logical frameworks should be accessible, useful, relevant, valid, and updated through a regular process of internal monitoring.</p>
<p>5. Ensure that partner selection processes are as clear and transparent as possible.</p>
<p>6. Ensure the availability of adequate training, support and capacity building for all partners regarding budgeting and reporting.</p>
<p>7. Review processes to help ensure that any future co-funding obligations from partners can be met without detracting from other areas of a partner's work.</p>
<p>8. Building on its successes, ICMC/MADE should take further steps to identify and strategically engage with other key stakeholders and networks, working across issues of migration (including asylum seeker and refugee issues) and in the development and humanitarian sectors.</p>
<p>9. Continue working towards more reliable and multi-year funding.</p>
<p>10. Work towards identifying and strengthening mechanisms to link the local to the global, and to be able to channel and translate information in both directions in future work.</p>

Annex 1: List of Documents Reviewed

- MADE Africa, MADE and ICMC “*Taking Stock of Valletta: Africa and European Civil Society Consultation Initiative Concept Note*”
- Logical Framework ENGAGE (November 2010)
- Logical Framework IMPACS (November 2010 updated 2016)
- Annex III_revised Narrative IMPACS_14.11.2016
- Annex III_revised narrative_NCE 18.10.2016
- MADE Communications Plan 2016
- Annex IVa_to the updated log frame (IMPACS)
- C-334176_Consolidated_ROM Report_20161020_FINAL
- Cover letter ENGAGE signed (Request for No Cost Extension)
- Translated Evaluation Summary: Honduras Pilot Project (January 2017)
- Global Survey on Migration and Development_final (Forcier Consulting)
- Proposal for the continuation of MADE Network and Programme (August 2016)
- ICMC-MADE organization chart October to November 2016
- Interim report_ENGAGE_2014_final
- Interim report_IMPACS_2014_final
- Interim report_ENGAGE_2015_final for print
- Interim report_IMPACS_2015_final for print
- List of Recipients Questionnaire Valletta_Jan17
- Movement Report_EN_final 2016
- Concept note - MADE global report 2015_final
- MADE Programme_List of contacts
- Results Evaluation GFMD CSD 2016
- Valletta Concept from PH Jan 17 2017
- List of selected MADE Pilot Fund projects_links
- Pilot Country Overview
- Partner MOUs (SIMN, MFS, Cordaid, INMD, AFFORD, ADPC)
- Strategic Priorities 2016
- DRAFT final report_ENGAGE (2016)
- DRAFT final report IMPACS (2016)
- Annexes (ENGAGE and IMPACS Draft final reports 2016)
- Annex 1_Budget and co-funding GFMD-MADE 2014-16
- Annex B - Budget - ICMC Europe_ENGAGE (28 November 2013)
- AnnexB_ICMC Europe_Budget - IMPACS project_091213
- budget changes ENGAGE 18.04.2014
- Budget changes ENGAGE 24 06 2015
- Budget changes IMPACS 03.04.2015.xls
- ENGAGE-budget amendment request_090414 -WM-SN
- I. ENGAGE Justification budget changes and requested budget (25.06.2015)
- I. IMPACS Justification budget changes and requested budget (02.06.2015)
- II. Budget changes IMPACS 02 06 2015_IH
- III. Annex 1a_Narrative IMPACS (thematic program) - updates 02.06.2015
- Request for amendment (ENGAGE)_180414

CALL FOR CONSULTANTS

Migration and Development Civil Society (MADE) Network External Evaluation *Data collection, analysis and report*

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Location :	Brussels (Belgium) or home-based
Application Deadline :	20 November 2016
Theme :	Migration and Development
Type of Contract :	Freelance Contract
Post Level :	Consultant
Languages Required :	English + working language of Spanish and/or French an asset
Duration of Appointment :	. Starting asap. 25 working days; deadline February 1, 2017
Start Date :	January 1, 2017

Background

The Migration and Development Civil Society Network (MADE www.madenetwork.org) is an international, civil society-led platform that connects and supports civil society worldwide to promote policies and action for the well-being and protection of all migrants. MADE began in 2013, with the life span of the initial programme activities until March 2017. The programme has two EC funded projects: IMPACS connects civil society movements with external partners and organizations and ENGAGE brings civil society movements within MADE together.

The primary objective of MADE is to build and strengthen civil society organizations (that work on some of today's major challenges in migration and development), and TO strengthen regional networks of these CSOs. See also the civil society "[5-year 8-point Plan of Action](#)", which MADE takes forward as civil society's agenda for change and collaboration with states on issues of migration and development.

The MADE program is coordinated by ICMC¹² (www.icmc.net) in direct partnership with implementing civil society partners in Africa, Asia, the Americas and Europe.¹³ The programme is building and strengthening three regional civil society networks: MADE Asia, MADE Africa and MADE Americas, in addition to a Europe chapter and a global coordinating office in Brussels. MADE has also facilitated the start of three thematic working groups: diaspora and migrants for development, global governance of migration and development and labour migration and recruitment. At the Global level, MADE Global Coordinating Office works closely with partners to organize activities of civil society organizations worldwide in processes that involve governments, decision-makers and international agencies¹⁴.

In the (recent) past, the MADE program has conducted important assessments – or was subject of this. In 2015, MADE commissioned the first edition of a "[Movement](#)" report as an independent assessment of what progress has been made on achieving each of the eight goals in the 5-year 8-point Plan of Action in its first two years of implementation (2013-2015). Based on interviews, literature review and a [global survey](#) among over 300 civil society organizations, the report painted a picture both of improvement and inertia, of action taken by civil society and of action needed to be taken for the Plan to move forward, including key recommendations to civil society and governments. (A second edition of the Movement Report is currently being prepared as a follow-up to and within the same parameters of the first edition; this edition will be ready early 2017). Next to this are the internal final reporting of the IMPACS and ENGAGE projects in process and an internal ROM evaluation initiated by the EC. The consultant is invited to use these reports and make them part of the final evaluation where appropriate. The logical frameworks of the IMPACS and ENGAGE projects are to be used as benchmarks; especially the results and indicators.

Objectives of the External Evaluation

Objective 1

In line with the requirements of the EC the MADE programme is recruiting a dedicated and experienced consultant for an external final evaluation of its IMPACS and ENGAGE projects. The first objective of this evaluation is to gather lessons learned and suggestions for the future of MADE **from MADE partners** on the achievements of the two projects of MADE. Questions to be answered are (but not limited to):

- For its partners, how effective has the structure of MADE been in the past 3 years in relation to organization and implementation?
- How have MADE and its partners monitored themselves and to what extent has this had an impact (positive/negative) on the functioning of the network?
- How are the roles of (and need for) a central coordinating office understood/appreciated; especially in relation to and as support for the regional civil society networks and for the thematic working groups?

¹² The International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) is an internationally operating non-governmental organization that serves and protects uprooted people: refugees, internally displaced persons and migrants, regardless of faith, race, ethnicity or nationality.

¹³ The implementing civil society partners are: Migrant Forum in Asia; Caritas Senegal; AFFORD; Cordaid; Fundación Scalabrini Chile together with the Scalabrini International Migration Network (SIMN); the International Network on Migration and Development (INMD); ICMC and ICMC Europe.

¹⁴ Such activities include the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD), civil society activities around the UN High-Level Summit on refugees and migrants, the Migrants in Countries in Crisis Initiative (MICIC), Pilot Funds focused on national advocacy activities and the implementation of the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

- Has the MADE programme worked successfully (or not) on filling in gaps; both geographically and thematically? What lessons learned can be identified?
- Has the current network structure additional and appropriate value for the individual civil society members; especially on achieving the goals in the 5-years 8-point action plan?
- Has MADE succeeded in connecting the regional and national level to global processes on migration and development (GFMD, HLS and other processes)?

Objective 2

A second objective of this evaluation is to gather lessons learned and suggestions for the future of MADE from **other stakeholders** (governments/other CSOs/international organizations (INGO's, UN agencies)/private sector), particularly those that have worked with MADE in some capacity. Questions to be answered are (but are not limited to):

- For external stakeholders, how effective has the structure of MADE as a global network of civil society on migration and development (related to the 5-year 8-point action plan) been, in the past 3 years in relation to organization and implementation?
- To what extent have external stakeholders used the knowledge, experience and network of the MADE programme and its partners on the thematic approaches of: diaspora and migrants for development, global governance of migration and development and labor migration and recruitment? How was this appreciated?
- How are the roles of (and need for) a central coordinating office appreciated by external stakeholders; especially in relation to and as support for the regional civil society networks and thematic working groups?
- Has MADE succeeded in connecting the regional and national level to global processes on migration and development (GFMD, HLS and other processes)?

Duties and responsibilities

Under the overall supervision of ICMC's MADE Coordinating Office based in Brussels, the consultant will be responsible for the following deliverables:

1. Develop and execute an evaluation including methodology and work plan, based on qualitative and quantitative research such as (but not limited to) desk research and analysis of other assessments (e.g. mentioned above), of secondary data sources and MADE outputs and interviews with a representative selection of MADE partners (phase 1) and a representative selection of other stakeholders (phase 2)
2. Liaise closely with the MADE regional and thematic coordinators, and approach a selection of other stakeholders that should include civil society, governments, international organizations and members of the diaspora/migrant groups.

Deliverable

An evaluation report of no more than 40 pages, excluding annexes, (i) highlighting the evaluation and (ii) formulating conclusions and recommendations to be used also for the future of the MADE programme.

Preliminary Time line

Preparation of methodology and work plan & consultation with the MADE coordinating office	3 working days
Interviews, research, field visits etc.	15 working days
Draft report writing	5 working days
Final report editing/writing	2 working days

Required skills and experience:

Experience

- Excellent quantitative and qualitative research skills, proven by a portfolio of at least 3 previous research studies in a similar field
- Previous experience in the field of migration and development at a global or regional level is desirable
- Experience with EC assessments and EC funding requirements is desirable

Education

- Masters (or equivalent) degree in one of the following or related areas – migration, social sciences, international relations, politics

Language

- Excellent English writing skills
- Fluency in Spanish and French is a significant asset

Annex 3: List of Interviews

NO.	PERSON INTERVIEWED	POSITION	ORGANISATION	TYPE	COUNTRY
1	Mr. Jeroen Corduwener	Programme Manager	MADE	NGO	Belgium
2	Ms. Emer Groarke	Advocacy and Communication Officer	MADE	NGO	Belgium
3	Ms. Petra Hueck	Head	MADE/ICMC Europe	NGO	Belgium
4	Ms. Laura Hieber	Communications and Events Officer	MADE	NGO	Belgium
5	Ms. Iustina Haroianu	Finance Manager	MADE/ICMC	NGO	Belgium
6	Mr. John Bingham	Head of Policy and Coordinator of Civil Society Activities of the GFMD	ICMC	NGO	Switzerland
7	Ms. Elaine McGregor	Researcher	UNU-MERIT and the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, Maastricht University	Research/Academic	The Netherlands
8	Mr. Colin Rajah	Co-founder and former Coordinator of the Global Coalition on Migration & Civil Society Chair GFMD 2016	Independent Consultant	NGO	United States
9	Ms. Wies Maas	Former Programme Coordinator: MADE	Independent Consultant	NGO	The Netherlands
10	Mr. Sönke Lorenz	Head of Unit of Migration Issues	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Gov't	Germany
11	Ms. Nahida Sobhan	Minister	Permanent Mission of Bangladesh in Geneva	Gov't	Bangladesh
12	Ms. Aurelie Sgro	Project Manager, Migrants in Countries in Crisis	International Centre for Migration Policy Development	Research/Policy Centre	Belgium
13	Ms. Sophie van Haasen	Former MADE Programme Officer, and MADE Coordination [maternity leave from Nov 2016]	MADE/ICMC	NGO	Belgium
14	Ms. Sophie Ngo-Diep	Programme Manager, EPIM (formerly Funding Coordinator and Regional Network Developer for MADE Network)	European Programme for Integration and Migration	NGO	Belgium

15	Ms. Leila Marzo	Former Programme Officer	MADE/ICMC	NGO	France
16	Ms. Anna Crowley	Program Officer, International Migration Initiative	Open Society Foundations	Donor	UK
17	Ms. Cecile Raillant	Programme Manager	Joint Migration and Development Initiative, United Nations Development Programme	International Organisation	Belgium
18	Ms. Stella Opoku-Owuysu	Engagement and Capacity Manager	Afford	NGO	UK
19	Mr. Alphonse Seck	Director	Caritas Senegal	NGO	Senegal
20	Mr. Mario Jose Zambiasi	Executive Assistant	Scalabrini International Migration Network	NGO	United States
21	Mr. Bob van Dillen	Policy & Advocacy Officer (former Coordinator of Working Group on the Global Governance of Migration and Development, through Cordaid, the Netherlands)	Caritas	NGO	Belgium
22	Ms. Claudia Leon Ang	Researcher	International Network on Migration and Development	NGO	Mexico
23	Mr. William Gois	Regional Coordinator	Migrant Forum in Asia	NGO	Philippines
24	Mr. Guillermo Reyes	First Secretary	Permanent Mission of Mexico in Geneva	Gov't	Mexico
25	Ms. Melissa Pitotti	Head of Policy	International Council of Voluntary Agencies	NGO Coordination Body	Switzerland
26	Mr. Enrico Fos	Minister	Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva	Gov't	Philippines
27	Ms. Gabrielle Parenteau	MADE Program Coordinator	Scalabrini International Migration Network	NGO	Chile
28	Mr. Vincent Chasteloux	Programme Officer – Migration & Asylum DEVCO.B.3 – Migration, Employment, Inequalities	European Commission, International Cooperation and Development	Donor	Belgium

29	Ms. Karina Chircu	Cooperation Officer – DEVCO B.2 -- Civil Society and Local Authorities	European Commission, International Cooperation and Development	Donor	Belgium
30	Mr. Pietro Mona	Deputy Head	Global Programme for Migration and Development; Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation; Federal Department of Foreign Affairs	Gov't/Donor	Switzerland
31	Ms. Sichel'mpilo Shange-Buthane	Executive Director (former Executive Director for the Consortium for Refugees and Migrants in South Africa	Amnesty International South Africa	NGO	South Africa

RELEVANCE

BROAD

Is the project doing the right thing? How important is the **relevance or significance** of the intervention regarding local, national, regional and international requirements and priorities?

1. To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?
2. Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
3. Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

SPECIFIC

1. How do IMPACS and ENGAGE link to the strategic priorities of ICMC?
2. What is the relevance and value added of MADE's work in terms of working towards the international community's Sustainable Development Agenda?
3. To what extent has MADE programming aligned with and respond to the EC's needs and priorities?
4. How relevant has the project been to other key stakeholders (i.e. civil society organizations; governments; private sector; INGOs; migrants and affected communities?)
5. To what extent has the programme's identification, design and implementation process involved local, regional, national and international stakeholders as appropriate?

EFFECTIVENESS

BROAD

Are the objectives of the development interventions being achieved? How big is the **effectiveness or impact** of the project compared to the objectives planned (Comparison: result – planning)?

1. To what extent were the objectives achieved/are likely to be achieved?
2. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

SPECIFIC

1. For its partners, how effective has the structure of MADE been in the past three years? Is MADE's organizational structure clear? To what extent does its structure contribute to, or interfere with, project implementation?
2. To what extent has the central coordinating office contributed to the effectiveness of MADE? Has its role been clearly understood, particularly in relation to (and as support for) three regional civil society networks and for the thematic working groups?
3. What kind of positive changes to beneficiaries have resulted from the work of MADE?
4. What areas of work have proven to be most successful in terms of ownership in relation to the local context and the needs of beneficiaries? To what extent and in what ways has ownership, or lack of it, impacted the effectiveness of the projects?
5. Has the MADE programme worked successfully (or not) on filling in gaps, both geographically and thematically? What lessons can be identified?

6. How have MADE and its partners monitored themselves, and to what extent has this had an impact (positive or negative) on the functioning of the network?
7. Has MADE succeeded in connecting the regional and national level to global processes on migration and development (GFMD, HLS and other processes, such as MICIC)?

EFFICIENCY

BROAD

Are the objectives being achieved economically by the development intervention? How big is the **efficiency or utilisation ratio** of the resources used (Comparison: resources applied – results)?

1. To what extent were the costs justified, given the changes/effects that have been achieved?
2. Were objectives achieved on time?
3. To what extent were the costs proportionate to the benefits achieved? What factors have influenced any discrepancies?

SPECIFIC

1. To what extent did the MADE Coordinating Office and Regional Network Partners have the capacity to design and implement projects?
2. Was there enough funding to carry out the activities as described in the logical frameworks? To what extent did spending match anticipated costs?
3. Were there issues of over-spending or under-spending during the project, and if so, how were these issues resolved and adjustments made?
4. To what extent were institutional arrangements adequate for implementing MADE's IMPACS and ENGAGE projects? What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the projects face and to what extent has this affected its efficiency?
5. Has the current network structure added additional and appropriate value for the individual civil society members, especially on achieving the goals in the 5-years 8-point action plan?

IMPACT

BROAD

Does the development intervention contribute to reaching higher level development objectives (preferably, overall objective)? What is the **impact or effect** of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected?

1. What has happened as a result of the programme?
2. What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
3. How many people have been affected?

SPECIFIC

1. To what extent have external stakeholders used the knowledge, experience and network of the MADE programme and its partners on the thematic approaches of 1) diaspora and migrants for development; 2) global governance of migration and development; and 3) labour migration and recruitment?

2. Have there been any specific government policies or practices that have been demonstrably impacted through the work of MADE?
3. To what extent have there been any unanticipated impacts of MADE's work, either positive or negative?

SUSTAINABILITY

BROAD

Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable? How is the **sustainability or permanence** of the intervention and its effects to be assessed?

1. To what extent do you expect the benefits of IMPACS and ENGAGE to continue at the end of the project cycles?
2. What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of IMPACS and ENGAGE?

SPECIFIC

1. To what extent did ICMC/MADE engage the participation of beneficiaries in design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?
2. To what extent was the capacity of MADE regional partner staff built to sustain or enhance their involvement in migration and development programmes and projects?
3. To what extent have MADE's partnership activities led to the development of new projects or programmes in the various focus regions?
4. What planning has been done towards the continued sustainability of the MADE network, beyond IMPACS and ENGAGE funding? Has an exit plan, or a plan for sustainably transitioning, been developed?

COHERENCE/COMPLEMENTARITY

1. To what extent is the work of MADE, through IMPACS and ENGAGE, coherent with wider EU policies?
2. To what extent is it coherent with international obligations?
3. To what extent is the intervention coherent with other interventions which have similar objectives?

COMMUNITY VALUE ADDED

1. Have there been any specific benefits, or additional value, of having EC funding for IMPACS and ENGAGE, compared to what could be achieved by Member States at national and/or regional levels?
2. To what extent do the issues addressed by the intervention continue to require action at the EU level?
3. What kinds of challenges would you envision for the continuation of the work of MADE without EC support?

Annex 5: MADE Organisation Chart (most updated)

