

THE EUROPEAN UNION EMERGENCY TRUST FUND FOR STABILITY AND ADDRESSING THE ROOT CAUSES OF IRREGULAR MIGRATION AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN AFRICA

Action Fiche for the implementation of the Horn of Africa Window

T05-EUTF-HoA-REG-28

1. IDENTIFICATION

Title/Number	Monitoring and Learning System for the EUTF Horn of Africa		
Total cost	Total estimated cost: 6 900 000 ¹ EUR Total amount drawn from the Trust Fund: 6 900 000 EUR		
Aid method / Method of implementation	Direct management: negotiated procedure - service contract with Altai Consulting		
DAC-code	150	Sector	

2. RATIONALE AND CONTEXT

2.1. Summary of the action and its objectives

The Monitoring and Learning System will measure the overall progress of projects implemented under the Horn of Africa (HoA) window of the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EUTF) against its key strategic objectives and regional priorities. It will also describe if and how the projects confirm the various theories of change which were assumed when designing the EUTF HoA approach, thus also identifying gaps in the activities/results/outcome chains which need to be addressed if the change is to effectively happen. It will assess how the approach adopted by the EUTF in delivering programmes fulfils other success criteria, and allow stakeholders to learn collectively from its results – both positive and negative. Finally, in order not to lose sight of the overall impact to which the EUTF interventions should contribute, it will design and pilot a system to keep track of selected key development; migration and stability indicators at national and/or regional level. **This action thus contributes to the four objectives of the EUTF²** by directly supporting the implementation and the monitoring and evaluation of already approved and future individual projects, as well as informing the design of future projects³.

¹ An additional amount of 115 500 EUR will be contributed to the contract under this AD from the Technical Cooperation Facility of the North of Africa (NOA) window of the EUTF Africa, under DG NEAR. This amount will cover the NOA-related activities under the Lessons Learned Phase II that the MLS has been tasked with undertaking.

² "Greater Economic and Employment Opportunities; Strengthening Resilience of communities in particular the most vulnerable as well as refugees and displaced people; Improved migration management in countries of origin, transit and destination and Improved Governance and conflict prevention and reduction of forced displacement and irregular migration" – EUTF Strategic Orientation Document

³ While the focus will primarily be on EUTF HoA projects, the lessons learnt are expected to be directly useful for the programming of projects more generally in the region, as well as on similar sectors outside of the region

The action directly responds to one of the **core principles of intervention of the EUTF Strategic Orientation Document**, which considers that "strong research and analysis is central to understanding the context and ensuring that interventions have a positive impact".

The **geographical coverage** of this action encompasses all countries eligible under the Horn of Africa Window of the EUTF, i.e. Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda⁴. In addition, it will cover all countries eligible under the North of Africa Window of the EUTF only in relation to the second phase of a Learning Lessons exercise that the MLS has been tasked with by the EUTF.

The **intervention logic** of the action is that by being able to monitor whether the EUTF in the Horn of Africa and its individual projects are achieving their intended objectives, and by analysing the reasons for their performance, as well as by assessing the success factors of the EUTF more generally, useful evidence will be collected to improve project programming and implementation, as well as to inform strategic decisions and policy making around the EUTF.

In order to reinforce this logic, the proposed action will need to interact closely and continuously with the Research and Evidence Facility contracted under the EUTF Horn of Africa, as its mandate is to "collate and produce evidence and policy relevant knowledge primarily to inform targeted EUTF interventions through primary and secondary research".

The Monitoring and Learning System will consist of two main elements: a) the monitoring of projects implemented under the EUTF Horn of Africa window against a set of EUTF Common (proxy⁵). Indicators directly linked to the four strategic objectives of the EUTF, as well as to the priorities of the Horn of Africa window; and b) an in-depth analysis of individual projects or groups of projects to assess whether and why they have been successful or not, and from this to develop and exchange lessons learnt. This will also be complemented by the research conducted by the EUTF.

The target groups of the action are the governing institutions of the EUTF, i.e. the Strategic Board and the Operational Committee (which include EU Member States and concerned African partners and Regional Organisations), the EUTF management team, the EU Delegations, the project implementing partners and other interested stakeholders.

⁴ The MLS will cover all projects approved under the HOA window including i.e. regional projects implemented in Burundi (T05-EUTF-HOA-REG-79), the Emergency Transit Mechanism in Rwanda (T05-EUTF-HOA-REG-81) and Support to South Sudanese refugees in DRC (T05-EUTF-HOA-REG-71)

⁵ A proxy indicator is in this case an indicator which measures the collective performance of several projects, by summarising into one common formulation the various indicators used by each project. Such a proxy indicator could be "Number of people supported to establish income-generating activities". Two different indicators (from two different projects) could then be translated into that proxy indicators, for example: "Number of small-holder farmers receiving training on income-generating activities in Kenya" and "Number of households with acquired skills and inputs or working capital to run income generation opportunities in Ethiopia". The translation methodology would ensure the right transparency so that the simplification process is well understood.

2.2. Context

2.2.1. Country/regional context, if applicable

Protracted displacement, forced migration and conflict are among the most significant contemporary challenges facing the Horn of Africa region. Political instability, economic deprivation, changing population dynamics, resource scarcity, and complex influences that travel back and forth between diaspora and home communities all combine to create an environment of flux, in which people are moving, sometimes out of choice but often in the absence of any positive choice, in search of a better life.

In order to address these challenges, the EUTF Horn of Africa window takes an evidence-based approach when it comes to identifying, designing, implementing and monitoring interventions. The evidence is collected through analysis of existing literature and project evaluations, the undertaking of primary research, and the monitoring of ongoing interventions.

2.2.2. Sector context: policies and challenges

Monitoring and Evaluation framework

The overall approach to monitoring, evaluation and learning under the EUTF Horn of Africa window is composed of four different components. These are:

- The monitoring and evaluation of individual projects. Each project funded under the EUTF Horn of Africa window uses its own customised monitoring and evaluation system, such as organised by the implementing partners. The European Commission as Contracting Authority also ensures the appropriate monitoring of individual projects, including through the Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Facility, if required;
- The Monitoring and Learning System as proposed in this Action Document;
- The Research and Evidence Facility, which collects evidence through primary and secondary research to the benefit of project design and implementation; and, vice-versa, benefits from the findings of the projects and the Monitoring and Learning System to inform its research;
- Mid-term and final evaluations of the overall programme, which will, amongst others, include a detailed review of issues such as value for money and aid effectiveness.

The current Action Document is for a Monitoring and Learning System which will:

- support the development of sound logical frameworks and indicators for each program, and provide implementing partners with advice on the set up of their M&E systems (Technical Assistance role)
- measure the performance of the overall programme against the EUTF strategic objectives, the priorities for the Horn of Africa window laid down in its Operational Framework, and the EUTF principles of intervention described in more detail below. These three measures of success will form the "performance dashboard" of the EUTF Horn of Africa Window;

- develop analysis from evidence collected on project performance or non-performance, as well as on the role of each project in the various EUTF theories of change and the potential gaps identified in programming to support a coherent theory of change in line with the overarching objectives of the EUTF HoA; and ensure dissemination of lessons learned as well as the analysis of cross-cutting issues identified that could benefit all programs ("the learning strategy");

- design and pilot a system to keep track of key trends at the regional level in terms of migrations flows and trafficking; vulnerability and resilience of populations in movement / host communities; stability and natural shocks; the evolution of the capacities, response and coordination systems put in place in the region to better respond to migrations, natural shocks and instability. This will aim at providing the EUTF management team and stakeholders with baselines and trends on macro-level indicators against which to realistically frame the EUTF (and other similar EU) interventions; inform future EU programming and policy making; and ultimately track the *joint impact* of the EUTF HoA projects at the regional level through a top-down approach. This should complement the monitoring of outputs and outcome indicators informed by each project in their immediate perimeter and aggregated by the MLS in its Monitoring function through a bottom-up approach⁶.

This system will particularly focus on populations in movements across the region, the driving factors of these movements (security event and political repression, climate shocks and natural disaster), the reaction to these shocks (including displacements generated), the systems in place across the HoA region to manage these shocks and the generated displacements, taking a top down approach to ultimately be able to analyse the contribution of the EUTF funded programs to improving the reactions to shocks and displacement, curbing the trends of illegal migration and trafficking, and ultimately contribute to decreasing instability in the region.

This will be based on a combination of sensors, tracking systems, and longitudinal case studies. It will try to leverage existing systems and data sources as much as possible.

The "performance dashboard" of the EUTF Horn of Africa Window

a) **EUTF Strategic Objectives.** All projects funded under the EUTF Horn of Africa window should contribute to one or more of the four strategic objectives of the EUTF Strategy, i.e. 1) Greater economic and employment opportunities; 2) Strengthening resilience; 3) Improved migration management, 4) Improved governance and conflict prevention. They are therefore intended to adopt the respective intervention logics attached to these four lines of action, which are themselves based on specific assumptions⁷.

⁶ This macro-level tracking system will be crafted around the EUTF HoA program to stick to its priorities and will therefore not aim at covering broader social & economic indicators and general populations that are not in the boundaries and mandate of the EUTF.

⁷ For a complete description of the strategic lines of actions, and related intervention logic and assumptions, please refer directly to the EUTF Strategic Orientation document.

b) **Horn of Africa Window priorities as originally laid down in the EUTF HoA Operational Framework** and further defined through the EUTF strategic board. The Operational Framework adopted a two-fold logic: a migration and displacement logic; and a stabilisation logic. As such, the projects have to demonstrate their added-value in moving the following initiatives and processes forward.

- Migration: Regional Development and Protection Programmes (RDDPs); capacity building in support of political dialogues on migration at national and regional level; promotion of legal channels for migration; and cooperation on return, readmission and reintegration;

- Stability and Peacebuilding: targeting aid in support of peripheral and cross-border areas; addressing internal conflicts and trans-regional security threats, specifically in Sudan and South Sudan; and preventing violent extremism.

On 21st September 2018, the EUTF Strategic Board set the following strategic priorities for the use of remaining funds under the EUTF: 1) Return and reintegration; 2) Refugee management, notably in the HoA; 3) Completing progress on the securitisation of documents and civil registry; 4) Anti-trafficking measures; 5) Essential stabilisation efforts in Somalia, Sudan and South Sudan; 6) Migration dialogue.

These priorities are often being addressed jointly by a "group" of projects using similar approaches and intervention logics. This is notably the case for the Regional Development and Protection Programmes (RDDPs) ongoing in Uganda, Somalia, Kenya, Ethiopia, and Sudan. In this context, it makes sense that performance is also measured at an intermediary level (between the individual project level and the overall EUTF programme) for these groups of projects, in order to better capture their collective outcome. For this reason, the MLS has to exploit all synergies with initiatives such as the Learning and Evaluation Team (LET) which has been put in place to evaluate the outcomes of the RDDP portfolio (including but not only most of the EUTF – funded RDPP programmes).

c) **Principles of intervention**. The projects have to be designed and implemented in line with the principles of intervention set in the EUTF Strategic Orientation Document, and therefore answer positively to the following main questions:

- Are the interventions strategic and efficient, in tandem with political dialogue?
- Have interventions been based on an in-depth understanding of local contexts and an evidence-based targeting of geographies, beneficiaries and implementing partners?
- Have interventions been based on local ownership and effective dialogue and cooperation with relevant Regional Organisations?
- Have interventions adopted a holistic, integrated and coordinated approach?
- Have interventions adopted a "do no harm" and "conflict-sensitive approach"?
- Are interventions based on strong research and analysis?

- Is the EUTF HoA acting in complementarity with other EU instruments and tools and/or donor interventions?

In order to assess the collective achievements of the EUTF Horn of Africa window, the projects need to report against a set of EUTF Common indicators. Some of these common indicators, including both quantitative and qualitative, have been developed with the support of the Research and Evidence Facility (REF), paying particular attention to the following:

- the indicators need to reflect the strategic objectives and operational priorities, and therefore build on the indicative indicators formulated in the existing EUTF Results Framework ("top-down" approach);
- the indicators need to find enough resonance in the already existing indicators captured by the logical frameworks developed by individual projects ("bottom-up" approach);
- the indicators need to be formulated in such a way as to ensure that individual project indicators can be "aggregated" into the core indicators: the REF also proposed, for each core indicator, how this aggregation process could take place, in order for projects to be disrupted as little as possible. This is particularly important considering that the Monitoring and Learning System comes at a time when a significant number of EUTF projects are already being implemented and are collecting data according to their specific indicators.

There is then a need to understand which interventions are working and why, in order to adjust existing projects and feed this learning into the design of new ones.

The "learning strategy" of the EUTF Horn of Africa window

The learning strategy should analyse the conclusions of the above assessments, analyse the information behind them, (which entails "zooming" into specific projects or groups of projects), in order to better understand the reasons behind their achievement or non-achievement, and disseminate the knowledge to the relevant target groups.

The learning strategy should also encompass a detailed mapping of the theories of change which have been assumed when developing the EUTF approach (i.e. why, through which mechanisms and under which assumptions will the intended change happen and objectives be met) and explain how the EUTF projects confirm or not these theories, as well as identify which additional initiatives are necessary where there are gaps.

Finally; it should allow framing the EUTF story within the broader migration and stability situation and trends in the region, in order to put the EUTF into perspective and make a realistic assessment of the potential outreach of EUTF projects in terms of impact.

In doing this; it should pay particular attention to:

- facilitating more qualitative case-study based approaches to monitoring which is a useful way to provide analyses of lessons learned and to learn from best practices. Case-based analysis takes into account the specific approaches and contexts of one or

more projects using a specific indicator or small subset of indicators, and allows for exchange of practice between them. This will be in particular useful for projects addressing similar priorities and objectives, such as the RDPPs;

- creating a key link between the monitoring of projects and the research carried out under the EUTF Horn of Africa window, notably through the REF. There needs to be continuity between the data gathered and analysed for monitoring purposes, and it needs to be ensured that it is also used in the thematic analysis⁸.

In order for the learning strategy to increase its potential, other projects funded by the European Commission (for example in the framework of the National and Regional Indicative Programmes) which respond to the same strategic objectives of the EUTF could be included in the analysis and reporting activities foreseen under the proposed Monitoring and Learning System.

2.3. Lessons learnt

The proposed intervention has taken on board the following recommendations and lessons learned:

- the Final Audit Report on the Design and Implementation of EU Trust Funds from the Internal Audit Service of the European Commission of January 2016 has identified that "the lack of an adequate performance framework for Trust Fund activities may lead to ineffective monitoring of the progress achieved and a deficiency in performance information, which may impair a proper follow up and evaluation of the adopted actions", and that "DG DEVCO and DG NEAR should enhance their performance framework and develop a set of indicators for measuring the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the TFs".

- it is widely recognised that, in order for a monitoring system to also be used effectively as a learning mechanism, it needs to be developed in a participatory manner, involving the different stakeholders and their various requirements. The Monitoring and Learning System should therefore have the capacity to outreach and consult with the EU Delegations, project implementing organisations, and project beneficiaries (both state and non-state) at all stages of development and implementation of the system, in order to achieve buy-in and commitment to use it.

- the action includes best practices gathered by the Evaluation and Monitoring Unit of the European Commission's Directorate General for International Cooperation and Development on how to combine "bottom-up" (i.e. what the individual agreed projects have as indicators) as well as "top-down" (i.e. what drives the EUTF strategy and Horn of Africa Operational Framework) approaches in the definition of indicators, as well as on how to develop methodological notes supporting each indicator, and the reporting mechanisms considered for the compilation of the overall EU Results Framework.

⁸ For example, research on the border economies and centre-periphery relations (one of the themes proposed by the EUTF REF) will both inform and be strengthened by information gathered through the Monitoring and Learning System under the 'Greater economic and employment opportunities' and 'Strengthening Resilience of Communities...' related indicators.

2.4. Complementary actions

- As noted above, the Monitoring and Learning System will have to operate in very close coordination with the REF to ensure streamlined information sharing, make possible deeper analysis into the relation between individual and collective EUTF activity performance and achievements, and the dynamics of irregular migration, displacement and conflict that are the chief concerns of the REF;
- The Monitoring and Learning System should also operate in close collaboration with the two other windows of the EUTF, in order to maximise the learning potential, and allow reporting against common indicators;
- As the EUTF projects will be required to report their progress through common on-line IT platforms, such as the Akvo “really simple reporting” and the EUTF website, the Monitoring and Learning System will not develop its own platform; it will use existing platforms to the extent that they can provide the adequate support; the MLS will play the important intermediary role between data collected at project level and the aggregated data which will need to be encoded into these platforms to be reflected in a standardised way across the EUTF;
- The Monitoring and Learning System will have to use a very collaborative yet differentiated approach with regards to the individual monitoring and evaluation systems developed at the level of individual projects (or in some cases programmes covering projects of a similar nature, such as the RDPPs). Some of them will be more advanced or sophisticated than others, and each will have its own constituency of stakeholders to report to. While attempting to disrupt these systems to the least extent possible, the Monitoring and Learning System will have to work with the projects to ensure harmonisation of data collection, appropriate and transparent "translation" of project indicators into core indicators, and availability of project implementing staff to ensure the qualitative analysis behind the indicator measurement.

Unsurprisingly, with a portfolio reaching over 80 contracts across nine countries at the time (currently, almost 300 contracts are signed under HOA), a first assessment of all ongoing EUTF HoA interventions in terms of their M&E systems identified some very different approaches when it comes to program implementation and M&E and some weaknesses which include: weak logic of interventions, absence of SMART indicators, absence of baselines for main indicators; inexistent or very basic templates to export collected data; poor quality of data collection; unrealistic verification sources, etc.

The differences in approach and highlighted weaknesses mean that the MLS will have to make important efforts in capacity building and technical assistance to the projects upstream to improve all these procedures and systems before any reliable aggregation and analysis of results/outcomes, etc. can take place and any lessons can be learnt.

At the same time, the initial attempt made by the MLS to map IP indicators to the EUTF indicators - and their targets - though successful, highlighted the limitations of “simply adding” indicators together. Indeed, the wide variety of work being undertaken across the portfolio by a great number of different partners starting their

contracts at different moments meant that similar-looking indicators could actually reflect a very different reality: the IPs collecting, interpreting and calculating data and results in different ways could lead aggregate indicators to lack relevance. In fact, solely relying on aggregate indicators could lead to superficial analysis or erroneous results and would most certainly not do justice to the investment, work and impact created by the EUTF HoA.

Realising this, a revision of the EUTF Common output Indicators took place during 2019/2020 and final versions were shared with Operational Committee partners in July 2020. It was a result of a long process of consultation with Implementing Partners, EU Delegations and between the three EUTF Africa windows in order to harmonise, improve, and formalise the indicators through a set of methodological notes to best capture the EUTF context and activities going forward. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic that has affected all countries in the region and understandably EUTF implementation, the revision includes the addition of three COVID-19 related indicators that will apply where relevant.

2.5. Donor co-ordination

Considering that all contributing donors (and other stakeholders) of the EUTF Horn of Africa window are directly concerned with the outputs of the MLS, the system will pay particular attention to making data and analysis easily available and accessible at all times.

More formally, the Monitoring and Learning System will report periodically to the members of the EUTF Horn of Africa window through the Operational Committee and the Board, at least on a bi-annual basis.

3. DETAILED DESCRIPTION

3.1. Objectives

The **overall objective** of the programme is to use an evidence-based approach for programming and implementing interventions in the Horn of Africa region, as well as to inform policy around the themes of the EUTF in the region.

The **specific objectives** are as follows:

Specific Objective 1: to establish and implement a Monitoring and Learning System which monitors and reports on the overall progress of the EUTF Horn of Africa window against EUTF strategic objectives, Horn of Africa policy priorities and EUTF principles of interventions.

Specific Objective 2: to develop and implement a learning strategy based on detailed investigations into how and why individual projects or groups of projects are performing or not, and whether and how they confirm the theories of change underpinning the EUTF approach, in order to improve their delivery and also the design of future projects.

Specific Objective 3: to design and pilot a system of macro-level indicators (high level indicators) of movement, vulnerability, stability and crises management

capacity at the national and regional level against which to realistically frame the EUTF (and other similar EU) interventions; inform future EU programming and policy making; and ultimately track the *joint impact* of the EUTF HoA projects at the regional level through a top-down approach.

Expected results and main activities

The **expected results** are:

For Specific Objective 1:

Result 1.1.: A system is in place allowing projects funded under the EUTF Horn of Africa window to regularly report against a core set of proxy indicators (EUTF Common Indicators) related to the EUTF strategic objectives, Horn of Africa operational priorities and the EUTF principles of intervention

While the projects' individual logical frameworks are based on these strategic objectives, operational priorities and principles of intervention, they are however very diverse when it comes to the formulation of results and related indicators. This is a reflection of the wide range of approaches adopted by the projects to address complex challenges, as well as their context-specific nature and the variety of implementing partners involved and their M&E culture and capacity. In order to assess the collective progress of the EUTF, their results and impact need to be aggregated.

Indicative activities include: finalising the performance dashboard with EUTF Common Indicators, including the relevant disaggregation such as age, sex, types of population (refugees, internally displaced persons, migrants, host populations, asylum seekers, returnees, etc.); finalising the formulation and methodological notes for the set of EUTF Common indicators; providing dedicated capacity building and technical assistance to implementing partners to improve their logical frameworks including clarifying the intervention logics, formulating output and outcome indicators, establishing baselines, etc. mapping the existing project logical framework indicators against these EUTF Common indicators, familiarising and/or training EU Delegations and implementing partners on the use of these indicators and the reporting requirements (including guidelines for harmonisation of data collection, etc.); developing data collection and reporting guidelines for projects; maintaining a database of information related to these indicators which allows aggregation of data which can be easily traced and understood; ensuring quality assurance on the data reported by projects through desk and field support; providing hands on and helpdesk support to the projects on how to collect data with regards to the indicators; and directly contributing to the design and input of data directly into the EUTF adopted on-line IT platforms.

Result 1.2.: The information collected on projects' performance is collated, aggregated, and presented in a format suitable to the various target groups

Indicative activities include: providing dedicated capacity building and technical assistance to implementing partners on data collection to ensure appropriate quality, traceability and harmonisation across the EUTF interventions; compiling the information collected through the EUTF Common indicators and presenting it using

adapted formats and innovative and clear visuals; defining the pyramidal architecture of reporting, including intermediary levels where a sub-set of projects of a similar nature are presented together, for example for the RDPPs; ensuring transparency by explaining the aggregation process; presenting the collected information into various meetings, workshops and conferences; and preparing publications on the collected information; ensuring that the data can be easily encoded and presented on the EUTF adopted on-line IT platforms; ensuring exchange of data and coherent methodologies with other partners performing monitoring and/or evaluation of sub-sets of EUTF programmes.

For Specific Objective 2:

Result 2.1.: Analysis is conducted to better understand the reasons behind the performance or non-performance of projects

Indicative activities include: deconstructing and analysing the information provided through the Monitoring and Learning System; reviewing projects' implementation reports and own monitoring and evaluation reports (including for relevant projects funded by the European Commission with other instruments); interviewing project implementing partners, project beneficiaries and other stakeholders; field visits and other necessary steps; keeping track of the various policy dialogues' developments in the priority areas to monitor whether the projects are adapting to them; keeping track of other initiatives in the region which have attempted to follow similar principles; and drafting analysis papers.

Result 2.2.: intra and inter-project learning is facilitated, notably through the development and dissemination of qualitative case studies describing specific project contexts, the approaches taken and how these affected the delivery of results, and so allowing exchange of lessons learned and best practices

Indicative activities include: drafting of case studies based on analysis; interviews and field visits; dissemination of case studies in various fora to allow for exchange and learning, paying particular attention to bringing together projects of similar nature; dissemination of case studies to other development partners, civil society and the media; coaching of project implementing partners and EU Delegations on how to concretely use the evidence collected to improve project implementation (including for projects funded under other instruments); organising workshops for exchange of best practices and lessons learned between projects; and advising the projects on how to reformulate logical frameworks.

Results 2.3.: The Monitoring and Learning System uses evidence collected through the research carried out by the REF to inform its analysis, and vice-versa provides evidence to the REF on lessons learned

Indicative activities include: maintaining close contact with the REF experts and the research carried out by the REF for exchange of information; developing a set of learning questions in collaboration with the REF to analyse the ways in which the EUTF projects relate to wider, cross-sector dynamics (such as on curbing future

involuntary displacements, providing choices to potential migrants or reducing tensions).

Result 2.4.: Evidence collected by the projects is used to inform the design of future EU interventions as well as policy making

Indicative activities include: providing operational advice on how to integrate findings from the projects into the design of future interventions (including under other instruments); reporting to strategic instances of the EUTF in order to inform policy makers; and providing clear communication briefs to other development partners, civil society and the media.

Result 2.5.: Evidence collected by the projects is used to describe if and how the projects confirm the various theories of change which were assumed when designing the EUTF HoA approach, thus also identifying gaps in the activities/results/outcome chains which need to be addressed if the change is to effectively happen

Indicative activities include: compiling data on results and outcomes at various levels of the theories of change, from EUTF implementing partners outcome and impact monitoring, existing meso-level data collection efforts as well as national and regional macro-level indicators (see next objective); comparing results with the level of effort at the inputs of the theories of change in order to identify potential gaps and bottlenecks; discuss this analysis with key experts, including EU delegation programme managers and EUTF partners program designers; revise theories of change as needed; and recommend corrective actions where possible.

For Specific Objective 3:

Result 3.1.: Relevant high-level indicators are defined in consultation with EUTF management and EUDs

An initial desk research combined with the inherent knowledge of the EUTF HoA mandate and objectives allows the MLS team to draft a first list of relevant indicators, with a definition of each and sources / means of measurement suggested. This first draft set is presented to EUDs to get their feedback and complementary suggestions based on their specific context and needs.⁹

Result 3.2: Existing sources of data across organisations and governments are identified and their quality assessed in order to avoid duplication and rely on the most sustainable systems

e.g. Tracking migration flows: IOM DTM and RMMS 4M systems are currently collection data and profiles along migration routes in various fashions. FRONTEX is

⁹ The high-level indicators were identified and designed as a pilot project in the initial phase of the EUTF's MLS. In the extension phase they will become a permanent tool, based on the real time update of key indicators in the MLS dashboard, and on annual analyses that will be conducted by a data scientist with a strong understanding of the EUTF portfolio, to identify relevant correlations between EUTF interventions and positive changes - by thematic areas and geographies. Specific extractions and presentations will be made available to EUDs to help them use the HLI on a more regular basis, as a tool supporting strategy, programming and implementation.

also collecting several layers of information along migration routes. The MLS team will further assess these systems, assess complementarities and identify gaps / weaknesses, to ultimately propose a comprehensive approach that could possibly be built in collaboration with these organizations but would lead to more reliable indicators of movements and profiles.

In the same logic, current information systems around natural disaster and climate change developed by IGAD will be assessed to measure the ability of these systems to provide sufficient frequency and detail so that a proper monitoring of these events and the resulting displacement can be done on an ongoing basis.

Result 3.3: A first draft system is designed and presented to EUTF HoA Management team

This system should include a list of high level indicators, their relevance for the EUTF and other stakeholders, a definition of their nature, sources and effort of data collection required, partners to be involved.

Several options with a rough budget estimate will be presented to EUTF management team in Brussels (and possibly to the EUDs) to get their feedback on the approach and identified partners / options. The most relevant options will be retained to be further developed in the last phase of the project.

Result 3.4: A number of pilot activities are conducted to validate the assumptions and approach proposed, and refine the concept

A number of case studies will be conducted based on the proposed approach in order to test the proposed approach and model, as well as refine the collaboration modalities with the potential partners, and potential hand over plans.

Result 3.5: A final concept is presented to EUTF HoA with several scenarios in terms of resources and implementation.

Based on the list, a comprehensive concept will be proposed with its objectives, structure, implementation plan and budget – with potentially several scenarios – to be submitted to the EUTF Operational Committee at the end of 2018.

3.2. Risks and assumptions

The main risks and mitigating measures are:

1. There may be limitations of access in countries or to project areas due to instability, pandemics or conflict that limits optimal monitoring of EUTF activities. Were that to be the situation, the Monitoring and Learning System would need to rely on desk studies, third party monitoring and other means.
2. There may be difficulties in aggregating and comparing monitoring data if it is not collected using the same methodologies or is not categorised in the same way. There also may be limitations in the availability of baseline data.

Early analysis of EUTF activities' M&E system showed that some planned to monitor outputs incompletely or with too limited amount of details and disaggregation to be of use for deep analyses; some had definitions for their indicators that were inconsistent

with other activities definition; some had overly narrow or broad outcome indicators that would not accurately reflect actual outcomes of the project, or would make it difficult to assert the chain of causality.

This risk will be minimised by regular communication with EUTF activities and the establishment of clear parameters for data collection at the outset of the Monitoring and Learning System.

3. EUTF activities may not collect or share all information as required by the Monitoring and Learning System. To mitigate this risk, the latter will adopt a participatory approach and organise several sessions with project implementers and EU Delegations to familiarise them with the Monitoring and Learning System approach, and act as a supportive advisor/coach and not a controller.

4. Direct causal links between indicators and outcomes may be obscured by other external factors, such as changes in security, increases in food insecurity as a result of climatic or other economic factors. This will have to be clearly explained in the various analysis provided by the Monitoring and Learning System.

The assumptions for the success of the project and its implementation include:

1. The individual Governments of the beneficiary countries of the Horn of Africa Window will support and facilitate the monitoring work.

2. The EUTF activities will be able to implement their projects and gather monitoring information as set out in their logical frameworks.

3. There will be smooth and strong communication between the REF, the Monitoring and Learning System, and individual EUTF activities.

4. It will be possible to gather information on the indicators identified (i.e. that the cultural, social or political barriers to gathering the data will be minimal).

3.3. Cross-cutting issues

The main cross-cutting issue of this action is foreseen improved policy and practice, by filling knowledge gaps and consolidating information of projects otherwise operating in relative isolation from one another.

The Monitoring and Learning System will also play a crucial role in supporting coherent and credible communication around the EUTF, notably in relation with the media. It should therefore contribute to positive visibility of the EUTF.

In the formulation of indicators, the Monitoring and Learning System will ensure where possible the disaggregation of information by status (e.g. refugees, vulnerable groups, host communities), gender, age and locality in order for the information collected to be as specific and useful as possible to orient project implementation and programming towards the intended EUTF target groups.

3.4. Stakeholders

1. The individual projects implemented through the EUTF Horn of Africa window, and more particularly the implementing agencies and management staff who will receive support through this action yet are also instrumental in providing the necessary information.
2. The EU Delegations who will ensure complementarity between the monitoring and analysis carried out through the Monitoring and Learning System, the existing systems put in place by the individual projects themselves, and the eventual ROM missions. The EU Delegations will also make the link between evidence gathered through the EUTF projects and the other programmes being implemented in country.
3. The members of the EUTF Operational Committee who will use the information provided by the Monitoring and Learning System to take strategic and policy decisions with regards to their programmes, and who will receive evidence on the impact of their contributions to the EUTF.
4. The beneficiary countries of the EUTF, who will receive targeted information on whether and how the EUTF projects are fulfilling their promise to support stability and address the root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons.

4. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

4.1. Financing agreement, if relevant

No Financing agreement is foreseen for this action.

4.2. Indicative operational implementation period

The implementation period will begin from the date of signature by the last party of the contract implementing this Action and will last until the 31/12/2025¹⁰. This operational implementation period will be followed by a liquidation period of 18 months which will end on the 30/06/2027.

4.3. Implementation components and modules

The action will be implemented in centralised management, through a negotiated procedure for the award of a service contract. To that end a number of organisations will be invited to submit a tender. Those organisations will have long standing experience in the conduction of monitoring (with a strong learning component) in the fields covered by the EUTF, and preferably in the areas covered by this action. They shall also have proven administrative and financial capacity to manage this action.

In 2017 Altai Consulting was awarded the service contract for the implementation of the EUTF HOA MLS. Due to their gained expertise, experience, and the satisfactory implementation, they are expected to continue the implementation under the current cost extension. The extension of the services may therefore be awarded through a new service contract with Altai awarded through a negotiated procedure with one single offer.

¹⁰ Final Date of Implementation for EUTF Africa.

4.4. Indicative budget

Component	EUTF contribution (EUR)
Service Contract, including communication and visibility	6 800 000 ¹¹
Monitoring, audit and evaluation	100 000
Total	6 900 000

4.5. Evaluation and audit

If necessary, ad hoc audits or expenditure verification assignments could be contracted by the European Commission for one or several contracts or agreements.

Audits and expenditure verification assignments will be carried out in conformity with the risk analysis in the frame of the yearly Audit Plan exercise conducted by the European Commission. The amount allocated for external evaluation and audit purposes should be shown in the budget at section 4.4. Evaluation and audit assignments will be implemented through service contracts, making use of one of the Commission's dedicated framework contracts or alternatively through the competitive negotiated procedure or the single tender procedure.

4.6. Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU. This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner countries and entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be entered into the Agreements concluded by the Commission with the entrusted entities and the partner countries.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

A **logical framework** showing targets and indicators is attached.

¹¹ An additional amount of 115 500 EUR will be contributed to the contract from the Technical Cooperation Facility of the North of Africa (NOA) window of the EUTF Africa, under DG NEAR. This amount will cover the NOA-related activities under the Lessons Learned Phase II that the MLS has been tasked with undertaking. As such, 2 900 000 EUR will come from the remaining funds under the EUTF HOA window.

ANNEX I - INDICATIVE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE ACTION

Please note that baselines and indicators will be further defined during the inception phase.

	Intervention logic	Indicators	Baseline (Nov 2016)	Targets (Apr 2021)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall Objective	To use an evidence-based approach for programming and implementing interventions in the HoA region, as well as informing policy around the themes of the EUTF in that region	% of projects achieving a satisfactory score for incorporating lessons learnt through the MLS	0	75% of projects	Project implementation reports (lessons learnt); surveys	
Specific Objectives	<p>Specific Objective #1: Establishing and implementing a MLS system which monitors and reports on the overall progress of the EUTF HoA against its strategic objectives, policy priorities and principles of interventions</p>	The MLS is in place and most EUTF funded interventions in the HoA are reporting against the core indicators defined by the System	No MLS in place	All projects (apart from the REF and this one) report through the MLS	Reports from the MLS	<p>1. That the individual governments in the Horn of Africa will support and facilitate the monitoring work.</p> <p>2. That the EUTF activities will be able to implement their projects and gather monitoring information as set out in their logical frameworks</p> <p>3. That there will be smooth and strong communication between the REF, the MLS, and individual EUTF activities</p> <p>4. That it will be possible to gather information on the indicators identified (i.e. that the cultural, social or political barriers to gathering the data will be minimal).</p>
	<p>Specific Objective #2: Developing and implementing a learning strategy based on detailed investigations into how and why individual or groups of projects are performing in order to enhance their delivery and also the design of future projects.</p> <p>Specific Objective #3: to design and pilot a system of high-level indicators of movement, vulnerability, stability and crises management capacity at the national and regional level against which to realistically frame the EUTF (and other similar EU) interventions; inform future EU programming and policy making; and ultimately track the <i>joint impact</i> of the EUTF HoA projects at the regional level through a top-down approach.</p>	<p>% of projects having incorporated analysis provided by the MLS in their design or implementation processes</p> <p>Design and first pilot of the system is in place</p>	0	75% of projects	Project implementation reports (lessons learnt); surveys	
			No system is in place	A system with the most relevant high indicators on migration and stability is available to EUTF stakeholders	Reports from the MLS	
			17			

	Intervention logic	Indicators	Baseline (Nov 2016)	Targets (Apr 2021)	Sources and means of verification
Results	<p>Result 1.1.: A system is in place allowing projects funded under the EUTF HoA to regularly report against a core set of EUTF Common indicators set out in the M&E performance dashboard related to the EUTF strategic objectives, HoA operational priorities and the EUTF's principles of intervention.</p>	<p>The performance dashboard is in place with EUTF Common indicators; A system is in place with regular and harmonised reporting of projects against the EUTF Common indicators; Reports are produced on the collective performance of the EUTF HoA</p>	<p>No dashboard No system No reports</p>	<p>Performance dashboard finalised System in place with all projects reporting through on-line platforms</p>	<p>Performance dashboard made public; Reporting guidelines to projects; on-line monitoring system accessible to all stakeholders; reports produced on demand</p>
	<p>Result 1.2.: The information collected on projects' performance is collated, aggregated, and presented in a format suitable to the various target groups</p>	<p>Number reports produced on the collective performance of the EUTF HoA projects</p>	<p>No reports</p>	<p>At least two reports are produced per year</p>	<p>Reports made available to stakeholders and possibly made public</p>
	<p>Result 2.1.: Analysis is conducted to better understand the reasons behind the performance or non-performance of projects</p>	<p>Number of analysis reports produced and properly disseminated</p>	<p>No reports</p>	<p>At least 5 ad-hoc reports per year produced</p>	<p>Reports available to stakeholders, and possibly made public</p>
	<p>Result 2.2.: intra and inter-project learning is facilitated, notably through the development and dissemination of qualitative case studies describing specific project contexts, the approaches taken and how these affected the delivery of results, and so allowing exchange of lessons learnt and best practices</p>	<p>Number case studies in place and properly disseminated %of projects using MLS analysis to orient implementation</p>	<p>No case studies 0</p>	<p>At least 5 case studies reports per year produced 75% projects</p>	<p>Case studies available to stakeholders, and possibly made public REF research outputs published on its website MLS analysis available</p>
<p>Results 2.3.: The MLS uses evidence collected through the research carried out by the REF to inform its analysis, and vice-versa provides evidence to the REF on lessons learn</p>	<p>Number of research outputs produced by the REF which incorporate projects' findings; Number of analysis produced by the MLS which is enriched with REF research</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>All REF research once MLS is running All MLS analysis</p>	<p>Projects' Action Documents Operational Framework</p>	
<p>Result 2.4.: Evidence collected by the projects is used to inform the design of future EU interventions as well as policy making</p>	<p>% of projects using MLS analysis in their design Number of policy papers using MLS analysis</p>	<p>0 0 18</p>	<p>All projects designed once MLS is in place Operational framework is revised</p>		

	Intervention logic	Indicators	Baseline (Nov 2016)	Targets (Apr 2021)	Sources and means of verification
Results	<p>Result 2.5: Evidence collected by the projects is used to describe if and how the projects confirm the various theories of change which were assumed when designing the EUTF HoA approach, thus also identifying gaps in the activities/results/outcome chains which need to be addressed if the change is to effectively happen</p> <p>Result 3.1.: Relevant high-level indicators are defined in consultation with EUTF management and EUDs</p> <p>Result 3.2: Existing sources of data across organisations and governments are identified and their quality assessed in order to avoid duplication and rely on the most sustainable systems</p> <p>Result 3.3: A first draft system is designed and presented to EUTF HoA Management team</p> <p>Result 3.4: A number of pilot activities are conducted to validate the assumptions and approach proposed, and refine the concept</p> <p>Result 3.5: A final concept is presented to EUTF HoA with several scenarios in terms of resources and implementation.</p>	<p>Theories of change supporting the achievement of the objectives of the EUTF HoA are developed and projects mapped against them</p> <p>Analysis of the contribution of projects towards these theory of changes are outlined in MLS monitoring reports</p> <p>List of high-level indicators on migration and stability</p> <p>Analysis report of which existing systems can help provide data towards main indicators</p>	<p>No theories of change for the EUTF HoA</p> <p>No analysis</p> <p>No list, analysis or draft system</p>	<p>At least four theories of change (one per strategic objectives)</p> <p>Analysis existing and disseminated to stakeholders via MLS reports</p> <p>A pilot system is in place with a list of indicators with verifiable sources – a final concept is presented for future potential funding</p>	<p>Special report from the MLS</p> <p>MLS monitoring reports</p> <p>MLS delivers list</p> <p>Concept delivered by MLS</p>

