

# **SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS of the Mid-term Evaluation of the European Union Emergency Trust Fund (EUTF) for Stability and Addressing Root Causes of Irregular Migration and Displaced Persons in Africa 2015-2019**

## **I. Background**

The purpose of the evaluation was: (1) to provide the relevant external co-operation services of the European Union and the wider public with an overall independent midterm assessment of the EUTF for Africa; and (2) to identify key lessons and to produce recommendations to improve current and inform future choices concerning EU strategic approaches and operationalization to support all aspects of stability and contribute to better migration management as well as addressing the root causes of instability, forced displacement and irregular migration. The evaluation assessed the extent to which the EUTF has achieved its objectives so far – in midterm (implementation started only on 2016).

The scope of the evaluation included 200 out of over 600 contracted projects implemented between 2016 and 2019. All services concerned in DEVCO<sup>1</sup>, as well as in other DGs<sup>2</sup>, EEAS and numerous EU Delegations<sup>3</sup> throughout the relevant regions of Africa were consulted during the evaluation process, providing valuable contributions. Throughout the process, a Consultative Group of EU Member States' evaluation experts provided feedback and reviewed all key reports. Field visits were conducted in six countries selected to ensure coverage of a number of key dimensions of the EUTF (Ethiopia, Libya, Morocco, Niger, Senegal, and Somalia).

## **II. Main conclusions**

- ✓ The EUTF has generated important lessons about the management of complex programmes in fragile environments. It has allocated significant resources for addressing irregular migration, although the nature of the problem, or the most appropriate means for addressing it, was not well defined in the early stages.
- ✓ A more complete understanding of the contribution that the EUTF has made to reducing instability, forced displacement and irregular migration in these situations will become more evident only as the various projects mature. The EUTF, being a short-term emergency instrument, had too wide a mandate and despite its time-limited nature it was tasked with addressing the root causes of some of the most intractable societal challenges that are faced by partner countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> Units D1, D2, B3, A4, with special thanks to the EUTF Coordination Team within Unit D1

<sup>2</sup> DGs NEAR, HOME, ECHO, and FPI

<sup>3</sup> Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, and Uganda

- ✓ The importance of addressing the root causes of irregular migration in an integrated/comprehensive manner across the EU and with EU MS is increasingly recognised. However, in seeking to address these root causes a complex portfolio of interventions was created on the basis of (mostly) local level knowledge and understanding rather than a more targeted strategic approach across the programme. This provided the EUTF with a great deal of flexibility to respond to specific local issues, but also created a portfolio of interventions that was not always internally coherent and did not always have clear exit strategies in mind.
- ✓ The EUTF produced an early results framework and later a more rigorous indicator system for tracking progress. A devolution of responsibilities for defining regional results frameworks led to regionally more appropriate focus. However, this results framework does not appear to have had a strong influence in the strategic direction of projects.
- ✓ The EUTF has managed to make modest contributions to increased economic opportunities and employment. It was most effective in this area when interventions were packaged in a way that engaged the private sector directly. These measures also worked better where there were more sophisticated labour markets and higher levels of labour demand.
- ✓ The EUTF governance and management structure was flexible and efficient. It delivered fast decisions based on a strategic overview of the issues and knowledgeable and committed staff.
- ✓ The EUTF knowledge production and quality assurance are highly value-adding – the facilities put in place have collectively increased the international knowledge base about complex development issues and help to ensure the transparency of EUTF activities.
- ✓ Important results have been achieved in building the capacity of national bodies responsible for migration management throughout the EUTF region and cross-border cooperation between these bodies has been an important development in some cases. However, the EUTF's focus on irregular migration, combined with weak migration policy frameworks in partner countries, has undermined attempts to engage in effective dialogue on the larger migration challenges.

### **III. Main Recommendations**

- ✓ During the remaining implementation period, the EUTF should focus on generating further knowledge and understanding of its interventions and do this in a collaborative manner with other international bodies. To better capture outcomes and impacts, an ex-post evaluation should be conducted at least one year after all activities have been completed.
- ✓ The EU should consider programming all its interventions in a country or region within one common (analytical) framework.
- ✓ The EU should have differentiated results framework structures depending on the development challenges in the partner country/region.

- ✓ The EU should strengthen the treatment of migration in its bilateral and regional programmes, ensuring that the entire Valletta Action agenda is covered.
- ✓ The EU should develop differentiated contracting and implementation regulations for fragility, conflict and violence (FCV) contexts.
- ✓ The EU support to economic opportunities and employment creation should be embedded within larger market development efforts and private sector involvement.
- ✓ The EU should provide “whole of community” resilience interventions particularly when addressing situations of natural resource fragility.

#### **IV. Response of the Services**

Recommendations were cleared by all Services and their responses are included in the *fiche contradictoire*. The services agree in principle with all recommendations, noting that some of the issues highlighted in the evaluation are already been tackled by the Services.