



International Labour Organization

iTrack

Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

Evaluation Title: Final Evaluation of the EU-India Cooperation and Dialogue on Migration and Mobility project

ILO TC/SYMBOL: 107019

Type of Evaluation: Final Evaluation

Country: India

Dates of the evaluation: December 2021-April 2022

Name of consultants: Dominikos-Kyriakos Chrysidis and Anna Ohannessian-Charpin

ILO Administrative Office: ILO Country Office -India

ILO Technical Backstopping Office: ILO Decent Work Team (DWT) South Asia

Other agencies involved in joint evaluation: International Centre for Migration Policy Development

Date project ends: 15/04/2022

Donor: country and budget EUR Funded by the European Union, country: India, Budget: 2.48M EUR

Evaluation Manager: Seeta Sharma

Key Words: EU, ILO, ICMPD, HLDMM, EU-india CAMM, EU-India CDMM, Evaluation

This evaluation has been conducted according to the ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

Disclaimer:

This report was produced by two consultants that were contracted to conduct the Final Evaluation of the action “EU-India Cooperation and Dialogue on Migration and Mobility”, which is funded by the European Union and implemented by the International Labour Organisation and the International Centre for Migration Policy Development.

The report is the result of a collaborative effort by the Evaluation Team, Expert 1 - Lead Evaluation Expert, Dominikos-Kyriakos Chrysidis and Expert 2 – Evaluation Expert, Anna Ohannessian-Charpin. The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the consultants and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union, the International Labour Organisation and the International Centre for Migration Policy Development.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	iii
List of acronyms and abbreviations	iv
Preamble	6
Key purpose of the final evaluation.....	6
Structure of the Final Report.....	6
A. Introduction.....	6
Description of the Action.....	6
Scope of the evaluation	7
Overall methodological approach	8
Challenges	8
Objectives of the Final Report	8
B. Answers to the evaluation questions - Findings	9
1. Relevance	9
2. Coherence and complementarity	14
3. Effectiveness.....	16
4. Efficiency.....	19
5. Impact and sustainability	23
6. EU Added Value.....	24
C. Conclusions.....	27
Relevance	27
Coherence and complementarity	28
Effectiveness.....	28
Efficiency.....	28
Impact and sustainability	29
EU Added Value.....	29
D. Recommendations	29
E. Annexes.....	33
Annex I - List of documents collected and reviewed	33
Contracts and methodological documents	33
EU strategy and other documents.....	33
ILO strategy and other documents	33
Reports of the Action	33
From relevant websites.....	33
From other websites	34
Annex II – List of stakeholders that were interviewed	35

List of acronyms and abbreviations

EU	European Union
CAMM	EU-India Common Agenda on Migration and Mobility
CDMM	Cooperation and Dialogue on Migration and Mobility
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DG HOME	Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs (European Commission)
DG INTPA	Directorate-General for International Partnership (European Commission)
EQ	Evaluation Question
EUD India	EU Delegation to India and Bhutan
FPI	Foreign Policy Instrument
GAMM	Global Approach to Migration and Mobility
GoI	Government of India
HLDMM	High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Mobility
ICM	Indian Centre for Migration
ICMPD	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
MFF	Multi-annual Financial Framework
MS	Member State(s)
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PI	Partnership Instrument
PIMS	Project Implementation and Monitoring System
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
ToR	Terms of Reference

Preamble

The International Labour Organization awarded a contract for the Final Evaluation of the Action “EU-India Cooperation and Dialogue on Migration and Mobility” to a team of evaluation experts. The Final Report is the fourth main deliverable produced by the evaluation team.

Key purpose of the final evaluation

The overarching purpose of this assignment is to provide an independent evaluation of the Action “EU-India Cooperation and Dialogue on Migration and Mobility”, identify conclusions and provide recommendations to improve future programming and inform decision-making, particularly with respect to potential future relevant actions.

Structure of the Final Report

The Final Report is structured in line with the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation. It incorporates the following:

- **Section A – Executive summary** that presents background information and the context of the evaluation assignment, and a summary of the main conclusions and recommendations;
- **Section B – Introduction** describing the objectives and activities of the Action, and the scope of the evaluation;
- **Section C – Answers to the evaluation questions – findings** presenting the main findings per evaluation question, together with evidence and reasoning;
- **Section D – Conclusions** elaborating on the major conclusions organised per evaluation criterion; and
- **Section E – Recommendations** that aim at proposing measures for improved performance for future related actions.

Parts of this report are also:

- Annex I, that includes the list of documents provided by the implementing partners and the EU, together with documents and information collected during the inception and interview phases; and
- Annex II, that provides the list of persons consulted and interviewed.

A. Introduction

The European Union (EU) and the Government of India (GoI) launched the “EU-India Cooperation and Dialogue on Migration and Mobility” action (hereinafter referred to as the “EU-India CDMM”, the “Project” or the “Action”) in September 2017. The Action was launched under the Partnership Instrument (PI) for Cooperation with Third Countries¹, which is the EU’s first instrument specifically designed to promote the Union’s strategic interests worldwide by reinforcing its external strategies, policies and actions. In the case of the CDMM, the actions related to the migration and mobility fields; and financed under the Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014-2020 package of instruments for financing EU external action. The International Labour Organization (ILO) and the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) are co-implementing this project. It was officially launched in September 2017 for 36 months and was extended with an addendum until August 2021 and subsequently with another addendum until February 2022.

Description of the Action

The first India-EU Summit took place in Lisbon in June 2000, and the EU-India Strategic Partnership was established at the fifth Summit in 2004. Reflecting the growing importance of migration and mobility in EU-India relations, a High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Mobility (HLDMM) was launched in 2006 and the EU-India Common Agenda for Migration and Mobility (EU-India CAMM)

¹The PI was part of the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 package of instruments for financing external action to advance and promote EU interests and values abroad. It was designed to strengthen the EU’s role as a global actor, partnering with third countries including middle-income countries – and in particular strategic partners – on a peer-to-peer basis. This Instrument allows the EU to weigh in on policy making in third countries and at international level, taking the EU interest as the starting point. The PI is not subject to requirements for **Official Development Assistance (ODA)**. In the context of the new Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027, the PI will be subsumed under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI).

https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/about_the_european_commission/eu_budget/db_2021_programme_statement_partnership_instrument_for_cooperation_with_third_countries_pi.pdf

was endorsed at the EU-India Summit in 2016. The CAMM provides a comprehensive framework for the EU and GoI cooperation on joint objectives, recommendations and actions in the following four priority areas: 1) better organising legal migration; 2) preventing and combatting irregular migration and addressing trafficking of human beings; 3) maximising the development impact of migration and mobility; and 4) promoting international protection.

Against this background, the overall objective of the EU-India CDMM Action was to contribute towards better governance of migration and mobility between the EU and India, as well as to prevent and address the challenges related to irregular migratory flows. The specific objectives of the Action were: (1) to adopt and implement international standards and best practices on migration management; and (2) to support the EU-India HLDMM and the implementation of the CAMM. The expected four results of the Action were:

Result 1	Regular, structured and reliable dialogue on issues related to labour migration and mobility between India and the EU is strengthened.
Result 2	Improved knowledge base and information on migration flows between India and the EU.
Result 3	Enhanced legal, policy and administrative institutional capacity of India and the EU on the governance and management of migration.
Result 4	Shared good practices on the governance of migration.

The Action used a mix of policy dialogue, research, communication and outreach with selected target groups. Based on the principle of mutual collaboration the project aimed to provide a reliable and sustainable platform for regular and structured dialogue between India and the EU, on migration and mobility issues. This included the facilitation and delivery of policy-focused exchanges, sharing of expertise, and the production of knowledge tools. Seminars, meetings, research papers, knowledge products and information materials are some of the means through which results were to be realised.

Scope of the evaluation

The rationale for undertaking the final evaluation of the EU-India CDMM was to assess whether the Action achieved its objectives and to determine its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. To these evaluation criteria of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC), as defined in the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the evaluation, two EU-specific criteria were also added. As noted in the Inception Report:

- EU added-value, is one of the evaluation criteria required for EU-funded projects. It aims to measure the added value and/or benefits of the Action funded by the EU, particularly by the PI. It thus examines what could have been delivered by the Foreign Policy Instrument (FPI) in comparison to those interventions funded by EU Member States (MS). It also highlights EU visibility during the implementation of the Action; and
- Coherence is another of the evaluation criteria for both OECD-DAC and the EU. It addresses whether the Action's design and implementation were coherent with the EU's migration policy approach in general, and with a focus on India.

More specifically, the final evaluation aimed at providing DG HOME, the FPI, the EU Delegation (EUD) to India, but also the GOI, ILO, ICMPD and the Indian Centre for Migration (ICM), among others, with:

- An assessment of the relevance of the Action's design and the validity of the assumptions in light of the results achieved;
- A review of the implementation of the Action and its influence on the results;
- An identification exercise of the supporting factors and constraints that led to achievement or lack of achievement;
- An examination of the Action's implementation efficiency, including the effectiveness of its management arrangements and its monitoring system; and
- An identification of main findings, conclusions, and good practices, an analysis of “what worked and what not”, and provision of recommendations on areas for replication.

Overall methodological approach

The broad range of services, activities and deliverables, required multiple approaches and steps on the part of the evaluation team. These were:

- **A participatory approach to ensure appropriation of results**

The evaluation methodology was utilisation-focused and included discussions with the Evaluation Reference Group² and consultations with the implementing partners, in order to streamline the approach and incorporate comments on the findings, whilst also ensuring a degree of ownership of the results by the key actors. The evaluation team had additional meetings with the teams of the ILO and the ICMPD to discuss key issues that needed more information and analysis. Their contribution to identify and motivate interviewees to engage in the evaluation was essential.

- **The list of key informants selected for interviews covers the entire spectrum of project stakeholders**

Key stakeholders and the organisations they cooperated with to support specific activities, are the implementing partners’ staff in Brussels and New Delhi, and the organisations they cooperated with to support specific activities. External stakeholders include national public sector organisations and the Gol; private sector companies and industry; third sector organisations, Universities, Civil Society Organisations; and an array of EU MS representatives, national agencies and/or Ministries.

Challenges

The evaluation did not face any extraordinary or unexpected, major challenge (e.g., limited time available for implementation, etc.). The most important challenges were:

- **Access to primary data was facilitated by implementing partners**

In most cases implementing partners fully responded to the requests for reports and additional materials, for verification by the evaluation team. Among the potential interviewees provided by the implementing partners, the majority of those who agreed to contribute to the evaluation had very close ties to the Action. Responses to meeting requests were overall positive although the response rate/pace varied. However, changes in the personnel within the pertinent institutions have impacted the rate and/or the quality of responses to a certain extent.

- **Obtaining data related to non-reported/ non-spending activities**

There is often complexity in identifying cause effect linkages in strategic partnership actions with increased political and policy interest, as either pertinent data are not available or not referred to in reports. This is the case in the ILO-ICMPD relations, the relations of the implementing partners and the EU, and for both of them with the Gol. To this end, the evaluation has attempted to encapsulate the diverse political/policy opinions on but also the constellation of the implementation modality.

Objectives of the Final Report

From late December 2021 to the end of January 2022, the external final evaluation of the EU-India CDMM Action was at its Inception Phase. The initial meetings with the ILO and the ICMPD were held in the first two weeks of January, and the official kick-off meeting took place on January 12, with the participation of staff from DG HOME, EUD to India, ILO and ICMPD. Based on the evaluation’s ToR, the proposed methodology at tender stage, and on the steps agreed during the kick-off meeting, the evaluation team prepared the draft Inception Report which was submitted on January 24 and a revised version on February 23.

Following the submission of the draft Inception Report, the evaluation team entered the Interview Phase of the assignment. This aimed at collecting and reviewing documents, as well as conducting remote interviews with stakeholders, the relevant EU services in Brussels and the EUD India, staff of services of EU MS, and governmental and private sector stakeholders in the EU and India, including the Project Managers from the ILO and the ICMPD, with whom the evaluation team were in close communication.

² The evaluation reference group included staff of ILO, ICMPD, DG HOME and the EUD India.

The document review and consultation/interview processes allowed the evaluation team to identify preliminary relevant hypotheses and draw initial responses to each Evaluation Question (EQ). Specific information gaps were identified in the light of the preliminary findings and responses to each EQ and Judgement Criterion (JC). This built the foundation for a fine-tuned methodological design and targeted approach for the final evaluation phase, that was focused on both complementing information gaps via internal stakeholders and collecting primary data through alternative tools (semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions) targeting a broad range of stakeholders involved in the Action.

B. Answers to the evaluation questions - Findings

1. *Relevance*

Evaluation Question	EQ 1 – To what extent do the Action's design and objectives respond to the political priorities outlined within the EU-India CAMM?
Main Findings	<p data-bbox="331 636 1431 674">JC 1.1 – The design of the action aligns with the EU-India CAMM</p> <p data-bbox="331 680 1431 719">The design of the action aligns with EU priorities</p> <p data-bbox="331 725 1431 1032">The EU and India have a long-standing relationship on several issues of mutual interest, and the migration dialogue between them builds upon this complementary relationship. India is not only the largest country of origin worldwide with a young population, but also a growing economy. On the other hand, the EU is a mature economy, with a declining working-age population and talent shortage. There are significant migratory flows from India to the EU, and collaboration between the two sides on migration and mobility has the potential to be mutually beneficial across several sectors, and at all skills levels, low- to high-skilled, especially in the IT and technology sectors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1039 1431 1346">Building on this strategic partnership and reflecting on the growing importance of migration and mobility in EU-India relations, the CAMM was endorsed at the EU-India Summit in 2016. The CAMM is one of the two key bilateral cooperation frameworks under the EU's Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM), which was adopted in May 2012 and provided, at the time of the design stage of the EU-India CDMM action, the overarching framework of the EU external migration and asylum policy. Specifically, the GAMM outlined how the EU conducts its policy dialogues and cooperation with non-EU countries, based on defined priorities and embedded in the EU's overall external policy and action, including development cooperation.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1352 1431 1391">The design of the Action reflects developments of the EU-India relations</p> <p data-bbox="331 1397 1431 1503">The EU-India CDMM action is not a traditional development/ ODA project, but a strategic partnership one, and therefore looks at the relevance of the Action from the perspective/ policy focus of the EU.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1509 1431 1771">Europe has not been among the top destinations for Indian migrants, with the exception of the UK³, and interest on the Indian side had just started to grow around the start of the project (September 2017). Interviews undertaken for this evaluation and policy prioritisation from the Indian side, demonstrated a growing interest, by both India and the EU, in exploring and working together. Apart from the growing importance of India-EU relations overall, India seemed more interested in strengthening its ties with EU capitals after the UK referendum in June 2016⁴, in particular with Berlin and Paris.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1778 1431 1924">The EU-India Summit in October 2017 confirmed the readiness of both sides to adopt a declaration of cooperation in the fight against terrorism with a view to deepening their strategic relationship. The Joint Communication, in November 2018, sought to develop a shared approach to global challenges, develop cooperation and responses</p>

³ The United Kingdom was part of the EU when the Action started.

⁴ Europe-India: new strategic challenges, Karine Lisbonne-de Vergeron European Issue n°616, 13/12/2021. <https://www.robert-schuman.eu/en/european-issues/0616-europe-india-new-strategic-challenges>

to security threats and other issues of importance for the region⁵. It was followed by the Road Map to 2025 agreed at the 15th India-EU Summit in 2020, underlining the importance of joint action on issues such as: security, crisis management and peacekeeping and strengthening of military relations, among others. Furthermore, the negotiations for a bilateral EU-India free trade agreement, were formally relaunched in May 2021.

The EU-India CAMM’s operationalization was relevant to this evolving policy context.

The design of the action is in-line with the EU-India CAMM

The EU-India CAMM provides a comprehensive framework for cooperation on joint objectives, recommendations, and actions for the EU and GoI, focusing on four priority areas:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 1 | better organising and promoting of regular migration and fostering well-managed mobility; |
| 2 | preventing and combating irregular migration; addressing trafficking in human beings; |
| 3 | maximising the development impact of migration and mobility; and |
| 4 | promoting international protection. |

The CDMM action/ technical support project of the CAMM provides the framework to reinforce the collaboration on the issues of migration and mobility, “to contribute to better management of mobility and legal migration between the EU and India, as well as to prevent and combat irregular migratory flows”⁶. The Action seeks to achieve, at a more specific level, two objectives:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Outcome 1 | to adopt and implement international standards and best practices on migration management at state level; and |
| Outcome 2 | to support the EU-India HLDMM and the implementation of the CAMM. |

The second outcome is by definition relevant to the CAMM. It follows the whole structure of the HLDMM and its relationship with the CAMM, aiming precisely to feed into the dialogue and enrich it with knowledge. Also, international standards and best practices (outcome 1) are highly relevant for a dialogue to continue and to the implementation of the CAMM. The support of the HLDMM and the implementation of the CAMM could, also benefit the adoption of international standards and good practices.

As for the first outcome, the adoption of these standards and good practices on migration management is aimed to take place at state level. Outcome 1 implies that these practices could also be implemented at the state/local level⁷, without this being clearly defined in the project design. These two outcomes imply that the CDMM should follow a multi-level approach in implementation: first, at the EU-India level, then at the Indian (national) level and at the state/local level. While the aim of working at these levels is highly relevant, it may be problematic to try to bring them all together in one action, or at least it was challenging for this first strategic cooperation project. The timespan of the project can be a challenge, therefore relating the implementation of the CAMM to HLDMM should be viewed as a first step – at EU-India and national levels which can consequently be followed with implementation of agreements at state level.

⁵ At the same time, on the international arena, India became a member of the UN Human Rights Council from 2019-2021, a member of the UN Security Council in 2021-2022 and is expected to take over the G20 Presidency in 2023 (Europe-India).

⁶ As per the Description of the Action, Annex I to the EU Delegation Agreement.

⁷ As India is a Federal or a Union State.

The Action addresses the four CAMM pillars (or priority areas), that are in line with the GAMM, and its activities are oriented towards achieving four expected results:

Output 1	Regular, structured and reliable dialogue on issues related to migration management, governance and mobility between India and the EU;
Output 2	Improved knowledge base of migration flows of all kinds between India and the EU;
Output 3	Enhanced legal and administrative institutional capacity of India on all aspects of migration management; and
Output 4	International standards and best practices on migration management implemented.

The description of the Action states that there are three strategic approaches in order to achieve these outputs. This implies, in the view of the evaluation team, the development of mechanisms in support to (1) improve access to and utilisation of quality information and data management to make informed policy decisions; (2) knowledge sharing, and (3) policy development to ensure comprehensive, coherent, and feasible measures to improve the governance of migration. These should ensure the necessary level of commitment of the CAMM signatory parties and technical support provided by the CDMM action.

This also implies that the HLDMM is held systematically ensuring guidance to the project activities, that in turn feeds the dialogue through its actions. This relationship, between the dialogue and the Action, is the backbone of the project, where every implemented activity needs prior acceptance, through Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings. To this end, the design of the project’s institutional arrangement is relevant to the whole approach of the CAMM, based on reciprocity and in ensuring that actions are built upon mutual consensus⁸.

The implementation of the 4 Outputs of the CDMM project is envisaged through actions that are proposed in the logframe as indicative actions and their implementation is decided by the respective PACs. Below we provide an analysis on relevance per project result.

1	Regular, structured and reliable dialogue on issues related to migration management, governance and mobility between India and the EU is strengthened.
----------	--

Output 1 builds upon the commitment of both parties of the CAMM to engage in a structured and meaningful dialogue and partnership building. Its approach focuses on promoting regular migration and mobility opportunities, while reducing risks of irregular movements. Activities undertaken to achieve this output aimed at generating information and guidance to inform policymaking, through research, data, tools, and technical briefs, background papers and studies, as well as face-to-face interaction amongst stakeholders in meetings and seminars (exchange on information and legislation, best practises etc.). The envisaged activities in the logframe were relevant to the output because of their diversity in types and the thematic areas they covered, that demonstrated a holistic approach, relevant to the dialogue and following the four CAMM priority areas.

2	Improved knowledge base of migration flows of all kinds between India and the EU generate knowledge in all areas of migration aiming to inform and ensure productive cooperation between the EU, its MS and India.
----------	--

⁸ More on the institutional arrangements are presented under the efficiency section of the present report.

This output was related to knowledge generation in all areas of migration aiming to inform and ensure productive cooperation between the EU, its MS and India. It follows the CAMM that calls for an exploration of enhanced mobility and exchange of researchers, high skilled workers, and their employers. It specifically listed the following types of activities: statistical baseline reports on migration and managing data covering flows and stocks, and the development of legal and institutional framework under all CAMM priority areas. For example, a special focus was put on students, helping them to prepare for their journey and their graduation, with activities that are in line with, and relevant to, the output’s expectancies.

In the logframe, this output is measured through the number of events and the feedback received. The output is on knowledge base; therefore, dissemination activities of deliverables are highly relevant. However, one of the actions to achieve this output - the labour market study, brings certain confusion, the

While the study seemed more relevant to the thematic coverage of the technical papers under Output 1, as outputs 1 and 2 are closely interconnected, therefore one could argue that labour market can be seen (indirectly) as holding the knowledge for directing potential migration flows.

However, dissemination activities of acquired knowledge and information that the Action produced - the virtual fairs, campaigns, checklists, and podcasts are highly relevant to Output 2 and helped to broaden the understanding and knowledge of migration flows.

03

Enhanced legal and administrative institutional capacity of India and the EU on all aspects of migration management.

By translating policy dialogues into practical engagement, this output seeks to strengthen migration management and governance on EU-India migration flows. Especially, because of the diversity of stakeholders involved, activities related to this output were one of the most challenging to organise.

This output addressed migrants in a direct way. Three handbooks - two on integration in EU destination countries and one on pre-departure - involve the origin and destination countries (EU MS and India) flows. The pre-departure handbook and its dissemination sought to further prepare migrants for informed departures to EU MS. While these handbooks build capacities, dissemination campaigns helped these handbooks to be distributed and become functional.

The activities in this output also addressed the Indian diaspora in different EU countries, aiming to strengthen their links with India through training and outreach events, and to reinforce their engagement focusing on best practices. Two diaspora studies and a compendium of best practices were drafted. In this way, pre-departure, integration, and diaspora engagement on India-EU not only follow the journey of a migrant but they also address migration with a long-term perspective.

The indicator in the logframe relates this output’s achievements to the number of international migration related handbooks, technical papers, studies, reports and information packs developed. This indicator does not imply any capacity building activities and stays quantitative, while indirectly, the handbooks do reflect aspects of institutional building on migration management, pre-departure, and integration of migrants. While in this output not all aspects of migration management are addressed, the activities designed are relevant to the two Specific Objectives.

04

International standards and best practices on migration management implemented.

While the design of the Action foresaw that there is “a clear need for balanced analysis, advice, support and advocacy that highlights rights-based approaches to international migration focusing on governance at various levels and protection

issues of migrant workers”, this output is limited in its activities as it touches sensitive areas. It does not also per se, specify actions at the state level.

The design of the Action is relevant to the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development

As the Action is relevant to the CAMM, the four priority areas of the latter are relevant to the Agenda 2030⁹. The CAMM and its implementation through the activities of the CDMM are highly relevant to the SDGs, as many of the SDGs are recognised in the different activities of the project. The project’s main relevance corresponds to SDG 10.7: Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people and SDG 8.8 - protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants. It also responds to SDG 4: ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and 4.4: increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship. It is equally relevant to SDG 1.3 in implementing nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable.

The design of the Action is relevant to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration

The CDMM is also relevant to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration as it considers the multidimensional reality of migration and the necessity of the involvement of multi-stakeholders including migrants, diasporas, local communities, civil society, academia, the private sector, parliamentarians, trade unions, national human rights institutions, the media, and other relevant stakeholders in migration governance.

The design of the Action is relevant to ILO’s Decent Work Country Programme

In terms of alignment of the Action with the implementing partners’ policy priorities, it is relevant to the Decent Work Country Programme of ILO, in developing fair and efficient labour migration frameworks, institutions and services to protect migrant workers.

The design of the institutional arrangements is relevant to the Action’s objectives and activities

The project is implemented by ILO and ICMPD, in a close partnership with the India Centre for Migration (ICM), as the Indian partner. The choice of these three partners is highly relevant for the implementation of the CAMM.

The ILO with its country office in India and through its tripartite constituents, decent work programmes and major work on labour migration, is the first implementing partner and as such is relevant mostly for priority area 1 of the CAMM, but also for priority area 3. The ILO was also selected because it occupies a recognised position in the area of labour migration in India and has a credible and close relationship with the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA).

The ICMPD’s participation as second implementing partner is also highly relevant, due to its experience and knowledge of various international high-level dialogues on migration and mobility between the EU and different regions worldwide, like the Rabat and Khartoum processes, the EU-Africa Migration and Mobility Dialogue, the Budapest, and the Silk Road Processes. The ICMPD’s experience in developing migration management strategies, irregular migration policies and integrated border management and security is relevant for the same priority areas plus 2 (that is 1, 2 and 3).

This partnership was further reinforced by the participation of the India Centre for Migration (ICM) as a close associate (local partner) during implementation. The evaluation team notes that taking on board the ICM was not envisaged at the design

⁹ Migration and the 2030 Agenda, IOM, <https://migration4development.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/IOM-EN-BOOKLET%20WEB.pdf>

of the Action; and implementation was only possible after the ICM was brought in as an associate as there needed to be a partner from the India side, to equalize with partners from the EU side. Overall, the institutional arrangements’ *raison-d’être* was the physical presence of the implementing partners in New Delhi and Brussels, the establishment of good contacts with the MEA and EU and EU MS. Thus, ILO-India, as an India-based UN agency, would facilitate or open possibilities for engagement with MEA, sharing experience and knowledge to bring them on board. The ICMPD, as an international centre specialised in migration policy and management, would facilitate the planning and implementation of activities by sharing best practices from other EU strategic partnership contracts; and enrich dialogue processes with their own knowledge and expertise. The ICM, the Indian think tank and research centre at the MEA which covers all matters relating to international migration for India and would share local knowledge and facilitate communication with GOI. This set-up underlines the common approach and the fact that the CAMM is in fact common.

2. Coherence and complementarity

Evaluation Question	EQ (1) To what extent is there coherence and complementarity between the Action and EU’s migration policy approach to India?
Main Findings	<p>JC 2.1 – Coherence between the Action and the EU’s migration policy approach to India</p> <p>The EU-India CDMM action was initiated in support of the implementation of CAMM, tasked to strengthen the HLDMM and support it to become a more regular, comprehensive, and structured dialogue. The EU-India CAMM is composed of four priority areas aligned with the EU GAMM, considered at the design stage of this project (before 2017) as the “overarching framework of the EU external migration policy”, adopted in May 2012.</p> <p>The four GAMM priority areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organising and facilitating legal migration and mobility; • Preventing and reducing irregular migration and trafficking in human beings; • Maximising the development impact of migration and mobility; and • Promoting international protection. <p>Based on these priority areas, the CAMM offers a “flexible framework for cooperation in the mutual interest of the signatories [...] on the basis of full reciprocity”¹⁰. The EU-India CAMM was endorsed at the EU-India Summit in 2016, while previous summits, in 2010 and 2012 had recognised the important implications of mobility and the movement of people between India and the EU. The EU-India CAMM with its four priority areas and its implementation through the CDMM is coherent with the GAMM.</p> <p>In 2018, a year after the start of the Action, the Joint Communication¹¹ included investing in talent and innovation as a win-win, underlining that it is of mutual interest to increase mobility of talent exchanges between students, researchers, and professionals. The Joint Communication called for the promotion of this mobility networking between the EU and Indian innovators. It further underlined that the EU should promote cooperation on legal migration with a view to achieve its own skills objectives, notably on highly skilled workers such as scientists, IT specialists, engineers, and managers, but also the low- and middle- skilled workers. The Joint Communication also called for a harmonised cooperation with India on irregular migration, notably to address issues faced in the readmission process. It highlighted that better-managed migration and mobility, using a balanced approach between the EU and India is in the interest of both sides.</p> <p>Most of the proposed actions in the Joint Communication, such as outreach activities, sharing tools and good practices aimed to develop transferable skills and competences are included in the CDMM and part of its activities. More so, the Joint</p>

¹⁰ European Union-India Joint Declaration on Common Agenda on Migration and Mobility.

¹¹ Brussels, 20.11.2018, Joint Communication to The European Parliament and The Council, Elements for an EU strategy on India.

Communication suggests the “use of existing tools to their full potential for cooperation on migration and mobility, including the Common Agenda on Migration and Mobility”. While the Joint Communication was developed during the implementation of the Action, it demonstrates the coherence of the Action’s objectives and activities with the general EU strategy towards India and the Strategic Partnership that was put forth.

In 2020, during the implementation period of the Action, the Road Map to 2025 was drafted to further strengthen the EU-India Strategic Partnership at the 15th EU– India Summit on the 15th July 2020. The Road Map reiterates the importance of the implementation of the CAMM to ensure the follow-up of the HLDMM and to strengthen dialogue, through workshops studies and dissemination of information and knowledge- sharing tools. The Road Map stresses on better organising and promoting regular migration at relevant skill levels and fostering well-managed mobility, including issuance of visas. It underlines the importance of maximising the development impact of migration and mobility, including through cooperation on social security issues between India and EU MS. It considers that preventing and combating irregular migration and addressing trafficking in human beings, and promoting international protection, are coherent and in line with the respective obligations of the EU and India. The Road Map also recalls that migration contributes to development by enhancing the mobility of students, researchers, professionals, low-skilled workers and other business-persons. Moreover, it underlines that return, and readmission are part of this comprehensive approach.

The GAMM, dating back to 2011, and the European Agenda on Migration of 2016, are followed by the Pact on Migration and Asylum¹² adopted by the European Commission on 23 September 2020. The Pact assigns a prominent place to cooperation with third countries of origin and transit of migration flows and aims to find a compromise between the 'various realities faced by different Member States'. The Pact proposes rather a tailor-made approach based on a joint assessment of the interests of both the EU and its partner countries, taking into account the specific situation of each partner country or region¹³, aiming at:

- Protecting refugees and people in need of international protection and supporting refugee-host countries;
- Building economic opportunities in particular for youth and addressing root causes of irregular migration;
- Reinforcing partner countries' capacities on migration management and governance, including on border management and combating migrant smuggling;
- Fostering cooperation on return, readmission, and reintegration; and
- Supporting well-managed legal migration, including through new Talent Partnerships.

Although designed prior to the Pact, the CDMM demonstrates coherence with the Pact’s objectives and its tailor-made approach. In fact, The CDMM results, approach, and implementation modalities, based on flexibility reaffirm the need to have a tailor-made approach, as per the Pact. echo

Last but not least, the active involvement of DG HOME, along with FPI/EUD to India, in the PAC and Project Steering Committee (PSC) and its guidance/ recommendations regarding the strategy to be followed and the types and contents of its intended activities demonstrate the importance of the project to the EU migration policy in general, and its approach to India in particular. The participation and support of EU MS in many project activities is another indication that EU MS are

¹² [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/690535/EPRS_BRI\(2021\)690535_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/690535/EPRS_BRI(2021)690535_EN.pdf) *The external dimension of the new pact on migration and asylum A focus on prevention and readmission*, EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service Author: Eric Pichon; Graphics: Eulalia Claros Members' Research Service PE 690.535 – April 2021

¹³ [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/690535/EPRS_BRI\(2021\)690535_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/690535/EPRS_BRI(2021)690535_EN.pdf)

positively considering the project as important and in line with EU and their overall and thematic approach to India.

3. Effectiveness

Evaluation Question	EQ (1) To what extent has the EU-India CDMM achieved the expected outputs, outcomes, and results of the Action in an effective manner? What were key facilitators and key barriers to the achievement of results?
Main Findings	<p>JC 3.1 – The Action has achieved the expected results included in the original design</p> <p>The original design of the Action was indicative for the possible activities. It also became indicative for the proposed outcomes, as activities related to outcome 1 could not be implemented at the state level, upon the Gol’s request. The same applies to international protection and best practices that have not been directly addressed as stated by the 3 Interim Reports.</p> <p>Starting from the first year, the Gol’s approach was to focus on, 1) strengthening regular migration between India and the EU and 2) advancing the dialogue on migration and development. The second year four activities covering only two of the four CAMM pillars were prioritised by the MEA, namely pillars 1 and 3 of the CAMM, also dropping some activities already approved during the first PAC meeting. The third year of the project was a turning point; it demonstrated how the previous two years served to build consensus and coordination with the Gol and how a balance of activities amongst regular and irregular migration became possible. The extension phase was then able to take this momentum further.</p> <p>The four PAC meetings¹⁴ were essential to implement the project as they meetings helped “set the priorities of the project” (Minutes, First PAC meeting, June 2018)¹⁵ and approved activities to be implemented. The first PAC meeting had planned two yearly meeting, nevertheless they were held only once a year.</p> <p>The two outcomes are also implemented in an unbalanced way. For example, the first Interim report states that achievements towards outcomes have not been met in the first year. For Outcome 1, the project has not been able to work directly at the state level, however, four state government representations were present and interacted in the seminar on migration governance and in parallel, 11 EU member states were present¹⁶. In year four, the pre-departure handbooks events were held collaboratively with three states as a way to start state engagement, opening the door for future engagement. This can be considered as a very first introductory step in engaging on a state level student mobility engagement with EU MS also gained momentum.</p> <p>Concerning Outcome 2, the main focus of the activities largely was around regular migration and migration and mobility management in the first two years, leaving for the last years the implementation of activities on preventing and combating irregular migration. While for regular migration and migration management, there has been considerable advancement during the three years enriching and broadening these thematic areas, irregular migration was only discussed during the Migration Governance Seminar on 10 July 2019 in New Delhi, and a first workshop on irregular migration took place towards the end of the project. Overall, the good practices that emerged are reflective of the activities that were undertaken mainly in the area of regular migration. They do, however, include activities that cover both regular and irregular migration. In the extension period, the openness and willingness of MEA to collaborate on the issue of irregular migration was noted as a good practice.</p> <p>The study of diasporas and start-ups have contributed to:</p>

¹⁴ First PAC meeting in June 2018, 10 months after the project start date. Second PAC meeting in July 2019, immediately after the HLDMM in July 2019. Third PAC meeting in July 2020. Fourth PAC meeting in June 2021.

¹⁵ It is interesting to note that in the minutes of the first PAC meeting the project CDMM is named technical Support Project under India-EU CAMM and India-EU HLDMM, which directly shows the link of the project with the CAMM and the HLDMM.

¹⁶ Four Indian states (A.P, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Kerala) were present in the seminar and 11 EU MS, (Czech Republic, Spain, Finland, Italy, Ireland, Austria, Germany, Belgium, Slovakia, Poland, and Britain).

- Enrich and install common understanding and put forth common interests; and
- Make both sides, or both signatories, full proactive partners in implementing the CAMM.

At the design stage, at output level, not all the achieved results were expected neither all of the activities that were implemented. The four outputs were achieved in an unequal way. We below present the overall assessment of the evaluation team on activities per output, focusing this time, less on the successes, but rather on the cases where inefficiencies were identified.

Activities for Output 1 - Regular, structured, and reliable dialogue on issues related to migration management, governance and mobility between India and the EU

The first output, that aims to ensure that migration management, governance and mobility feed into the dialogue in a regular, structured and reliable manner, is handled through technical papers, events (seminars or webinars). The subject matters addressed by the activities do not cover all issues that are inherent to migration management (such as migration health, assistance for vulnerable migrants), and even less to migration governance (such as migration legislation and effective policy frameworks). However, the issue is not to be exhaustive but to feed into, and ensure that, the dialogue is structured, and progressively evolves into a holistic coverage of migration management and governance. Thus, for Output 1, the evaluation team found that the designed activities have been carried out satisfactorily.

Activities for Output 2 - Improved knowledge base of migration flows of all kinds between India and the EU

Within this output, the evaluation team found that some proposed studies or research were not approved, while others were dropped for different reasons. However, the reports do not systematically mention the reasons given for dropping an activity and when reasons were provided they are not sufficient and do not always mention if alternatives were proposed. Thus, for output 2, the evaluation team finds that was carried out satisfactorily but with organisational challenges that undermined effectiveness.

Activities for Output 3 - Enhanced legal and administrative institutional capacity of India and the EU on all aspects of migration management

In the case of activities that fall under Output 3, the evaluation team was able to identify reasons explaining why they were not implemented. Some are noted below:

- The GoI sees activity 3.1 “as part of ILO’s core support function in the country and not one that they want to see through this bilateral project” (Interim Report). This is a very important remark that shows the importance of follow-up and coordination at the GoI level. The GoI did not accept any direct action in “training” or capacity building from the EU side. Adaptation was therefore required at all levels.
- For activity 3.3, the reason offered for not pursuing the activity with local women’s association in EU MS/Italy is the language problem as mentioned in the report, with no further explanation and whether an alternative was proposed. Instead, some hands-on training was provided through the consultant, mainly for male community workers as it was not easily possible to reach the women’s organisations.

Activities for Output 4 - International standards and best practices on migration management implemented

For all Outputs, some activities are rebranded or renamed, and some were not approved, in a way showing sometimes language and naming differences “between two different cultures” that need to be considered. Sometimes the activities proposed may be fully relevant and acceptable, but the wording needs to be changed in order to have a common understanding of the issue under study.

	<p>In the Interim reports, we rarely see references to the relation of one activity to another. For example, the findings of the statistical report (migration profile) were presented at the Migration Governance Seminar and were “highly appreciated”. There was an event in the extension phase where the findings of the Seminar were discussed, and a report of that event is available. The evaluation team consider this a good practice in terms of sustainability of results achieved.</p> <p>However, we don’t have information on the further usage of this study. or what follow-up can be proposed, and sometimes, what needs they respond to. This should have led to engagement with the statistical authorities for data management. As the sole interlocutor of this project was the MEA, it has not been possible for the project to engage with other institutions directly.</p> <p>The Interim reports do not demonstrate the diversity and more specifically the quality of the work. Quality of work is not only what has been done, but the relation with the other activities, the gaps that are covered and the niches that are expanded, which is seen through the products of the project and the interviews and meetings carried for the evaluation.</p> <p>In general, and while there is a need for more explanation on specific activities on why they were dropped, what alternatives proposed or simply what are the obtained results or follow-up, the relation and contribution these activities brought in achieving the different outputs need also to be demonstrated. This can be done through different infographics in a more functional and proactive way, showing interlinkages among the different activities, highlighting the functional relationships. These infographics may be presented to the HLDMM and feed into the dialogue, further ensuring the dialogue is better structured and reliable, based on knowledge and information, capacity and considering good practices.</p> <p>In fact, the general feeling is that there has been no prior needs’ analysis, or a general framework detailing and identifying the activities needed, and potentially activities that build on another, a consensus on wording and naming, even if the CAMM specifies the priority areas to advance the HLDMM. This is understandable to a certain extent, given that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this is the first iteration of the Action and had to build everything from the beginning and establishing the working environment; and • the activities outlined in the Description of the Action were not discussed beforehand with the MEA; and that ideas for activities mostly came from the implementing partners’ discussions with stakeholders, which were lengthy and required a lengthy approval process as well. <p>In this context, the evaluation team considers that the implementing partners were left with little choice, but to try different initiatives that reflected the CAMM priorities. This was done with success, but inefficiencies along the way could have been avoided earlier, and the sustainability of activities could have been better ensured.</p>
Evaluation Question	<p>EQ (2) To what extent has the EU-India CDMM mainstreamed the gender equality relevant SDGs and their linkages, rights-based approach and “leaving no one behind” principle into the design and implementation of the activities?</p>
Main Findings	<p>JC 3.3 – Promotion of activities related to SDGs</p> <p>The project did not plan to have an overall gender dimension. To this end limited activities also covered women. These were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A study on women regular migrants was prepared, while the study on women irregular migration was not completed due to paucity of information. • One activity under 3.3 is solely on Indian women irregular migrants to Italy, but, as discussed above, this activity has not been pursued in full due to language issues. <p>Other women-related specific activities were envisaged but they were not all completed. Often gender/women-specific references are also absent in chapters or</p>

paragraphs of research studies dedicated to women, or panels during specific events and seminars. With the exception of:

- the Integration handbooks: “a social worker from Italy had informed that they were referring to a book which they had received, which had information on whom to approach for assistance when women face a difficult situation at home. The book referred to in this case is the integration handbook that had been prepared under the project” (Minutes, 3rd PAC meeting);
- Women are considered in the checklists for EU students going to India, and Indian students going to EU.
- Also, the migration Baseline Report offers insights on the flows of men vs. women.

Against this background, gender diversity is a big focus area of the IT industry: More than 35% in the sector are women, and there is a growing interest of the IT sector to invest further to this direction and increase the participation of women. This means that if not all, then most activities could have a gender dimension in a horizontal way, for low, middle and the highly skilled workers.

However, the project reported the number of women participating in events for EU and Indian stakeholders: 3,901 women out a total of 10,236 participants, demonstrating a percentage of 38%, according to the draft final PIMS report available, and exceeding the initial target of 1548 female participants that was set at the inception phase of the Action.

4. Efficiency

Evaluation Question	(1) To what extent were the institutional arrangements of the EU-India CDMM efficient and effective, including the roles of the Project Steering Committee (including the role of DG HOME, FPI and the EUD to India) and the Project Advisory Committee, the shared arrangement between the two implementing partners and local partner?
Main Findings	<p>JC 4.1 – The institutional arrangements of the project support the smooth implementation</p> <p>The institutional arrangements of the project include the active involvement of the following entities: an advisory body- the Project Advisory Committee, a governance body - the Project Steering Committee; the Project Implementation Team: ILO and ICMPD; ICM, the EC related entities: DG HOME, FPI, and the EUD to India. Other meetings organised by the EUD, where also EU MS participated are considered useful mechanisms for knowledge sharing.</p> <p>The PAC</p> <p>The PAC was established with the aim of setting priorities for the project, and the overall steering of the implementation process. The meetings of the PAC were meant to be organised twice in a year. The PAC first meeting was held in June 2018, 10 months after the project start date. Subsequently, three other PAC meetings were held in July 2019, April 2020, and June 2021. The Committee includes representatives from the GOI, EU, ILO, ICMPD, and the project’s local implementing partner, India Centre for Migration (ICM). The evaluation team received the minutes of all PAC meetings.</p> <p>Most of the PAC meeting minutes had a clear structure that includes the list of participants, opening remarks by EU and Indian stakeholders, a review of the main activities and achievements, and a preliminary work plan for the next implementation period. Two important elements were coherently included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational arrangements such as: approval of main studies and events,

details on the next months’ planning.

- Strategic directions for the next implementing period’s workplan, such as priorities for the policy papers and events to be produced by the project.

The PAC also served to keep the two sides engaged on subjects related to the migration dossier (between EU and India), apart from just discussing on project activities related to migration and mobility. Statements found in PAC such as “their commitment to the project’s success and reiterated the need for strategic project related interactions” or the need “to establish a balanced delivery [...] ensuring the development of new products or activities” is not only a reflection of the priorities of the project, but also elements of an active engagement in the strategic partnership.

However, the need “to establish a balanced delivery, covering all four priority areas, ensuring the development of new products or activities” demonstrates as well the reluctance of the Indian side, at least in the first years of implementation, to address the ones of irregular migration. Preference was given to activities on regular migration by the Indian side. This clearly evolved, and with the 4th PAC, when, finally, the Indian side agreed to a more balanced approach related to activity planning., and stand-alone activities on irregular migration were also agreed by the Indian side.

There appears to have been more challenges the implementing partners had to face. The organisation of the first PAC meeting, only took place 10 months after the action’s kick off, despite discussions on organising a first PAC from the beginning of the Action. As noted previously, project activities started shaping only around a year after the project start.

In the view of the evaluation team, there are many reasons underpinning this delay:

A first reason can be considered misaligned expectations: it was not clear from the Indian side that a specific project was about to be implemented when the CAMM was signed. Interviews demonstrate that a more inclusive approach could have been followed, especially as there was a bilateral agreement to the direction of a strategic partnership on migration and mobility dialogue. Besides, the CAMM, was a political accord, which often is the result of negotiation and compromise. India signed an agreement stating that the EU and India intend to work on irregular migration (return and readmission) and international protection, without necessarily foreseeing an implementation action. An agreement, or simply an exchange of views and discussions on specific focus areas (such as irregular migration) and the activity types (such as trainings, media engagement etc.), was necessary before starting the project. In the view of the evaluation team the different sides may have had different opinions of when this would come and what it would entail in terms of activities, and how operational the CAMM would be, which led to major delays.

Linked to the above, and as a second reason, is the fact that from the GoI point of view the set-up of implementation was unfamiliar to its own practises: interviews showed that India is not used to externalising activities of high political importance such as migration, unlike the EU. It was therefore difficult to engage with two implementing partners, out of which one was well known to the Indian side but not the other, and work with them on policy-oriented approaches. In the context of a strategic partnership action, the lines between political, policy and project levels can be grey areas, and this is the reason why better preparation between the EU and India was needed before and also during the design stage of the Action.

A third reason has to do with the lack of interest in investing on pertinent capacities: although representatives of the GoI participated in CAMM meetings (including when the project was launched), their response to initial and further communication was slow and cautious. It was also noted in many interviews that India was probably not ready to engage because migration between India and the EU was not in their top

priorities, or a rather new priority area¹⁷, which may also mean that they were not ready to invest relevant resources at the beginning of the Action and were not prepared to contribute to its implementation. This led the Action’s first implementation year into a silent planning phase.

Extending this argument broader, specifically on the institutional arrangements of the ICM, an important element that also played a role and is beyond the sphere of control of the Action and its implementing partners, was the changes of the personnel within ICM and/or MEA, as interviews demonstrate. This led to delays due to continued and repeated efforts to re-establish trust, between the Indian partner and the implementing partners, and did not allow the Action to undertake long-term planning.

In the last two years of implementation the situation appeared entirely different, with the Indian partner that is forthcoming and communication lines that were well established and continuous. This is clearly reflected in the evolution of the PAC meetings, the interim reports, but also in the positive notes during the interviews with Indian counterparts. The ILO’s close contacts with the GoI have been supportive in creating this momentum, as the evaluation team observes. The engagement of ICMPD including their efforts to involve EU MS in project activities, were paramount to bring institutional arrangements to a healthier partnership built on trust. The same can be said for the project’s strategy, which confirms the importance of having a local associate that eased situation and created bridges in order to bring the GoI on board. The ICM became a major contributor to towards creating this momentum in the EU-India CDMM project. This had a counter positive/unexpected effect that gave ICM the potential to grow into a stronger national think-tank.

The Project Steering Committee

The PSC includes the EU (represented by the DG HOME representative from Brussels, FPI representatives at the EU Delegation to India), and the ILO and ICMPD project teams. The main role of the PSC is to ensure effective governance of the project. The meetings of the PSC were to be held on a quarterly basis and more frequently in the last year to ensure completion of activities.

It can be said that many regular meetings have taken place. However, meeting minutes have not been taken to allow the evaluation team to tap into all discussion points. From the interviews it appears that the state of play of the project was discussed systematically, together with the arranging of details for meetings with the MEA, as well as relevant meetings’ results and also next steps to unlock upcoming activities.

Implementing partners

The ILO and the ICMPD do not have any joint working history in India. Building on their experience, existing tools and methodologies and their local (ILO) and international (ILO and ICMPD) networks had a substantive positive impact on the efficiency of the Action.

Each organisation focused on the migration and mobility fields of their mandate/policy focus. The ILO’s mandate focused on labour issues, which was also an easier topic in terms of agreeing on specific activities with the GoI. The components of irregular migration were allocated mainly to the ICMPD. This led to an implicit work division and allocation of the type of stakeholders to be covered, with regard to migration and mobility, by the two implementing partners. This is confirmed by relevant interviews, which demonstrate clearly that most stakeholders have worked only with one of the two implementing partners. Such an arrangement can be seen as an opportunity but also as a challenge, as knowledge generated may not have brought the expected

¹⁷ We may also consider the fact that India is used to discuss issues related to migration, such as Visa etc, directly with the EU MS; and at the begging, such a discussion may have been considered less relevant.

outcomes at project level, if both implementing partners are not fully informed about the development of their mutual activities. Towards the last phase of the project however, EU had to request ILO’s intervention to get ICMPD’s irregular migration event and the baseline report cleared. However, interviews also show that the project has focused on “things that matter” and did its best to keep stakeholders informed about the development in the relevant sectors.

The highly qualified ILO and ICMPD teams were able to gain the confidence of national (governmental and private) actors and offer adequate support for the development of the activities. The evaluation team however has identified gaps in communication between the two partners and although has noted an improvement along the years of implementation, which also led to gradual increase of the efficiency of the implementation of the Action, it is rather clear that communication lines had not been clearly defined at project start which, would have helped to easily avoid various inefficiencies. There is also the sensitive issue of working with another culture, as discussed above relating to the wording and language issues for example, that needed to be taken into account before starting the project.

It is worth to noting that the COVID-19 global pandemic appeared not to have impacted the ability of the team to organise workshops, seminars, conferences and other awareness raising activities. The project did not lose its efficiency during the pandemic, and whether or not physical events would have enabled more effectiveness in some aspects, such as support sharing of best practices, policy application examples, EU’s technical expertise and further networking opportunities, strengthening EU’s visibility, remains an unknown factor. The pandemic has shown that flexibility and adaptation are key tools in the successful implementation of any PI-funded action. It has also tested, the resilience of international, national and even sub-national governance systems in continuing the activities and finding alternatives. The CDMM team has shown flexibility in efficiently turning its activities into digital formats and adapting project implementation to the unique and unprecedented situation of the pandemic. The digital formats contributed to a much broader diffusion of the project’s products.

Evaluation Question

(2) Were the resources (including technical expertise, staff, time, activity costs) used in a timely and cost-effective manner by both implementing partners?

Main Findings

JC 4.2 – Financial and project management of the Action – managing for results

The overall budget envisaged at project start was of 3M EUR (2M EUR for ILO and 1M EUR for ICMPD), which was reduced with the Addenda I and II to 2,4M EUR (1,4M EUR for ILO and 1M EUR for ICMPD) The final reported expenditure was of around 2,3M EUR (for ILO – around 1,4M EUR – and ICMPD – around 830k EUR), which means that the implementing partners implemented most of the budget available after the Addenda. With the information at hand it is understood that (1) the project was late in kick-off activity planning and implementation in the first year due to the delayed response and participation of the GoI; (2) the pace of budget consumption was slower than expected and overall, there were less activities implemented than envisaged in the design of the Action for reasons explained in previous sections of the present report; and (3) the low level of disbursement of travel expenses (due to travel restrictions during COVID-19 pandemic) and other expenses related to physical events etc. The relevant savings allowed for the Addendum I that included lowering the overall available budget and to Addendum II, a no-cost extension of the project implementation period till February 2022, which was considered necessary as the project had built the basis for cooperation and had to take advantage of the momentum. Overall, the relevant savings allowed for an improvement on the value for money. The evaluation team identifies no major efficiency issues, and it can be said that, overall, effectiveness was improved.

5. Impact and sustainability

Evaluation Question	(1) To what extent has the EU-India CDMM generated potential positive impacts on the EU’s relationship with India, particularly the EU-India CAMM?
Main Findings	<p>JC 5.1 – Contribution to a better governance of migration and mobility between the EU and India</p> <p>While one may think that a four-and-half--year action may not be sufficient to assess the direct impact on policy and migration management, it is important to underline that the project was able to achieve, through the support it provided to the CAMM and the High-Level Dialogue – an increased level of mutual understanding and cooperation on migration management between the two signatories of the CAMM.</p> <p>The project faced a few challenges at the beginning of its implementation period, as explained in other parts of the present report. In addition to the practical implementation challenges faced another challenge may have been the operationalisation of a level of reciprocity, as it should be in a strategic partnership. India was working with the EU, which is unique in its form with federal elements, but without being a federation, and at the same time with the representatives of the EU MS, with whom India has been long working with, on a bilateral basis. Combined, together, the EU-India level and the India-EU MS create more opportunities and it demonstrate higher chances of sustainability of the HLDMM and the Action’s impact.</p> <p>Among the evident long-term results of the Action, which was not part of the expected results, was the empowerment of the ICM, the Indian associate. The ICM existed as a migration think-tank attached to the MEA, which had the potential to become more active and considerably widen its areas of interest and activities and have an impact in its turn on migration governance of the Indian MEA.</p> <p>In the last four and half years, the project has organised 39 dialogues/events, of which ILO was responsible for 27, ICMPD for 9 and 3 were held jointly by ILO & ICMPD. The events targeted 10,236 participants, produced 29 reports/publications, and delivered 67 information and communication products to the stakeholders and participants in India and some targeted EU MS. Through the design and delivery of the project activities under the four results, it appears that both public and private stakeholders from India and the EU have gained a better understanding of migration and mobility relations between the two sides. There are a few signs that the relationship between the EU and India is becoming closer with renewed discussions at Indian level on further engagement. In this case, it seems that the project has contributed to a stronger EU-India relationship to promote solutions for joint challenges on migration and mobility issues. This is apparent through the focus on CAMM activities, as explained below.</p> <p>JC 5.2 – Contribution to the EU-India CAMM</p> <p><u>Contributing to strengthening and broadening migration management and mobility through the implementation of the CAMM:</u> In general, while the activities focus more on regular migration, they follow the inherent approach of the CAMM based on reciprocity and mutual recognition of the India-EU migratory flows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While focusing more on priority areas 1 and 3, the project has contributed to broaden understanding, strengthened exchange and mutual participation and recognition between the EU, EU MS, and India. The activities have contributed directly or indirectly to 58% of the CAMM main intervention points (18 out of the 31 points of CAMM were covered under the CDMM Action). • The project has covered major aspects and major parts of the migratory journey with the diaspora engagement compendium, pre-departure handbook to Europe and the different Handbooks for Integration in different EU MS. It has worked on diasporas and contributed to a long-term approach to migration. <p><u>Contributing to producing and sharing knowledge and good practice that has brought common understanding and interests, broadened and diversified the partnerships:</u></p>

- With the students’ checklist not only students are prepared and informed of legal channels, but also of the different offers from EU MS universities, as well as EU programmes for post-graduates. On their part, universities in the EU MS are informed on good practises, such as how to recruit students through legal channels, or how to conduct interviews for students. Another checklist was developed for EU students that wish to study in India.
- The same goes for all the work done for start-ups with the reciprocal study of Indian start-ups in the EU and the EU start-ups in India.
- Likewise, the studies and the different “tools”, the project produced on and with the diaspora, was a first step in putting the diaspora in a “partnering” position with the country, in highlighting engagement with the country of origin and also to the destination country. It helped to have a better understanding of the communities in Europe and support better and highlight the reciprocal relationships: diaspora-country of origin, diaspora-country of destination and vice versa.

These demonstrated quite unique approaches in the topic of migration and mobility.

The project has contributed to strengthening the dialogue and ensuring the sustainability of the CAMM:

- The project activities have created multiple opportunities for knowledge sharing and dialogue between the two sides, including exchanges and promotion of good practices. This is essential to support the dialogue, but also put the EU-India CAMM on a more sustainable path, as shown also by the Road Map to 2025.
- The project worked in a two-way flow relationship to a certain extent. It highlighted migration aspects and mobility for both the EU and India and in this way, it contributed towards strengthening dialogue.
- The dialogue has also been strengthened through the diversity of thematic issues and knowledge products, the diverse ways of implementing the actions and the types of activities and the stakeholders it reached.
- The dialogue has been strengthened because the project has been able to work in a reciprocal way. This does not necessarily mean that at all times deliverables of the project have been used/adopted at the High-level Dialogue towards a sustainable inter-relationship, but that the project supported the progress of the dialogue. It created a framework, with concrete examples, on which the dialogue could built. The major impact of the project is that it managed to set the basis of a common understanding and consensus on several issues pertaining to migration and mobility. As a result of this sustainable relationship, future actions of interest to both sides can be better identified and built, based on what was developed in the first phase of the CDMM.
- Some activities were made more accessible to the target audience by other stakeholders – non-state actions, think tanks, organisations – who used them and contributed to the dissemination of outputs and outreach, thereby multiplying the impact and ensuring the sustainability of the Action.
- The project has been able to ensure the GoI’s ownership through the ICM and its increased involvement, but it also ensured ownership on the EU part and from its MS.
- A major, albeit unexpected, impact was the active engagement and visibility enhancement of the ICM through the partnership.

6. *EU Added Value*

Evaluation Question

(1) To what extent has the EU-India CDMM demonstrated the EU added value in the implementation of the Action, particularly the specific PI added value in the implementation of the Action?

Main Findings

JC 7.1 – Supportive authority of the EU on migration matters on behalf of EU Member States

Funding the EU-India CDMM action through the PI has enabled the EU to engage with India through a less political channel of cooperation, by focusing on policy-oriented processes, and by enabling the expected ownership of the Action’s results by the EU MS and the Indian institutions. It is noted that the activities implemented, including the participation of Indian businesses, have enabled the EU and Indian stakeholders (incl. public sector institutions and private sector organisations) to participate in an extended dialogue to enhance relations on migration and mobility issues between the EU and India, strengthening links necessary for inter-institutional cooperation in legal, social and economic areas. This supports the indirect objective of the EU, in the view of the evaluation team, to consolidate the EU’s position as a partner of choice for India for cooperation on migration and mobility, among other issues. Below, we present the evaluation team’s views on the EU added value, stemming from the Action, in relation to the CAMM, India and the EU MS.

EU added value to the implementation of the CAMM: As mentioned in the relevance and impact sections of the present report, the project has broadened the overall understanding of migration and mobility and managing migration between the EU and India. It has had a unique approach in building consensus and mutual relationships. Migration is viewed, understood, and approached not only through different angles, but also through building and enforcing different partnerships: the EU-India partnership, the India-Labour Migrants-Diaspora-Students partnership, the EU-India start-up partnerships and partnerships with the private sector

EU added value in its relationship with India: The EU added value in this Action is multiple, often unexpected. It has provided the EU and India with an understanding of the value of the partnership. The latter has been re-enforced, widened, and put on solid foundations with the contribution of the project, by building on reciprocity, and anchoring this reciprocity in the EU-India relationship, accomplishing consensus and achieving mutual understanding, and advancing together on matters of common interests.

EU added value with the EU MS: EU MS maintain bilateral relations with India and favour these relations. The question was to understand where the EU stands and how India, as one country, is to interact with the EU as a global player, without the EU replacing the bilateral relations its MS have with India. The project also reflected the needs of the EU MS. The Action gave EU MS access to knowledge and tools – on issues related to talent mobility, students, diaspora, integration, , data management on migration, irregular migration, and social security (which falls under MS competences), but also on how to build a relationship with the Indian interlocutor, how to tackle language and cultural differences, and it offered the necessary tools for mutual understanding, that alone the MS could not have been able to achieve. This in its turn reinforced the added value of the EU vis-à-vis its MS working with India. Undoubtedly, the Action broadened the inclusion of EU MS and re-enforced their relationships with India. It is worth noting that there were MS that do not have intensified bilateral relations with India, let alone lines of communication for issues related to migration. This Action provided the space for them to explore opportunities, learn, participate, and connect with relevant stakeholders in India and in the EU. It created an informal network where especially MS, with small teams in India, have a forum to listen and interact.

Interviews with stakeholders showed that different work permits and social security approaches in the EU MS are key constraints for Indians to migrate to the EU and regarding the mobility of Indians within the EU. Rules and regulations in the different EU MS are seen as a disadvantage for many Indian stakeholders. They create large administrative workload for private sector companies who send people to the EU with short-term or long-term work permits. It has also been highlighted that social security issues can be seen as a constraint – for example the latest agreement of Germany and India on social security puts pressure on employees who contribute a good

	<p>percentage of social security, while their benefits as well as the portability upon return are rather minor. The evaluation team understands that these issues are rather not targeted by the Action directly and considers that such discussions should happen within and not outside the EU. The project could create the platform to reinforce the EU’s position internally if the right knowledge is produced with external action. This could be simply put forward by creating an informal dialogue platform so that EU and Indian stakeholders sit together and discuss challenges and potential solutions. More EU involvement at all levels, would be welcomed by the private sector, it has been noted.</p>
Evaluation Question	(2) To what extent has the Action contributed positively to the image and visibility of the EU in India?
Main Findings	<p>JC 7.2 – Adherence to the EU visibility guidelines</p> <p>As per the Action Fiche, communication and visibility were meant to be an integral part of the Action. The Description of the Action, annexed to the Delegation Agreement specifies that a “communication plan shall be prepared by the implementing partners and implemented in line with relevant guidelines that, inter alia, will define the key messages and specific communication/EU visibility actions to be taken”, which will “be finalised in the inception phase...”.</p> <p>The Communication and Visibility Plan is in adherence to the EU visibility guidelines. It is designed to enhance the flow of information in the field of EU-India migration and mobility issues and to inform EU and Indian stakeholders on a regular basis of progress being made and results obtained; to raise awareness directly within both the EU and Indian governmental stakeholders and other types of stakeholders, such as Universities or businesses; to provide a vehicle for stakeholders’ feedback and views on the EU-Indian relations, by implementing workshops, business fora, information sessions, and attending events.</p> <p>The Inception Report of the Action includes the following communication materials: (1) Project Information data pack; (2) Standees; (3) Monthly updates for the first two months of project implementation; (4) Project webpage; and (5) a Project Brochure/Factsheet. The main materials were reviewed, and the evaluation team established that they are in line with the core EU visibility guidelines. It also appears that visibility rules for the project have been agreed with the EU and the GoI.</p> <p>The first Interim Report presents 2 annexes dedicated to communication and visibility. Annex 10 foresees that a Communication Pack is produced, composed of infographics with the EU and Indian flags. The Communication Visibility Plan for Year 2 defines the identified information and communication tools, communication activities and events, activities with the media. It defines the main target groups and activities. The Plan for year 3, in the Interim report 2, suggests to primarily focus on the promotion and dissemination of project achievements amongst the target groups. The evaluation team has reviewed the Plan targeting Year 3 and 4 (annexed to Interim Reports 2 and 3).</p> <p>In terms of visibility deliverables, a wide range of products were produced, such as knowledge sharing platforms (ILO and ICMPD websites), standees, brochures, banners, infographics, and social media posts. Furthermore, the Action used creative ways in promoting project and/or related activities. For example, to ensure EU visibility, the hashtag #EUIndiaCamm has been created and used by both implementing partners when sharing news and relevant information about the project on social media (Twitter). A project dedicated webpage was developed within the ICM’s website, which will also serve as a repository of all project deliverables.</p> <p>During the implementation of the project, and in all activities carried out, EU support was made visible to all entities and stakeholders involved as well as in media, social media, brochures, and any other communication material. In line with relevant EU visibility guidelines, all documentation and promotional material produced in the framework of the project did bear the EU flag and did mention that it is financed by</p>

the EU. Although the evaluation team considers that EU’s presence and visibility in activities has been sufficient, interviews highlighted that stakeholders would welcome EU staff and EU’s visibility in general to be reinforced in a potential next phase of a relevant Action.

The document review and the interviews conducted also show that there is a very high added-value and visibility regarding the tools produced, the different checklists, handbooks, reports, and events have mobilised a huge number of experts, stakeholders into a very dynamic process.

Finally, the evaluation team found that what was supportive in terms of visibility and outreach was the fact that the project was present with an exhibition booth at the Pravasi Bharatyia Divas in 2019, an activity quite outside the project’s scope, but highly beneficial for its visibility and dissemination of knowledge. Extending this argument, the evaluation team also notes further outreach from the participation of persons from the project teams to other events or networks with their EU-India CDMM “hat”, which acts as a multiplier of the communication efforts of the Action. Some examples can be: (1) The participation of Seeta Sharma (ILO) to the EU – India Digital Business and Investment Roundtable¹⁸, which was organised outside the EU-India CDMM action; and (2) The nomination of Naozad Hodiwala (ICMPD) as one of the 2020 class of 40 under 40 Europe India Leaders list (#EuropeIndia40)¹⁹.

C. Conclusions

Relevance

#C1	The Action’s design and the selection of the project activities are relevant to enhance the EU-India partnership in general and specifically on issues related to migration and mobility, in particular, but not only, addressing the highly skilled migrants in the IT and technology sector, as well as the low-skilled migrants. This is clearly also in line with the EU’s digital and green transformation agendas.
#C2	The diverse activities of the project are relevant to its main outputs and contribute to strengthening the HLDMM through the implementation of the CAMM. All activities are highly relevant to the main objectives aiming to strengthen the dialogue through the implementation of the CAMM. At the same time, the range of the themes covered by the activities are relevant to the sub-themes of regular migration in line with the CAMM’s and the GAMM’s priority areas. More so, this exchange of information helps address mutual issues, build common understanding, support the information flow between the two sides promoting the EU-India migration and mobility relations, and achieve consensus from both sides to facilitate legal movement and broaden the understanding of the priority areas of the CAMM.
#C3	The implementation of the Action confirms the relevance that characterised the design of activities for both the EU and India. The Action also proved instrumental in underlining the EU-India common challenges and policy priorities as per the CAMM, and the EU’s global approach to migration and mobility.
#C4	The Action is relevant to other international frameworks, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and relevant SDGs. It is also in line with policy priorities and/or activities of the ILO and ICMPD (for example, ILO and Decent work, ICMPD and migration dialogues), the co-implementing partners.
#C5	Partnering with two international organisations that have internationally recognised mandates, credibility, and established relations in their respective fields underlines the role

¹⁸ <https://www.globalbusinessinroads.com/news-details.php?EU%20%E2%80%93%20India%20Digital%20Business%20and%20Investment%20Roundtable&sno=177>

¹⁹ <https://www.eicbi.org/2020-class-europeindia40-leaders>

	of the Partnership Instrument as enabler of the EU-India strategic partnership on migration and mobility.
#C6	The choice of the ILO and ICMPD as implementing partners for the Action was legitimate. The reasons are multiple: ILO was well established in India with office presence and good contacts with MEA. They are also one of the most recognised organisations working on labour migration. ICMPD is one of the most trusted partners of the EU when it comes to irregular migration and development. The nature of the project that goes beyond traditional cooperation projects and its non- ODA nature, reinforces this argument. Both the ILO and the ICMPD demonstrated significant flexibility and adaptability to make the project a success story. Involving the ICM as local partner was instrumental to the success of the project.

Coherence and complementarity

#C7	The Action was found to be coherent with EU international migration policy and the EU’s migration approach to India, along with preliminary indications related to a coherence and complementarity between the project and EU’s migration policy dialogue and related actions with India.
#C8	Through multiple and different types of activities, the CDMM has initiated an introductory platform, that is coherent with the Joint Communication and the EU strategy for India as identified during discussions of the evaluation team with DG HOME.

Effectiveness

#C9	<p>The Action has partly achieved the expected results as referenced in its original design. This does not necessarily mean that it did not achieve a big part of it, but it did so with alternative proposed activities. The level of achievements and effectiveness of the Action has been highly dependent upon the level of commitment and interest demonstrated at the national level. When interest was high, the environment enabled activities to be designed and implemented efficiently.</p> <p>For some areas of work, the scope and achievements have been fairly limited. Other perspectives show however that if there are fewer activities proposed in the area of irregular migration, it is due to the sensitivity and understanding of the need to build trust and create a stable partnership first. To this end, phasing the interventions in the light of the necessity of installing reciprocity and common interests was important.</p>
#C10	As this is about a strategic partnership, one would expect that if there were activities on building capacities, they would address both the EU and India. Furthermore, given the non-ODA nature of the partnership instrument that funds this Action, one would not expect to see an entire component on building the capacities of a strategic partner country, which would probably be the case for a project in the traditional development funding.
#C11	Although women-specific activities were planned, not all were delivered. Examples of activities implemented related to gender are considered relevant and they demonstrate high efficiency of the Action. The project reported with gender-disaggregated data in reports and studies.

Efficiency

#C12	The institutional arrangements of the project facilitated a smooth implementation of issues related to technical expertise that was required. Building on prior experience, the tools and networks of the implementing partners, the ILO and ICMPD, has been appropriate and ensured the efficiency of the project. However, the implementation modality of the Action, that is the co-delegation, was not very successful and remained in unequal terms of
------	---

	responsibility. The project’s efficiency relied on each partner’s prior knowledge and experience rather than the collaboration between the two implementing partners.
#C13	The COVID-19 global pandemic appeared not to have impacted the ability of the Action to organise workshops, seminars, conferences and other awareness raising activities. However, the evaluation team intends not to undermine the potential of face-to-face interactions, which could have also resulted to more engagement at all participation levels (apart from the large webinared events), and in particular state level engagement. The CDMM team has shown flexibility in turning its activities in digital formats and adapting project implementation to the unique and unprecedented situation of the pandemic.
#C14	Thanks to the savings from the event costs because of the COVID pandemic, and because of the momentum that was starting to build up, the project was granted two no-cost extensions to continue its engagement in India. It is important to underline that the available funds were not the primary reason for the extension, but rather the impact the project started to have and the momentum it created, enabling it to move forward.

Impact and sustainability

#C15	Through the design and implementation of various activities, it appears that the EU-India CDMM Action has generated some potentially positive impacts on the EU-India dialogue on migration and mobility, and the EU’s migration policy objectives towards India. The Action has contributed to strengthening and broadening migration management and mobility through the implementation of the EU-India CAMM. The Action aimed at targeting a broad range of stakeholders, governmental and private sector, in both regions, the EU and India. Any impact would take time to become evident, but the project has managed to bring the right stakeholders around the same table, to define priority areas of cooperation, and reach out to stakeholders in both regions, keeping them informed about the situation in the relevant sectors. The evaluation team considers this is an ambitious goal, that has been achieved and, on which the project has contributed with the necessary flexibility and organisation.
------	---

EU Added Value

#C16	The EU-India CDMM has demonstrated a supportive role in promoting the EU as a relevant interlocutor for India on migration matters.
#C17	The project has positively contributed to the visibility and the image of the EU in India, through a broad range of tools and topics and as a result it reached a broad range of stakeholders: Visibility of the EU was promoted via varied communication tools, such as knowledge sharing platforms, (social) media coverage of some of the activities and public events.

D. Recommendations

#R1	It is necessary to continue supporting policy-driven actions in the field of migration between the EU and India, considering their relevance for the implementation of EU global strategy on migration and the EU-India CAMM, and the momentum that these issues are gaining in national, EU and international decision-making fora, in particular in the current context of the on-going multiple crises (economic, climate, instability in security etc.) and the transition in social, economic and environmental terms. <i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME, EEAS, and EUD, in cooperation with the GoI</i>
#R2	During the identification of potentially relevant actions, it is recommended to work towards articulated strategies and agendas in India. Flexibility in design will allow the

	<p>implementing partner(s) in identifying the best ways to cooperate with national authorities and respond to evolving needs during implementation, without being bound to logframes that are not viable.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME and EUD, in cooperation with the Gol</i></p>
#R3	<p>The EU should continue to work through and with international organisation(s) as implementing partner(s). At Action design it is important to take into account what the implementing partner(s) already do(es) or what is its/their mandate and their relationships in India. This is especially true for international organisations that already have a mandate and work in the country or in similar contexts in other countries to avoid potential duplication but also to strengthen the deployment of best practises. To maximise the distinctive added value of implementing partner(s) and the EU in the implementation of the Action, operational, management and governance arrangements should ensure a common understanding of expectations, clear definition (and adherence) of roles and responsibilities from the very beginning.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME and EUD India; and potentially the future implementing partner(s)</i></p>
#R4	<p>Priority should be given to more detailed identification of SDGs at the Action design, which can form the activities in terms of sectors, that go beyond the ones traditionally linked to migration (such as employment), including SDG 4: quality education, and SDG 5: gender equality.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME and EU, in cooperation with the Gol</i></p>
#R5	<p>The relevance and effectiveness of the future action(s) should be enhanced by strengthening even more the role of the EUD India, the GOI, and potentially the local partner; and state governments when it comes to selection and design of activities.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME and EUD, in cooperation with Gol and other relevant stakeholders, including state governments</i></p>
#R6	<p>Priority should be given to more detailed identification of potentially relevant actions to explore synergies, such as the global and regional PI and/or INTPA-funded actions related to business and human rights, and women empowerment that also target India.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME and EUD India</i></p>
#R7	<p>The EU should continue to work and reinforce its cooperation with the EU MS on the action from design to evaluation. This will allow the EU to feed the project’s planning with new priorities of the MS, but it will also ensure greater visibility of the PI-funded action.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME, EEAS, and EUD India</i></p>
#R8	<p>A future action should narrow down the type of activities by focusing more on EU and India’s objectives and interest, but also what is possible to be implemented with the local partner/s. It should also commit to a more department-department partnership and a public-private partnership: enlarge the thematic/policy scope of the project to be able to involve more specialised (Indian) national institutions, MS representatives and experts and the private sector based in India that work or send people for work in the EU. This could lead to an increased effectiveness of the Action.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME, EEAS, and EUD India; and potentially the future implementing partner(s), in close cooperation with the Gol</i></p>
#R9	<p>Project activities could be deployed at a larger scale, with more targeted institutions in Indian States, potentially with high political buy-in, where the probabilities to influence</p>

	active engagement may also be higher. <i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, DG HOME and EUD India; and potentially the future implementing partner(s)</i>
#R10	<p>There is a need to establish feedback mechanisms from involved stakeholders, organisation partners and participants. Tools should be developed and used to track usefulness, and processes triggered by the delivered knowledge products, outputs or events. This could also include more comprehensive feedback and followed up on the part of the implementing partner(s).</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: implementing partner(s)</i></p>
#R11	<p>It is vital to ensure that M&E reporting formats are better used by the implementing partner(s) but also by the Contracting Authority for decision-making and communication purposes. They should focus on outcome mapping rather than outputs and activities reporting, along with the management of knowledge and capturing of learning. This should include integration of more gender-responsive indicators and/or sex-disaggregated indicators to measure effects and impacts on women (workers, entrepreneurs, etc.). There should be more emphasis on improved data collection and monitoring, in order to judge actual results more credibly.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: EUD India; and implementing partner(s)</i></p>
#R12	<p>Future reporting (narrative reports) should include infographics, or similar tools that bring the varied activities together, enhance the interlinkages of the different studies, conclusions of webinars and other events, technical papers showing the coverage, the relations to the output and the outcome and give more visibility to the inter-relationships and how they feed one another.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: implementing partner(s)</i></p>
#R13	<p>Communication and the flow of information between stakeholders – DG INTPA, DG HOME, EEAS, EUD India and implementing partner(s) - but also local partners should be set from the onset of the Action. A knowledge sharing and dialogue/understanding facilitation strategy and a two-way internal communication mechanism should be designed at the beginning of a future action, which will increase coordination and accountability for decisions and planning. This will be integrated in the management structure of the Action and will be part of the PAC meetings.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: DG INTPA, EUD India; and implementing partner(s)</i></p>
#R14	<p>The sustainability of activities should be planned with an early exit strategy and continued support mechanisms from the local partner/s. The strategy needs to be developed, presented, and discussed at least 6-months before the end of the project; and finalised with the project Final Report. The strategy should particularly target Indian sub-national public and EU MS in India.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: implementing partner(s)</i></p>
#R15	<p>There is a need to identify at the early stage of the project a platform that can host all project materials and deliverables and can work as the main knowledge sharing platform and project webpage.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: implementing partner(s)</i></p>
#R16	<p>Ensuring that stakeholders engaged in the actions are featured and involved in the communication efforts is imperative. Activities on outreach should be considered also beyond the Action’s specific communication, visibility and outreach strategies: This can be reinforced via the participation of implementing partners to other fora and events to communication the objectives of the Action and further raise the visibility of the EU-India CDMM and of the EU.</p>

	<i>Main implementation responsibility: implementing partner(s)</i>
#R17	<p>A balanced approach to define action-level communication and visibility is necessary; in order to equally represent and feature the implementing partner(s) and the EU. In this way all, including potentially close partners can more easily and frequently communicate activities via their own social media.</p> <p><i>Main implementation responsibility: implementing partner(s)</i></p>

E. Annexes

Annex I - List of documents collected and reviewed

Contracts and methodological documents

- Action Fiche for Strengthening the EU-India cooperation and dialogue on Migration and Mobility
- European Union Delegation Agreement PI/2017/387-619, including the relevant Annexes: description of the action and its initial logframe, the General Conditions, budgetary plans and the communication and visibility plan.
- Addendum No. 02, European Union Delegation Agreement PI/2017/387-619, including the relevant Annexes: description of the action, its updated logframe and workplan for the extension, and revised budgetary planning.

EU strategy and other documents

- A Global Strategy for the European Union’s Foreign and Security Policy - Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe
- The EU’s Global Strategy: Three years on, looking forward
- European Commission - Press release, EU shapes its ambitious strategy on India (20/11/2018)
- Elements for an EU strategy on India, Joint Communication (20/11/2018) and other notes and communications of the EU Delegation to India
- EU-India Strategic Partnership: A Roadmap to 2025
- European Union-India Joint Declaration on Common Agenda on Migration and Mobility
- Brussels, 20.11.2018, Joint Communication to The European Parliament and The Council, Elements for an EU strategy on India
- Non-paper on enhancing cooperation on migration and mobility with India (January 2022)
- The external dimension of the new pact on migration and asylum. A focus on prevention and readmission, European Parliament Brief, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/690535/EPRS_BRI\(2021\)690535_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2021/690535/EPRS_BRI(2021)690535_EN.pdf)

ILO strategy and other documents

- India, Decent Work Country Programme for India (2018 – 2022)
- Quick Facts, Annual Evaluation Report 2020-2021
- ILO Evaluation Guidelines and Support Guidance Documentation, including relevant Guidance Notes, Checklists, Protocols, Templates and Tools
-

Reports of the Action

- Inception Report, Covering activities from 01/09/2017 to 30/11/2017
- Interim Report – Year 1, 1 September 2017- 31 August 2018
- Interim Report – Year 2, 1 September 2018- 31 August 2019
- Interim Report – Year 3, 1 September 2019- 31 August 2020
- Mid-term Evaluation of the EU-India CDMM
- Other documents and sources: Minutes of project meetings, Budget and financial reports, analytics from the project’s websites, draft Final PIMS report

From relevant websites

https://www.ilo.org/newdelhi/whatwedo/projects/WCMS_572866/lang--en/index.htm
<https://www.icmpd.org/our-work/projects/india-eu-cooperation-and-dialogue-on-migration-and-mobility-india-eu-cdmm>
<https://mea.gov.in/icm.htm> and its social media account: <https://twitter.com/icmnewdelhi>
 Relevant studies, reviews and checklists and baseline reports, Policy briefs, Event reports

From other websites

- Service for Foreign Policy Instruments <https://partnership-instrument-map.ec.europa.eu/>
- United Nations Network on Migration, <https://migrationnetwork.un.org/projects/eu-india-cooperation-and-dialogue-migration-and-mobility>
- News agencies and online newspapers, such as Business Standard https://www.business-standard.com/article/news-ani/india-eu-hold-high-level-talks-on-migration-mobility-119071200104_1.html or Wionews, <https://www.wionews.com/india-news/india-european-union-hold-high-level-talks-on-migration-mobility-235167>
- Europe-India: new strategic challenges, Karine Lisbonne-de Vergeron European Issue n°616, 13/12/2021, <https://www.robert-schuman.eu/en/european-issues/0616-europe-india-new-strategic-challenges>
- Indian Government's approach to Emigration, June 2019. <https://medium.com/@indiamigration/indian-governments-approach-to-emigration-f55bb3419caa>
- National migrant policy: A good first draft, by Priya Deshingkar, 07 April 2021, <https://www.downtoearth.org.in/news/governance/national-migrant-policy-a-good-first-draft-76352>
- Migration and the 2030 Agenda, IOM, <https://migration4development.org/sites/default/files/2021-09/IOM-EN-BOOKLET%20WEB.pdf>

Other documents and links received and/or discussed; from/with stakeholders interviewed

- Notes from interviews conducted during the inception, desk and final phases of the evaluation
- Twitter of the German Ambassador to India & Bhutan <https://twitter.com/AmbLindnerIndia/status/1422025421722296322?s=20&t=Xqza-NJSuuJt0cLj1HO-g>
- GOPIO, <http://www.gopio.net/>
- NASSCOM, <https://nasscom.in/>
- UNI-Italia, <http://www.uni-italia.it/it/>
- WIPRO, <https://www.wipro.com/>
- Presentation of GOPIO and activities involved in the Action

Annex II – List of stakeholders that were interviewed

Name	Organisation/ Institution
Abbagani Ramu	MEA, India
Benoit Sauveroché	EC, EUD to India
Bruno di Boni	EC, DG HOME
Christine Oberauer	Federal Ministry of the Interior, Austria
Dagmar Walter	ILO India
Eline Houwer	EC, EUD to India
Federica Maria Giove	Uni-Italia
Gagan Sabharwal	NASSCOM, India
Gulshan Sachdeva	Jawaharlal Nehru University, India
Joana Fernandes	ICMPD, seconded by the Government of Portugal
Manoj Kumar	GOPIO France
Marco Funk	EC, DG HOME
Maria Madrid Pina	EC, DG HOME
Matej Dornik	EC, EEAS-BANGKOK, ex. EUD to India
Mehen Poinosawmy	GOPIO France
Naozad Hodiwala	ICMPD
Parminder Kakria	WIPRO, India
Philipp von Ritter	Embassy of Germany to India - education section
Rucha Bagul	GOPIO France
Seeta Sharma	ILO India
Surabhi Singh	ICM, India
Tarun Kalwani	GOPIO France