

# **EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT**

**Free Movement of Persons and Transhumance in the IGAD Region: Improving Opportunities for Regular Labour Mobility**

## **FINAL REPORT**

## **PROJECT'S BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

The IGAD region covers eight countries: Djibouti, Eritrea<sup>1</sup>, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda and South Sudan. Together, these countries form a diverse region, comprising areas of economic growth and investment, on the one hand, and areas prone to natural and manmade disasters that lead to humanitarian crises, on the other.

Despite differences, the eight countries that make up the IGAD regional economic community, share a number of challenges and opportunities as they move towards regional integration. While several countries have experienced strong economic growth rates in recent years, this has yet to translate into significant job creation. Labour markets must absorb large numbers of new workers entering the labour force each year as a result of population growth and migrants, with difficulties in creating productive, formal sector employment.

Labour migration can provide a solution to reduce the pressures on national labour markets that do not provide sufficient opportunities for decent work. Indeed, there is increasing recognition that free movement agreements have an immediate effect on the decent working conditions of migrant workers, as they provide access to legal channels for migration as well as a normative framework for addressing the rights of migrants.

As such, the overall objective of this project is to facilitate free movement of persons in the IGAD region in order to enhance regional economic integration and development, and specifically to improve opportunities for regulated labour mobility and decent work within IGAD countries.

The project's interventions cover two main areas: knowledge-building and operational implementation. The knowledge-building component seeks to deepen understanding of migration and labour market dynamics in the region, including the constraints and opportunities for employment creation and causes of skills shortages. It also aims to build the capacity of key labour markets actors.

The operational component seeks to provide pilot actions for the development of employment and skills opportunities in the Ethiopia-Sudan migration corridor, so as to serve as models to be replicated or incorporated into broader national and regional interventions. The intervention strategy seeks to create employment for nationals and current and potential migrants through value chain development, which focuses on developing market systems that offer opportunities for job creation and improved job quality. In parallel, it supports skills development and recognition, access to finance, and the respect of gender equality and the fundamental rights of migrant workers will be addressed.

## **PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT**

In accordance with ILO policy governing technical cooperation projects, an evaluability assessment is required for projects over a budget of USD 5 million, which is the case for the present project "Free Movement of Persons and Transhumance in the IGAD Region: Improving Opportunities for Regular Labour Mobility.

---

<sup>11</sup> Eritrea suspended its membership in 2007

Evaluability is the extent to which a project/program can be evaluated in a reliable and credible manner. It is a results based management (RBM) tool to ensure that its key elements are included at the point of departure of a project.

The main purposes of an evaluability assessment are to: a) improve management effectiveness and accountability; b) define realistic expected results; c) ensure that the project monitor progress toward the achievement of expected results; d) guarantee that the project can be evaluable (mid-term review and final evaluation); e) ensure that the project report on performance; and d) integrate lessons learned into management decisions.

**METHODOLOGY**

To support results-based management of ILO projects and programmes, it is critical that its design meet the minimum standards for monitoring and evaluation (M&E). This can be determined by assessing a set of design-specific aspects prior or during first year of implementation.

This assessment was carried out using the evaluability instrument, presented in the inception report and validated by ILO, to score the project on a set of M&E criteria in order to analyse them and provide recommendations for improvement. The seven criteria used to review the project’s M&E strategy are:

- 1. Clarity of objectives/outcomes
- 2. Quality of Indicators
- 3. Establishment of baselines
- 4. Inclusion of time-bound milestones
- 5. Assessment of risks and assumptions
- 6. Comprehensiveness of M&E system
- 7. Validity of methodology for gender analysis

Each criteria comprises a set of statements to be assessed according to a scoring scale from 1 (no content) to 4 (very good content). Also, each criteria has been attributed a weighting depending on the order of importance. There is no such standard or agreed weighting, but assuming that for a project to be evaluated, at least two elements are necessary. These are clear formulation of outcomes, and SMART indicators with baselines and targets. These 2 fundamentals have then the same and higher weighting. The other elements are also important with less weighting.

Therefore, the weighting score for the criteria “Clarity of outcomes and outputs” and “Quality of indicators with established baselines and targets” has been set to 30% each. The remaining criteria have the same weighting score set to 10% each.

Once the weighting score for each criterion is calculated, the sum of all these scores constitutes the final score. This final or composite score corresponds to the following conclusion:

Fully Evaluable:	3.5>= final score <= 4
Mostly Evaluable can improve:	2.5>= final score <3.5
Limited Evaluability needs substantial improvement:	1.5>= final score <2.5
Not Evaluable:	final score < 1.5

## FINDINGS

### 1. Objectives and Outcomes

#### **Finding 1: Coherent, Relevant, and Close alignment with regional, EU, UN and ILO priorities**

The project's outcomes are in line with regional and EU priorities. IGAD addresses migration through its Regional Migration Policy Framework (RMPF). The RMPF provides strategic recommendations on various aspects of migration management while building the capacity of IGAD member states to develop national migration policies that address specific migration related challenges in a comprehensive and holistic manner. The RMPF is being operationalised through a Migration Action Plan (MAP) 2015-2020 whose strategic priorities include better management of labour migration, supporting and facilitating the cross-border and internal mobility of pastoralist communities, building national data systems on migration and accelerating economic integration and prosperity through the facilitation of free movement of people in the IGAD region.

This project contributes to EU Trust Fund objectives, which are: (1) creating greater economic and employment opportunities by promoting the progressive establishment of a free movement protocol within the IGAD region; (2) strengthening resilience of communities and in particular the most vulnerable – in this specific case, pastoralists; and (3) improving improved migration management, by laying the ground for a better system of legal migration among IGAD countries.

The project is aligned with ILO's global Policy Outcome 9 "Promoting fair and effective labour migration policies": Improved national legislation, policies and bilateral or multilateral agreements that are fair, effective and gender sensitive, inclusive of persons with disabilities, aimed at reducing governance gaps related to international labour migration and mobility in the protection of migrant workers' rights and the functioning of labour markets, in line with international labour standards; and Strengthened capacity to implement and monitor fair governance frameworks and to deliver inclusive services for the protection of migrant workers' labour rights; the promotion of productive employment and decent work for migrant workers, refugees, and other forcibly displaced persons.

The project's outcomes contribute to SDGs 8 and 10, in particular SDG target 8.8 and SDG target 10.7. Indeed, target 8.8 is to "Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments of all workers, including migrant workers, particularly women migrants, and those in precarious employment". Target 10.7 is to "Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies".

The project is within the framework intervention of Ethiopia DWCP for the period 2018-20. Specifically, the project contributes to Ethiopia DWCP Priority 1 "Promoting productive and decent employment for sustainable development and poverty reduction", Outcome 3 "Conducive environment created for vulnerable groups with particular attention to youth, women, PWDs, PLWHAs and Migrants to address decent jobs creation", CPO indicator 3.2 "Improved Labour Migration Governance to facilitate fair and effective migration". Sudan DWCP is under development.

For Ethiopia UNDAF, the project supports the achievement of Outcomes 2 and 11, particularly Outputs 2.2 and 11.3. For Sudan, the project seems to contribute to UNDAF focus area 1 and 5.

### **Finding 2: Partially clear articulation of the results statements**

An Outcome is the likely or achieved medium-term effects of an intervention's. The articulation of the project's outcomes is relatively clear. While Outcome 1 is clearly formulated, Outcome 2 is not. Indeed, this outcome is formulated as a) an activity; and b) the target group is not specified.

Outputs are the products, capital goods and services which result immediately from a development intervention's activities and within the control of the organisation. With that definition, three outputs (outputs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.5) out of seven are very well formulated. Two out of seven are relatively of good content (outputs 1.1 and 1.2).

For Outputs 2.3 and 2.4, there is a need for a complete reformulation. Output 2.3 is formulated as an outcome and its activities do not lead directly to its achievement. Output 2.4 does not specify who is concerned by the expected change and for what purpose.

### **Finding 3: Mostly clear logical framework**

A logical framework (logframe) is a management tool used to improve the design of interventions, most often at the project level. The strategic elements (Overall objective, outcomes, outputs and activities) have been identified by the project, as well as their causal relationships. However, the logic and causality between outcome 2 and output 2.3 is not clear. If output 2.3 is removed, outcome 2 can still be achieved and the causality still more logical by implementing outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5.

### **Finding 4: Mostly close alignment between activities, outputs, outcomes and overall objective**

The completion of the activities identified result directly in the production of outputs, which in turn contribute to the achievement of outcomes. The only exception is for output 2.3. The activities listed in the logframe under output 2.3 do not have a direct effect on end beneficiaries as it is formulated. The direct change will be at the level of financial services providers. Moreover, the two activities identified are not logically enough to achieve the output.

## **2. Indicators with baselines and targets**

### **Finding 5: Relatively SMART indicators**

The main issues are measurability and relevancy. It is formulated mostly either as activities or outputs, sometimes as targets, and in some cases one indicator comprises 2 to 3 aspects, while one indicator should be measuring one type of change. Therefore, there is no unit of measurement for the indicators.

Moreover, they tend to indicate the direction of change while they should not and need to be neutral. Also, most of them are relatively relevant for performance measurement and need to be reformulated and more specific.

The indicators use very little quantitative or qualitative variables to verify changes produced by the project relative to what was planned. Quantitative indicators are represented by a number, percentage or ratio. In contrast, qualitative indicators seek to measure quality and often are based on perception, opinion or levels of satisfaction. Indicators should be expressed in neutral language, such as 'the level or degree of satisfaction'. It should be noted that there can be an overlap between

quantitative and qualitative indicators. Some statistical data or information stated with number can provide qualitative meaning. For example, a survey might measure on a scale of 1-10, which would reflect quality rather than quantity.

**Finding 6: No baselines and targets for indicators**

The baselines for the project's indicators have not been set yet. However, the project has finalised five studies and assessments to establish the baseline for all the project's indicators.

Likewise for targets, they have not been set for the project's indicators, except for indicator 1 of outcome 1, but even this indicator needs some improvement.

**Finding 7: Data collection is feasible**

According to key informant interviews with the project's staff, they are confident that the stakeholders have the capacities to collect and analyse required data to inform the project's indicators. Moreover, as the implementation is insured directly by the project, in partnership with different national and regional partners, there is a control on quality check and accuracy of data, particularly for Outcome 2 where the geographic area of the interventions is limited.

The delay in achieving output 1.1 of Outcome 1 might indicate that one of the reasons was an issue in the availability of data for baseline studies, but data could still be collected.

**3. Milestones**

**Finding 8: No milestones for outputs and outcomes**

Milestones, per se, have not been set for outcomes and outputs. However, the project has used Gantt chart for planning the activities, and this is a good basis to set the milestones. If the project is extended for an additional 12 months, then there is a high probability that the milestones will be achieved. If not, the project needs to revise its activities and decide to focus and redirect its efforts on the achievement of some specific outputs, instead of all.

**4. Risks and Assumptions**

**Finding 9: Very well identified assumptions**

The assumptions to achieving outcomes have been comprehensively and very well identified. Also, there are internal and external assumptions which are clearly stated as well.

**Finding 10: Mostly well identified risks and risk-mitigation measures**

The risks to achieving outputs and outcomes have been identified, so are the mitigation measures. Risk assessments consider a wide range of potential risks, including strategic, environmental, financial, operational, organizational, political and regulatory risks.

The risk levels are at the appropriate level. However, for the risk "Lack of conducive environment or policy for migrants' right to work", one of the mitigation strategies is to develop financial products specific to migrants' access to finance. It is not clear how financial products or services will improve or enable a more conducive environment or policy for migrants. Secondly, and according to Doing business 2019 for Ethiopia and Sudan, there are difficulties and constraints for getting credit. So what

would be the case for migrants who are at a higher risk of solvency due to their status per se (moving from one country to another) with a high risk for financial providers of not recovering their credits? Therefore this risk should be added as "the willingness of financial services institutions to provide micro-credits to migrants", levelled at high.

## **5. Monitoring and evaluation system**

### **Finding 11: Limited M&E plan**

The M&E plan is used to systematically plan the collection of data to assess and demonstrate progress made in achieving expected results. It highlights mechanisms or modalities for monitoring the achievement of outputs and contribution toward achievement of outcomes. The project does not have an M&E plan per se, but a results matrix which incorporates some elements such as indicators, means of verification, and assumptions. These elements can be used to develop a proper M&E plan.

The human and technical resources available for the project's implementation and for the monitoring are good. The implementation and backstopping staff have solid experience in monitoring projects and programmes. For the financial aspect, there is no indication based on the documents and interviews, but the project has almost finalised all the studies for baselines, therefore it can be induced that similar financial resources will be engaged for data collection and analysis.

### **Finding 12: No performance management framework (PMF)**

The project does not have a performance management framework. The PMF is an essential tool and part of the M&E system to monitor the performance of a project or programme and provides for assessment of the results. It comprises in one document all the performance indicators, with their baselines, targets, methods of data collection, frequency for data collection, means of verification, staff and stakeholders responsible, and the assumptions. It can be declined into a monitoring tool in order to obtain real-time data and contribute to evidence based decision making to allow informed adjustments to activities.

## **6. Gender equality**

### **Finding 13: No gender equality integrated in the project's interventions**

From the desk review (PRODOC, logframe) and interviews with the project staff, there is no concrete and factual information that the baseline studies include analyses of relevant gender concerns (i.e. a gender analysis), and therefore it is not clear how the theory of change will adequately integrates gender equality or address specific gender concerns. The logical framework does not contain any gender-disaggregated indicators. Therefore, the project will not be able at this stage to collect data sufficiently sex-disaggregated, nor be able to measure any specific or asymmetric results for men and women.

Some key informants interviewed argue that the studies assess labour market, migration governance and skills development from a system perspective, and therefore it is "not relevant to analyse gender equality while dealing with systems". This argument can be understandable, but gender analysis can still apply to assess how systems are responsive to gender concerns. Moreover, it is a fundamental principle of ILO work to mainstream gender equality and women's rights into planning and programming its interventions.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the scoring scale detailed in the methodology section, this project obtains a total weighted score of 2.29 meaning that its evaluability is limited and needs some substantial improvement. Limited articulation of indicators and lack or inexistence of baselines and targets, in addition to a lack of a proper M&E plan are the elements that infringe seriously the evaluability of the project. Gender equality is another concern but of less effect in relation to the project's evaluability.

Milestones for outputs and outcomes have not yet been set, but the project's Gantt chart gives some indication for this purpose.

Risks and assumptions are mostly well identified, but there are some additional risks that the project might need to consider and monitor during implementation.

Outcomes and outputs are well articulated in general, and most importantly they are relevant to answer the issues identified in relation to labour migration. However, some needs either to be reformulated or to be more precise.

The table below summarizes the scores obtained for each evaluability assessment criteria. The detailed *assessment tool is attached in annex 1*.

	Raw score	Weight	Weighted score
Objectives/Outcomes Score	3,20	0,30	0,96
Indicators, Baselines & Targets Score	1,75	0,30	0,53
Milestones Score	2,25	0,05	0,11
Risk & Assumptions Score	2,75	0,20	0,55
M&E plan Score	1,40	0,10	0,14
Gender equality Score	0,00	0,05	0,00
<b>Final Score</b>	<b>1,89</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>2,29</b>
<b>Final assessment</b>	<b>Limited Evaluability. Needs substantial improvement</b>		

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following actions are recommended in order to improve the evaluability of the project:

**Recommendation 1** : revise the logframe, especially to reformulate Outcome 2 and outputs 2.3 and 2.4. The following justified reformulations, highlighted in bold, are suggested where applicable:

Original Results / Activities of the logframe	Proposed revision	Justification
<b>Objective 1</b> Provide increased access to employment and skills development opportunities in strategic market sectors along the Ethiopia-Sudan migration	<b>Objective/Outcome 1</b> The knowledge base for developing labour market mobility policies and measures, in IGAD member States, <b>is strengthened</b>	This is how a result should be formulated



Original Results / Activities of the logframe	Proposed revision	Justification
<b>Result 1.1</b> Policy-relevant research is produced and disseminated on the linkages between regional migration and labour market issues.	<b>Result/Output 1.1</b> Policy-relevant research is produced and disseminated on the linkages between regional migration and labour markets <b>dynamics in the IGAD region</b>	Using the word “issues” in the original formulation of this result, underlines that migration creates labour issues, while the project is trying to demonstrate the contrary. It could be replaced by “dynamics”. Moreover, the studies will concern labour market dynamics in 7 countries; therefore market should be in plural.
<b>Activity 1.1.1</b> Conduct comprehensive baseline assessments on labour migration and mobility governance in five countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya and Uganda) and 3 rapid assessments in other member States (Somalia, South Sudan and Eritrea)	<b>Activity 1.1.1</b> Conduct comprehensive baseline assessments, <b>including gender analysis</b> , on labour migration and mobility governance in <b>IGAD region</b> (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, and Uganda)	This is just to remind that these assessments will consider the gender dimension and include a gender analysis (if still possible). Moreover, same baseline assessments should be done for all countries. The project cannot use a method for 5 countries and another for 3 countries to collect baseline information, as stated in the original formulation.
<b>Activity 1.1.2</b> Conduct labour market analyses to understand overall dynamics of labour shortages and surpluses in up to five countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, Uganda)	<b>Activity 1.1.2</b> Conduct labour market analyses to understand <b>labour shortages and surpluses in IGAD region</b> (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, and Uganda)	Analysing the labour shortages and surplus will come up with the overall dynamics; therefore there is no need to state in the original formulation.
<b>Activity 1.1.3</b> Map out and assess TVET systems in up to five countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya and Uganda)	<b>Activity 1.1.3</b> Map out and assess <b>existing technical and vocational trainings, qualification frameworks and recognition arrangements in the IGAD region</b> (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, and Uganda)	Assessing a system is too vast, while the idea is to map and assess existing TVET trainings and the employability outcomes of these trainings.
<b>Activity 1.1.4</b> Conduct multi-country study on the links between climate change, migration and employment	<b>Activity 1.1.4</b> Conduct multi-country study on the links between climate change, migration and employment, <b>including how it impacts women</b>	This to remind the project to add a gender dimension to this activity, as general literature shows that women can be more affected by the consequences of climate change
Original Results / Activities of the logframe	Proposed revision	Justification

<b>Activity 1.1.5</b> 2 tripartite meetings to disseminate findings of assessments	<b>Activity 1.1.5</b> Organise tripartite meetings to disseminate findings of assessments conducted under <b>activities 1.1.1, 1.1.2, and 1.1.4</b>	
<b>Result 1.2</b> Labour market actors have increased capacity to collect and analyse labour market and skills indicators and link migration governance and labour market issues	<b>Result/Output 1.2</b> <b>Key</b> labour market actors, <b>in IGAD member States</b> , have increased capacity to collect and analyse <b>labour migration, labour</b> market and skills indicators and link migration governance and labour market issues.	In order to link migration governance and labour market issues, key labour market actors (and not all of them as the original formulation states), need to be trained in analysing labour migration too. For this reason, it has been added in the new formulation.
<b>Activity 1.2.1</b> Develop and implement a training plan for government officials and social partners on labour migration governance; deliver a regional “Academy on Labour Migration”	<b>Activity 1.2.1</b> <b>Organize a regional training on Labour Migration</b> for government officials and social partners <b>of IGAD member states</b>	The proposed changes are more specific for activities. Developing a training plan is an input for an activity.
<b>Activity 1.2.2</b> Develop and rollout tools for mainstreaming the rights of migrant workers	None	
<b>Activity 1.2.3</b> Conduct training on anticipating and matching skills needs	<b>Activity 1.2.3</b> Conduct training, <b>for key government officials of IGAD member States</b> , on anticipating and matching skills needs.	This is more specific as it identifies the participants in this training.
<b>Activity 1.2.4</b> Support data collection exercises for local and regional skills forecasting by public employment services	None	
<b>Objective 2</b> Provide increased access to employment and skills development opportunities in strategic market sectors along the Ethiopia-Sudan migration corridor	<b>Objective/Outcome 2</b> <b>Migrants, potential migrants and nationals have</b> increased access to employment and skills development opportunities in strategic market sectors along the Ethiopia-Sudan migration corridor	The initial formulation was for an activity. The new formulation specifies what is expected to be realized and for which target groups (the end beneficiaries)
<b>Result 2.1</b> Priority market sectors with potential for growth and job creation for national and migrant women and men are identified	<b>Result/Output 2.1</b> None	
Original Results / Activities of the logframe	Proposed revision	Justification

<p><b>Activity 2.1.1</b> Conduct rapid market assessment in 2-4 sectors with potential for employment creation and improved working conditions, in particular for women and youth</p>	None	
<p><b>Activity 2.1.2</b> Facilitate consultative meeting with key stakeholders to select sector(s) for value chain initiatives</p>	None	
<p><b>Activity 2.1.3</b> Undertake value chain analysis in identified sector</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.1.3</b> Undertake value chain analysis in identified sector(s)</p>	Several market sectors for job creation can be identified following this activity; therefore “sector” should be in plural.
<p><b>Result 2.2</b> Intervention strategy to support the development of selected value chain is developed</p>	<p><b>Result/Output 2.2</b> Intervention strategy to support the development of selected value <b>chains</b> is developed</p>	Same as above
<p><b>Activity 2.2.1</b> Develop initial action plan in consultation with market actors</p>	None	
<p><b>Activity 2.2.2</b> Support formulation of detailed value chain intervention framework</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.2.2</b> Support formulation of detailed value chain intervention framework <b>for selected sectors</b></p>	
<p><b>Activity 2.2.3</b> Support implementation of selected value chain development initiatives</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.2.3</b> Support implementation of selected value chain development initiatives, <b>based on activity 2.2.2</b></p>	
<p><b>Activity 2.2.4</b> Regional workshop to share best practices and lessons learnt on value chain development</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.2.4</b> <b>Organise a</b> regional workshop to share best practices and lessons learnt on value chains development</p>	
<p><b>Result 2.3</b> National and migrant women and men have access to relevant financial services to take advantage of economic opportunities across the identified value chains</p>	<p><b>Result/Output 2.3</b> <b>Financial service providers have increased their capacities to support nationals and migrants’ access relevant financial services to take advantage of economic opportunities,</b> across the identified value chains</p>	The project will support financial services providers, and not directly train end beneficiaries. Therefore, this output is re formulated as such to reflect it. Moreover, the original formulation of result 2.3 is for outcomes and not outputs. However, it is unclear how

		logically output 2.3 will have an effect in achieving Outcome 2. In other words, if output 2.3 is removed, Outcome 2 can still be achieved with the other outputs.
Original Results / Activities of the logframe	Proposed revision	Justification
<b>Activity 2.3.1</b> Develop capacity-building activities to provide access and use to diversified financial services through financial literacy; develop and deliver training of trainers programme	<b>Activity 2.3.1</b> <b>Map and assess the capacity of financial service providers to respond to the demands and needs of the project target groups</b>	This is to set the main activities in a logical sequencing for output 2.3. Also, these additional activities would give more “weight” to keeping output 2.3 if there is no possibility to delete it and merge its activities with output 2.2. Logically, assuming that financial literacy (with no entrepreneurship trainings) will increase access to employment opportunities is still to be demonstrated, in reference to literature in this domain. It is necessary to add supporting entrepreneurship activities within the logic of the project. However, and knowing the limits of the implementation timeframe of the project, it is realistic not to add entrepreneurship training and supporting activities.
<b>Activity 2.3.2</b> Support financial service providers to provide more accessible and affordable services to micro, small and medium sized enterprises; map demand and supply and assess capacity of financial service providers and provide training and technical assistance as needed.	<b>Activity 2.3.2</b> <b>Develop Financial education programme, tools and learning materials</b>	
	<b>Activity 2.3.3</b> <b>Develop and deliver training of trainers programme in financial education</b>	
	<b>Activity 2.3.4</b> <b>Organize capacity-building activities for financial service providers to develop more accessible and affordable services to nationals and migrants</b>	
<b>Result 2.4</b> Skills and vocational training programmes are developed in line with identified market needs	<b>Result/Output 2.4</b> <b>The TVETs have developed skills and vocational training programs that respond to market needs</b>	The new formulation specifies what institutions are targeted by the support of the project and for what purpose.
<b>Activity 2.4.1</b> Set up tripartite sector skills councils to support skill development in a specific sector	<b>Activity 2.4.1</b> Set up tripartite sector skills councils to support skills development in <b>the sectors identified by activity 2.1.1</b>	
Original Results / Activities of the logframe	Proposed revision	Justification

<p><b>Activity 2.4.2</b> Identify occupational and skills requirements, training centres and support the development of skills-based curricula and learning materials in consultation with local government actors and social partners</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.4.2</b> <b>Assess the capacity of TVETs and support them to provide trainings in selected value chains and fields in the project’s intervention areas</b></p>	<p>The original formulation implies that the project will develop the curricula, while this will be done by TVETs with a support from the project.</p>
<p><b>Result 2.5</b> Mechanisms for skills recognition in place to increase labour mobility</p>	<p><b>Result/Output 2.5</b> Mechanisms for skills recognition <b>are</b> in place to increase labour mobility</p>	
<p><b>Activity 2.5.1</b> Design model occupational and skills profiles relevant for the sub-sector in collaboration with social partners</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.5.1</b> Design model occupational and skills profiles relevant for the sub-sector, <b>identified in activity 2.1.2</b>, in collaboration with social partners</p>	
<p><b>Activity 2.5.2</b> Support the development of TVET quality assurance guidelines for training and certification of skills obtained in the sub-sector</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.5.2</b> Support the development of TVET quality assurance guidelines for training and certification of skills obtained in the sub-sector, <b>including through informal and on-the-job training</b></p>	
<p><b>Activity 2.5.3</b> Disseminate quality assurance guidelines and good practices for skills recognition and accreditation of training providers</p>	<p><b>Activity 2.5.3</b> Disseminate quality assurance guidelines and good practices for skills recognition <b>to Ministry of Education and TVETs</b></p>	

**Recommendation 2** : given the remaining time of 14-18 months to implement the activities and achieve the results, it is realistic to conclude that the project’s performance could be at stake, as the results should be commensurate with the environment, existing and potential capacities, resources, and timeframe. If a no-cost extension is not granted by the EUTF, there will be a need to adjust the results statements. Moreover, it may raise undue expectations which cannot be met, and thus could undermine the overall project and collaboration with the donor. Therefore, it is recommended to re-focus the project intervention, as well as the expected results. It is suggested two options:

- **Option 1 to Enhance employment generating sectors:** the project focuses on the realization of Outputs 2.1 and 2.2. In this case, Outcome 2 should be articulated as the following *“Migrants, potential migrants and nationals have increased access to employment opportunities in strategic market sectors along the Ethiopia-Sudan migration corridor”*. The indicator “Number of trainees that access new sources of finance” should be removed.

- **Option 2 to Increase skilled labour mobility:** the project focuses on the achievement of Outputs 2.4 and 2.5. In that scenario, Outcome 2 would be *“Migrants, potential migrants and nationals have increased access to skills development and skills recognition along the Ethiopia-Sudan migration corridor”*. The indicator “Number of trainees that access new sources of finance” should be removed.

The final decision remains with the project’s management team, but **definitely it is not recommended for the project to invest more level of efforts to realize Output 2.3 on financial literacy, which does not contribute directly to achieving Outcome 2.**

**Recommendation 3** : develop the project’s performance management framework to improve the M&E system.

The PMF will elaborate on the methods to be used, frequency and responsibility to ensure that performance information is collected on a regular basis, which in turn allows for real-time, evidence based decision making. The PMF should be validated with partners in order to ensure the availability of data within the periodicity set with them. *The PMF developed for the project is in annex 2.*

This proposed PMF takes into consideration the indicators of EUTF in the reporting format and in their quarterly reports.

**Recommendation 4** : adapt ILO’s template for annual reports to donors, in order to fit EUTF needs. By incorporating EUTF indicators in the PMF, progress reporting will be facilitated for both ILO and the donor. As such, an *adaptation of PARDEV template for annual report is suggested in annex 3.*

**Recommendation 5** : take into consideration other risks for the second component (Outcome 2). One could be the *“ease of doing business in Ethiopia and Sudan”*, i.e. an enabling environment for developing and sustaining enterprises along the value chains identified.

As there is no indication or information on this subject given by the project, World Bank Doing Business 2019 report could be a proxy indication to assess the level of this risk. An economy's ease of doing business score is reflected on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the lowest and 100 represents the best performance. The ease of doing business ranking ranges from 1 to 190. According to Doing Business 2019 for Ethiopia, the ease of doing business is ranked 150 out of 190 with a score of 49.06, while the regional average is 51.61. For Sudan, it is ranked 162/190 with a score 48.84. **Therefore, this risk should be added and the mitigation measures identified and considered when developing the intervention strategy to support the development of selected value chains (output 2.2).**

The other risk to be considered is *“the willingness of financial services institutions to provide micro-credits to migrants”*, levelled at high

Finally, the risk matrix (in the PRODOC) should be completed by setting the frequency of its assessment by the management team. This can be performed quarterly during monitoring meetings. ***A revised risks matrix can be found in annex 4.***

**Recommendation 6** : add the monitoring and adjustment of the risks matrix during the planning meetings, and/or when developing the annual action plans. ***A proposed frequency for re-assessing the level of risks, as well as the mitigation measures, is proposed in annex 4.***

**Recommendation 7** : include a gender analysis when conducting the market assessment studies in order for the project to be compliant with ILO's gender equality policy, and to be able to identify any gender concerns where the intervention can improve women's rights. ***The corresponding adjustments to implement this recommendation were formulated in the revised logframe and in the PMF.***