



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

MIGRATION CRISIS SUPPORT TO ADDRESS MIGRANT EXPULSIONS IN WESTERN TANZANIA PROJECT

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT



Leonard Turugari

March 2015

Contents

List of Tables	i
List of Acronyms	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Introduction: IOM in Tanzania	1
1.2 Migrants and Migration Management in Tanzania	1
1.3 The IOM Response to Forceful Expulsion of Irregular Migrants from Tanzania	2
CHAPTER 2: THE PROGRAMME EVALUATION	3
2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation	3
2.2 Specific Objectives of the Evaluation	3
2.3 Scope of the Evaluation	3
2.4 Methodology	5
2.4.1 Sampling	5
2.4.2 Data Collection	5
2.4.3 Evaluation Conceptual Framework	5
2.4.4 The analytical framework	6
2.4.5 Output rating system	6
2.4.6 Rating of Outcomes	6
2.1.1 Assessment of Impact	7
CHAPTER 3: KEY FINDINGS	8
3.2 Relevance of the Project	9
3.3 Project Effectiveness	12
3.3.1 Strategic Engagement with Government	12
3.3.2 Capacity Building for Humanitarian Border Management	13
3.3.4 Implementation of e-Registration	16
3.3.5 Assisted Voluntary Returns	19
3.3.6 Orderly return	20
3.3.7 Project Implementation Partnerships and Coordination Arrangements	20
3.4 Project Efficiency and Value-for-Money Considerations	21
3.4.1 Project implementation procedures	21
3.5 Value-for-money considerations	22

3.6	Value Added by the Project	22
3.6.1	Transformative Impacts of project on the Lives of the Migrants	22
3.6.2	Transformative impacts of e-Registration of Government Way of Doing Business	23
3.7	Sustainability of Results	23
CHAPTER 4: STRATEGIC REPOSITIONING OF THE MIGRATION IN THE COUNTRY’S DEVELOPMENT AGENDA		27
4.1	Tanzania’s Commitment to Migration Management	27
4.2	The Migration Crisis Support Project: Unlocking Opportunities for Elevation of Migration in the National Development Agenda	28
CHAPTER 5: ENABLERS, LESSONS LEARNT AND BEST PRACTICES		30
5.1	Result Enablers	30
5.2	Lessons Learnt	30
5.3	Best Practices	30
6.1	Conclusion	31
6.2	Recommendations	32
6.2.1	Policy level recommendations	32
6.2.2	Programmatic Recommendations	32
References		34
ANNEX I: Output and Outcome Rating Tool		35
ANNEX II: Terms of Reference		40
ANNEX III: List of Key Informants Interviewed		43
ANNEX IV: Research Instruments		44

List of Tables

Table 1: Reconstructed results structure and activities	4
Table 2: A sample Output Measurement Tool	6
Table 3: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: Strategic Engagement with Government Outcome	13
Table 4: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: Capacity building for HBM	15
Table 5: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: Capacity building of ISD Officials for e-Registration	15
Table 6: Migrants registered by district	17
Table 7: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: e-Registration Implementation Outcome..	20
Table 8: Ratings of Impact	24
Table 9: Impact ratings by indicator performance	25

List of Acronyms

GoT	Government of Tanzania
AVR	Assisted Voluntary Return
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ISD	Immigration Services Department
UNDAP	United Nations Development Assistance Plan
EAC	East African Community
JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
DFID	Department for International Development
ACBC	African Capacity Building Centre
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
DAC	Development Assistance Cooperation
HBM	Humanitarian Border Management
SOPs	Standard Operation Procedures
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America
DEX	Direct Execution
NEX	National Execution
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
MTR	Mid Term Review
COMMIT	Comprehensive Migration Management Strategy in Tanzania
CSFD	Centre for the Study of Forced Migration
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
BMIS	Border Management Information System
SC	Steering Committee

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to all the people who have made this report possible. First and foremost, I am grateful to the IOM Tanzania management and programme staff for their kind cooperation in providing information as well as arranging meetings for field visits, under the leadership of Tamara Keating, the Programme Coordinator, who was the IOM focal person for the evaluation. Special thanks go to Pius of IOM Kigoma Sub-Office and Gracia Anthony in the Programme Support Unit (PMSU) for scheduling interviews under very short notice. Their dedication to this exercise made it possible for the consultant to meet most of the key stakeholders for the evaluation.

I am particularly indebted to the officials in the Department of Immigration Services in the Ministry of Home Affairs, and those in the Ministry of Local Government in Kigoma Regional Offices and the District Offices for Kigoma Urban, Kigoma Rural and Uvinza District who made themselves readily available for discussion and shared their insightful views with the consultant.

The production of this report would not have been possible without the invaluable contribution of Johanitha Tiba who worked tirelessly in the data collection process by contacting community FGDs, key informant and household interviews.

Lastly, special gratitude is given to the senior management of IOM Tanzania, especially the Head of Mission, Mr. Damien Thuriaux for creating time in their busy schedule to provide quality interviews with the team leader, as well as input into the draft report.

Without the cooperation and support of all these people, the consultant would not have been able to produce the report in its current shape and quality.

Leonard Turugari
Social Development Consultant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STUDY BACKGROUND

The International Organization for Migration's office in Dar es Salaam was opened in 2004 and works in four main areas of migration management that include: Migration and Development, Facilitating Migration, Regulating Migration and addressing Forced Migration. Tanzania has a long history as a hub for migration. This to large extent owes to the long periods of peace and tranquillity that have prevailed in the country, which has made it a safe destination for those fleeing from conflicts in neighbouring countries. The irregular migration phenomenon has mostly affected the north-western regions that include Kagera, Kigoma and Rukwa. The migrants in these regions originated mainly from neighbouring countries that include Burundi, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo, and to a lesser extent Uganda and Zambia.

In 2013 Tanzania issued a presidential which required irregular migrants to leave the country by 11th August, 2013, or face expulsion. This directive, which was mainly executed by the military under *Operation Kimbunga* resulted in the expulsion of over 65,000 migrants, with thousands getting stranded at the border with Burundi. In response IOM initiated a project this project to assist the GoT in following due process and humanitarian principles in managing the migration crisis. This would be achieved through enhanced national migration management capacity that would facilitate access to migrant documentation and regularization, and improved return migration management in the border regions of Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda. The project was a joint initiative of IOM, the Government of Tanzania and partners, funded by the United Kingdom Government's Department for International Development (DFID)

Purpose of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of this evaluation was to review the effectiveness and efficiency of the project, assess its outcome and impact, and consider prospects for sustainability, as well as to identify and document lessons learned and best practices in view of the planned replication and up-scaling of the project activities.

Scope of the Evaluation

This evaluation was "*A Terminal Outcome Evaluation*" meant to focus on whether or not the project objectives outlined above had been achieved. The evaluation was supposed to be executed within the context of the Results Framework outlined in the project document, but instrument lacked the necessary depth. The evaluation, therefore, used the results framework proposed by the mid-term review of the project as the basis for the evaluation of the project results, with additional improvements.

Limitations of the Evaluation

The evaluators faced challenges in contacting national level key informant interviews due to non-confirmation of appointments. In addition, the limited time for fieldwork could not allow for the interviewing of sizable numbers of communities and households

Study Methodology

The evaluation used a combination of quantitative and qualitative evaluation methodologies. Key research methods included: desk review of relevant documents; key informant interviews with national stakeholders (6), donor partners (1), district (10) and community level stakeholders (4); focus group discussions with migrants (1 per district); and household interviews (15 migrant households in each of the three communities covered by the study).

Evaluation conceptual framework

The evaluator assessed the whole results chain from project inputs, outputs, outcomes, and when evident, short and medium term impacts with regards to the achievement of the intended results. The evaluation of the results chain was on the understanding that IOM had more control over the inputs and processes than on the outcomes and impact.

The analytical framework

The evaluation system focused on two categories of evaluation criteria. *Category 1* criteria consisted of the four OECD/DAC key project quality and performance evaluation criteria - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. *Category 2* criteria consisted of measures of strategic positioning which included: strategic alignment, responsiveness and added value.

Output and outcome rating system

The rating system considered the level of achievement of outputs and outcomes through the assessment of available data and/or opinion of stakeholders and beneficiaries. The achievements against each key output were ranked on a colour-coded scale. The output ratings then advised the outcome ratings, which in turn also advised the impact rating. The assessment of outputs for each outcome were summarised using an Output Measurement Tool. The next step was the rating of IOM contribution towards the achievement of the results at the three levels.

KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

Quality of project design

The project design was generally of good quality. It was designed through a consultative and participatory process, giving it a wide foundation for stakeholder ownership and recognition. The project results were, however, pitched at a low level such that they underplayed the project focus on migrant rights (due to mandate considerations) and protection focus of the project.

Relevance

The project was a relevant response to the plight of the irregular migrants who were under the threat of forced deportation from Tanzanian territory. Its relevance was strengthened by its coherence to the IOM corporate planning frameworks, partner programmes and programming frameworks and national development plans. It was also consistent with the IOM mandate and country programme in Tanzania

Effectiveness

The project effectiveness was measured against each of the four project outcomes and outputs.

Outcome 1: *Increased government commitment to adhere to humanitarian standards and principles in migration management* was achieved with critical IOM contribution. The evaluation established that the project was a result of intense and protracted lobbying and negotiation between GoT on one side and the international community and development partners on the other.

Stakeholders revealed that IOM played a critical role in convincing the government on the value of an alternative to forceful expulsion of migrants. The negotiations resulted in the conclusion of a pact adopted by all the parties that committed them to support the GoT in its endeavour to adopt a protection-sensitive approach to the management of the migration crisis as well as develop a durable solution to the crisis. The results of the negotiations demonstrated partners' commitment to ensuring that GoT's citizenship and immigration laws were strictly observed. At the same time, GoT committed to adopt a Comprehensive and

protection-sensitive Migration Management Strategy in Tanzania to address, among other things, irregular migration.

Outcome 2: *Migration management agencies in Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda have improved capacities to implement HBM management principles* was achieved with critical IOM's contribution. All the interviewed immigration officials reported that due to the training on Humanitarian Border Management received under this project, there was major behaviour change in the way they were treating irregular migrants, hence cases of abuse of irregular migrants had significantly been reduced. These achievements were underpinned by the protection-sensitive migration management principle which was being championed by IOM in the project.

The building of the capacity of relevant border authorities in Humanitarian Boarder Management (HBM) through a number of steps: Assessments of HBM capacities that resulted in two HBM Assessments being contacted; HBM training for border officials; Development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for emergencies; and Resuscitation of Border Management Committees. The project also designed and procured the mobile communication and registration technology solutions.

Outcome 3: *The Tanzanian ISD has improved institutional capacity to identify, register, or regularize irregular migrants.* The evaluation concluded that the project had made good progress towards the achievement of this outcome, with IOM making significant contribution. For this reason, SOPs were prepared and adopted for the implementation of this component. Immigration officials were trained to ensure that they had the skills and knowledge necessary to roll out the registration and e-application system. The ISD officers demonstrated conversancy with the design and operation of the e-registration system. However, the registration equipment had not yet been installed at the regional offices for the continuation of migrant biometric registration as it was still being used for training.

Outcome 4: The e-registration process went through three phases which included: sensitisation, awareness raising and mobilisation of the migrants; migrant population mapping; and the biometric registration of the migrants.

The central activity of the project under review was the biometric and biographic e-registration of the target migrant population. The e-registration was done in four districts of the project pilot region of Kigoma, which were Uvinza, Kigoma Urban, Kigoma Rural and Buhigwe. The evaluation established that a total of 22,282 migrants consisting household heads and their dependence participated in the biographic and biometric data registration, thus exceeding the target of 20,000 migrants. These were subsequently issued temporary cards that gave non-AVR cases protection from deportation, initially for two years which could be extended to four years, whilst giving the ISD ample time to assess the eligibility of the individual migrants for the various options and process applications for regularisation.

The evaluation noted that, in the absence of the total number of migrant households and people identified during the household mapping exercise it was difficult to ascertain the success of the e-registration process in terms of coverage vis-à-vis the migrant population in Kigoma Region. The biometric registration of the migrants was not done against the household mapping lists. As a result unmapped people living across the border in Burundi infiltrated the registration process and there were large errors of inclusion. District level interviews also revealed that large numbers of migrants could not participate in the e-registration because of the long distances to the designated registration sites. There was also no independent process monitoring to ensure that e-registration SOPs were being followed to the letter.

Notwithstanding the process-related challenges, the project had made good progress towards achievement of this outcome, though with scope for further improvement. Whilst the achievements of the e-registration process could be below expectation in quantitative terms, the achieved significant qualitative impacts. It

build a model for the biometric registration of migrants in Tanzania whose design has great potential for improvement. Being a pilot, the challenges piloting biometric registration of migrants were achieved with significant IOM contribution.

There were, however, outstanding caseloads in Kigoma, Kagera and Geita Regions. IOM and GoT should, therefore, mobilise resources to ensure that the migrants in these regions are registered as well. In addition, the registration was not supposed to be a once-off process over a few days.

Efficiency

Project efficiency was compromised by the unavoidable delays in take-off of key project activities related to the e-registration of migrants, which was the major component of the project. The project, however, managed to accelerate implementation in the last three months of project implementation, but to some extent at the expense of quality and effectiveness.

Value for Money considerations

Generally, the project was value for money. This could be concluded from the level of project performance on the four “E’s”: efficiency, effectiveness, economy and equity. The project also realised some economies through the use of government staff for project implementation. However, equity was compromised by distance-related limited outreach, as people with disabilities, the elderly and women who could not leave their homes unattended for long periods could not participate in the registration process.

Value added

The project also made remarkable value addition, particularly in terms of its transformative impacts on the behaviour of migration authorities and host communities towards the irregular migrants. The project was the beginning of a new era for the irregular migrants in Kigoma Region of Tanzania, characterised mainly by a shift in mindsets with regards to their rights. The PVC registration card brought with it: Freedom of movement for the migrants who could as result do their daily businesses without fear of harassment or arrest by law enforcement agents; Freedom of association in the communities; Fair working conditions for migrants providing labour to the local people; Right to seek recourse to justice and protection for violation of migrants’ human rights; and Friendly access to social services.

Project sustainability

Sustainability of project outcomes was strengthened by Government leadership of the project implementation, capacity for HBM and the transformative impacts manifested through positive behaviour change in migration authorities and host communities towards the migrants. However, it was compromised by weak community ownership of the project and weak institutionalisation of capacities in Government, lack of clarity with regards to the future of e-registration in the pilot districts, and the absence of a permanent policy structure to exercise oversight over programme continuity.

Intended impact: *Irregular migrants in Tanzania have enhanced safety, protection, freedom of movement, participation and association.*

The project had made significant progress towards the achievement of its intended impact, as demonstrated by the improvements in the sense of safety, protection and belonging among the migrants. The e-registration card brought with it the enjoyment of basic human rights by the migrants. There was still, however, need to see the process to its completion when migrants would be granted permits. This will consolidate the impacts that have already begun to manifest in the short term.

Strategic repositioning of IOM

In order to unlock the kinetics in the potentials stored in government commitment for strengthening the role of migration in the development of the Tanzania’s economy IOM could utilise its *Partner of Choice in Migration Management* tag it earned through the implementation of the project under review to put in

motion key processes of concerted dialogue with, and engagement of the GoT and other key stakeholders. The project under review opened the following windows of opportunity and issues to push the migration agenda forward to become a national development priority: Dialogue and engagement; Transforming migration challenges into opportunities for all affected countries in the Region; Encourage proactive responses to migration; Need to influence donor priorities; Need to support Government institutionalise HBM and migrant e-registration; and World Humanitarian Summit 2016 IOM position paper on humanitarian border management.

Conclusion

Overall the Migration Crisis Support to Western Tanzania Project had made significant progress towards the achievement of its intended results by the time of this evaluation. Key outstanding issues included the need to continue with the e-registration process in the pilot district to capture those who could not register due to limited project outreach, processing of the registration forms, as well as roll out e-registration to Kagera and Geita Regions. For Kigoma Region, there is now need to move to the next steps, i.e. verification and the issuance of peasant permits for approved cases.

Recommendations

Policy level recommendations

- The project should be scaled-up to cover other districts facing challenges of irregular migration;
- There is need for Government and IOM to influence donor priorities so that in the short to medium term, they continue to acknowledge that the migration crisis is not yet over, hence the need for them to prioritise their assistance to this cause;
- Transform migration challenges into opportunities for all affected countries in the Region. In particular, Governments of Tanzania and Burundi could start thinking of transforming the migration problem into an opportunity and design mechanisms for the migration flows to benefit the two countries;
- There is need for intervention design to make informed choices between a wide but shallow and narrow but deep intervention. The choice should be commensurate with the intended results, resource envelope and implementation timeframe; and
- The Steering Committee should monitor implementation of the post-registration activities to ensure that the registration forms are processed and migrants informed about the options available in time.

Programmatic Recommendations

- There is need for comprehensive results framework that clearly shows the theory of change. The absence of such a results framework compromised project evaluability;
- The project should be linked to clear post-return/integration programming in recipient countries to support migrant populations who will opt for AVR, though AVR is unlikely to be a priority for phase 2;
- There is need for project design to strike a balance of project duration, intended geographical and population coverage and the resource envelope;
- The project should have a well-articulated exit strategy: The project exit strategy was not adequately designed and communicated to the partners;
- There is need for transparency in the e-registration process so that migrants take informed decisions with regards to participation and choices;
- In the course of project implementation commission independent process monitoring and evaluations to ensure procedures are being followed and address process challenges encountered by beneficiaries on time; *and*
- There is need to enhance the shared understanding of project objectives, processes and exit strategy among project management, project implementers, communities and beneficiaries

CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction: IOM in Tanzania

The International Organization for Migration's office in Dar-es-Salaam was opened in 2004 and gradually established sub-offices of Kasulu, Kigoma, Moshi, Mtwara and Mwanza. In 2009, IOM's African Capacity Building Centre (ACBC) was established in Moshi, in order to further support and promote the migration management capacity of African States. The Government of Tanzania recognizes IOM as the lead agency in providing technical assistance on a wide range of migration management issues. Tanzania became an IOM Member State in 1998.

IOM Tanzania works in four main areas of migration management that include: Migration and Development, Facilitating Migration, Regulating Migration and addressing Forced Migration. From 2009 to 2014, in conjunction with the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), IOM supported the assisted voluntary return of 2,962 Ethiopian migrants. During the same period, in conjunction with the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, it also supported the successful repatriation of former refugees affected by the closure of the Mtabila Refugee Camp. In response to Operation Kimbunga implemented by Government of Tanzania (GoT) to forcefully expel all immigrants who had not taken heed of its presidential directive for all irregular migrants to leave the country by 11th August, 2013, IOM initiated a project entitled "Migration Crisis Support to Address Migrant Expulsions in Western Tanzania" to assist the GoT in following due process and humanitarian principles in managing the migration crisis.

This report provides the key findings of the evaluation of the extent to which the project "Migration Crisis Support to Address Migrant Expulsions in Western Tanzania" managed to achieve objectives, with special focus on assessing IOM's level of effort, i.e. its contribution towards the achievement of each of the project outputs and outcomes.

1.2 Migrants and Migration Management in Tanzania

Tanzania has a long history as a hub for migration. This to large extent owes to the long periods of peace and tranquillity that have prevailed in the country, which has made it a safe destination for those fleeing from conflicts in neighbouring countries. While some of the migrants have followed due processes to legalise their stay in the country, others have entered and settled in the country without following the relevant legal provisions.

The irregular migration phenomenon has mostly affected the north-western regions that include Kagera, Kigoma and Rukwa. The irregular migrants in these regions originated mainly from neighbouring countries that include Burundi, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo, and to a lesser extent Uganda and Zambia. Literature identifies three broad groups of irregular migrants, which are:

- i. Foreigners whose presence in the country is inconsistent with the law;
- ii. People who claim to be Tanzanian nationals, but whose claims are disputed by immigration authorities;
and
- iii. Asylum seekers who did not formally seek asylum status. Among these are naturalised refugees without naturalisation certificates and children and descendants of naturalised refugees who were overlooked during the naturalisation processes.

Irregular migrants have drawn the attention of Government over the past 20 years. Over this period, Government has been taking a number of measures to address irregular migration and settlement. These measures included encouraging voluntary return of migrants to their countries of origin, operations to identify and expel irregular migrants and regularisation of their status through granting of peasant permits.

In recent years, the Government of Tanzania launched two major operations towards addressing the unwarranted presence of migrants in the country. One of them was the closure of Mtabila Refugee Camp which saw a total of 34,000 refugees - mainly Burundian nationals - being voluntarily repatriated, with others being naturalised. The other operation, Kimbunga, followed the presidential directive of 2013 which required irregular migrants to leave the country by 11th August, 2013, or face expulsion. This directive, which was mainly executed by the military, resulted in the expulsion of over 65,000 migrants, with thousands getting stranded at the border with Burundi.

The operation raised concerns among UN and other humanitarian agencies in that it did not follow due process and failed to recognise some of the humanitarian principles of migration management. Therefore, the need arose to engage Government and urge it to employ other options that were protection-sensitive and adhered to humanitarian principles.

1.3 The IOM Response to Forceful Expulsion of Irregular Migrants from Tanzania

The Migration Crisis Support to Address Migrant Expulsions in Western Tanzania Project was designed and implemented as a humanitarian response to the Government of Tanzania's directive that required irregular migrants in the western regions bordering Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda to leave the country by 11th August 2013 or face expulsion. Since the directive was issued, approximately 65,000 migrants were expelled from Tanzania, creating a migration crisis in neighbouring states.

The overall objective of the project was to reduce the number of stranded and vulnerable irregular migrants at the Tanzanian borders with Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda as a result of a comprehensive and protection-sensitive migration management approach. This would be achieved through enhanced national migration management capacity that would facilitate access to migrant documentation and regularization, and improved return migration management in the border regions of Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda by providing:

- (i) safe and orderly assisted voluntary repatriation to former Burundian refugees and irregular migrants from Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda; and
- (ii) capacity building on humanitarian border management services to immigration services in Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda.

The project was a joint initiative of IOM, the Government of Tanzania and partners, funded by the United Kingdom Government's Department for International Development (DFID). Its implementation sites were Tanzania, Burundi, and Uganda. Within Tanzania, the specific project sites were the Kigoma, Kagera, and Geita regions. The total budget of the project is USD 2,312,704.

CHAPTER 2: THE PROGRAMME EVALUATION

2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of this evaluation was to review the effectiveness and efficiency of the project, assess its outcomes and impact, and consider prospects for sustainability. Its overall objective was to identify and document lessons learned and best practices in view of the planned up-scaling of the project activities.

2.2 Specific Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluator's interpretation of the overall purpose and objective of the evaluation was that the evaluation had the following specific objectives, i.e. to:

- i. assess the extent to which the project had developed and strengthened institutional and technical capacities of migration authorities to respond to the needs of migrants by facilitating access to migrant documentation and regularization, and to improve return management in the border regions of Burundi and Uganda;
- ii. evaluate the project impact in terms of enjoyment of migrant rights and protection by the affected migrant population;
- iii. Assess the project against key OECD/DAC project quality and performance evaluation criteria that include: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability;
- iv. Carry out a value-for-money analysis of the project results in terms of the four E's: i.e. economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity;
- v. Assess the project's strategic alignment to: (a) IOM national, regional and global development priorities; and (b) the GoT development priorities as outlined in MKUKUTA and UNDAP;
- vi. Assess IOM's responsiveness, through the project, to changes in migrants protection needs and priorities;
- vii. Analyse the degree of value addition of the project in terms of its transformative effect on the lives of the migrants;
- viii. Assess the degree to which the project had strategically positioned IOM as the lead agency in promoting HBM and make Tanzania a regional and continental reference with regards to migration management;
- ix. Assess the degree to which the project addressed five UN programming principles (cross-cutting issues) of human rights, gender equality and gender mainstreaming, integration of environment concerns in the sector work and results-based management and capacity development across project areas, as well as the five principles of aid effectiveness under the Paris Declaration, i.e. ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and mutual accountability;
- x. Identify and document lessons learned and best practices in view of the planned scale-up of the project activities; and
- xi. Assess the extent to which the best practices and lessons learnt from the project would reposition IOM Tanzania to play a pivotal role in the country's Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda with regards to the promotion of comprehensive migration management systems and migrant rights.

2.3 Scope of the Evaluation

This evaluation was a *"terminal"* evaluation meant to focus on whether or not the project objectives outlined above had been achieved. The evaluation fieldwork focused on three districts of Tanzania's Kigoma Region, i.e. Kigoma Urban, Kigoma Rural and Uvinza. This region was the project pilot region.

The evaluation was supposed to be executed within the context of the Results Framework outlined in the project document. The evaluator, however, noted that the intended project results in this matrix were at a

Table 1: Reconstructed results structure and activities

Intended result	Indicators
Expected Impact: Irregular migrants in Tanzania have enhanced safety, protection, freedom of movement, participation and association.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of migrants expressing satisfaction with access to each of the rights No. of migrants reporting positive behaviour change in host communities No. of communities reportedly supporting integration of migrants into their communities. Proportion of stakeholders seeing benefits in transforming migration into an opportunity for the benefit of Tanzania and migrant supplying countries
Outcome 1: Increased government commitment to adhere to humanitarian standards and principles in migration management	Agreement of cooperation adopted and signed by all the parties
Output 1.1: Consensus reached with Government in implementing human rights sensitive approaches to migration management	1.1.1. No. of forceful expulsion of migrants reported 1.1.2. Documentary proof of policy change towards promotion of voluntary migration and regularisation
Output 1.2: Roles of partners in project implementation agreed upon	1.1.1 Lead project management agency defined 1.1.2 Lead project implementation agency defined
Outcome 2: Migration management agencies in Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda have improved capacities to implement humanitarian border management principles.	2.1 No. of border management agencies reporting behaviour change in treatment of migrants 2.2 No. of reported cases of migrant abuse
Output 2: Humanitarian border management assessment report available.	2.1.1 No. of assessment reports produced 2.1.2 No. of countries participating in HBM assessment
Output 2.2: Standard operating procedures for the implementation of humanitarian border management principles and for conducting appropriate returns are in place.	2.2.1 No. of SOPs produced 2.2.2 No. of parties to the project endorsing standard operating procedures.
Output 2.3: Officials of ISD have knowledge and skills necessary to appropriately manage returns and to implement humanitarian border management principles.	2.3.1 Training needs assessment produced 2.3.2 No. of officials trained in HBM 2.3.3 No. of training workshops held by type of training 2.3.4 No. of training workshops cascaded
Outcome 3: The Tanzanian Immigration Services Department has improved institutional capacity to identify, register, or regularize irregular migrants in Kigoma, Kagera, and Geita regions of Tanzania.	3.1 No. of districts with databases of migrants in their respective areas 3.2 No. of migrants registered independently by ISD Officers
Output 3.1: Immigration officials have the human and technical resources necessary to roll out the registration and e-application system.	3.1.1 No. of ISD officials conversant with the design of the e-application system and processes 3.1.2 No. of districts equipped with e-registration equipment 3.1.3 No. of ISD officials participating in the e-registration of migrants
Outcome 4: Irregular migrants are making informed decisions on regularization on the basis of accurate information.	4.1 Proportion of migrants benefiting from protection against forceful expulsion through their participation in e-registration and possession of the PVC card.
Output 4.1: Irregular migrants mobilised and participate in the biometric registration process	4.1.1 No. mass awareness meetings held 4.1.2 No. of migrant mapping sites identified per district 4.1.3 No. of migrants mapped 4.1.4 No. of migrants registered and issued registration cards
Output 4.2: Irregular migrants and ex-Mtabila former Burundian refugees have access to assisted voluntary return services.	4.1.1 No. of migrants requesting assisted voluntary return services. 4.1.2 No. of ex-Mtabila refugees assisted with voluntary return to Burundi

lower level, such that they underplayed the impact the project would have on Government policy, realisation of migrants' rights and the paradigm shift it would cause in Government towards embracing migrant rights and the humanitarian aspects of border management. The evaluation, therefore, used the results framework proposed by the mid-term review (MTR) of the project as the basis for the evaluation, with additional improvements (table 1).

2.4 Methodology

2.4.1 Sampling

At the national the strategy was to interview representatives of all the key stakeholder institutions. This also applied to the regional level sample where the assessment sought to collect the opinions of all relevant institutional stakeholders. At the lower level, the three of the four districts where the registration of migrants had been completed were selected for the evaluation. In each of the three districts the evaluator held a focus group discussion and carried also sampled at least 15 households for household interviews. In this sample, a total of 67 people participated in key informant interviews, community FGDs and household interviews.

2.4.2 Data Collection

The evaluation employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The triangulation of multiple research approaches was intended to broaden the scope of analysis and to enhance validity and reliability of data and information. Key research methods included:

Review of literature and project documentation: As much as possible, the strategic approach of the evaluation was to build on existing evidence, information and analysis of earlier project reviews and documentation to understand the context in which the programme was implemented. Simultaneously, the inception phase was an opportunity for consulting and dialoguing widely with the key IOM programme staff, management and other key stakeholders to clarify their expectations and priorities for the project evaluation. The consultations resulted in decisions and agreements on the priority areas for examination, and informed the stakeholder consultative process and the evaluation of the project.

Key Informant Interviews were held at national, regional and community levels. National level key informants included: IOM management and project staff; Centre for the Study of Forced Migration and DFID. There were, however, challenges in organising interviews with the other key informants that included Ministry of Home Affairs, Immigration Services Department (ISD), Embassy of Japan and Embassy of Burundi. At the regional level, the key informants included: Regional Commissioners, Regional Administrative Secretary, Regional Immigration Officer, the Burundi Consulate in Kigoma, and IOM field staff. Community level key informants were the Ward and Village Executive Officers. The list of interviewed key informants is in Annex III.

Focus group discussions: In each of the three districts covered by the evaluation survey the evaluation carried out a FGD in one identified migrant community. These focus groups consisted of men, women, boys and girls.

Household interviews: Where feasible the evaluation interviewed up to 15 migrant households in each of the selected communities.

2.4.3 Evaluation Conceptual Framework

The evaluator assessed the whole results chain from project inputs, outputs, outcomes, and when evident, short and medium term impacts with regards to the achievement of the intended results. The evaluation of the results chain was on the understanding that IOM had more control over the inputs and processes than

on the outcomes and impact. Thus, the project contribution was measured in terms of both **contribution** and **attribution**.

2.4.4 The analytical framework

The evaluation system focused on two categories of evaluation criteria. *Category 1* criteria consisted of the four OECD/DAC key project quality and performance evaluation criteria - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. *Category 2* criteria evaluated the extent to which the project design and implementation strategy strengthened the strategic positioning of the IOM Tanzania in supporting the country’s development agenda. These included: strategic alignment, responsiveness and added value.

2.4.5 Output rating system

The assessment considered the level of achievement of outputs through the assessment of available data and/or opinion of stakeholders and beneficiaries. The achievement against each key output was ranked on a colour-coded scale as follows: Achieved (Green); Good Progress towards Achievement

Table 2: A sample Output Measurement Tool

IOM Project Outcome				
Outputs	Output Ranking (Real database ranking or stakeholder opinion)			
	Indicator & Baseline	Target	2014 Status	Output rating
Output 1:				
Output 2:				
Output				
Overall Ranking of Outcome 1				Insert Score

(Blue); Partially Achieved (Orange); and Not Achieved (Red). The assessment of outputs for each outcome was summarised using an Output Measurement Tool (Table 1).

2.4.6 Rating of Outcomes

The evaluation employed two outcome rating systems. The first was related to the status of the outcome, as shown in Table 1 above. The outcome ratings were as follows: **Achieved**; **Good Progress towards Achievement**; **Modest**; and **Not Achieved**. This was then followed by the evaluator’s opinion on the degree to which IOM Project contributed to the attainment of the Outcome. The contribution rating had four categories: **Critical**; **Significant**; **Modest**; and **None**.

2.1.1 Assessment of Impact

Assessment of impact also relied on: (i) stakeholder and beneficiary opinion on the status of the impact indicators; and (ii) assessment of available data from service provider administrative data and analytical reports, as well as relevant IOM data. The evaluation then repeated the two steps similar to those for Outcome Rating, i.e.:

- (i) *Rating of Status of Impact*, with the following rating criteria:
 - *Achieved* (impact Indicator targets were achieved);
 - *Good Progress towards Achievement* (impact not yet achieved but prospects of achievement were very high)
 - *Modest* (impact would have been partially achieved by end of target timeframe); and
 - *Not Achieved* (there would have been very little, or, no change in impact indicators by end of target timeframe).

- (ii) *Rating of IOM contribution to the impact through the relevant outcomes.*
 - *Critical* (impact would likely not have been achieved without IOM contribution);
 - *Significant* (IOM contribution was likely to influence impact achievement in a great way);
 - *Modest* (IOM contribution towards achieving the impact was small);
 - *None* (IOM did not contribute to the achievement of the impact).

CHAPTER 3: KEY FINDINGS

3.1 Quality of Project Design

Key research questions: Is there a project document for the project under evaluation? Is there a project results framework and how comprehensive is it? Is the project results chain clearly defined? Is there a project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework and how comprehensive is it? What measurable indicators and targets have been defined and are they evaluable? What is the project implementation strategy? Who are the key project partners and stakeholders? Did the project design draw from global innovative techniques and best practices in project design?

The implementation of the project was guided by a project document that clearly outlined the rationale and justification for the intervention. Stakeholders revealed that the project was designed at the request by the Government of Tanzania to IOM to assist in the design and implementation of a protection-sensitive solution to the migration crisis which had been created by *Operation Kimbunga*. Other stakeholders, including the United Nations (UN) agencies, particularly the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) whose major mandate is refugee protection, the Department for International Development (DFID) UK who had supported IOM and UNHCR in addressing the voluntary repatriation of refugees affected by the closure of Mtabila Refugee Camp, Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) which was supporting the repatriation of Ethiopian Refugees and the European Commission which was supporting capacity building for border management, were all consulted during the project design process. The project was, therefore, produced through stakeholder **consultative and participatory process, giving it a wide foundation for ownership and/or recognition.**

The project design included a results framework meant to strengthen results-based management. However, as correctly noted by the project MTR the results framework was poorly articulated and formed a weak basis for project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This terminal evaluation also notes that, although it might have been a deliberate move to avoid mandate-related conflict with organisations mandated with human rights superintendence, the intended project **results were at a lower level, such that they underplayed the impact the project had on Government policy, realisation of migrants' rights and the paradigm shift in Government towards embracing protection-sensitive migration management and the humanitarian aspects of border management.**

The project was implemented through a combination of direct and national execution (DEX and NEX). Project management capacity was resident in IOM, while Government of Tanzania's ISD in the Ministry of Home Affairs had the leadership role in project implementation. A number of factors dictated the choice of the combination of the two project execution approaches:

- i. The project was conceived soon after Operation Kimbunga. With the mistrust the migrants had in Government institutions, it was perceived that mobilisation of the migrants, household mapping and registration would not have garnered the necessary cooperation by the migrants if the exercise was implemented under Government leadership. However, after some protracted negotiations, the SOP then gave Government leadership role in these processes;
- ii. The project duration was too short and Government could not have been able to mobilise and establish the necessary project management capacity in such a short period;
- iii. The ISD had weak migration management capacities, hence the capacity development in the Department for humanitarian border management (HBM) became a key component of the project. As such, the capacity development process needed to be driven by a second party outside government;
- iv. The procurement process for the biometric registration equipment was very complex, and it would not have been done effectively and within the expected timeframe through the government public procurement system and procedures; and
- v. The manufacturers and exporters (especially USA) of the biometric registration, which constituted the core of project procurement, required strict security guarantees that the equipment would be

installed and used for purposes not related to the promotion of terrorism, or, violation of human rights. IOM as a UN agency stood a better chance than GoT of giving an acceptable guarantee.

The evaluation noted that DEX would have increase the risk of weak national ownership of the project and negative impacts on the sustainability of the project achievements and results if it had not been counterbalanced by leaving leadership of implementation to Government. Despite the protracted negotiations at the beginning of the project with regards to partner roles, among other things, the co-existence of the DEX of project management functions and NEX of project implementation functions augured very well for the smooth implementation of the project.

The DEX of the management function by IOM was critical for enhancing adherence of the migration crisis management processes to humanitarian principles. Firstly, IOM ensured that the allocation and use of project resources were directed towards protection-sensitive migration crisis management processes that observed the principle of humanity. Secondly, being an agency closely associated to the UN and a full member of the One UN team in Tanzania, IOM was also a neutral player that sort to ensure neutrality of the processes through managerial control. Thirdly, the IOM management function would also ensure impartiality of the migration crisis management process. Lastly, it would guarantee independence of managerial decisions in the migration crisis management process, without undue political influence by the GoT.

The project design drew lessons and best practices from other national and regional experiences. The management of the closure of Mtabila Refugee Camp and the subsequent naturalisation of some of the refugees demonstrated that Tanzania had the capacity and will to adhere to humanitarian principles in migration management. The expulsion of DRC nationals by Congo Brazzaville and that of Somali migrants by Kenya in recent years were also major learning points for the design of this project. Through the association of CSFM with the project, IOM had access to the 2009 UNHCR registration of refugees, which was carried out in part by CSFM. However, as will be discussed later on in this report, the design process did not fully draw from the experiences of UNHCR for the registration process, leading to some challenges being encountered by the IOM-supported e-registration process.

It can, therefore, be concluded that **the project design was of good quality**, but with scope for improvement with regards to the formulation of the project results framework. Some attempt to address this weakness was made for the submission of the request for project extension to DFID, but still the deficit was not adequately addressed. It is important to highlight that **there was no management response to the MTR recommendation to strengthen the results framework** by recasting it to reflect an elaborate project results chain and theory of change. This could have gone a long way in enhancing the quality of the project design.

3.2 Relevance of the Project

Key research questions: To what extent was the project responsive to the needs of migrants in Western Tanzania? *Corporate alignment:* To what extent was the Project intended to feed into the results of the IOM programming frameworks at the national, regional and global levels? *Systemic alignment:* To what extent did Project capitalise upon complementarity and avoid duplication with other partner activities?

The project derived its relevance from the migration crisis situation that had been created by Operation Kimbunga, whose need for a durable solution had become a national priority. The relevance and need for the intervention was driven by three key challenges, which were:

- i. The expulsion of migrants which had resulted in the separation of families, loss of property and straining of capacities at the borders of both Tanzania and recipient countries. There was, therefore, a

- need to prevent further expulsions of the same nature and create an opportunity for the migrants who were still in-country to be treated with due procedure and with adherence to humanitarian principles;
- ii. Tanzania had not warned its neighbours about the impending expulsion of irregular migrants. This created a crisis situation at the borders with recipient countries, leading to expelled migrants remaining in holding camps for prolonged periods of time. While the focus of the project was not to speed up the processing of this migrant traffic at the border per se, the important issue was to enhance the capacities of the border posts to be able to account for and assist each migrant passing through the border into and out of the country; and
 - iii. The need to ensure that the management of the migration crisis adhered to humanitarian standards and took into consideration the vulnerabilities of the migrants and the imperative for a durable solution to the management of migration flows.

The inability of government to address the migration crisis by its own means and independently through its own systems in a protection-sensitive manner, as well as the need to protect the rights of the current and future migrants in the country through a durable solution to the migration crisis rendered the project **invaluable, appropriate and relevant**. Thus, with regard to the project's ability to cater for the needs of the target groups, it was relevant to the safety and protection needs of the migrants, as well as to the capacity development needs for migration management in Tanzania.

The project was also relevant in that it was strategically aligned to -and anchored on - corporate, systemic and national results and development frameworks.

Corporate Alignment refers to internal coherence with the organisation's national, regional and global results and planning frameworks. The evaluation established that the migration crisis support project was, at the national level, aligned to IOM's Programme of Cooperation with the GoT, particularly in the area of mixed migration. This was one of the mixed migration projects under which IOM supported the Government of Tanzania with equipment and infrastructure, promoting voluntary return and reintegration of irregular migrants, and facilitating training for government officials.

At the regional level the project was strategically aligned to the IOM Regional Strategy for East and the Horn of Africa 2013 – 2014 and fed into *Outcome 1: Migrants, mobile populations and people in migration-affected communities are better equipped to deal with issues of vulnerability*, and *Outcome 2: Increased availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of services by migrants, those in crisis affected areas and mobile populations in identified spaces of vulnerability*. Specifically, it contributed to *Output 2.1: Migration Management authorities' knowledge, understanding and capacity to respond to mixed migration, smuggling and trafficking are increased*.

At the global level, the project was strategically aligned to the IOM Strategy of 2007 which spelt out the primary goal of IOM as: *"to facilitate the orderly and humane management of international migration"*. The project contributed towards the following key objectives of this strategy:

- To enhance the humane and orderly management of migration and the effective respect for the human rights of migrants in accordance with international law;
- To support States, migrants and communities in addressing the challenges of irregular migration, including through research and analysis into root causes, sharing information and spreading best practices, as well as facilitating development-focused solutions;
- To assist States to facilitate the integration of migrants in their new environment and to engage diasporas, including as development partners; and
- To undertake programmes which facilitate the voluntary return and reintegration of refugees, displaced persons, migrants and other individuals in need of international migration services, in cooperation with other relevant international organizations as appropriate, and taking into account the needs and concerns of local communities.

The project was also formulated within the realm of IOM's Migration Crisis Operational Framework adopted by Member States during the 101st Session of the IOM Council. The Framework is based on international humanitarian and human rights law, and humanitarian principles. It combines IOM humanitarian activities and migration management services. It is IOM's way to address migration dimensions of modern-day crises.

Systemic alignment illustrates partnerships and collaboration for results. The activities of this project were integrated into the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) 2011-2015, which is the joint planning framework for the United Nations Country Team in Tanzania, a pilot "*Delivery as One*" country. In UNDAP programming, IOM activities are grouped in the work plans of several "Programme Working Groups", most notably the Social Protection working group (where IOM carries out activities to combat trafficking in persons, among others), and the Programme Working Group on Refugees, where UNHCR is the lead agency.

National alignment is critical in terms of defining how a programme/project feeds into national level development results as outlined in national development frameworks. Tanzania, being a Member State of IOM, is committed to the implementation of the various migration related Conventions to which it is signatory and party. The Conventions by and large shape the country's development agenda with regards to migration management. The project under review contributed towards the implementation of Tanzania's commitments to:

- The Charter of the United Nations, 1945;
- United Nations Declaration on Human Rights of All Migrants, 2000;
- International Convention on the Protection of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, 1990;
- Declaration on the Human Rights of Individuals who are Not Nationals of The Country in Which They Live, 1985;
- Protocol Against The Smuggling Of Migrants By Land, Sea And Air Supplementing The United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime United Nations 2000; and
- Other relevant International Conventions.

The project relevance was, therefore, strengthened by its strong strategic position at national, regional and global development frameworks. It had coherence with other relevant results frameworks at all the three levels.

3.3 Project Effectiveness

Key research questions: To what extent were the intended outcomes achieved? To what extent has the project contributed towards the creation of a conducive environment for migrants to enjoy their rights and protection against violation of the same? To what extent has project enhanced the capacities of Government to manage migration crisis situations? Did the project enhance adherence of the migration crisis management processes to humanitarian principles?

The evaluation assessed project effectiveness by establishing the extent to which its objectives were achieved, taking into account their relative importance. The effectiveness of the project under review was the extent to which it managed to put in place a comprehensive and protection-sensitive migration management approach that could facilitate the registration of migrants with a view to support their return or regularization and reduce the number of stranded and vulnerable irregular migrants around Tanzania's borders with Burundi and Uganda. This is the degree to which the project managed to establish a durable solution to the migration crisis in western Tanzania. The detailed ratings of outcomes and outputs are in Annex II.

3.3.1 Strategic Engagement with Government

The evaluation established that the project was a result of intense and protracted lobbying and negotiation between GoT on one side and the international community and development partners on the other. On one hand, Tanzania had the legitimate rights to protect its territory against any threats to national security and natural resources, as well as to determine who may or may not stay on its territory and, if necessary, take action towards stamping out any threats. On the other hand the international community and development partners had some concerns with regards to the infringement of migrant rights by operation Kimbunga, and the repercussions of operation on human suffering. They were also concerned about the damage that the continued implementation of the "*Hurricane Operation*" would cause on relations in the Region and the protracted crisis that could arise in recipient countries. There was, therefore, general consensus that Tanzania could exercise its sovereign rights through other means that could sustainably address the root causes irregular migration into the country.

Stakeholders revealed that **IOM played a critical role** in convincing the government on the value of an alternative to forceful expulsion of migrants. IOM's advocacy led government to consider the various options for regularisation of the stay of migrants in the country, as well as facilitating the voluntary return of those willing to do so to their countries of origin. IOM's negotiating stance also ended up convincing the donor community, particularly DFID, that there was value addition in pursuing a durable solution to the migration crisis as opposed to them perennially supporting IOM's migration-related humanitarian activities towards irregular migrants.

The negotiations resulted in clear allocation of roles to the project partners. Government, through the ISD in the Ministry of Home Affairs, assumed the leadership role in project implementation. It assumed leadership on the community mass mobilisation of the registration of the migrants, as well as responsibility for the biometric and biographic registration of the migrants. IOM assumed the role of technical partner with the responsibility of providing project managerial, technical and financial assistance. The CSFM was allocated the information, education and communication responsibility, including the development of awareness materials.

IOM's strategic engagement with the government resulted in a win-win situation for all the parties. Firstly, government would benefit from the capacity building for migration and humanitarian border management, a long lasting solution to the migration management dilemma and a good regional and international image.

IOM, its partners and international community ensured adherence to international humanitarian standards in the management of the migration crisis, as well as mobilising programmable resources towards strengthening adherence to humanitarian principles and fulfilling their mandates in the protection of migrants. The migrants, on the other hand, were afforded the opportunity to regularise their stay, as well as pursue the choice to be assisted with voluntary return to their countries of origin.

Overall, therefore, *Outcome 1: Increased government commitment to adhere to humanitarian standards and principles in migration management* was **achieved with critical IOM contribution**. The negotiations resulted in the conclusion of a pact adopted by all the parties that committed them to supporting the GoT in its commitment to a protection-sensitive approach to the management of the migration crisis as well as to developing a durable solution to the same. The evaluation also concludes that the results of the negotiations demonstrated partners’ commitment to ensuring that GoT’s citizenship and

Table 3: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: Strategic Engagement with Government Outcome

Outputs for the Government Engagement Outcome	Rating of Outputs and Outcome Achievement	Rating of IOM Contribution
Output 1.1: Consensus reached with Government in implementing human rights sensitive approaches to migration management	Achieved	Critical
Output 1.2: Roles of partners in project implementation agreed upon	Achieved	Significant
Overall rating of Outcome	Achieved	Critical

immigration laws were strictly observed. At the same time, GoT committed to adopt a Comprehensive and protection-sensitive Migration Management Strategy in Tanzania (COMMIST) to address irregular migration, among other things.. To this end, the COMMIST would seek to pursue three key solutions to the migration crisis, which are: assisted voluntary return (AVR) of migrants willing to return to their countries of origin; regularisation of stay in Tanzania through the issuance of permits and naturalisation; and orderly return for those who did not opt for AVR and do not qualify for assisted regularisation.

3.3.2 Capacity Building for Humanitarian Border Management

An important output in building a durable solution to the management of the migration crisis in western Tanzania, as well as strengthening government ownership of the process was the building of the capacity of government, specifically the ISD, as well as that of other border management authorities in neighbouring countries in Humanitarian Border Management (HBM) as the comprehensive migration management strategy to protection sensitive migration management. This important output was supposed to be achieved through a number of steps. These steps and their achievements are highlighted below.

“HBM aims to ensure that border authorities are prepared to manage migration crises in a way that protects national borders while at the same time fully respecting migrants’ human rights”: David Knight, Head of Immigration and Border Management Division in IOM Headquarters in Geneva.

Assessments of HBM capacities: IOM conducted an HBM Assessment at the Tanzania—Uganda border in July 2014. The assessment was aimed at establishing whether or not ISD and other parties had the capacities to respond to emergency situations and migration crises that could result in mass cross-border movements. The focus of the assessment was a sample of Border Control Points (BCPs) which were used to expel migrants during Operation Kimbunga. The initial findings pointed out many inadequacies related to HBM capacity and contingency planning at the BCPs. A humanitarian border management assessment was also conducted in Burundi. The assessment involved on-site visits to transit camps, border points and meetings with regional commissioners. SOPs for HBM were, however, still to be finalised.

HBM training for border officials: The broad objective of the project was to support the GoT to enhance its national migration management capacity to promote protection-sensitive migrant documentation,

regularization and return management. One of the two ways through which this objective was to be achieved was through training of border officials on HBM. The evaluation established that a number of training workshops were conducted. These included training of e-registration, use of e-registration hardware and software, return management and HBM. A total of 40 participants from Geita, Kagera and Kigoma participated in the e-registration and use of e-registration hardware and software workshop in Kagera. The workshop was conducted by the Tanzania ISD in collaboration with IOM. Selected ISD officers trained in Kagera were further trained as registration supervisors. Forty (40) immigration officers were also trained in return management training in Moshi.

Development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for emergencies: The evaluation got evidence that Government had developed and adopted the SOPs for the e-registration of irregularly settled migrants in North-western Tanzania. The specific objective of the SOPs was to register all non-citizens irregularly residing in north-western Tanzania, those with unclear migration status, and all holders of Peasant Permits, in order to determine/confirm their legal status and desired intervention and address their situation in accordance with the applicable laws and policy directives.

These SOPs outline the objectives of the exercise, detailed procedures for related mass information and e-registration, the applicable laws, the roles of the various actors and management, cooperation and coordination arrangements. The SOPs also give broad outlines of the components of the three options for migrant regularisation and assistance, leaving the details to be given in the SOPs that are specific to those pillars which will be developed at a later stage. Thus, by the time of this evaluation, the SOPs for AVR and HBM were still pending development.

Resuscitation of Border Management Committees

The evaluation was informed that the Regional Safety and Security Committee in Kigoma was very active, with the project representatives periodically called upon to provide project implementation reports to this committee. Tanzania and Burundi were also cooperating in periodic border management meetings to monitor the situation at the borders as well as discuss possibilities of a long lasting solution to the migration challenges between the two countries. The evaluator was informed that these joint meetings were already toying around with the possibility of regularised migrant labour exchange for the benefit of the two countries.

In the western border regions of Tanzania, there were no interagency cooperation mechanisms established to allow for a more coherent response to crises. The active interagency cooperation mechanism for this purpose was the Refugees Programme Working Group, a structure created by the UN Country Team in Tanzania in the framework of the One UN, who facilitated the implementation of this component of the UNDAP.

Design and procurement of mobile communication and registration technology solutions: The output was **achieved with critical contribution by IOM**. A technical specialist recruited by IOM developed the registration and e-application system in coordination with immigration officials. IOM then acquired and dispatched all equipment needed to conduct the e-registration exercises in Kigoma Region where the e-registration was going to be piloted. The equipment included finger print readers, computers, laptops, scanners, web cameras, barcode readers, Wi-Fi routers and registration card printers. All equipment was handed over to the immigration department at the end of the registration process. The evaluation, however, established that after the e-registration process the equipment reverted into the custody of IOM, since they intended to use it at a major training workshop before handing it back to the Regional Immigration Office in Kigoma.

Given the successes in achievement of the outputs above, the evaluation concludes that *Outcome 2: Migration management agencies in Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda have improved capacities to implement humanitarian border management principles* was **achieved (Table 4)**. All the interviewed immigration officials reported that due to the training received under this project, reported major behaviour change in the way they were treating irregular migrants. Previously they would arrest, detain and deport any irregular migrants. They were now using the rights-based approach that afforded the migrants the right to defend

Table 4: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: Capacity building for HBM

Outputs for the HBM Capacity Building	Rating of Outputs and Outcome Achievement	Rating of IOM Contribution
<i>Output 2.1: Humanitarian border management assessment report available.</i>	Achieved	Critical
<i>Output 2.2: Standard operating procedures for the implementation of humanitarian border management principles and for conducting appropriate returns are in place.</i>	Good Progress Towards Achievement	Significant
<i>Output 2.3: Officials of migration management agencies have knowledge and skills necessary to implement humanitarian border management principles.</i>	Achieved	Critical
<i>Output 2.4: Resuscitation of Border Management Committees</i>	Good Progress Towards Achievement	Modest
<i>Output 2.5: Design and procurement of mobile communication and registration technology solutions:</i>	Achieved	Critical
Overall Rating of Outcome 2	Achieved	Significant

himself/herself in the Tanzanian court of law. They were also no longer confiscating the property of irregular migrants. The number of cases of abuse of irregular migrants had, therefore, significantly been reduced. These achievements were underpinned by the protection-sensitive principle which was being championed by IOM in the project. Thus, IOM’s contribution to this outcome was **critical**.

e-Registration of Migrants

Capacity building of ISD officials for e-registration

e-Registration was the core of the project. For this reason, SOPs were prepared and adopted for the implementation of this component. Immigration officials were trained to ensure that they had the skills and knowledge necessary to roll out the registration and e-application system. The ISD officers demonstrated conversancy with the design and operation of the e-registration system. They could correctly provide a technical description of how it worked. All the officers trained in e-registration and use of registration

Table 5: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: Capacity building of ISD Officials for e-Registration

Outputs for the Capacity building of ISD Officials for e-Registration Outcome	Rating of Outputs and Outcome Achievement	Rating of IOM Contribution
<i>Output 3.1: Immigration officials have the human and technical resources necessary to roll out the e-registration system.</i>	Good Progress towards Achievement	Critical
Overall rating of Outcome 3	Good Progress Towards Achievement	Critical

hardware and software participated in the registration exercise. The ISD district officials demonstrated capacity for independently implementing and managing the e-registration process when they registered on over 200 migrants on their own when IOM could not reach the registration sites by boat.

As stated in a preceding section, however, the registration equipment had not yet been installed at the regional offices for the continuation of migrant biometric registration.

The evaluation was informed that the equipment was being used in the training of 100 ISD officers which

was running in Arusha during the time of this evaluation, and would be installed at the Kigoma Regional Office thereafter. Due to the absence of the e-registration as well as completed registration forms at the participating ISD district offices, none of the district had in its custody a database of the registered migrants.

The evaluation conclude that the project had made **good progress towards the achievement** of *Outcome 3: The Tanzanian ISD has improved institutional capacity to identify, register, or regularize irregular migrants*. IOM made **significant contribution** towards the achievement of the outcome by facilitating and providing technical and financial assistance to the training of the ISD officials.

3.3.4 Implementation of e-Registration

The e-registration process went through three phases which included: sensitization, awareness raising and mobilization of the migrants; migrant population mapping; and the biometric registration of the migrants.

Sensitisation, Awareness Raising and Mobilisation for Migrant Registration: This phase was implemented by the ISD with the support of Ministry of Local Government through its district offices, ward and village level structures. Both the political and administrative arms of local governance played a pivotal role in raising awareness of the programme among the communities and migrant population. The ISD in conjunction with the district level offices of the local government ministry held training workshops for Ward and Village Executive officers, as well as other village leaders to equip them with knowledge about the impending mapping and registration exercises. The latter were expected to organise mobilisation and sensitisation meetings in their respective constituencies. The government agencies in conjunction with IOM also held mass information meetings at designated centres in the districts, while CSFD prepared flyers for distribution to the communities.

Interviews with stakeholders revealed two major criticisms with regards to the way the information campaign was done. Firstly, a once-off training for the community leaders was not adequate. Most of them reportedly lacked clarity on the purpose of the registration process, and even their roles. As a result they were providing half-baked information to the communities, with some even discouraging the migrants to participate in the registration process. Secondly, the selected sites for the mass information meetings with the government teams were too far for some. These resulted in some of the migrants missing information on the importance of the registration process.

Population Mapping: Population mapping was carried out as part of the information campaign. Before the commencement of the registration exercise, IOM carried out field visits to determine the best sites for registration, based on the recommendations of ISD, who also had the information of 2009 UNHCR-supported exercise. The ISD, in collaboration with the local authorities then conducted a manual registration of the target population in order, among other reasons, to establish their numbers and physical location in Kigoma Region. This step was not necessarily meant to guard against the possibility of unintended persons joining the registration exercise, but to obtain the necessary data that would inform the planning and the resource deployment for the registration exercise, including determining the location of the registration centres based on the location of the concentration of the population.

Stakeholders revealed that the effectiveness of the mapping exercise was compromised by long distances to the centres selected for the mapping exercise. They strongly felt that the mapping should have followed the UNHCR model for registration of refugees. The UNHCR mapping process was done in each and every village. The approach enabled them to have good approximations of the migrant populations in the participating districts. They, therefore, felt that the approach used by the project resulted in errors of exclusion.

Migrant biometric and biographic e-Registration: The central activity of the project under review was the biometric and biographic e-registration of the target migrant population. The intention was to capture their individual data and information in order to facilitate decision on alternative solutions including assisted voluntary return, assisted application for regularization of status, and any other appropriate solution. In the forefront there was the issuance of PVC cards that would serve as identify and prove that one's stay in the country is known to the authorities, thus protect them from expulsion.

The e-registration was done in four districts of the project pilot region of Kigoma. Table 5 shows the numbers of migrants registered in each of the four districts of Uvinza, Kigoma Urban, Kigoma Rural and Buhigwe. (See table 6).

KIGOMA				
District	Households	Individuals	Males	Females
Kigoma Urban	2,093	5,473	3,131	2,342
Kigoma Rural	1,515	4,324	2,211	2,113
Buhigwe	739	1,474	648	826
Uvinza	3,830	11,011	5,964	5,047
TOTAL	8,177	22,282	11,954	10,328

The evaluation established that a total of 22,282 migrants consisting household heads and their dependence participated in the biographic and biometric data registration, thus exceeding the target of 20,000 migrants.

These were subsequently issued temporary cards that gave non-AVR cases protection from deportation, initially for two years which could be extended to four years, whilst giving the ISD ample time to assess the eligibility of the individual migrants for the various options

and process applications for regularisation. The registration card also gave AVR applicants a grace period (to be determined by the Immigration Department) during which they would be able to pack their belongings, close any businesses and prepare themselves for departure.

The e-registration of the migrants was the climax of the project. IOM provided technical and financial assistance by meeting the transport, travel and subsistence costs of the ISD Officers who were carrying out the registration process.

“The success of e-registration was not in the numbers of registered migrants achieved, but in the fact that, as migration authorities, we now know where the migrants are located and their needs.”
District Immigration Officer in Kigoma Region

The evaluation noted that, in the absence of the total number of migrant households and people identified during the household mapping exercise it was difficult to ascertain the success of the e-registration process in terms of coverage vis-à-vis the migrant population in Kigoma Region. Interviews with IOM programme staff indicated that daily tallies of the household mapping exercise were not done consistently, hence the non-availability of the total number of households and individuals identified by the mapping exercise.

The biometric registration of the migrants was not done against the household mapping lists. As a result unmapped people living across the border in Burundi infiltrated the registration process and there were large errors of inclusion.

“Come next Operation Kimbunga” those who could not make it to the distant registration sites will be regarded as irregular migrants. There is, therefore, need to address this situation through outreach programmes”: District Immigration Officer, Kigoma Region

The project managers based the decision on the sparseness of the e-registration sites on the assumption that since the registration itself was free, people would use the funds they would otherwise have paid for

the registration to pay for transport to the nearest registration point. Notwithstanding this assumption, the e-registration exercise took place over a very short period of time, which did not give poor households the chance to mobilise the money for transport fares.

Other challenges experienced by migrants with the e-registration process

FGDs and household interviews revealed a number of challenges that the migrants encountered during and with the registration process. They revealed that:

- i. The IEC process and the Immigration Officers did not fully explain the purpose of registration to the migrants. Most of them participated because they thought it was the gateway to supported migration to America or Europe, whilst other thought they would be granted citizenship. However, the project managers and implementers submitted that the deprivation of information was a deliberate strategy to lure the migrants to cooperate and participate in the project, given the circumstances that were prevailing on the ground.
- ii. Migrants who participated in the registration process did not know the options for which they were going to be considered. This was because it was left to the discretion of the registering Immigration Officer to determine the option for regularisation after taking into consideration factors such as the number of years the migrant had lived in Tanzania. This was not communicated to the migrants;
- iii. Migrants were not aware of the next steps with regards to their registration. They were just waiting in the dark, without knowing whether or not there was any post-registration follow-ups they were supposed to make;
- iv. The Ward Executive Officer was a passive participant in the registration exercise. His role of stamping already completed forms did not give him/her power and prerogative to decide on the eligibility of the applicants. To most of them the fact that the migrant had already acquired and completed the form was a sign that he/she had been accepted by the higher/issuing authority, hence could not rule against the discretion of this authority. As a result the registration process had leakages;
- v. A moral hazard permeated the registration process. Migrants who had relatives across the Burundi border called them for the registration. This was mainly because they thought the registration was the gateway to Tanzanian citizenship, or, assisted migration to America and Europe;
- vi. There were children whose guardians were registered under the UNHCR programme, but they themselves were not registered with UNHCR. These children were then registered under this IOM-supported project. Due to misconceptions, the guardians were happy that their children would be assisted to migrate to America or Europe, but they were worried about what would happen if the results of the registration process required them to be deported back to Burundi. This meant they would be separated from their children;
- vii. Children born of a Tanzanian father and a Burundian mother were made to register as Burundians. The clarification the evaluator got on this issue from the ISD was that the law did not allow for the separation of families, hence there would be no situation where this process would require the deportation of the registered part of the family. On the other hand, everything else being equal, the law gave custody of minor children to the mother. The children upon attainment of majority age would then exercise their right to revoke one of the citizenships because Tanzania did not allow dual citizenship;
- viii. The registration process had closed, but there were justifiable cases of people who could not register because they had been away during the registration process, or, they could not reach the registration sites. These people feared that they would be unwarranted victims of the next hurricane operation;
- ix. Some community leaders were not clear on the purpose of the registration exercise, hence they shielded some immigrants from identifying themselves as such, resulting in them not participating in the registration process.

The evaluation noted that there was limited (if at all) shared understanding of the project objectives and processes between the project managers and implementers on one side, and the community leaders and

the migrants, on the other. Buy-in and internalisation of the processes by the target population were weak, especially due to the inadequate investment of the project into awareness raising. Although about 70 community leaders in each district participated in district level information meetings, it appears they did not fully grasp the messages, nor, fully cascade the information sharing in their communities. For those who participated in the e-registration, most of them did so out of desperation and false expectations, without fully understanding the reasons for their participation and the implications of being registered, while a good proportion also failed to participate due to ignorance. Whilst the evaluation would agree with the project managers and implementers who argued that the prevailing circumstances required that the migrants be deprived of the details of the registration process in order to attract big numbers, the evaluator was of the opinion that an effective information and education campaign to seek the buy-in and internalisation of objectives and processes would have resulted in a better quality result.

It also contends that the major cause of most of these anomalies was that there was no independent process monitoring to ensure that e-registration SOPs were being followed to the letter, as well as flag out the challenges being encountered by the migrants so that they could be addressed in good time during the course of the registration process. Although the registration process was done over a short period of time, a windscreen process evaluation could still have helped the situation.

It also appeared that the registering Immigration Officers received the technical aspects of the e-registration process, but did not receive the necessary training on the human relations aspects of handling the concerns and queries of the registrants. Although there was a help desk at each registration site, FGDs and household interviews revealed that the immigration officers were not able to address their queries.

3.3.5 Assisted Voluntary Returns

During the registration exercise, any migrant wishing to return to their place of origin could request assistance from IOM. By the time of this evaluation, only 14 migrant households had enrolled for the AVR initiative in Kigoma Region. When this is considered against the overall target of 3,000 people assisted, it could be concluded that the target was over-ambitious. This could, however, not be regarded as failure to meet the target because the AVR initiative was not an objective into which the project invested resources for its achievement, but was based on the probabilistic expectation that considerable numbers of migrants would take up the initiative as the viable option for their circumstances. As explained by project management, initially AVR was key purpose of the project funding. However, this was overtaken by events because GoT had offered a lifeline for the ex-Mtabila refugees to stay on, and for other irregular migrants to register for regularisation.

Regardless of the low uptake, the design of the AVR component of the programme was sensitive to the vulnerabilities of the migrants. Applicants for AVR were required to indicate any vulnerability (such as being a disabled beneficiary, lactating mother, unaccompanied minor, pregnant woman and an elderly person, etc.).

3.3.6 Orderly return

By the time of this evaluation cases for orderly return had not yet been determined. According to the SOP for e-registration, those found to not have a legal basis for continued stay in Tanzania, nor for not returning to their countries of origin would be so informed and advised to seek the assistance of IOM to join the Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR) program. The personal data of the returning migrants and the locations they would be returning to would be communicated to the country of origin in advance so as to facilitate return and reintegration planning. However, lack of a place to go in the country of origin would not prevent the return of a migrant this or her country of origin. Likewise, consent of the country of origin would not be required for the return of any migrant seeking AVR, or who is subject of Orderly Return or removal under the Immigration Act 1995.”

Notwithstanding the abovementioned process-related challenges, the evaluation concludes that the project had made **good progress towards achievement** of *Outcome 4: Irregular migrants are making informed decisions on regularization on the basis of accurate information*, though with scope for further improvement. Whilst the achievements of the e-registration process could be below expectation in **quantitative** terms, the achieved significant **qualitative impacts**. It build a model for the biometric registration of migrants in Tanzania whose design has great potential for improvement. Being a pilot, the challenges piloting biometric registration of migrants **were achieved with significant IOM contribution**.

Table 7: Ratings of Achievement and IOM Contribution: e-Registration Implementation Outcome

Outputs for the e-Registration	Rating of Outputs and Outcome Achievement	Rating of IOM Contribution
Output 4.1: Irregular migrants mobilised and participate in the biometric registration process	Good Progress Towards Achievement	Significant
Output 4.2: Irregular migrants and ex-Mtabila former Burundian refugees have access to assisted voluntary return services.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Overall rating of Outcome	Good Progress Towards Achievement	Significant

There were, however, outstanding caseloads in Kigoma, Kagera and Geita Regions. While there was common understanding that the e-registration in Kigoma Region was a pilot, expectations had already been raised in all the three regions which were known to be experiencing heavy burdens of irregular migration. IOM and GoT should, therefore, mobilise resources to ensure that the migrants in these regions are registered as well. In addition, the registration was not supposed to be a once-off process over a few days. Community mobilisation and registration could have continued with outreach programmes to

outlying areas.

3.3.7 Project Implementation Partnerships and Coordination Arrangements

The pilot project was implemented by the Government of Tanzania in collaboration with the IOM and the CSFM of the University of Dar es Salaam. The Project Management function was housed in IOM under the overall supervision of the Chief of Mission IOM Tanzania. Two project managers were responsible for the day-to-day coordination of all activities and ensuring implementation, through supervision and support from the program coordinator. The Tanzania ISD was the government lead agency in the implementation of the project on the ground. The department exercised its role in conjunction with both the administrative and political arms of local government at the regional, district and local levels.

In order to support partner implantation capacities IOM would as and when necessary engage short-term consultants and temporary staff. A data specialist was hired and worked closely with both project managers

to develop the database with registration interface and enable connectivity with other border management information systems (BMIS). IOM also hired staff for the entry of the collected migrant data into the data systems. Consultants were also hired to develop SOPs, conduct HBM assessment and the external evaluation at the end of the project period.

The project also created partnership with the CSFM which was assigned the role contacting the project awareness campaign.

In order to enhance the effectiveness of the partnership by ensuring effective coordination of the activities of the various actors, a Steering Committee (SC) was established at the national level consisting of the Immigration Department, IOM and CSFM. During the course of the project the Steering Committee met on four occasions during which key decisions were made with regards to project activities and SOPs for the e-registration process.

The project also worked in close liaison with the Safety and Security Committees, especially at the regional level. On one occasion the Steering Committee was called to present a project implementation brief to the Safety and Security Committee. Joint committees were also established with the border management authorities of neighbouring countries to enhance migration management between the countries.

Through IOM, the project also liaised with other UN agencies in the Refugees Working Group of UNDP. Previously it was feeding into the UNDP coordination process through the Social Cluster.

On the basis of the achievements made under these project partnerships, the evaluation concludes that **the partnerships were effective**. The challenge though is on the continuity of the Steering Committee when the project winds up. The Committee was a project-related structure whose tenure is limited to the project implementation period. It was unlikely that the Committee would continue to function beyond the project period. If it would, then it would have been holding post-registration meetings to ensure that the migrant data was being timeously processed, as well as determine the suitable forms of regularisation for any contentious issues.

3.4 Project Efficiency and Value-for-Money Considerations

Key research questions: How efficient was the DEX implementation arrangement in terms of driving the processes? To what extent did Project procedures and processes impeded or facilitated the accomplishment of results? How well did the Project deliver resources towards the project outputs? Were subprojects approved and launched timely? What is the nature of variance of annual project budgets? What were the project resource absorptive capacities? What were the challenges to budget utilisation? How have IOM and other partners addressed deviation from planned budgets? Was the project value for money?

3.4.1 Project implementation procedures

With IOM being the financial management agent for the project, resources were used and accounted for according to IOM accounting regulations and procedures. The DEX of the managerial function enhanced timely implementation of decisions on procurement of human resources, materials and equipment, mainly so because IOM has flexibility in the procurement of experts and temporary staff, as well as a quick financial disbursement mechanism. Project efficiency was compromised by the delays in the procurement of the e-registration, but this was beyond the control of IOM. The supplier had not provided adequate information on his capacity to meet his contractual obligations in a timely manner.

The project experienced major start-up delays due to the protracted negotiations between Government and the project partners, as well as the delays in the delivery of the e-registration equipment. IOM utilised the delays for implementing the HBM capacity building component of the project. However, the project resource absorption rates were compromised, to the extent that by the 31st October 2014, the project had only utilised 34 percent of its total budget. IOM thus requested and was granted a project extension to 31st March 2015. The revised budget was 23 percent less than the resource requirements that had been

projected in the original budget. This implied that the extended project period had to be implemented with a budget about 43 percent of the original planned resources. The period December 2014 to February 2015 saw accelerated resource absorption due to increased activity related to e-registration of migrants. There were quick approvals of subcomponents of the project related to e-registration, i.e. awareness campaigns, migrant mapping and e-registration to the extent that the whole budget was almost exhausted during that short space of time. At the time of writing of this evaluation report (early March 2015), The revised budget was expected to be almost completely utilised by the end of the project duration, giving a 100 percent absorption rate.

3.5 Value-for-money considerations

In addition to project effectiveness and effectiveness already discussed above, the other value for money criteria is economy and equity.

Economy: The project realised some economies from the use of government personnel for the e-registration exercise. These were already on government payroll, hence the project saved on salary payments. In addition, within the project management function in IOM, the project also employed the strategy of spreading staff functions across a number of projects. Thus, instead of hiring financial accountants for the project, the function was added onto those of already existing staff. Some economies were however achieved at the cost of project quality. The clustering of wards for mass information, household mapping registration affected project quality.

Equity: The project, due to financial constraints could not strive towards equal access to the registration process for all the migrant socioeconomic groups. Although mass information campaigns were inclusive of ward and village leaders who could take the information to their individual wards, mass information meetings were not taken to the individual wards. The mapping exercises were also done at identified sites that could combine wards into clusters. The critical e-registration process was also not taken to the individual wards and villages, but was done at selected sites that also clustered a number of wards together. The approach to these processes was therefore not sensitive to the limitations and vulnerabilities of the elderly, people with disabilities and women who could not leave their children and homes unattended for extended periods of time.

3.6 Value Added by the Project

Key research questions: What could not have happened if IOM had not intervened in the migration crisis? Could another development intervention have done a better job than IOM and why? Taking into consideration the technical capacity of IOM, as well as the development challenges in the country, is IOM well-suited to provide leadership in migration programming in Tanzania? Is IOM perceived by stakeholders as a strong player in advocating for migrant protection in Tanzania?

The value added by the project relates to all the transformative impacts and changes that could not have happened if IOM had not intervened in the search for lasting solution to the migration crisis in western Tanzania. The evaluation established that the project had two types of transformative impacts, viz.: Impacts of e-Registration on the Lives of the Migrants; and Impact of e-Registration of Government Way of Doing Business.

3.6.1 Transformative Impacts of project on the Lives of the Migrants

e-Registration and the registration card brought a number of transformations to the lives of the migrants. Prior to the registration exercise migrants did not have freedom of movement. They were always wary of being stopped, searched and arrested or harassed by law enforcement agents. In the communities migrants could also be harassed without the right to seek recourse to justice and protection. They could provide labour to local employers but would be threatened for being immigrants and be forced to leave without receiving payment for their services. They were also victims of segregatory language in social service institutions, i.e. health and education, which encouraged home deliveries by pregnant mothers, and

withdrawal from school by some children. They could not freely do business. They could be harassed by law enforcement agents, be arrested and pay bribes for their freedom. FGDs revealed that these violations of the human rights of the migrants encouraged underground criminal activities by the migrants to settle scores with some of the perpetrators of the human rights abuses.

The project was the beginning of a new era for the irregular migrants in Kigoma Region of Tanzania, characterised mainly by a shift in mind-sets with regards to their rights. The registration card brought with it:

- Freedom of movement for the migrants who could as a result do their daily businesses without fear of harassment or arrest by law enforcement agents;
- Freedom of association in the communities;
- Fair working conditions for migrants providing labour to the local people;
- Right to seek recourse to justice and protection for violation of migrants' human rights; and
- Friendly access to social services.

"I am now more Tanzanian than you who is not known even at the district level":
Migrants now jokingly teasing their Tanzanian colleagues, as they do not have national IDs (Reported by some FGD participants).

3.6.2 Transformative impacts of e-Registration of Government Way of Doing Business

The major short-term transformative result of the project on government was that it enhanced the capacities of the ISD to manage, monitor, trace and provide the necessary migration services to migrants.

"The project also made Immigration Officers and the police come back to their human rights senses in the way they treated the migrants": Kigoma rural key informant.

Most importantly, it also made Immigration Officers and the police come back to their human rights senses in the way they treated the migrants. These agencies were beginning to follow proper human rights procedures in the handling of migrants, i.e. migrants who were arrested were now being duly brought before the courts, who in turn made the decisions through judgement on the fate of the migrant.

This was a significant departure from the "arrest, detain and deport" paradigm that was prevailing before the HBM training and the e-registration process. A realisation that force was not always necessary in combatting the migration problem had begun to develop in Government.

The project enhanced the officers' knowledge of international migration issues. At the border entry points there was reportedly a significant change in the way the migration officials handled asylum seekers. They could now listen to them and try to help them in a human manner. The project also enhanced cooperation between the border regions of Tanzania and Rwanda in terms of migration and border management. The two parties had begun to hold periodic joint meetings to review the situation. Police reports presented in these meetings indicated a 30 percent reduction in crime in the border regions since the registration process was done. There is now a growing phenomenon among some progressive Tanzanians to see Burundian migrants as partners in development, particularly so as they regarded the Burundians as very hard working people. This group had begun to see opportunities in coordinated migration management for the economic benefit of the two countries.

3.7 Sustainability of Results

Key research questions: What sustainability mechanisms were put in place at project design? Have the achievements of the project been maintained to date, i.e. (Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts)? What is the likelihood that the Project initiatives will be sustainable? What changes in project implementation strategy are necessary to enhance sustainability of results?

The project has put into place a number of sustainability factors.

- i. *Government's leadership role in the e-registration process* was critical for strengthening national ownership of the project. As a result, GoT has taken a commitment to process all the registration

- forms and support the migrants pursue the options applicable to each individual case. The evaluation also gathered information that the Minister of Home Affairs has already taken steps to bid for resources from the national budget to support and carry forward the migration management initiative.
- ii. *Training*: The project supported the development of human capital in HBM and e-registration, whose long term presence in Government and the ISD in particular will be critical for the sustainability of the project outcomes and impacts;
 - iii. *Transformative changes*: The transformative changes in the behaviour of migration staff and authorities towards the migrants is bound to sustainably reshape the migration management landscape in Tanzania. With the rights-based approach having begun to take root from the highest level in Government with its shift in policy from forceful expulsion to protection-sensitive management of migration, to the border management officials who have also shifted from the “arrest, detain and deport” practice to a more migrant friendly approach hinged on human rights, it will be difficult to revert back to the aggressive approach of handling migrants.

There were also, however, a number of threats to sustainability. Resolution of these issues will be critical for the sustainability of results. These included:

- i. Weak community ownership of project outcomes and impacts. The project did not assign communities any specific roles in the migration management, regardless of the fact that migrants leave in the communities;
- ii. Although the project led to behaviour changes among individuals in the institutions, it did not lead to institutional structural changes to sustain the protection-sensitive migration management paradigm shift. Whilst, for example, border management agencies might develop SOPs for HBM, the creation of a unit in the responsible government agency would go a long way towards ensuring compliance to the SOPs and the sustainability of the HBM initiative;
- iii. There was capacity building of ISD (technical training in HBM) and provision of e-registration equipment, but the future role of e-registration beyond the project was not clearly defined; and
- iv. The Project Steering Committee was not a permanent structure but project-related. It was also not related to more permanent structures like the Refugee Programme Working Group of UNDP. The future location of the oversight role on migration management for the sustenance of the project outcomes and impacts was also not defined.

3.8 Assessment of Project Impacts

Key research questions: Has the project managed to achieve its intended impacts? What long term institutional and behavioural changes have occurred as a result of the intervention? Has it resulted in any transformational

As been previously stated, although the project fell short in terms of achieving the target quantitative measures, it performed significantly in terms of the qualitative measures of success. Despite the short period of implementation, the project outputs and outcomes have already begun to translate into impacts in a big way. The project was on course and had **made good progress towards achievement of expected impact: Irregular migrants in Tanzania have enhanced safety, protection, freedom of movement, participation and association.**

Table 8: Ratings of Impact

Outcomes and Expected Impact	Rating of Outcome Achievement	Rating of IOM Contribution
<i>Outcome 1: Increased government commitment to adhere to humanitarian standards and principles in migration management</i>	Achieved	Critical
<i>Outcome 2: Migration management agencies in Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda have improved capacities to implement humanitarian border management principles.</i>	Achieved	Significant
<i>Outcome 3: The Tanzanian Immigration Services Department has improved institutional capacity to identify, register, or regularize irregular migrants in Kigoma, Kagera, and Geita regions of Tanzania</i>	Good Progress Towards	Critical

	Achievement	
<i>Outcome 4: Irregular migrants are making informed decisions on regularization on the basis of accurate information.</i>	Good Progress Towards Achievement	Significant
Overall rating of Impact	Good Progress Towards Achievement	Significant

Interviews with the communities and households revealed that to the registered migrants, the card brought with it full enjoyment of their human rights (Table 9).

- i. *Access to basic social services:* Migrants who were inflicted with abusive and segregatory language in social service institutions were now being treated with the respect they deserve like other Tanzanian nationals. Thus, the migrants had begun to restore their self-respect and pride;
- ii. *Access to protection:* Migrants could now take recourse to justice for injustices perpetrated against them, whether among themselves, or, by members of their host communities. Unlike during the pre-registration era, they now had the freedom to report such injustice to the police and community leaders without the fear of being victimised for their irregular migrant status;
- iii. *Freedom of movement:* They could move freely without fear of arrest, or, harassment by law enforcement agents;
- iv. *Freedom of participation:* The migrants were being accepted as equal members in community development work by their host community members. In fact, some FDG discussions regarded the migrants as key development partners in their communities as most of them own business enterprises that benefit the communities. This important figure role in community development was previously being suppressed by the illegal migrant tag. However, stakeholders were sceptical with the extension of this right to participation into a right to vote in national elections. This abuse of the right to participation was, however, difficult as long as registration into the voters' roll was not verifiable against a national identity card. The evaluation heard that Tanzania has not yet established a national identity card system; and
- v. *Right to be heard:* Unlike previously when the authorities used the arrest, detain and deport approach, migrants were being afforded their right to be heard and defend themselves in courts of law.

Table 9: Impact ratings by indicator performance

Impact	Indicator	Status of Indicator: March 2015	Impact Ratings
<i>Irregular migrants in Tanzania enjoy their rights to safety, protection, freedom of movement,</i>	Proportion of migrants expressing satisfaction with access to each of the right	All interviewed migrants reported significant improvements in their rights	Good Progress Towards Achievement

participation and association			
	Proportion of migrants reporting positive behaviour change in host communities	All FGDs indicated major behaviour changes by host communities.	
	No. of communities reportedly supporting integration of migrants into their communities.	The integration of migrants was garnering community and stakeholder support	
	Proportion of stakeholders seeing benefits in transforming migration into an opportunity for the benefit of Tanzania and migrant supplying countries	Policy and technical level stakeholders were all urging the GoT and GoB to transform the migration crisis into an opportunity for mutual benefit of the two countries.	
Overall rating of impact			Good Progress Towards Achievement

CHAPTER 4: STRATEGIC REPOSITIONING OF THE MIGRATION IN THE COUNTRY'S DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

4.1 Tanzania's Commitment to Migration Management

The on-going developments, consultations and multilateral dialogue in the migration management sector present significant opportunities for IOM Tanzania to push for the elevation of migration in the country's development agenda. It could also take advantage of Tanzania's migration related obligation emanating from its membership in international and regional institutions with interests in migration management.

On the international front Tanzania is a Member State of IOM and it has ratified and domesticated a number of Conventions and Protocols. These include:

- The Charter of the United Nations, 1945;
- United Nations Declaration on Human Rights of All Migrants, 2000;
- International Convention on the Protection of All Migrant Workers and members of Their Families, 1990;
- Declaration on the Human Rights of Individuals who are Not Nationals of The Country in Which They Live, 1985;
- Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, 1975;
- Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951;
- Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of the Refugee Problem in Africa, 1969;
- Protocol Against The Smuggling Of Migrants By Land, Sea And Air Supplementing The United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime United Nations 2000;
- Protocol To Prevent, Suppress And Punish Trafficking In Persons, Especially Women And Children, Supplementing The United Nations 2000; and
- Other International Human Rights Conventions.

At the regional level, Tanzania is a signatory to the East Africa Community Protocol on free, safe and orderly movement of persons. In the region, migration occupies a central place in the regional integration process. In order to realise the core objectives of the abovementioned EAC Protocol, there is general consensus among stakeholders across the region on the need for proper migration management through a planned, organised and a planned, coordinated approach, which is intrinsically tied to migration challenges such as irregular migration, among others. This will be critical in order to maximise the development potential of migration.

On the domestic front Tanzania has domesticated the abovementioned international and regional instruments by mainstreaming them into the following national legal instruments and statutes:

- The Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania, 1977;
- The Immigration Act, 1995;
- The Immigration Regulations, 1997;
- The Citizenship Act 1995;
- The Citizenship Regulations 1997;
- The Refugees Act 1998;
- Law of the Child Act 2009; and
- Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act, 2008.

The country's development framework, MKUKUTA makes reference to migration in Goal 3 of Cluster 1: Growth for Reduction of Income Poverty where better understanding of migration in the context of employment creation was required. Goal 5 of Cluster II: Improvement of Quality of Life and Social Well-Being also the need to understand migration in the context of social service delivery.

To support the implementation of migration related issues in the context of MKUKUTA, the UN Country Team in Tanzania has constituted a multiagency Refugee Working Group.

The country's commitment towards the fulfilment of its commitments under the abovementioned international instruments, and its expression of that commitment by the domestication of the same illustrates that the GoT is ready for engagement on placing migration management at the centre of development planning. The country had also begun to take major steps towards migration programming through MKUKUTA and the UNDAF.

4.2 The Migration Crisis Support Project: Unlocking Opportunities for Elevation of Migration in the National Development Agenda

In order to unlock the kinetics in the potentials stored in government commitment illustrated above for strengthening the role of migration in the development of the Tanzania's economy IOM could utilise its *Partner of Choice in Migration Management* tag it earned through the implementation of the project under review to put in motion key processes of concerted dialogue with, and engagement of the GoT and other key stakeholders. The project under review opened the following windows of opportunity to push the migration agenda forward to become a national development priority.

Dialogue and engagement: IOM enhanced the visibility of the project through multiple presentations of the project before the PWG Refugees, donor meetings (e.g. Governance working group of the Development Partners Group, etc.), the work with the GoT on the migration profile, and the active participation in the UNDAF II planning meetings. The evaluation notes, however, that IOM did not use the opportunity created by the rapport it had managed to establish under this project to dialogue with GoT for the elevation of migration in national development planning. Inroads into such dialogue could strengthen Government commitment to sustain the protection-sensitive migration management by including it as a key budget line in the national budget. IOM could also have used the opportunity to strengthen its lobby on Government to domesticate any key Conventions it has ratified but not yet translated into legislation nor policy.

World Humanitarian Summit 2016 IOM position paper on humanitarian border management: IOM HQ is in the process of preparing its position paper on HBM to be presented to the upcoming World Humanitarian Summit 2016. This paper on humanitarian border management seeks to contribute to this consultation by proposing an approach wherein humanitarian action can be improved by assisting governments and their border institutions to more effectively manage crisis-induced displacement and mass movements. IOM Tanzania should capitalise on this opportunity to show-case the Tanzanian experience by contributing this paper, as well as support visibility of Tanzania as a shining example of the East Africa Region in migrant protection. This could be catalytic for resource mobilisation for follow-up projects and programmes to this project under review.

Transforming migration challenges into opportunities for all affected countries in the Region: IOM could use its partner of choice in migration management tag to promote dialogue among countries with stakes in the Tanzania migration crisis to devise mechanisms for migration cooperation that would benefit the concerned countries economically, politically and socially. IOM could utilise its global knowledge networks to support such an initiative with lessons and best practices from around the world with regards to organised migration cooperation on labour and business. Towards this end, IOM could also capitalise on the ongoing discussions in the region about strengthening free movement in the context of the East Africa Community.

Encourage proactive responses to migration: There is general consensus among stakeholders that a project of this nature should have been implemented a long time ago. Given that the country was aware that the prevailing peace in the country attracts migrants and refugees from all over the Sub-Saharan Africa, and the security threats the country is being subjected to due to armed conflicts in the Region, it should not have postponed action to seek international assistance strengthen to its border management systems. Thus, GoT should have taken migration as a development priority and requested the international community, under

the leadership of IOM to assist and mobilise in mobilise other partners to take preventive action against any future migrant mass deportation operations by continually cooperating with GoT on HBM.

Need to influence donor priorities: Whilst IOM's focus is on ensuring that the regularisation of migrants in western Tanzania is pursued to its logical conclusion, some donors have been distracted by the need to support the integration of naturalised former refugees into society. IOM, therefore, has a major challenge in convincing the donors to give priority to the migrant population that is still at risk and highly vulnerable. To IOM the outcome of the current migration management intervention is still a migration crisis outcome, and not yet a migration governance outcome. This calls for lobbying and dialogue for the change of mindsets. The IOM Head of Mission had already begun resource mobilisation discussions with the donors. Government is gearing for the scaling up of the project to other regions affected by the irregular migrant phenomenon. In its drive scale up the project it requires the financial and technical support of IOM. This adds to the urgency for IOM to elevate its resource mobilisation efforts to a higher level.

Need to support Government institutionalise HBM and migrant e-registration: Government has illustrated enhanced capacity by independently organising workshops to train its migration officers in migration management. The development of SOPs was another indication of enhanced capacity. There is, however, need for IOM to support Government realign its institutional structures in the relevant agencies to ensure that protection-sensitive migration management is internalised through structural changes for sustainability.

CHAPTER 5: ENABLERS, LESSONS LEARNT AND BEST PRACTICES

5.1 Result Enablers

Despite all the challenges observed by this evaluation, there were a number of enabling factors that facilitated the achievement of project results. These factor played catalytic roles to results achievement both individually and in combination. They included the following:

- i. Cordial working relations between IOM and GoT;
- ii. The win-win strategy that emanated from the strategic engagement of all parties towards an agreed project modus operandi;
- iii. Building of trust with migrant communities;
- iv. Partnerships; and
- v. Joint planning of activities with GoT and CSFM.

5.2 Lessons Learnt

There were a number of lessons learnt from the project under review, the key of which are the following:

- i. The imperatives that led to operation Kimbunga were a result of deferred inaction by the Government of Tanzania to place migration at the centre of national planning. Knowing very well that the country's migration problems mainly emanated from the country's status as the isle of peace in the East Africa Region and its strong sense of human rights based on the principle that all humans are equal both of which were migrant pull factors, Government should have been proactive and preventive by seeking assistance for strengthen its migration management systems.
- ii. Limited community participation in project implementation creates resistance which minimises community cooperation towards the achievement of project activities.
- iii. The law can serve to antagonise community relations, or, harmonise them. When migrants were enemies of the law, communities would join in to hate them. With e-registration, the law then regarded migrants as regularised migrants. This also swayed community relations between nationals and migrants towards harmonisation.

5.3 Best Practices

One best practice by the project that was worth noting was its observance of the Convention on the Rights of Child and the African Charter on the Rights of the Child which place the child's interests first in any situation of conflict. In this project, every child – documented or not, accompanied or not, trafficked or not – would enjoy necessary protection, regardless of his/her and/or his/her parents migratory status. Moreover, the project observed the need for efforts to conduct some tracing/assessment in the registration exercise, to support the child best interest in the registration process and prevent situations where migrant children remain in limbo in Tanzania.

The development of SOPs for key activities was also a best practice in that it provided the policy and technical prescription to process implementation. SOPs also promote accountability in process implementation as well as protect the interests of beneficiaries. In addition, affording an arrested migrant the opportunity to be heard and defend oneself in a court of law is an international best practice.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusion

Overall the Migration Crisis Support to Western Tanzania Project had made significant progress towards the achievement of its intended results by the time of this evaluation. Key outstanding issues included the need to continue with the e-registration process in the pilot district to capture those who could not register due to limited project outreach, processing of the registration forms, as well as implementation of the AVR component of the project.

Quality of project design: The project design was generally of good quality. It was designed through a consultative and participatory process, giving it a wide foundation for stakeholder ownership and recognition. The project results were, however, pitched at a low level such that they underplayed the migrant human rights and protection focus of the project. The management function of the project was executed directly by IOM while project implementation was nationally executed by GoT. The arrangement was necessitated by some imperatives in the operational environment.

Relevance: The project was a relevant response to the plight of the irregular migrants who were under the threat of forced deportation from Tanzanian territory. Its relevance was strengthened by its coherence to the IOM corporate planning frameworks, partner programmes and programming frameworks and national development plans. It was also consistent with the IOM mandate and country programme in Tanzania.

Effectiveness: As a pilot, the project was effective in demonstrating the feasibility of implementing protection-sensitive approaches to the resolution of migration crises. Biometric registration proved to be a practical and sustainable solution that could strengthen the capacities of migration authorities to exercise significant control over migrants in terms of location, monitoring and support. Effectiveness was, however, compromised by the inability of the project to capture all deserving cases and lack of continuity. Project effectiveness had great scope for improvement through better choices between a narrow and deep intervention, as opposed to a wide and shallow intervention to suite the resource envelope and implementation timeframe. Notwithstanding these gaps, the visible value addition by the project was the key factor in underplaying the impact of the challenges on project effectiveness.

Efficiency: Project efficiency was compromised by the unavoidable delays in take-off of key project activities related to the e-registration of migrants, which was the major component of the project. The project, however, managed to accelerate implementation in the last three months of project implementation, but to some extent at the expense of quality and effectiveness.

Value for Money considerations: Generally, the project was value for money. This could be concluded from the level of efficiency and effectiveness. The project also realised some economies from the rationalisation of implementation arrangements, but equity was compromised by limited outreach to limited funding. It also made remarkable value addition, particularly in terms of its transformative impacts on the behaviour of migration authorities and host communities towards the irregular migrants.

Project sustainability was strengthened by Government leadership of the project implementation, capacity for HBM and the transformative impacts manifested through positive behaviour change in migration authorities and host communities towards the migrants. However, it was compromised by weak community ownership of the project and weak institutionalisation of capacities in Government, lack of clarity with regards to the future of e-registration in the pilot districts, and the absence of a permanent policy structure to exercise oversight over programme continuity.

Intended impact: By the time of the evaluation, the project had made significant progress towards the achievement of its intended impact, as demonstrated by the improvements in the human rights of the migrants. The e-registration card brought with it the enjoyment of basic human rights by the migrants.

There was still, however, need to see the process to its completion when migrants would be granted permits, or, opt for AVR. This will consolidate the impacts that have already begun to manifest in the short term.

Strategic repositioning of IOM: The project also created a strong opportunity for IOM to engage and lobby Government to place migration at the centre of development planning. The opportunity had been opened by the GoT's commitment to the domestication of international and regional instruments on migration to which it is party, as well as the programming of migration which was already evident in the country's through MKUKUTA and UNDAP.

6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 Policy level recommendations

Recommendation 1: The project should be scaled-up to cover other districts facing challenges of irregular migration.

Recommendation 2: There is need for Government and IOM to influence donor priorities so that in the short to medium term the continue to acknowledge that the migration crisis is not yet over, hence the need for the to prioritise their assistance to this cause.

Recommendation 3: Transform migration challenges into opportunities for all affected countries in the region. In particular, Governments of Tanzania and Burundi could start thinking of transforming the migration problem into an opportunity and design mechanisms for the migration flows to benefit the two countries.

Recommendation 4: There is need for intervention design to make informed choices between a wide but shallow and narrow but deep intervention. The choice should be commensurate with the intended results and implementation timeframe.

Recommendation 5: The Steering Committee should monitor implementation of the post-registration activities to ensure that the registration forms are processed and migrants informed about the options available in time.

6.2.2 Programmatic Recommendations

Recommendation 1: There is need for comprehensive results framework that clearly shows the theory of change. The absence of such a results framework compromised project evaluability.

Recommendation 2: The project should be linked to clear post-return/integration programming in recipient countries to support migrant populations who will opt for AVR: AVR was not supported by durable solution programmes in recipient countries. IOM Tanzania could mobilise its sister offices in the East Africa Region to mobilise resources and design durable solution programmes to support the integration of AVR migrants into their new communities and re-establish their livelihoods.

Recommendation 3: There is need for project design to strike a balance of project duration, intended geographical and population coverage: One of the major pitfalls of the project under review was the mismatch between project duration, intended geographical and population coverage. This resulted in hurried implementation, failure to complete project in planned timeframe, and time-related rationalisation of awareness campaigns, household mapping and determination of numbers of e-registration centres per district. This compromised project quality and effectiveness.

Recommendation 4: The project should have a well-articulated exit strategy: The project exit strategy was not adequately designed and communicated to the partners. If anything, the exit strategy was funding and not impact/results related. By the time of the evaluation, it was not clear to stakeholders and beneficiaries whether project implementation had come to any end, or it had just been suspended for the data entry of the e-registration forms to be completed before it could then move on to the next steps.

Recommendation 5: e-Registration equipment should be installed at the ISD regional offices for the registration process to continue so that some of the migrants who were left out in the first phase could get the opportunity to register. This will also help maintain the credibility of the programme. Programme awareness campaigns should seek to establish beneficiary buy-in, internalisation and ownership of the programme.

Recommendation 6: Need for e-registration to be done against mapping lists to avoid errors of inclusion and leakages

Recommendation 7: There is need for transparency in the e-registration process so that migrants take informed decisions with regards to participation and choices. They should be fully informed about the need, reasons and available choices, as well as the post-registration processes.

Recommendation 8: Devote enough time to information sharing and awareness raising among the target beneficiary population.

Recommendation 9: In the course of project implementation commission independent process monitoring and evaluations to ensure procedures are being followed and address process challenges encountered by beneficiaries on time.

Recommendation 10: Promote community participation and ownership of the project for the sustainability of outcomes and impacts buy ensuring buy-in and internalisation of the project objectives and results.

References

Betts A., August 2008, New Issues in Refugee Research: Research Paper No. 162: Towards a 'Soft Law' Framework for the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants

IOM Tanzania, 2013, Concept Note on IOM Humanitarian Support in Western Tanzania

IOM Tanzania, 2013, Migrants Registration Report

IOM Tanzania, 2014, Humanitarian Border Management Assessment Tanzania-Uganda Report, IOM 2014

IOM Tanzania, 2014, Humanitarian Border Management Assessment Tanzania-Burundi Report, IOM 2014

IOM Tanzania, 2014, Humanitarian Support in Western Tanzania: IOM and TISD Start Population Mapping Exercise in Kigoma Region, Nov 2014

IOM Tanzania, 2014, Humanitarian Support to Migrants in Tanzania Situation Report: June to July 2014

IOM Tanzania, 2014, Humanitarian Support to Migrants in Tanzania Situation Report: June to July 2014

IOM Tanzania, 2014, Humanitarian Support to Migrants in Western Tanzania: 9 December 2014:

IOM Tanzania, 2015, Humanitarian Support to Migrants In Western Tanzania Update January 2015

IOM Tanzania, Humanitarian Support to Migrants in Western Tanzania: Week 2: Registration Exercise Kicks off in Kigoma Urban, Dec 2014

IOM Tanzania, IOM Tanzania Organizes Workshop on Return Management, February 2014

IOM, 2011, IOM Migration Crisis Operational Framework

IOM, 2013, International Organization for Migration Regional Office for East and Horn of Africa 2013 – 2014

IOM, IOM Strategy, Geneva 2007

IOM, World Humanitarian Summit 2016 IOM Position Paper on Humanitarian Border Management, Geneva 13 January 2015

Komenda H., Migration Crisis Support to Address Migrant expulsions in Western Tanzania: Mid-Term Review, IOM July 2014

Ministry of Home Affairs, 2014, Comprehensive Migration Management Strategy in Tanzania (COMMSIT): SOPs for e-Registration of Migrants in North-Western Tanzania, August 2014

René Verduijn R., Verduijn-Jönsson L., 2013, Closure of Mtabila Refugee Camp in THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF Tanzania and Return of 34,000 Former Refugees to Burundi: Lessons Learned, October 2013

UNHCR, 2005, Operation Training Manual, Reach Out Refugee Protection Training Project

UNHCR, Refugee Protection: A Guide to International Refugee Law, UNHCR

ANNEX I: Output and Outcome Rating Tool

Table 1: Status of Outcome 1 and its Outputs as at March 2015

Outcome 1: Increased government commitment to adhere to humanitarian standards and principles in migration management			
Output	Output and Outcome Indicators	Status of Indicator: March 2015	Output and Outcome Ratings
Output 1.1: Consensus reached with Government in implementing human rights sensitive approaches to migration management	No. of forceful expulsion of migrants reported	Since implementation of project, there were no forceful expulsions of irregular migrates in the project districts	Achieved
	Documentary proof of policy change towards promotion of voluntary migration and regularisation	Policy change was outlined in SOPs for e-registration adopted by all three parties in the Steering Committee	Achieved
Output 1.2: Roles of partners in project implementation agreed upon	Lead project management agent defined	IOM adopted as project and financial management agent	Achieved
	Lead project implementation agent defined	Government's ISD in MoHA adopted as lead project implementation agent	Achieved
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 1	Agreement of cooperation adopted and signed by all the parties	All three parties to the project reached an agreement with regards to the project modus operandi and partner roles	Achieved

Table 2: IOM Contribution towards achievement of Outcome 1

Outcome 1: Increased government commitment to adhere to humanitarian standards and principles in migration management			
Output	Status of Indicator: March 2015	IOM Contribution	Output and Outcome Ratings of IOM Contribution
Output 1.1: Consensus reached with Government in implementing protection sensitive approaches to migration management	Since implementation of project, there were no forceful expulsions of irregular migrates in the project districts	It was IOM that conceived the project idea which resulted in the ceasing of expulsion of irregular migrants	Critical
	Policy change was outlined in SOPs for e-registration adopted by all three parties in the Steering Committee	IOM suggested the need for the SOPs, but Government took the lead role in their development.	Significant
Output 1.2: Roles of partners in project implementation agreed upon	IOM adopted as project and financial management agent	All the three parties played major roles towards reaching consensus on partner roles	Significant
	Government's ISD in MoHA adopted as lead project implementation agent		
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 1	All three parties to the project reached an agreement with regards to the project modus operandi and partner roles	IOM with the resource leverage and as guardian of humanitarian principles had significant influence on the decisions	Critical

Table 3: Status of Outcome 2 and its Outputs as at March 2015

Outcome 2: Migration management agencies in Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda have improved capacities to implement humanitarian border management principles.			
Output	Output and Outcome Indicators	Status of Indicator: March 2015	Output and Outcome Ratings
Output 2.1: Humanitarian border management assessment report available	No. of HBM assessment reports produced	Tanzania-Burundi and Tanzania-Uganda HBM assessments done. Report for the latter was availed to the evaluators	
	No. of countries participating in HBM assessment	Three countries (Tanzania, Burundi and Uganda) participated	
Output 2.2: SOPs for the implementation of HBM principles and for conducting appropriate returns are in place.	No. of SOPs produced	SOPs were still to be finalised	
	No. of parties to the project endorsing standard operating procedures.	The SOPs were still to be finalised	
Output 2.3: Officials of ISD have knowledge and skills necessary to appropriately manage returns and to implement HBM principles.	Training needs assessment produced	Training needs were identified through the HBM Assessments	
	No. of officials trained in HBM	40 ISD officers trained in	
	No. of training workshops held by type of training	At least 2 workshops held	
	No. of training workshops cascaded		
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 2	No. of border management agencies reporting behaviour change in treatment of migrants	All three interviewed district ISD offices reported change in the way they related to migrants at the entry points. They were now assistive approach to migrants with challenges	
	No. of reported cases of migrant abuse	Although there were isolated incidences of migrant abuse at the Tanzania-Burundi border, the situation had drastically improved	

Table 4: IOM Contribution towards achievement of Outcome 2

Outcome 2: Migration management agencies in Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda have improved capacities to implement humanitarian border management principles.			
Output	Status of Indicator: March 2015	IOM Contribution	Output and Outcome Ratings of IOM Contribution
Output 2.1: Humanitarian border management assessment report available	Tanzania-Burundi and Tanzania-Uganda HBM assessments done. Report for the latter was availed to the evaluators	IOM provided both financial and technical assistance to the assessment. It procured the consultants to carry out the assessments.	Critical
	Three countries (Tanzania, Burundi and Uganda) participated		
Output 2.2: SOPs for the implementation of HBM principles and for conducting appropriate returns are in place.	SOPs were still to be completed		Critical
	SOPs were still to be completed		Critical
Output 2.3: Officials of ISD have knowledge and skills necessary to appropriately manage returns and to implement HBM principles.	40 ISD officers trained in	IOM provided technical and financial assistance for the training. It also provided the resource persons	Critical
	At least 2 workshops held		Significant
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 2	All three interviewed district ISD offices reported change in the way they related to migrants at the entry points. They had taken assistive approach to migrants with challenges	The behavior change was a result of the training that was supported by IOM.	Significant
	No. of reported cases of migrant abuse		Moderate

Table 5: Status of Outcome 3 and its Outputs as at March 2015

Outcome 3: The Tanzanian Immigration Services Department has improved institutional capacity to identify, register, or regularize irregular migrants in Kigoma, Kagera, and Geita regions of Tanzania.			
Output	Output and Outcome Indicators	Status of Indicator: March 2015	Output and Outcome Ratings
Output 3.1: Immigration officials have the human and technical capacity to roll out the registration and e-application system	No. of ISD officials conversant with the design of the e-application system and processes	138 immigration officers have been trained on e-application system and processes. 12 of them received Training of trainers (TOT). 25 officers have actually used the application on site	
	No. of Regional Offices equipped with e-registration equipment	Equipment was procured for the Kigoma Regions. Used for e-registration but not yet installed at the offices	
	No. of ISD officials participating in the e-registration of migrants	25 ISD have participated in the e-registration	
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 3	No. of districts with databases of migrants in their respective areas	Processing of e-registration forms was still in progress	
	No. of migrants registered independently by ISD Officers	IOM was just providing technical support. So, all migrants were independently registered by ISD officers.	

Table 6: IOM Contribution towards achievement of Outcome 3

Outcome 3: The Tanzanian Immigration Services Department has improved institutional capacity to identify, register, or regularize irregular migrants in Kigoma, Kagera, and Geita regions of Tanzania.			
Output	Status of Indicator: March 2015	IOM Contribution	Output and Outcome Ratings of IOM Contribution
Output 3.1: Immigration officials have the human and technical capacity to roll out the registration and e-application system		
	Equipment was procured for all 4 pilot districts. Used for e-registration but not yet installed at the ISD district offices	IOM processed all procurement for the equipment	Critical
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 3	Processing of e-registration forms was still in progress	IOM hired temporary data capturers to enter the individual migrant registration data into the system	Critical

Table 7: Status of Outcome 3 and its Outputs as at March 2015

Outcome 4: Irregular migrants are making informed decisions on regularization on the basis of accurate information.			
Output	Output and Outcome Indicators	Status of Indicator: March 2015	Output and Outcome Ratings
Output 4.1: Irregular migrants mobilised and participate in the biometric registration process	No. mass awareness meetings held	About three mass awareness meetings held in each district. However, registrants still lacked clarity on purpose of registration. They also did not know the next steps.	Good Progress Towards Achievement
	No. of migrant mapping sites identified per district	About three per district. Mapping sites clustered wards together which resulted in long distances to the mapping sites	
	No. of migrants mapped	The number was not available. Daily tallies not compiled	Partially
	No. of migrants registered and issued registration cards	22,282 migrants registered in 4 districts, but with big errors of inclusion.	
Output 4.2: Irregular migrants and ex-Mtabila former Burundian refugees have access to assisted voluntary return services.	No. of migrants requesting assisted voluntary return services.	Only 14 so far recorded in Kigoma Region. This was, however, no longer a priority as Government had offered option to consider migrants for permits	
	No. of ex-Mtabila refugees assisted with voluntary return to Burundi	None	N/A
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 4	Proportion of migrants benefiting from protection through the e-registration process	All the registered migrants were no longer under the threat of forceful deportation.	

Table 7: Status of Outcome 3 and its Outputs as at March 2015

Outcome 4: Irregular migrants are making informed decisions on regularization on the basis of accurate information.			
Output	Status of Indicator: March 2015	IOM Contribution	Output and Outcome Ratings of IOM Contribution
Output 4.1: Irregular migrants mobilised and participate in the biometric registration process	About three mass awareness meetings held in each district. However, registrants still lacked clarity on purpose of registration. They also did not know the next steps.	IOM provided financial and logistical support to the exercise	Significant
	About three per district. Mapping sites clustered wards together which resulted in long distances to the mapping sites		
	The number was not available. Daily tallies not compiled		
	22,282 migrants registered in 4 districts, but with errors of inclusion.		
Output 4.2: Irregular migrants and ex-Mtabila former Burundian refugees have access to assisted voluntary return services.	Only 14 so far recorded in Kigoma Region. This was, however, no longer a priority as Government had offered option to consider migrants for permits	N/A	N/A
	No Burundian refugees supported AVR because GoT had given them a lifeline to stay on.	N/A	N/A
Overall rating of achievement of outcome 4	Large proportion did not understand and internalise the purpose of e-registration. This was a deliberate strategy to lure them into participation.	IOM supported the multimedia information campaign	Significant
	All interviewed migrants were not aware of the next steps after registration. Again, this was a deliberate strategy. PVC card issuance for the migrants' protection was most critical.	IOM ensured the protection of the migrants from forceful expulsion by providing technical, logistical and financial support to the process	Critical

ANNEX II: Terms of Reference

Migration Crisis Support to Address Migrant Expulsions in Western Tanzania: End of Project Evaluation

Evaluation context

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As the leading international organization for migration, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration, and; uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

On 29th July 2013 the Government of Tanzania issued a public directive for irregular migrants in the western regions bordering Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda to leave the country by 11th August 2013 or face expulsion. Since the directive was issued, approximately 65,000 migrants were expelled from Tanzania, creating a migration crisis in neighbouring states.

In response to the expulsion of irregular migrants from Tanzania, IOM worked with the government and partners to implement a comprehensive protection-sensitive migration management approach, including regularizations or returns, and to therefore reduce the number of stranded and vulnerable migrants at Tanzania's borders with Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda, through the project entitled "Migration Crisis Support to Address Migrant Expulsions in Western Tanzania." The project began in December 2013 and was scheduled for completion in December 2014. It was extended for three months until 31/3/2015.

The project aimed to enhance the national migration management capacity to facilitate access to migrant documentation and regularization, and to improve return management in the border regions of Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda by i) providing safe and orderly assisted voluntary repatriation to former Burundian refugees and irregular migrants from Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda, and ii) providing capacity building on humanitarian border management services to immigration services in Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda.

Evaluation purpose

IOM conducts project and programme evaluations as part of its commitment to improved results based management. Evaluation recommendations are used to improve decision-making and evaluating performance to improve project and programme design and implementation. The overall purpose of this evaluation is to review the effectiveness and efficiency of the project, assess its outcome and impact, and consider prospects for sustainability. In addition, the objective is to identify and document lessons learned and best practices in view of the planned upscaling of the project activities.

Evaluation scope

This evaluation will focus solely on the project entitled "Migration Crisis Support to Address Migrant Expulsions in Western Tanzania." The project was implemented from December 2013 to 31/12/2014, with an extension until 31/3/2015 in Tanzania, Burundi, and Uganda.¹

Evaluation criteria

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Assess the relevance of the project towards the government policy on irregular migration and return
2. Assess the effectiveness of the project in reaching its stated objectives.
3. Assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of project implementation.
4. To assess the outcome and impact of the project.
5. Assess the prospects for sustainability.
6. Identify lessons learned and best practices.

Evaluation questions

A complete list of evaluation questions and sub-questions will be jointly developed together with the consultant. The following questions are indicative of the types of questions to be addressed in the evaluation:

Relevance

1. Are the objectives of the project relevant to the policy of irregular migration of the government of Tanzania?
2. Is the project relevant to the needs of the neighboring countries facing returns?
3. Is the project relevant to IOM policy on assisted returns?

Effectiveness

¹ Rwanda declined to participate in the capacity building activities related to humanitarian border management, citing the classified nature of the information to be shared in the course of these activities.

1. To what extent did the project enhance national migration management capacities for migrant documentation, regularization, and return management in the border regions of Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda?
2. To what extent did the project activities facilitate safe and orderly assisted voluntary repatriation to former Burundian refugees and irregular migrants from Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda?
3. To what extent did the project activities improve the capacity of immigration services on humanitarian border management?
4. To what extent did the project take into account gender and human-rights issues at the development and implementation phases?
5. To what extent did the project reduce the number of stranded and vulnerable irregular migrants at the Tanzanian borders with Burundi, Rwanda and Uganda?
6. Were project activities implemented as planned and on schedule?
7. What is the quality of the project outputs and/or the project activities?

Process and efficiency

8. How cost-effective was the project? How did the Government contribute to the costs of the project?
9. How efficient was the overall management of the project?
10. How appropriate was the project design to achieve its objectives in the context in which it operates?
11. What external factors affected the implementation of the project and how were they managed?
12. How effectively were the programme performance and results monitored?

Sustainability

13. Were suitable strategies for sustainability developed and implemented?
14. To what extent are the project results likely to be sustained in the long-term?

Outcome and Impact

Although it may be too early to assess the impact of the project, given that it can logically only be measured some time after the project has been completed, some initial conclusions may possibly be drawn. Regarding the outcome (immediate impact) some of the questions will be framed accordingly.

15. Is there any concrete outcome that can be registered in line with expected results?
16. What short-term and possible longer term changes can be observed in relation to the objectives of the project?
17. To what extent can observed changes be attributed to the project?
18. Are there unintended outcomes or impacts, in particular regarding the main objective of irregular migration management?

Evaluation methodology

Review of existing reports and documents; in-depth interviews with key informants such as immigration and border management officials, government and embassy officials of the governments of Tanzania, Rwanda², Burundi, and Uganda, United Nations agencies, and implementing partners; and questionnaires and focus group discussions with migrants.

For the document review, the following documents will be provided by IOM Tanzania:

- Project document
- Project budget
- Interim reports and final reports
- Monitoring reports
- IOM Tanzania strategy papers

Assistance will be provided in the identification of key stakeholders, and in organizing the schedule of interviews, focus groups, and site visits. Documentation related to initiatives implemented by IOM or other agencies that can be considered as complementary or as having an impact on the implementation of the project will be examined.

Evaluation deliverables

The consultant will produce the following:

1. Proposal for revised terms of reference for the evaluation, if required.
2. An evaluation inception report, inclusive of evaluation matrix (questions and sub questions, indicators and data sources), proposed methodology, and proposed work plan agreed upon.
3. .
4. A PowerPoint presentation debrief at the end of on-site data collection.
5. A draft evaluation report.
6. A final evaluation report.

² Rwandan officials might be willing to comment on the Assisted Voluntary Return operations conducted by IOM from the transit center at the Rwandan-Tanzanian border to the communities of migrants' origin.

All documents are to be submitted in English.

[Evaluation workplan](#)

The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between the project manager in IOM Tanzania and the evaluator. The evaluation will take place over a five-week period (ideally starting February 2, 2015), including three weeks in country and two weeks home-based. The final report should be submitted to IOM Tanzania by March 6, 2015.

Activity	Days	Location	Weeks				
			1	2	3	4	5
Initial document review and revision of ToRs	3	Home	x				
Draft inception brief (2 to 5 pages)	1	Home	x				
Management interviews and meetings	3	Dar es Salaam		x			
Final inception brief	2	Dar es Salaam		x			
Travel, in country interviews, and data collection	6	Dar es Salaam, Kigoma			x	x	
Draft evaluation report	5						x
Final evaluation report	2						x

ANNEX III: List of Key Informants Interviewed

Name	Designation	Organisation
National Level Interviews		
Mr. Damien Thuriaux	Head of Mission	IOM
Ms. Tamara Keating	Programme Coordinator	IOM
Mr. Charles Mkude	Programme Officer	IOM
Ms. Emma Laboyrie	Visibility focal point IOM Tz	IOM
Ms. Mia Immelback	Project Manager	IOM
Prof. Rutinwa	Director	CSFM
Mr. Charles Sokile	Programme Officer, Governance	DFID
Regional Level Key Informants		
Mr. John Ndunguru	Regional Administrative Secretary	Ministry of Local Government
Mr. Kingdom Mwanguku	Regional Immigration Officer	Immigration Services Department
Mr. Donbosco Ndayikengurukye	Consular General	Burundi Consulate
District Level Key Informants		
Mr. Sotelly Mussa Tundwe	Admin. Officer/Acting District Administrative Secretary	Ministry of Local Government
Mr. Nelson Mwandezi	District Executive Director, Kigoma Urban	Ministry of Local Government
Mr. Iddi Ndabhona	Council Legal Advisor	Kigoma Urban Council
Mr. Bulugu Edward Nkanga	District Immigration Officer, Kigoma Urban	Immigration Services Department
Mr. Halid Saleiman	District Immigration Officer, Kigoma Rural	Immigration Services Department
Mrs. Upendo Marango	District Administrative Officer, Uvinza District	Ministry of Local Government
Mrs. Hadijah Nyembo	District Commissioner, Uvinza District	Ministry of Local Government
Mr. Johns	District Immigration Officer Uvinza District	Immigration Services Department

ANNEX IV: Research Instruments

EVALUATION OF THE MIGRATION CRISIS SUPPORT TO WESTERN TANZANIA PROJECT FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

Name of Community Ward District
No. of Participants: Women Men Girls Boys Date

Purpose of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to review the effectiveness and efficiency of the project, assess its outcomes and impact, and consider prospects for sustainability. In addition, the objective is to identify and document lessons learned and best practices in view of the planned scaling up of the project activities.

- 1 What challenges were you facing before this project facilitated your registration?
- 2 How has the project assisted in addressing those challenges?
- 3 How were people mobilized for and made aware of the registration process?
- 4 Now that people have been registered what steps should you follow to regularize your stay in Tanzania?
- 5 What is the role of leaders in ensuring that the card holders are constantly reminded about the next steps?
- 6 Now that you are registered, what benefits are card holders getting in terms of:
 - Access to social services e.g. education, health, and food distribution?
 - Protection and safety?
 - Participation in public affairs i.e. community development planning?
 - Access to livelihood?
- 7 What was done well in this project?
- 8 What are your recommendations for improving the identification, registration, and post-registration processes?

Evaluation of the Migration Crisis Support in Western Tanzania Project

DFID and Japanese Embassy

Name: Designation Organisation

1. In 2013 Tanzania experienced challenges with mass outward migration emanating from the presidential directive for irregular migrants to leave the country, to which you responded with financial assistance through IOM to manage the resultant migration crisis. How did your migration support intervention fit into your corporate framework?
2. What were your key expectations in supporting the IOM Migration Crisis Support in Western Tanzania Project?
3. To what extent have these expectations been met? Do you think the project achieved its intended results?
4. Given the project implementation arrangements, partnerships and results, do you think your support to the project succeeded in meeting the criteria for aid effectiveness, i.e. Ownership, Alignment, Harmonisation, Managing for Results and Mutual Accountability?
5. Do you think the project was value-for-money?
6. Moving forward, what do you see as your organisation's role in supporting the project scale-up?
7. What has been done well in this project by IOM, GoT, other affected governments and partners? What could have been done better?
8. What lessons have been learnt from this project? What were the best practices?
9. What do you think are the critical issues that should not be left out/missed by this evaluation?
10. What are your recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the project in the event of a national scale-up?

EVALUATION OF THE MIGRATION SUPPORT TO WESTERN TANZANIA PROJECT

District Immigration Officer KII Guide

Name: Designation: Organisation

Location: Date

1. Tanzania has over the years been experiencing migration flows from neighbouring countries. What challenges has the district been experiencing in terms of managing these migration flows?
2. When the GoT issued a directive for all migrants to leave the country, what challenges did you encounter in coping with migration crisis?
3. To what extent has the project equipped Border Management agencies in the district with operational mechanisms designed to respond to changing and often escalating movement pattern?
4. What institutional mechanisms have been put in place in the district to enhance emergency preparedness and contingent planning?
5. What interagency cooperation mechanisms have been established for a more coherent response to crises?
6. What has been the impact of the registration technology on the operations of the border authorities? What benefits has the technology brought to the migrants?
7. What has been done well in this project?
8. What more could have been done which is not covered by the project scope but could have helped improve the project impact?
9. What lessons have been learnt from this project?
10. What recommendations would do you make for the improvement of the scaled-up project?

Evaluation of the Migration Crisis Support in Western Tanzania Project

IOM Management Interview Discussion Guide

1. Briefly explain the project and how it strategically positions IOM to fulfil its mandate in Tanzania.
2. Was the policy environment conducive for the project? At the policy level, how has Government supported the project?
3. To what extent has Government as the major duty bearer for protecting migrants played its part towards the establishment of a solution to the migration crisis? How did it demonstrate its commitment towards fulfilling its migrant protection roles under the various international Conventions?
4. What partnerships did IOM create for the implementation of the project? How has is cooperated with other relevant UN and other international development agencies, as well as NGOs?
1. What linkages has IOM created with similar initiatives in the Region with interests in migration management? What platforms have you utilised for sharing lessons, knowledge and best practices on migration crisis management? And how has the project benefited from IOM's global knowledge network? To what extent has the project positioned the Tanzania as a case study for Migration Management in the Region and internationally
5. What policy level lessons and best practices have been derived from the project which could help strengthen IOM's cooperation with the GoT and other partners on migration crisis management?
6. To what critical issues should this evaluation pay attention? What should not be left out by this evaluation?

Evaluation of the Migration Crisis Support in Western Tanzania Project

Regional Commissioner and Regional Administrative Secretary Interview Discussion Guide

Name: Designation: Region:

1. In 2013 Tanzania experienced challenges with mass outward migration emanating from the presidential directive for irregular migrants to leave the country. How has the GoT cooperated with IOM to address the migration crisis? What emerged to be the major challenges for Government with regards to the management of the migration crisis?
2. What capacity building has IOM supported to strengthen Government capacity to manage migration flows? How sustainable is this capacity?
3. With the support of IOM, the country has embarked on a massive registration of migrants. How successful was the registration exercise? What is the state of Government preparedness with regards to the post-registration processes? Are you ready for the massive applications for residence permits and citizenship?
4. Overall, was the project relevant and effective? What is your assessment of the IOM-supported Migration Crisis Support project in terms the achievement of intended results?

5. To what extent has the project influenced Government thinking with regards to migration management? Has there been a paradigm shift in mindsets? To what extent has the project elevated migration to the centre stage in national development planning processes?
6. What lessons has Government learnt from this project? What were the best practices?
7. What are your recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the project in the event of a national scale-up?

Evaluation of the Migration Crisis Support in Western Tanzania Project

District Administrative Secretary and District Community Development Officer Interview Discussion Guide

Name **Designation** **District**.....

1. In 2013 Tanzania experienced challenges with mass outward migration emanating from the presidential directive for irregular migrants to leave the country. How has the GoT cooperated with IOM to address the migration crisis? What emerged to be the major challenges for Government with regards to the management of the migration crisis?
2. What capacity building has IOM supported to strengthen Government capacity to manage migration flows? How sustainable is this capacity?
3. With the support of IOM, the country has embarked on a massive registration of migrants in Western Tanzania. How successful was the registration exercise? What is the state of Government preparedness with regards to the post-registration processes?
4. Overall, was the project relevant and effective? What is your assessment of the IOM-supported Migration Crisis Support project in terms the achievement of intended results?
5. To what extent has the project influenced Government thinking with regards to migration management? Has there been a paradigm shift in mindsets? To what extent has the project elevated migration to the centre stage in national development planning processes?
6. What lessons has Government learnt from this project? What were the best practices?
7. What are your recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the project in the event of a national scale-up?

EVALUATION OF THE MIGRATION CRISIS SUPPORT TO WESTERN TANZANIA PROJECT

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, IMIGRATTION SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Regional Immigration Officer KII Guide

Name: **Designation:**
Organisation **Location:** **Date**

1. Tanzania has over the years been experiencing migration flows from neighbouring countries. What challenges were you experiencing in terms of managing these migration flows?
2. When the GoT issued a directive for all migrants to leave the country, what challenges did you encounter in coping with migration crisis?
3. To what extent has the project equipped Border Management agencies with operational mechanisms designed to respond to changing and often escalating movement pattern?
4. Has an assessment of HBM capacities been carried out? What were the key findings? And how have the key gaps been addressed?
5. Have border officials undergone HBM training? What operational and institutional changes have taken place as a result of the training?
6. Have SOPs for emergencies to support the operations of migration authorities been developed? If yes, what is now being done differently as a result of the availability of SOPs?
7. What institutional mechanisms have been put in place to enhance emergency preparedness and contingent planning?
8. What interagency cooperation mechanisms have been established for a more coherent response to crises?
9. What has been the impact of the registration technology on the operations of the border authorities? What benefits has the technology brought to the migrants?
10. What has been done well in this project?
11. What more could have been done which is not covered by the project scope but could have improved the project impact?
12. What lessons have been learnt from this project?
13. What recommendations would do you make for the improvement of the scaled-up project?

Evaluation of the Migration Crisis Support in Western Tanzania Project
Ministry of Home Affairs Interview Discussion Guide

1. Tanzania is a Member State of, and has been cooperating with IOM. Can you briefly describe how your Ministry/Department feeds into this commitment by Government?
2. In 2013 Tanzania experienced challenges with mass outward migration emanating from the presidential directive for irregular migrants to leave the country. How has the GoT cooperated with IOM to address the migration crisis? What emerged to be the major challenges for Government with regards to the management of the migration crisis?
3. What policies and other instruments has GoT put in place to facilitate the smooth transition through the migration crisis, especially in terms of strengthening Government commitment towards the various international Conventions and instruments to which it is party?
4. What capacity building has IOM supported to strengthen Government capacity to manage migration flows? How sustainable is this capacity?
5. With the support of IOM, the country has embarked on a massive registration of migrants. How successful was the registration exercise? What is the state of Government preparedness with regards to the post-registration processes? Are you ready for the massive applications for residence permits and citizenship?
6. Overall, was the project relevant and effective? What is your assessment of the IOM-supported Migration Crisis Support project in terms the achievement of intended results?
7. The project as implemented in Western Tanzania was only a pilot. What is Government's preparedness in terms of scaling up this initiative?
8. To what extent has the project influenced Government thinking with regards to migration management? Has there been a paradigm shift in mindsets? To what extent has the project elevated migration to the centre stage in national development planning processes?
9. To what extent has the GoT/IOM cooperation on this project strengthened the country's capacity to cooperate with other countries in the Region on migration management? To what extent has the country become a case study with regards to migration management? What information sharing and knowledge platforms have you used to share your experiences with other countries?
10. What lessons has Government learnt from this project? What were the best practices?
11. What are your recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the project in the event of a national scale-up?

**Evaluation of Migration Crisis Support in Western Tanzania Project
Household/Individual Questionnaire**

Name of H/head: District: Ward

Date Name of Respondent:

Relationship to H/head:

Q1 – Q3: Fill in details of Head of Household/Individual

Q1: Sex? 1. Male 2. Female	Q2: Age	Q3: Marital status 1. Single 3. Divorced/Seperated 2. Married 4. Widowed
---	----------------	--

Q4: What is the total household size and how many household members are in each of the following age groups? [Year completed last birthday]

Household size	Sex	18 years or more	6 – 17 years	5 years and below
	Male			
	Female			

Q5: Why did you migrate to Tanzania?

Q6: As a household, what challenge were you facing before this project facilitated your registration with the authorities?

Q7: To what extent has your registration resolved the challenges?

Q8	Did you encounter any challenges with the registration process? 1. YES 2. NO	
-----------	---	--

Q9	[If YES in Q8]: What challenges did you encounter and how were they resolved?	
-----------	--	--

Q10	Are the registration procedures straightforward and user friendly? 1. YES 2. NO	
------------	--	--

Q11	Before registration, were you able to access: 1. YES 2. NO	
	Education for your children	
	Health care	
	Food distribution programs	
	Shelter	
	livelihoods	

Q12	After registration, are you able to access 1. YES 2. NO	
	Education for your children	
	Health care	
	Food distribution programs	
	Shelter	
	Livelihoods	

Q13	Before registration, did you have 1. YES 2. NO	
	Freedom of movement	
	Freedom to report injustice to the police	

Q14	After registration, do you have 1- YES 2. NO	
	Freedom of movement	
	Freedom to report injustice to the police	
	Confidence of safety and security	

Q15	Now that you are registered as a regular migrant in Tanzania which of the following option will you pursue? 1. YES 2. NO	
	Resident permit	

	Work permit	
	Citizenship	
	Voluntary retain to country of origin	

Q16	Are you aware of the procedures that should be followed towards your chosen option above? 1. YES 2. NO	
-----	---	--

Q17	What do you think could have been done differently in a better way with regards to:	
	Sensitisation, awareness and mobilization?	
	Household mapping?	
	Registration?	
	After registration	

Q18	Is there anything else you might want to bring to the attention of IOM and GoT with regards to the implementation of the project?

THANK YOU