FINAL EVALUATION REPORT |
November 2022

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE EU-IOM KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT HUB (KMH)

Evaluation Title: Final Evaluation of the EU-IOM Knowledge Management Hub (KMH)

Type of Evaluation: Independent Final Evaluation

Period of execution of the evaluation: July - October 2022

Independent evaluation expert: Anna Lucia Colleo

Evaluation Manager: Aleksandra Izydorczyk, KMH Project Manager, with direct coordination by Olta Ndoja, Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Officer, and Lubna Jahaf, M&E Officer

IOM Unit managing the KMH: Return and Reintegration Unit, Protection Division, Department of Programme Support and Migration Management (DPSMM), IOM Headquarters, Geneva

Title of the EU-funded intervention: Pilot action on voluntary return and sustainable, community-based reintegration

Contract number: C-364220

Implementation period: 1 March 2017 – 31 December 2022

Donor and budget: European Union, 15 million Euro

Areas of implementation of the KMH: Global

Table of Contents

Annexes:

List of acronyms

AD: Action Document (Commission's programming document)
AMIF: Asylum, Migration, and Integration Fund
AVRR: Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration
BMZ: Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)
COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease 2019
CSO: Civil Society Organization
DfID: UK Department for International Development
DoA: Description of the Action (contractual document)
DG INTPA: Directorate General International Partnerships
DG DEVCO: Directorate General Development Cooperation
ECA: European Court of Auditors
ERRIN: European Return and Reintegration Network
EU: European Union
EUD: European Union Delegation
EURINT: European Integrated Return Management Initiative Network
EUTF: EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa
GIZ: Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German International Cooperation Agency)
JI: EU-IOM Joint Initiative for the Protection and Reintegration of Migrants
KIIs: Key Informants Interviews
KMH: EU-IOM Knowledge Management Hub
ICMPD: International Centre for Migration Policy Development
FCDO: UK's Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office
IO: International Organization
IOM: International Organization for Migration
M&E: Monitoring and Evaluation
MIMOSA: Migrant Management Operational System Application

MPI: Migration Policy Institute
NCE: No-Cost Extension
NDICI: Neighbourhood, Development, and International Cooperation Instrument
NGO: Non-Governmental Organization
OECD-DAC: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee
PROTTASHA: Bangladesh Sustainable Reintegration and Improved Migration Governance
PSC: Project Steering Committee
RADA: Reintegration and Development in Afghanistan
ROM: Result-Oriented Monitoring
RSI: Reintegration Sustainability Index
RSS: Reintegration Sustainability Survey
SDGs: Sustainable Development Goals
SOPs: Standard Operating Procedures
ToT: Training of Trainers
ToR: Terms of Reference
TWG: Technical Working Group
UNMN: United Nations Network on Migration

Executive Summary

Aiming to support the harmonisation and strengthening of models of intervention, capacities, and evidence-based knowledge on return and reintegration, the EU-IOM Knowledge Management Hub (KMH) is a global support and resource centre available worldwide to policymakers and practitioners.

The design of the KMH is based on a solid reading of the state of the art on return and reintegration and remains a relevant response to the needs of the beneficiaries, within and outside IOM. The targeting of stakeholders in the partner countries is especially critical to pave the way to more sustainable benefits resulting from reintegration assistance.

Maintaining oversight of the outcomes of reintegration assistance is important and while there is room for improving the quality of the logframe associated to the KMH, the KMH is substantially contributing to improving monitoring functions in IOM's return and reintegration assistance.

There is a positive and generative collaboration between the KMH and IOM field offices implementing return and reintegration actions and new partnerships are being established with other international organizations, civil society, and academia. Complementarities and synergies with other existing lines of support available to the EU and the EU Member States (MS) in this domain could be further explored.

As a global support hub, the KMH operates across regions, countries and operations and is correctly positioned at IOM Headquarters (HQ); the expertise and operational capacity of IOM is critical to correctly implement the KMH. The implementation mechanisms and the resources available are adequate to pursuing the planned results. The expectation is that the KMH will implement the full set of activities and use all allocated funds before its end in December 2022.

The pace of delivery and quality of the outputs is positive for all four components of the KMH and in many instances, outputs are translating into meaningful outcomes. The KMH is concretely supporting a more articulated understanding of reintegration amongst its beneficiaries and contributing to establish more solid capacities in IOM. The tools rolled out with KMH support, as well as its outputs, reflect adequate sensitivity to gender and human rights issues, and to elements of vulnerability.

The core visibility asset of the KMH is the online Return and Reintegration Platform, which is progressively positioning itself as a global point of reference on return and reintegration. Additional inputs will be required to support the promotion of the audio-visual products beyond 2022.

Key stakeholders in the partner countries are participating in the KMH trainings and events in increasing numbers, suggesting appropriate traction and good potential for institutional sustainability; capacity building activities are ongoing and long-term benefits cannot be assessed within the implementation period. The availability of adequate M&E and Knowledge Management (KM) functions remains a structural issue in IOM's return and reintegration programmes, which the organization is now more strongly addressing, based also on the example set by the KMH and its collaboration with the EU-IOM Joint Initiative for Migrant Protection and Reintegration in Africa.

The finalisation of an Exit Strategy is in progress and consultations with the EU, selected EU MS and other potential donors remain ongoing. Financial sustainability prospects are mixed: more positive

when considering signs of a progressive institutionalisation within IOM, more open when looking at donor resources to maintain the KMH operationally.

Recommendations that require follow up by December 2022 include: (1) Complete the KMH Exit Strategy; (2) With DG INTPA, organise an event to present the support offered by KMH to model and design development-oriented return and reintegration actions; (3) Complete a Roadmap for the revision of the institutional M&E Package; (4) Consider translating selected key knowledge products into actionable inputs; (5) Develop a calendar of events identifying existing opportunities to promote the audio-visual products beyond 2022. Recommendations for the future, concern the need for a solid theory of change and intervention logic; the participation and engagement of the partner countries beyond individual events and training opportunities; the continued institutionalisation within IOM of M&E and KM capacities and practices.

Overview of the assessment of individual evaluation questions based on a 3-grade scoring system: Green for good or very good performance, Orange for the existence of issues that can be addressed, Red for serious deficiencies:

EVALUATION QUESTIONS	SCORING		
Relevance			
3.1.1 Adequacy of the response to existing needs	🟩		
3.1.2 Local ownership	🟩		
Quality of design, monitoring and reporting			
3.2.1 Consideration of existing lessons in the KMH design	🟩		
3.2.2 Quality of intervention logic and logical framework		🟧	
3.2.3 Quality of internal monitoring system and reporting	🟩		
Coherence and complementarities			
3.3.1 Cooperation with other interventions managed by IOM	🟩		
3.3.2 Coherence and complementarity with EU policies/actions		🟧	
3.3.3 Collaborations and partnerships with other organizations	🟩		
Efficiency			
3.4.1 Capacity of IOM to correctly implement the KMH	🟩		
3.4.2 Appropriateness of the implementation mechanisms	🟩		
3.4.3 Adequacy of resources for achieving the planned results	🟩		

3.4.4 Progress with implementation and corrective measures	🟩		
3.4.5 Spending conformity	🟩		
Effectiveness			
3.5.1 Delivery of the planned outputs	🟩		
3.5.2 Quality of the outputs	🟩		
3.5.3 Progress towards the planned outcomes	🟩		
3.5.4 Core outcomes of the KMH		🟧	
Impact			
3.6.1 Influence on the choices of beneficiaries outside IOM		🟧	
3.6.2 Influence on IOM policies and practices	🟩		
3.6.3 Influence on EU policies and practices		🟧	
Communication and Visibility			
3.7.1 Quality of C&V Strategy and products	🟩		
3.7.2 Visibility of the KMH	🟩		
3.7.3 Contributions to EU and IOM visibility		🟧	
Sustainability			
3.8.1 Institutional sustainability of benefits		🟧	
3.8.2 Financial sustainability of benefits		🟧	

Cross-cutting issues			
3.9.1 Gender equality and human rights' outcomes			
3.9.2 Rights-Based Approach and Do No Harm principle			
3.9.3 Consideration of environmental and climate change issues			

1. Introduction

1.1 The EU-IOM Knowledge Management Hub and its background

The EU-IOM KMH was established in September 2017 as part of the Pilot Action on Voluntary Return and Sustainable, Community-Based Reintegration (Pilot Action), funded by the EU under the Development Cooperation Initiative (DCI) - Multiannual Indicative Programme Global Public Goods and Challenges 2014-2017.

The Pilot Action, with the KMH, was initially designed in 2016, at a time when return and reintegration issues were gaining prominence on political agendas in Europe, following the so-called migration crisis that hit Europe in 2015. The European Commission's development arm, Directorate General for Development Cooperation – DG DEVCO (now DG International Partnerships – INTPA), showed an increased interest on return and reintegration and specifically, on investing in more sustainable efforts for the durable reintegration of migrants returning to their countries of origin.

DG DEVCO had been supporting return and reintegration programmes since 2005, implemented by international organizations and NGOs, but it was in the aftermath of 2015 that the discourse on reintegration and its relationship with development gained prominence, and additional efforts were put in place for improving policies and making assistance more effective and durable. The debate considered that despite a long track of actions, reintegration models and practices had not been fully established or sufficiently tested. The 2015 Valletta Summit Action Plan included return, readmission and reintegration as a priority area in migration management and committed the EU and EU MS to strengthen the capacity of government authorities and civil society organizations in countries of origin and transit to manage returns and support the reintegration of the returnees.

The EU funding landscape on return and reintegration had also changed considerably, with the launch of the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (EU TF) and the EU-IOM Joint Initiative (JI) for Migrant Protection and Reintegration under the EU TF supporting 26 African countries in the regions of Sahel and Lake Chad, Horn of Africa, and North Africa, with a total indicative budget of 140 million Euro. While other large actions with a return and reintegration focus were ongoing also in other countries, including Afghanistan and Bangladesh, the JI was unprecedented in size.

In this context, the strategic relevance of having a significantly smaller Pilot Action testing more sustainable approaches and generating evidence to inform reintegration models and practices came into question. The design of the Pilot Action ultimately reflected the expectation that the KMH would support EU-IOM actions on return and reintegration and other efforts in the same domain; the KMH was therefore by design conceived to transcend the Pilot Action and play a more global role in support to reintegration endeavours. There was a felt need for standardising approaches and the Pilot Action was the only global programme that could support this effort.

For the KMH, a critical shift was marked by the first amendment of the grant agreement between IOM and the EU in 2020. Following also on the findings of a Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) review on the Pilot Action in 2018, DG DEVCO acknowledged that the KM dimension of the Pilot Action presented a substantial opportunity to standardise approaches and support a generative learning process on

return and reintegration for IOM, the EU and other counterparts worldwide. An agreement was reached to refocus the intervention on the KMH component, while phasing-out the activities in Southern Africa. The latest No Cost Extension (NCE) formalised in 2021 has extended the implementation period until December 2022.

1.2 Synopsis of the Pilot Action and KMH

The KMH was designed as part of the Pilot Action and the logframe currently used to measure progress towards the planned achievements reflects the whole Pilot Action, including the KMH; there is no separate logframe for the KMH alone.

The planned **Overall Objective** (impact) of the Pilot Action is to contribute to the development of voluntary return and sustainable community-based reintegration approaches in targeted partner countries. Performance indicators at the OO level include: OO1. Percentage (%) of stakeholders declaring that they are more engaged in the field of voluntary return and sustainable (community-based) reintegration assistance of migrants (disaggregated by type of support and type of stakeholders); OO2 Number (#) of targeted partner countries that have mainstreamed return and reintegration in their national or local plans / strategies.

The 3 expected Specific Objectives – SOs (Outcomes, i.e. results achieved beyond the level of control of the intervention, e.g. changes in behaviour/attitude of the target group or actions taken by them) identified in the logical framework (logframe) of the intervention validated in 2021 are as follows:

SO1. To support targeted countries of origin, transit, and destination to enhance national structures and capacities to facilitate a dignified and sustainable return and reintegration process. SO1 indicators include: 1.1 # of stakeholders (target groups) strengthened through capacity building or operational support on voluntary return (number of individuals disaggregated by sex and type of institutions); 1.2 # of stakeholders strengthened through capacity building or operational support on reintegration (number of individuals disaggregated by sex and type of institutions); 1.3 # of coordination and referral mechanisms established for returnees; 1.4 # of EU-IOM Actions having adapted the Framework SOPs for AVRR to their respective settings, for consultation and implementation; 1.5 # of EU-IOM Actions using harmonized indicators for reporting on dignified return and sustainable reintegration, based on consistent M&E Frameworks/Plans and tools (consistent monitoring data across regions allows for comparative analysis and evidence-based programming, based on harmonised indicators); 1.6 % of key stakeholders surveyed who report having applied the knowledge acquired and skills developed or strengthened on sustainable reintegration policymaking and programming (disaggregated by sex, type of key stakeholder); 1.7 % of key stakeholders surveyed who report having applied the knowledge acquired and skills developed or strengthened on monitoring and evaluation for return and reintegration (disaggregated by sex, type of key stakeholder).

The **expected results** (Outputs, i.e. results that the intervention controls and delivers, e.g. a study, a workshop) **connected to SO1** are the following:

- 1.0 – Completion of inception phase and identification of migration corridor(s) to be targeted by the Action, measured by the following indicator: 1.1.0 Migration corridor identified and workplan updated as needed; 1.1 Assessment of existing return and reintegration structures, available services and key communities in targeted countries are developed or updated, measured by the indicator 1.1.1 # of assessments produced or updated;
- 1.2 – Key national, regional and local stakeholders in the targeted countries are equipped with increased capacities to develop or to strengthen their policies and processes to facilitate sustainable return and reintegration, with the indicator 1.2.1 # of capacity building activities and events organized during the Action, 1.2.2. # of institutions participating in coordination activities (disaggregated by state, non-state, individuals, sex disaggregation, 1.2.3 % of stakeholders (individuals) that declared increased knowledge on voluntary return and/or reintegration;
- 1.3 – Return and reintegration related data collection and analysis enhanced in the targeted countries, with the indicator 1.3.1 # of report generating lessons learnt from monitoring data collected through the Pilot Action;
- 1.4 – Knowledge management on approaches to voluntary return and reintegration in a development cooperation context strengthened (global component), with the following indicators: 1.4.1 # of user of the online platform and community of practice (# of online platform visitors and # of registered community members); 1.4.2 # of webinars organised by the KMH and hosted on the online platform and # of participants on average; 1.4.3 # of knowledge sharing workshops and participants in support of the community of practice; 1.4.4 # of demand-driven research studies conducted; 1.4.5 # of knowledge products produced; 1.4.6 # of facilitators who are part of the reintegration training programme facilitator roster; 1.4.7 # of governmental and non-governmental actors trained through the reintegration training programme; 1.4.8 # of governmental and non-governmental actors trained through the M&E training course for return and reintegration activities for return and reintegration activities; 1.4.9 # of audio-visual material on return and reintegration available in video stock library to be used, re-edited and broadcasted by televisions, radio stations and web portals; 1.4.10 Strategy to promote the sustainability of the KMH beyond the Action developed.

SO2 aims to support national authorities of targeted countries in the provision of dignified voluntary return assistance to stranded and vulnerable migrants. The two performance indicators associated to SO2 are 2.1 % of stakeholder declaring that they perceive the project as effectively supporting stranded migrants and reaching out to migrants who would otherwise not be in a position to return home; 2.2 % of migrants declaring that they have been able to return in a safe manner (disaggregated by sex and age).

The outputs related to SO2 are:

- 2.1 – 800 (1,000 in the initial Logframe) returning migrants have received assistance for their voluntary returns; indicators: 2.1.1 # of state and non-state actors involved in the provision of voluntary return assistance to migrants; 2.1.2 # of migrants assisted to return voluntarily to their countries of origin (disaggregated by sex and situation of vulnerability); 2.1.3 % of surveyed returnees satisfied with travel arrangements made for them (disaggregated by sex).

- 2.2. – 200 stranded migrants provided with assisted voluntary return support in the context of COVID-19 pandemic (added following the PSC meeting in June 2020). Indicator: 2.2.1 # of stranded migrants assisted to return voluntarily to their countries of origin in the context of COVID-19 (disaggregated by sex and situation of vulnerability).

SO3. To support targeted countries to enhance the sustainability of returnees' economic, social and psychosocial reintegration through tailored individual and community-level assistance. Related indicators look at the 3.1 % of monitored beneficiaries reporting sufficient levels of economic self-sufficiency, social stability, psychosocial wellbeing in their community of return, and 3.2 % of surveyed migrants referred to state and non-state actors who were assisted by those actors (disaggregated by sex and age).

Related outputs include:

- 3.1 – Returning migrants have increased access to employment, social and psychological services and enhanced access to justice (where relevant) tailored to their individual needs and vulnerabilities; indicator: 3.1.1 # of stakeholder involved in the provision of reintegration assistance to returning migrants (disaggregation by state and non-state stakeholders/ number of individuals); 3.1.2 # of beneficiaries who have received reintegration assistance (disaggregated by sex, type of support (economic, social, psychosocial) and level of project: migrants and community members; 3.1.3 # of stranded migrants who have received reintegration assistance in the context of COVID-19 (disaggregated by sex); 3.1.4 % of beneficiaries declaring being satisfied with the reintegration assistance received from IOM.
- 3.2 – Community-based reintegration initiatives established or scaled up in selected areas; indicators: 3.2.1 # of community- based reintegration initiatives implemented with the support of the project (disaggregated by country, by type of initiative and by beneficiary type (breakdown); 3.2.2 % of surveyed community members reporting that they feel involved in the implementation of community-based reintegration; 3.2.3 % of participants in community-based initiatives surveyed that report satisfaction with the initiatives supported.

The KMH provides support in four core areas of work: (1) Ensuring coherent voluntary return and reintegration approaches, with a view to ensure alignment and avoid fragmentation of approaches and practices across return and reintegration initiatives, countries and regions; (2) Supporting the cross-regional harmonisation of M&E activities, with a view to ensure the availability of reliable data for evidence-based programming and support comparative analysis across regions; (3) Setting-up knowledge management tools, with a view to foster exchanges among practitioners as well as knowledge-sharing and learning across regions; (4) Producing knowledge products, with a view to support the establishment of a research fund and promote studies addressing knowledge gaps.

The activities presented in the logframe are the following:

0.1.1 Identify pilot countries and communities along one migration route during an inception phase

0.1.2 Develop and implement a Communications and Visibility Plan for the Action

0.1.3 Establish and implement a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Action

0.1.4 Establish Project Steering Committee (PSC) to support implementation of the project

1.2.1 Undertake or update institutional assessments to cover the governance, legislation, policy, coordination mechanisms, procedures for return and reintegration, and available data in the target countries.

1.2.2 Implement capacity building measures in targeted countries.

1.2.3 Strengthen coordination and referral mechanisms for returnees at national and local levels in targeted countries

1.3.1 Monitoring data collection relevant to return and reintegration, based on harmonised indicators and tools developed by the knowledge management hub.

1.3.2 Monitoring data analysis to generate lessons learnt

1.4.1 Establish a knowledge management hub addressing return and reintegration in a development cooperation context

1.4.2 Set up an online portal and community of practice on return and reintegration in development cooperation contexts (including platform management, community moderation and webinars)

1.4.3 Support small-scale, demand-driven research on return and reintegration (including dissemination)

1.4.4 Organization of knowledge-sharing workshops

1.4.5 Roll-out of Reintegration Handbook

1.4.6 Develop, pilot and roll-out M&E training course for return and reintegration activities

1.4.7 Production and dissemination of audio-visual material on return and reintegration

1.4.8 Develop and update a strategy to promote the sustainability of the KMH

1.4.9 Conduct a final evaluation of the KMH

2.1.1 Identify and assist 800 returning migrants from the target country prior to their voluntary return

2.1.2. Assist 800 migrants in their voluntary return (it was 1000 in the initial GA)

2.2.1 Assist 200 stranded migrants in their voluntary return in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. (result added);

3.1.1 Develop and disseminate information materials for returnees and their communities on available assistance

3.1.2 Provide tailored, individual assistance to returnees to areas not targeted for community-based reintegration initiatives and vulnerable migrants in need of enhanced support

3.1.3 Provide reintegration support to stranded migrants assisted to return in the context of COVID-19 pandemic (added);

3.2.1 Establish or strengthen consultative platforms with targeted communities

3.2.2 Establish or scale up community-based reintegration initiatives

The target groups of the Pilot Action are government authorities at national, regional and local levels; CSOs, social partners, private sector, media; returning migrants and their families; communities of return/origin as beneficiaries of community-based initiatives. According to the latest DoA, **the direct beneficiaries, or target groups, of the KMH** include IOM staff in charge of formulating, implementing, and monitoring return and reintegration actions, and relevant governmental and non-governmental actors at the regional, national, and local level.

The final beneficiaries of the Pilot Action are societies in target countries, in particular communities with high number of returns and/or high irregular migration. **The final beneficiaries of the KMH** include the larger community of practitioners, scholars and policymakers who can access the KMH knowledge tools and products and to training and exchange opportunities, as well as the returning migrants and local communities assisted in the targeted countries.

2. The Evaluation

2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The scope of this independent final evaluation encompasses the whole KMH's implementation period, starting in September 2017, and considers the KMH initial design and its evolution over time.

While the KMH is part of the wider Pilot Action, in line with the provisions of the revised Description of the Action that is part to the 2021 NCE, the final external evaluation focuses on the KMH component only, "to assess the efficiency, effectiveness, impact, relevance, and sustainability of the KMH. The evaluation will assess how far the KMH has been able to contribute to the harmonisation of dignified voluntary return and sustainable reintegration approaches across EU-IOM Actions, and to foster a virtual community of practice. Given the pilot nature of this component, the aspects of relevance and effectiveness of implemented activities will be of particular importance to understand whether the approach followed can be sustained and improved beyond the Action, and the evaluation findings will feed into the strategy for the sustainability of the KMH."

2.2 Methodology

The evaluation follows a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative information. **Quantitative data** have mainly originated from the available project documentation, including contractual documents, monthly flash reports, annual progress reports, and updates presented by IOM to the PSC. Non-project related documents have sourced statistical (and other) data on return trends, and particularly on returns from the EU. **Qualitative information** was collected through the review of additional documentation and semi-structured interviews with key informants (KIIs) within and outside IOM. The additional documentation has included documentary outputs and additional materials produced with KMH support (studies and knowledge products; information, good practice factsheets and other materials published in the KMH Platform; training agendas and reports; reports of Steering Committee meetings). In addition, other sources were used to support the framing of the KMH in the broader context in which it operates and assess its relevance, collaborations and added value. They include IOM's positioning on Return and Reintegration, KM and M&E; evaluation reports and lessons drawn from the EU-IOM Joint Initiative for Migrant Protection and Reintegration, academic articles and reports produced by other organizations working on return and reintegration. At the same time, the evaluation has reviewed the EU relevant strategies as well as policy and programming documents supporting the initial design of the Pilot Action in 2017 and underpinning the revisions of the Pilot Action and centrality of the KMH, relevant communications from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council, European Council conclusions, as well as the European Court of Auditors' Special report on EU readmission cooperation with third countries issued in 2021, Frontex reports and analysis and available documentation on the EU-IOM actions more closely associated to the KMH. The full list of documents reviewed for the evaluation can be found in Annex I List of documents consulted.

Interviews with Key Informants (KIIs): The other and most important source of qualitative information for this evaluation has been the interviews with selected key stakeholders in and outside IOM. All interviews were conducted in remote modality, with the evaluation managers' support, and were based on a semi-structured matrix of questions that had been developed during the evaluation's Inception phase; the matrix includes questions differentiated by type of stakeholder, based on their association with the KMH. Key points for the discussion were anticipated to the KIIs before the meetings, allowing for adequate preparation and finetuning of the interview.

The identification of KIIs for this final evaluation has received careful consideration. A provisional list of KIIs has been prepared by the IOM team managing the evaluation, in consultation with the evaluation expert; additional KIIs were introduced during the field phase, when additional elements of control were needed on selected topics. The final list of KIIs includes representatives from a diverse group of stakeholders, ensuring adequate coverage of the different KMH facets.

The evaluator has interviewed a total of 52 key informants. The list includes four groups of stakeholders: (i) IOM staff managing the KMH and their management, the management of other relevant IOM Units, including the Core Protection and the Innovation and KM Units; (ii) staff concerned with the implementation of the EU-IOM actions directly associated with the KMH; (iii) EU counterparts in INTPA, HOME and Frontex; (iv) external stakeholders from international organizations, research centres and civil society organizations. The complete list can be found in Annex II List of Key Informants Interviewed.

Gender considerations were applied in the selection of the KIIs for the interviews, who included both men and women, from the implementing teams as well as from the target groups.

The use of multiple sources and options to gather data has ensured an appropriate **triangulation of the information** collected for the evaluation, and a robust validation of the evidence used. The possibility to triangulate information has allowed deepening and widening understanding of the KMH achievements and its recognition within IOM and beyond. It was also important to shed light on issues for which information was not univocal. The findings of the evaluation were built across a consistent process of elaboration and comparison of the information collected, which has helped to capture topics requiring more information and/or further discussions. This has been a critical element in the evaluation and was essential for minimising risks of information bias and refute/confirm hypotheses formulated throughout the process.

The evaluation process has included an Inception phase, starting with a documentary review aiming to gain adequate insights on the KMH design and progress to date and refine the evaluation questions, and ending with the organisation of the briefing meeting with IOM staff and the finalisation of the Inception report; a field phase completing the collection and review of relevant documentation and conducting the interviews with KIIs; a debriefing meeting at the end of the field phase; the reporting phase, ending with the submission of a draft Evaluation Report and its subsequent finalisation to reflect comments from IOM. The evaluation will end with the presentation of the evaluation's key findings, conclusions, and recommendations to a larger audience in a dedicated meeting organised by IOM. Oversight of the evaluation process by IOM was ensured via bi-monthly calls between the evaluator and IOM's team managing the evaluation.

2.3 Evaluation questions

As per the evaluation ToR, the evaluation questions are based on the six Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) criteria (relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact orientation, sustainability). The evaluator has finetuned questions for each criterion and has suggested to also scrutinise the intervention under three additional criteria, i.e. 1. Quality of design, monitoring and reporting; 2. Ccross-cutting issues; 3. Communication and visibility.

The evaluation criteria are defined as follows:

Relevance: The extent to which the intervention design and objectives are apt to address the needs of its direct and indirect beneficiaries and supports local ownership.

Quality of design, monitoring and reporting: The quality of the Intervention Logic underpinning design and its consideration of lessons and results from past experiences; the quality of the logframe and of the monitoring & reporting system in place.

Coherence: The exploitation of complementarities with other interventions in the same sector and within IOM, and the partnerships established with other interventions and organizations.

Efficiency: The appropriateness of the chosen implementation mechanisms; the capacity of the intervention to progress as planned, and the reasons for the delays, if any; the extent to which the available resources are in line with the needs of the intervention and how efficiently are they spent.

Effectiveness: The extent to which the intervention is delivering its planned outputs, the quality of the outputs, the transformation or prospects for transformation of outputs into outcomes.

Impact: The extent to which the intervention has generated or is likely to generate significant long-term benefits for its beneficiaries and is influencing their policy and actions, as well as those of IOM and the EU.

Sustainability: The extent to which the benefits generated by the intervention will continue or are likely to continue beyond the intervention's implementation period, considering the institutional and financial sustainability of the deliverables and the acquisition of established institutional capacities.

Cross-cutting issues: The intervention's sensitivity and contributions to the cross-cutting themes of gender equality and human rights; the inclusiveness of its results and the application of the Leave No One Behind principle; environmental and climate-related considerations.

Communication and Visibility: The Communication and Visibility strategy and outputs of the KMH and its visibility; contributions to IOM and EU visibility.

The ToR also request to identify **lessons learned** that can support the design and implementation of future return and reintegration actions, and formulate **concrete recommendations** for future KMH activities and to inform programme development in the field of migrant protection, return and reintegration to the benefit of IOM, the EU, and other relevant stakeholders.

3. Evaluation Findings

3.1 Relevance

Evaluation questions	Scoring[1]		
3.1.1 Adequacy of the response to existing needs			
3.1.2 Local ownership			

3.1.1 Adequacy of the response to existing needs

The design of the KMH remains a relevant response to needs that were identified at design stage and persist today. The evaluation findings confirm the importance of and continued need for knowledge generation and learning in return and reintegration efforts, so that solid evidence is available to support the modelling, design, and implementation of effective and sustainable actions.

The needs affecting the effectiveness of return and reintegration actions and the capacity to generate an adequate learning process are not specific to IOM, the EU, or other players. They concern this domain of operation in general, which continues to suffer from the lack of established and validated practices; it is the central objective of the KMH to progressively support more harmonised, evidence-based and sustainable practices. The KMH is intended to provide direct support to IOM field offices, starting with those managing six selected EU-IOM actions but considers that the consolidation of approaches and capacities on return and reintegration is needed beyond IOM.[2] The choice to conceive the KMH as a global support Hub, exceeding IOM, remains valid, also considering the increasing number of players who are becoming active in this field.

A critical element identified in design is that return and reintegration assistance is often offered without adequate anchorage with the existing local structures and systems as well as with other lines of assistance in countries of return. At the same time, the Description of the Action (DoA) emphasises that previous actions have indicated that an exclusive focus on assistance to individual returnees, which is not available to other members of the communities of return, can lead to potential tensions

---

[1] A scoring table provides a compact overview of the assessment for each Evaluation Criteria and Question. A 3-grade scale is adopted, with the following legenda: Green reflects a good or very good performance; Orange indicates the existence of issues to be addressed as they tend to negatively affect the overall performance of the intervention; Red flags serious deficiencies, exposing the intervention to risks of failure and requiring major adjustments to the intervention logic and/or implementation arrangements.

[2] Six EU-IOM Actions (EU-funded initiatives on return and reintegration) were selected jointly by the EU and IOM to receive direct support from the KMH. These include: the Pilot Action itself; the 3 windows of the EU-IOM Joint Initiative in Sahel and Lake Chad, North Africa, and Horn of Africa; the Improving Reintegration of Returnees in Afghanistan (RADA) project and the Sustainable Reintegration and Improved Migration Governance (PROTTASHA) in Bangladesh.

and overlooks the fact that reintegration outcomes are often influenced by family members and the wider community.

Moreover, a critical area addressed by the KMH concerns the largely scattered data originating from individual actions, especially when it comes to their outcomes, as the monitoring systems tend to remain geared on the delivery of outputs. Informing effective and sustainable reintegration also rests on the availability of comparable data and a consensus around the indicators used for measuring outcomes, across programmes, contexts, and agencies. With data remaining fragmented or inconsistent, the risk is that learning from these programmes remains limited.

One other relatively common observation that was collected in the framework of this evaluation is that the models of intervention remain based on assumptions that are not always based on sufficient evidence. While individual actions tend to collect data on the number of people assisted or stakeholders trained, for example, there is no solid confirmation that one type of assistance is more effective or sustainable than one other. The design of the KMH correctly incorporates the need for more harmonised data collection and data management efforts to support analysis and knowledge across individual interventions and understand what works and what does less, and under which conditions, to qualify return and reintegration efforts.

At the same time, the capacity building component of the KMH is meant to tackle the need to contribute to more equal capacities on return and reintegration across countries and amongst the concerned policymakers and practitioners, working at cross-regional, regional and national level. The inclusion of local government stakeholders amongst the target groups of capacity building activities is critical, as they are the ultimate duty bearers and also in many instances those with the most critical capacity issues. Capacity development efforts appropriately aim for the diffusion of a more articulated approach to reintegration and the need for stronger M&E systems.

Within IOM, the size of the field offices is a relevant variable, as larger missions are more likely to have more established M&E (as well as KM) functions, especially when they have a track record of managing large return and reintegration interventions, while individual country offices oftentimes lack the staff and established references to perform M&E and KM functions. While the larger offices are more prone to generate data out of bigger caseloads and more substantially contribute to generate solid knowledge and refine the institutional tools in place, smaller offices are most in need of direct support, which at HQ level is provided through the KMH. The support offered by the KMH is adequately targeting smaller and larger field offices.

The harmonisation and validation of models and practices does not however build on shared data collection tools or data analysis only. While the need for comparable data and for more evidence-based and accessible knowledge remains critical, there is a bulk of experience that has developed over the years. However, these mostly remain with the offices and organizations that have implemented them, while the circulation of experiences could socialise positive practices and feed dialogue within the community of practitioners and policymakers involved in return and reintegration. The efforts of the KMH to collect and categorise practices and existing tools and ensure they become available to interested stakeholders is an important undertaking, and the only one currently available on return and reintegration at the global level.

The same applies to the KMH efforts to develop and feed thematic discussions on reintegration topics, with the organisation of webinars and seminars and a Community of Practice. Through the Return and Reintegration Platform, accessible in English, French and as of 2022 also Spanish, the KMH provides space for dialogue and the sharing of experience, which has emerged in this evaluation as a widely felt need by the interviewed stakeholders, including the donors, and remain important to contribute to a more consistent pattern of global learning on return and reintegration. The Platform includes the following features: a virtual community of practice, accessible to registered members; an e-learning space including proposed e-courses, webinars and cross-regional knowledge sharing workshops; a repository of indexed publications and other documentary resources published from the year 2000 as well as training materials made available by the KMH; the Spotlight area, with a collection of articles about news from the field, the KMH, the EU-IOM actions or others and a series of bi-monthly newsletters; an interactive map displaying country-based reintegration initiatives for searching initiatives.

Furthermore, gaps in knowledge and understanding of different aspects of return and reintegration persist. The component of the KMH devoted to shed light and contribute knowledge on under-studied subjects, beyond M&E and data analysis, remains relevant to maintain the generation of knowledge tuned with reality, and contribute aspects that may be important to consider.

Finally, the KMH is coordinating the production of audio-visual materials on return and reintegration and the set-up of a dedicated online content library hosted on the KMH Return and Reintegration Platform to store these products and support a more balanced communication on return and sustainable reintegration. The existing audio-visual materials maintain a focus on success stories, often failing to portray the multidimensionality of reintegration processes. The KMH aims to encourage a more nuanced narrative portraying the realistic opportunities and challenges associated to reintegration.

The attention to specific vulnerabilities and to sustainability elements makes the KMH relevant to address the needs of the assisted returning migrants and local communities as its final beneficiaries. A Rights-Based Approach (RBA) is adequately reflected in the tools the KMH is contributing to mainstream across IOM and beyond. This is an important element of relevance, as return migration is still sometimes seen exclusively from a migration management perspective, without due attention to the rights and needs of returnees and their communities, and to the interlinkages between reintegration and local development prospects.

3.1.2 Local ownership

The direct beneficiaries of the KMH include IOM field offices implementing return and reintegration operations and relevant governmental and non-governmental actors at the global, regional and national/local levels. In the opinion of most key informants, the approach taken by the KMH to promote the use of a structured approach to reintegration remains generally relevant to foster awareness, capacity and progressive ownership of the discourse on reintegration also in countries of return, contributing to feed their leadership and move beyond receiving assistance and support from

the outside. The attention to the role of communities in reintegration is especially important for national and local authorities. More in general, there is an obvious need to step out of improvisation and orient reintegration models. In this sense, targeting government stakeholders, who remain ultimately responsible for the rights-based return and reintegration of returning migrants, is critically important to support the institutionalisation and sustainability of reintegration assistance.

The collaboration with IOM field offices is instrumental to involve the local stakeholders. The KMH publishes calls for applications for selecting the participants to cross-regional trainings, while the national trainings are organised in collaboration with the field offices, building on their established network in the country.

The KMH's offer of online resources and capacity development opportunities is positively received; there is specific appreciation for its twofold offer of trainings, aiming to promote an integrated approach to reintegration, targeting both government representatives and practitioners, and to strengthen monitoring and evaluation capacities, which underlies the importance of maintaining oversight of the sustainability of reintegration, targeting mostly practitioners.

As introduced also in the 2021 European Court of Auditors' Special report, the EU has provided development assistance via a multitude of instruments, with the primary goal of improving socio-economic conditions, but the linkage between development-oriented support and the reintegration of returnees is not systematic. It is recognised however that achieving sustainable reintegration for the returning migrants also depends on wider development factors and on the resources available to continue support to countries of origin. As part of the Neighbourhood, Development, and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI), the Commission has a horizontal spending target of 10 percent of external development funds to "enable the Union to respond to challenges, needs and opportunities related to migration". The evaluation notes that there is general consensus amongst the interviewed key informants and available research that a long-term development perspective is critical to ensure the sustainability of reintegration efforts, contributing to more stable conditions in communities with high rates of emigration and returns and as such preventing on the one hand, the failing of individual reintegration projects, thus preventing re-emigration out of necessity, and on the other hand, investing in addressing push factors of migration.

As indicated also in the 2015 "Study on the results and impact of EU funded projects in the area of voluntary return and reintegration", durable reintegration outcomes are closely associated to a more general capacity of the local contexts to offer opportunities, requiring an established capacity of the local systems to develop and offer opportunities to the local youth and reintegrate their citizens returning from abroad, and for development donors, calls for a system-building approach, in partnership with local government and non-governmental actors. Developing local capacities to address reintegration challenges and understand what works and what does not in reintegration, and how the best suited approaches can be put in place, is part of this structural effort.

The support offered by the KMH is fully in line with this vision. While there are several ongoing projects that contribute to this planned impact, the efforts supported by the KMH to put forward a more integrated approach to reintegration - across individual projects - and to aim to strengthen local

systems by directly targeting stakeholders in the partner countries, while also offering an organised framework for dialogue, remain fully relevant.

3.2 Quality of intervention logic, monitoring and reporting

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.2.1 Consideration of existing lessons in the KMH design			
3.2.2 Quality of intervention logic and logical framework			
3.2.3 Quality of internal monitoring system and reporting			

3.2.1 Consideration of existing good practices and lessons learned in the KMH design

The KMH builds on the tools built under previous interventions managed by IOM. These include the UK-funded "Mediterranean Sustainable Reintegration" (MEASURE) project, which ended in 2017 and supported the initial development of an M&E Framework for monitoring reintegration patterns, with the support of Samuel Hall, and the "Operationalising an Integrated Approach to Reintegration" (ORION) project, also funded by the UK, which delivered the IOM Reintegration Handbook in 2019 and the initial version of the training curriculum associated with the Handbook.

When ORION was coming to an end in 2020, the first amendment of the contract agreement between IOM and the EU was being discussed. The new design of the Pilot Action, with the KMH on the lead, committed to finetune, complete and rollout the tools and training materials developed. The MEASURE project had developed the Reintegration Sustainability Index (RSI) and Reintegration Sustainability Survey (RSS), which remain the core M&E references to collect data on the three dimensions of IOM' Integrated Approach to Reintegration presented in the Handbook (economic, social, psychosocial). The KMH has completed the monitoring package by introducing surveys dedicated to assessing the performance and beneficiary's satisfaction with the return and/or reintegration assistance received , including community-based reintegration assistance and capacity-building, targeting the returnees, key local stakeholders, and community members.

The approach to return and reintegration supported by the KMH builds on and directly addresses these experiences, promoting the integrated approach to reintegration as per the Reintegration Handbook, and promoting community-based assistance.

At the same time, the 2015 EU study, which remains an important reference for the EU, highlighted the need for tailoring assistance to the specific social, economic and cultural context of reintegration, and to work in support of governmental and non-state service providers in the countries of origin, investing in their capacities to assist the returnees, as key elements of design to ensure the generation of long-term benefits in reintegration assistance.

3.2.2 Quality of intervention logic and logical framework

The current logframe is the revised version annexed to the 2020 amendment. The logframe was only partially modified in 2020 and as in the initial version of the logframe, the KMH is still presented as an output associated to SO1 (To support targeted countries of origin, transit, and destination to enhance national structures and capacities to facilitate a dignified and sustainable return and reintegration process), i.e. 1.4. Knowledge management on approaches to voluntary return and reintegration in a development cooperation context strengthened. The logical link is not obvious, as SO1 is about enhancing national structures and capacities to facilitate a dignified and sustainable return and reintegration process, while the KMH is a global component and is not exclusively supporting national actors. Following a recommendation of the ROM review performed in 2018, a few additional outcome indicators were added in relation to SO1, more directly linking to the KMH (1.4 Number of EU-IOM Actions having adapted the Framework SOPs for AVRR to their respective settings, for consultation and implementation; 1.5 Number of EU-IOM Actions using harmonized indicators for reporting on dignified return and sustainable reintegration, based on consistent M&E Frameworks/Plans and tools).

The logframe remains by large the same matrix that had been initially developed and reflects the whole Pilot Action, before the KMH became the centre of the intervention. While this was allegedly done to avoid a lengthy process of amendment of the EU programming document, a more thorough revision would have supported a clearer overview of the work and planned results of the KMH and a better representation of its achievements in the reports. In its current form, the logframe misses part of its validity as management tool for the KMH, as it only partially supports the identification of critical elements that can emerge during implementation, and it also fails to support a punctual picture of the results achieved by the intervention, particularly visible at the outcome level. At the same time, the identified risks or assumptions were not specifically tailored on the KMH.

Looking at the overall quality of the logframe, this is informed by a linear, if implicit, intervention logic, but it lacks a solid theory of change, explaining how activities are expected to transform into outputs, outputs into outcomes and how these will contribute to long-term change. The result statements are sometimes ill-formulated or placed at the wrong result level; the outcomes are formulated as components of the intervention (to support targeted countries and national authorities) and do not indicate the change they pursue, while indicators are more process- than results-oriented (number of participants, percentage of those confirming benefits, number of webinars, and so on), failing to capture the results and changes the intervention aims to contribute. The lack of correctly identified outcomes and outcome indicators, in particular, tends to maintain monitoring and reporting at the level of deliverables, reflecting in relatively process-oriented reports. At the same time, outputs are formulated as activities/deliverables.

The logical framework includes a total of 40 performance indicators to measure progress towards the attainment of the planned results: 2 at impact level, 11 at outcome level and 27 associated to outputs. Baselines, targets and sources of verification are defined for each indicator, and sex disaggregation is mentioned for the relevant indicators.

3.2.3 Quality of internal monitoring system and reporting

While the KMH lacks a dedicated and therefore adequate logframe, it can count on an efficient monitoring and reporting system, with annual progress reports regularly submitted to the EU and including quantitative information on the progress towards the performance indicators' targets. Financial reporting is in line with contractual requirements and follows the provisions of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) between the EU and the UN. Data for monitoring and reporting against the logframe indicators are recorded at the end of each activity and available for reporting purposes at any given time. Additional monthly reports were introduced in September 2019, as recommended by the ROM review conducted in 2018; the monthly flash reports include relevant data when presenting the activities or results. At the same time, the narrative in both the annual and the monthly reports tend to remain activity oriented, and do not support an understanding of the most strategic achievements of the KMH. The KMH team uses additional monitoring tools to control the quality of its activities as perceived by the beneficiaries. For example, Training Satisfaction Reports, Participation Satisfaction Surveys and Training Evaluation Reports are filled in at the end of each training event to record the feedback and inputs collected from participants, as well as the recommendations to improve the quality of the training in terms of contents and approaches.

3.3 Coherence and complementarities

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.3.1 Cooperation with other interventions managed by IOM	🟩		
3.3.2 Coherence and complementarity with EU policies/actions		🟧	
3.3.3 Collaborations and partnerships with other organizations	🟩		

3.3.1 Cooperation with other interventions managed by IOM

By design, cooperation with IOM offices managing return and reintegration interventions is a cornerstone of the KMH scope of work. The Hub was always expected to strengthen learning across return and reintegration programmes by supporting coherence and harmonisation in methodological approaches, monitoring and evaluation systems and knowledge management. This is pursued by collaborating closely with IOM field offices managing return and reintegration programmes, starting with the six EU-IOM Actions identified at design stage in Africa, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh, plus the global Pilot Action the KMH is part of.

While the collaboration between the KMH and IOM field offices has started quite early in the implementation of the Pilot Action, the IOM field staff interviewed for this evaluation referred of critical improvements in the size of inputs and quality of the collaboration after the KMH gained its current capacity in 2020. The field offices have especially discussed their collaboration with the KMH in relation to the M&E package completed and pilot tested under the Pilot Action, their engagement in the organisation and delivery of regional and national trainings with the KMH, and the visibility opportunity offered by the KMH Platform. The interviewed IOM offices were aware of the full set of KMH deliverables and fully conversant about their collaboration with the KMH.

The interviews were remarkably consistent in praising the ongoing collaborative effort between the KMH and the concerned IOM field offices to take stock of lessons learned from the testing of the M&E package and review the package accordingly. This is taking place in a structured process of dialogue, coordinated by the KMH, involving the KMH and field colleagues. By so doing, the KMH is recognised to play a critical role in facilitating and feeding dialogue on return and reintegration between IOM HQ and the field, with the necessary technical competence.

Cooperation with IOM regional and country offices is not limited to the six identified EU-IOM actions. Other country offices implementing return and reintegration programmes, including offices based in Europe, have been approached by the KMH to discuss their practices and jointly organise a webinar (in collaboration with government officials, e.g. Portugal and French Office for Immigration and Integration), to present them to the wide community of practitioners that follow the KMH, including in IOM. Factsheets presenting these practices are then developed with KMH support and remain available through the KMH Platform, feeding a general sense of access to the experience of colleagues and understanding of return and reintegration efforts across the organization. Another example looks at the collaboration with IOM regional office in Thailand managing the EU-funded Regional Evidence for Migration Analysis and Policy (REMAP) project; REMAP is implementing the Returnee Longitudinal Survey to understand returnee reintegration and has sought the advice of the KMH to develop the survey matrix and to ensure circulation of REMAP's work in IOM and for external users. The KMH, in collaboration with the DTM-REMAP team, is working on a Knowledge Bite dedicated to the analysis of quantitative data from the REMAP Returnee Longitudinal Survey.[3]

At IOM Headquarters, the KMH continues to seek contact with other global projects managed by IOM, with a view to avoid overlaps and explore the potential for synergies. A relevant example is the Cooperation on Migration and Partnerships for Sustainable Solutions initiative (COMPASS, 55 M Euro, 2021-2023), funded by the Netherlands and managed by the Core Protection Unit, under the same Protection Division managing the KMH. COMPASS is implemented in North, East and West Africa, and the Middle East, including Afghanistan, to protect people on the move, combat human trafficking and smuggling, and support dignified return and sustainable reintegration. While its focus exceeds returnee reintegration, on this subject COMPASS has substantial complementarity with the KMH; COMPASS is prevailingly operational but has a space in the IOM global website (which differently from

---

[3] The Sustainable Reintegration Knowledge Bites are knowledge outputs based on Reintegration Sustainability Survey (RSS) data and other M&E data collected in the framework of return and integration programmes.

the KMH Platform is restricted to internal communications and dissemination) ,[4] as well as a Research component. Coordination with the KMH is well managed and overlaps are avoided, agreeing for example that the KMH takes the lead on research on returnee reintegration and COMPASS focuses on case management for trafficking victims. While they use the same training packages on the IOM Handbook and on M&E, which have become institutional references for IOM, COMPASS has collaborated with the KMH to develop and roll-out specific guidelines and training on case management, ensuring adequate synergies.

At the same time, the KMH team puts in place substantial efforts to coordinate and ensure relative added value with HQ institutional initiatives. In January 2022, IOM has established a new Unit for Innovation and KM, tasked with the objective to strengthen coordination and consistency of KM efforts across IOM and develop a global vision and a strategy to mainstream results-based monitoring and KM in IOM operations. While the Innovation and KM Unit does not specifically focus on return and reintegration, there are obvious points of contact and the KMH is ensuring adequate dialogue with its team about possible synergies. The prevailing opinion in interviews with IOM, especially in the field, is that the very fact that the KMH works with a specific thematic focus, a segment of the wider migration management domain, brings in the necessary sectoral expertise to meaningfully (not generically) support them in performing horizontal functions as M&E and KM.

The KM Unit manages another existing platform at IOM HQ, the Peer Exchange and Learning on Migration (POEM) platform, which functions as an IOM collaborative space to facilitate sharing of good practices and lessons learned and understanding of IOM policies and operations, to enhance programming and policy capacities and strengthen a culture of KM. The main differences with the KMH Platform, in addition to not having a specific thematic focus, is that POEM targets IOM staff only while the KMH is a global effort aiming to help the qualification of reintegration actions in and beyond IOM.

3.3.2 Coherence and complementarity with EU efforts policies/actions

There is a correct flow of information from IOM to the EU through the annual and monthly flash reports and via more informal communications between the team and the Operational Manager in charge at DG INTPA. The dissemination of the KMH products and opportunities is also adequate, through the KMH direct counterpart at DG INTPA. Through DG INTPA, other EU entities including relevant EUDs, DG NEAR, DG HOME and Frontex, have received invitations to attend the webinars, seminars or trainings, although their participation was discontinuous; representatives of Frontex have attended an online M&E training. Representatives of DG INTPA attended some of the KMH events, including cross-regional seminars, delivering opening or closing remarks. Attempts to collaborate with DG INTPA's Community of Practice have been challenged by the large offer of online events during the COVID-19 pandemic, and to date have not attracted sufficient attention and support. One attempt

---

[4] https://www.iom.int/compass

was made at the end of 2020 (before many KMH activities were implemented) with the organisation of a joint event with DG INTPA targeting EUDs, which received limited attention.

The KMH benefits of a functioning project governance structure, with the Project Steering Committee actively steering decision-making in the intervention and approving its workplan and deliverables. To date it has met four times, in November 2017, June 2019, June 2020 and November 2021.

At higher strategic level, the KMH has been discussed in the meetings of the EU-IOM Strategic Cooperation Partnership, particularly in the framework of the Working Group on Return and Reintegration. The value of the KMH in supporting the quality of return and reintegration actions, including the large actions funded by the EUTF, has been openly praised by DG INTPA in these meetings. To date, however, public appreciation has not translated into an established strategic partnership, with a joint vision of cooperation on return and reintegration based on mutual interests and relative strengths.

The EUDs have been more dormant. The interviewed EUDs were fully aware of the KMH but they cooperate with their IOM counterparts in their countries and do not ordinarily consult the KMH as knowledge hub.

The engagement of EU MS remains ad hoc and could be more systematically sought but is overall positive. Some EU MS have participated in KMH events and there are examples of active collaborations. For example, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development of Germany (BMZ) has reached out to the KMH proposing a joint study on Gender-responsive and Transformative Reintegration Programming, to be carried out by IOM.

It is important to emphasise that the KMH is operating in a changed environment when it comes to the EU on return and reintegration, comparing with the context when the Pilot Action was designed or the KMH strengthened, in 2020. For the period 2021-2027, the EU has decided that for promoting standardisation in the practices of the EU Member States on return and reintegration, the Commission supports the Member States through the European Migration Network's Return Experts Group (EMN-REG) and Frontex, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency.

Frontex is therefore mandated to not only assist EU MS to carry out return operations but to also provide returnees with reintegration assistance. The assistance provided by Frontex includes post-arrival and post-return assistance, for up to 12 months, to help returnees reintegrate into their societies. To this aim, Frontex manages a Reintegration Programme, through Joint Reintegration Services financed with Frontex budget. The budget earmarked for 2022 is 14.3 million Euro. The aim is to operate reintegration assistance in 50 countries worldwide and assist 7,000 persons per year, selecting countries in consultation with the Member States. The current geographical coverage counts 26 countries; the first call for services to select implementing partners was launched by Frontex on 1 April 2022; five partners were selected to deliver reintegration services to returnees assisted by Frontex or EU Member States under a 4-year partnership agreement with Frontex: Caritas International Belgium, WELDO, IRARA, European Technology and Training Centre (ETTC), Life Makers Foundation. The launch of a new Call for Proposals covering other countries is tentatively planned for the end of 2022 or start of 2023. The administrative case management system is managed by Frontex

through an online Reintegration Assistance Tool (RIAT), which should standardise the generation and exchange of comparable information on return applications, reintegration plans and financial reports. ICMPD has delivered training on data input in the RIAT system.

Finally, the EU Strategy on Return and Reintegration requests the Commission "to make available a quality framework for reintegration service providers based on common quality standards, in cooperation with the Member States, Frontex and the European Return and Reintegration Network by mid-2022", and to promote its use. There is an ongoing effort led by DG HOME to develop EU common monitoring and evaluation standards, which has involved ERRIN in the definition of common quality standards for the selection of reintegration service providers and the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) for the development of an indicator matrix to monitor reintegration assistance. The implementation of the Frontex Reintegration Programme is expected to address structural differences in the type and way reintegration assistance is provided by EU Member States.

3.3.3 Collaborations and partnerships with other organizations

By design and in implementation, the KMH has put in place convenient efforts to expand its reach beyond IOM and those involved in the EU-IOM Actions, targeting government and civil society actors, UN agencies, IOs and NGOs, academia and research institutes. This is a strategic goal of IOM that the KMH is helping to realise. The 2021 Return, Readmission and Reintegration Policy of IOM "recognizes that return, readmission and sustainable reintegration are integral elements of migration governance and are beyond the capacity of one single actor's engagement; the issue therefore depends on the combined efforts of all stakeholders. Partnerships and cooperation between a variety of actors (…) are required to enhance the range and quality of return, readmission and reintegration assistance available to migrants, avoid duplication of efforts and foster the sustainability of reintegration processes." The webinars, the seminars and the discussions of the Community of Practice are offering good support to bring reintegration practitioners together and facilitate peer-to-peer exchanges. Positive collaborations have been established or continued with the academia and research institutes involved in the production of the Research Fund studies. They are also involved in the delivery of joint webinars to present the studies and in capacity-building activities. The partnerships with research entities have been important to qualify research activities with solid academic standards and contribute to bridge theoretical analysis with the work on the ground, making evidence from the field more available. The Sustainable Reintegration Knowledge Bite Series of the KMH has especially raised the attention of research entities, for they make accessible reintegration data collected with the tools and products developed by the KMH and rolled-out in the EU-IOM actions. The collaboration with Samuel Hall precedes and continues during the KMH; in 2017 Samuel Hall have supported the development of the Reintegration Sustainability Index (RSI), IOM's measure for reintegration, and helped measure the integrated approach to reintegration with quantitative indicators and more qualitative tools; the matrix included community indicators, recognising that the community is an important dimension for sustainable reintegration outcomes.

The KMH has shown dynamism in seeking collaborations with other UN agencies, as well as non-governmental organisations, e.g. Save the Children. The exchanges with the UN Migration Network

have led to include the KMH as a Good Practice in its Hub and in support for disseminating the KMH Platform and activities through the Network; UNICEF is involved in the dedicated focus the KMH is according to children in return and reintegration and the plan is to involve them in trainings dedicated to the reintegration of children and their families planned for the last quarter of 2022. The SDG Integration Team – Data for Development of UNDP has included the KMH Return and Reintegration Platform amongst the 100 most important tools supporting SDG implementation. There is an ongoing discussion to collaborate with the KMH to gain more in-depth understanding of return and reintegration subjects and engage in a more structured collaboration to support cross-sectoral interventions. Exchanges with UNHCR are more preliminary but in Somalia, the KMH has provided inputs on data collection and management by UNHCR. The exchanges with the European Return and Reintegration Network (ERRIN) managed by ICMPD in support to the EU MS were collaborative, with the KMH Platform publishing ERRIN reports, but there is room for further exploring the potential for synergies. As of July 2022, ICMPD is leading ERRIN's follow-up programme, the Return and Reintegration Facility, fully funded by DG HOME, for 4 years, with 10 million Euro. There is potential for collaborating. On the one hand, ICMPD is mandated to provide timely support to EU MS to develop well designed, actionable, and effective return and reintegration actions. While the KMH Platform is amongst consulted resources, the EU MS usually request urgent support and IOM has both the office infrastructure and the technical competence with the KMH, to contribute knowledge of the country contexts and the perspective of countries of origin.

3.4 Efficiency

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.4.1 Capacity of IOM to correctly implement the KMH			
3.4.2 Appropriateness of the implementation mechanisms			
3.4.3 Adequacy of resources for achieving the planned results			
3.4.4 Progress with implementation and corrective measures			
3.4.5 Spending conformity			

3.4.1 Capacity of IOM to correctly implement the KMH

IOM has full institutional and technical capacity to implement the global KMH; the organization has been implementing return and reintegration actions for over two decades, mostly funded by the EU and EU MS. The organization has specific comparative added value for managing the KMH, that includes (i) its operational capacity worldwide, through its office infrastructure, which ensures its global outreach; (ii) its global migration mandate and local networks, as well as recognition as the

chair of the UN Migration Networks, which for the KMH translates into a capacity to disseminate worldwide and to attract interest from potential beneficiaries outside IOM, including in the partner countries; (iii) the fact that IOM's work on return and reintegration is not limited to the KMH and is on the contrary quite extensive, allowing IOM to collect data from relevant operations in different countries and use them to foster evidence-based knowledge and understanding of reintegration.

Because the KMH has come into existence with the support of development funds, another relevant aspect is that IOM has invested in the conceptualisation of a development and human rights-based vision on return and reintegration, which is clearly reflected in its 2017 Integrated Approach to Reintegration and 2019 Reintegration Handbook. Moreover, the Policy on the Full Spectrum of Return, Readmission and Reintegration released in 2021 calls for a holistic, rights-based approach to reintegration and the need to ensure that the needs of the returnees are addressed as part of a broader development framework. The KMH itself sits in IOM's Protection Division.

A more difficult element, which IOM is currently addressing across the organization, is the fact that IOM is still in the process of consolidating an institutional culture of M&E and KM and this reflects in generally limited investments on these functions, especially in field offices, including in countries with large return and reintegration operations. Field capacity issues have been challenging also for the KMH, especially before 2020, when one person only was working on the entire set of support expected from the KMH.

3.4.2 Appropriateness of the implementation mechanisms

The implementation mechanisms governing the KMH are efficient and do not constitute obvious obstacles towards the achievement of its planned outputs and outcomes. The Pilot Action is fully funded by the EU and managed by IOM, in direct management modality. Until activities in Southern Africa phased out in 2020, the Pilot Action was managed by IOM Regional Office in Pretoria, while the KMH was always based at IOM HQ in Geneva, which is a convenient choice considering its ambition to promote harmonised implementation approaches across IOM and beyond. As of January2020, the KMH/Pilot Action is managed by the Return and Reintegration Unit at the Protection Division, under IOM Department of Programme Support and Migration Management in Geneva. The Protection Division's mandate is to assist IOM regional and country offices to support partner countries ensure respect, protection, and rights-based assistance to migrants, including returning migrants, and people in displacement.

The arrangements between the KMH and IOM field offices involved in the organisation of the KMH activities at the country level are clear and worked well for all parties concerned, including when it comes to the shared covering of costs, with local offices bearing direct costs for venues, equipment, and participants' attendance, while also contributing the time of the staff involved. More importantly, to balance field capacity issues and the lack of KMH staff in the field, early in 2020 the JI has covered for an M&E staff position to support implementation of the M&E surveys rolled out as part of the KMH.

Since 2020, activities have been largely implemented as planned and the KMH team has shown good responsiveness and flexibility to adapt implementation to changing circumstances, including in responding to the COVID-19 mobility limitations with a timing shift to remote implementation modalities. The training packages themselves were adapted to online delivery.

The service providers contributing to the KMH are selected by means of a transparent and correctly managed process. For example, clear requests for proposals for the Research Fund are disseminated across the KMH recipients and published on the Platform and on IOM's global website and the selection of the proposals is based on clearly set criteria and a thorough assessment of the proposal's quality and capacity of the proposing entity; DG INTPA is involved in the selection process. The KMH team defines the scope, terms of reference, methodological approach and technical inputs required. The research (and in general knowledge) topics are identified through the ongoing dialogue fed across the KMH events and discussions, involving IOM field offices as well as governmental and non-governmental actors and the research community, and are validated with DG INTPA. The good quality of the outputs produced in collaboration with other organizations confirms that the selection process resulted in opportune choices.

3.4.3 Adequacy of resources for achieving the planned results

The allocation of budget resources was revised with the amendment of the grant agreement between IOM and the EU in 2020, ensuring that sufficient staff resources were available to implement the KMH. Until then, the KMH was one of the workstreams of the Pilot Action and could count on one full-time staff and a consultant only, the Knowledge Management and Data Officer based at IOM HQ, as in the early design of the Action, irrespective of its grown scope and geographical coverage.

With the contract amendment, the KMH became the centre of the Pilot Action, and new staff was recruited; the KMH team members are now 9 international staff,[5] all project-based, plus 2 web developers from the Online Communication Unit (OCU) based in Manila dedicated to the Platform (one full- and one part-time) and part-time liaison staff in IOM Regional Office in Brussels to liaise with the EU and ensure alignment with contractual obligations, as well as three external consultants. The core team forms a competent and motivated group of professionals, with a clear division of roles and responsibilities and an adequate mix of thematic and technical expertise. The capacity of the team and its modus operandi are key KMH assets. The hiring process for the core team was rather lengthy,

---

[5] A Programme Manager with overall responsibility for managing the intervention; a Project Support Officer supporting the overall project coordination and all the activities; a KM Officer assisting with the organisation of knowledge-sharing workshops and the moderation of the Platform and its virtual Community of Practice; a Research & Data Officer supporting the selection, coordination and follow-up of research, as well as monitoring data analysis for short knowledge uptakes; a Communications Officer responsible for the development and dissemination of the audio-video materials as well as supporting overall communication and visibility aspects, collaborating with part-time communications support staff (Geneva); a Resource Management Officer ensuring due administrative, financial and reporting functions; a Capacity Building Officer for the establishment of a regular reintegration training programme; a M&E Officer responsible for the design, development and delivery of the M&E training and other M&E activities of the KMH, working in collaboration with one other M&E Officer who have more recently joined.

half of the team was recruited at the end of 2020 and the rest in 2021. The pandemic has exacerbated difficulties in recruiting new staff and the delays in the formalisation of the first amendment did not help, as IOM Units can only start recruitment based on a formalised contract. The Protection Division management has contributed critical inputs to finetune and promote the work of the KMH. The external consultants have substantially contributed on the training methodology (adult learning) and to the knowledge papers.

Beyond KMH, the scarcity of M&E resources in the field was discussed with the key informants as a structural critical issue in IOM, also in large operations. As per the information collected across IOM, there is an ongoing institutional effort to strengthen M&E functions across the organization.

The available financial resources are adequate to implement the workplan of the KMH and pursue its planned results. The budget has a rather simple structure, with 6 subheadings. The 2021 NCE sees increased allocations under the subheadings Human Resources, Equipment and supplies, Local office, Other costs and services. The additional budget allocated to human resources was used to recruit more KMH staff, with an increase of 28 percent comparing to the initial budget, in recognition of the fact that KMH's work is prevailingly staff driven and requires the availability of a range of technical expertise on Reintegration, KM, Research and Data Analysis, M&E, Communications, and others; the increase under equipment/supplies and local office reflected the increase in staff positions. Decreases are noted under the subheadings Travel (due to the restrictions associated to COVID-19) and Other, by 18 and 31 percent respectively. Under Other, some extra funds were budgeted to reflect the expanded capacity-building activities under the KMH and the translation of KMH products into different languages; at the same time, some lines were reduced to reflect the virtual settings foreseen for the KMH workshops during the pandemic, originally planned in presence.

The share of the Pilot Action's funds allocated to the KMH has evolved over time. In the original contract that started on 1 March 2017, funds allocated to KMH amounted to approximately 1.2 million Euro (8 percent of the total budget). In February 2020, that amount was increased to approx. 5 million Euro (33 percent). Currently, after the budget revision that took place in June 2022, the amount allocated to the KMH increased again and amounts now to approx. 6.8 million Euro, corresponding to 45 percent of the total budget for the Pilot Action. Considering the size of the KMH workplan and the type of activities therein, requiring considerable staff inputs, the resources seem in line with needs. Staff cost units are standard IOM rates for the foreseen positions and cost-efficiency considerations were confirmed, when possible, by the evaluation (the budget detail does not support a thorough assessment). For example, the interviewed research centres who have collaborated with the KMH have referred that the resources received for the research studies (150,000 Euro on average) were in line with the scope of the work and with market trends.

Disbursements from the EU to IOM were timely, but they suffered the lengthy process of formalisation of the NCEs. The first NCE was signed after the original agreement had ended already and the second was signed on the last day; IOM has ensured that staff was retained during the short transition and activities continued.

A significant element in relation to the KMH is the use of technology and digital solutions for M&E data collection and knowledge management. Data collection and data management standardisation is a central area in which the KMH contribution is expected.

When the M&E package was designed, the M&E guidance identified the institutional information management system, MiMOSA, as the correct 'place' to record the data collected. Interviews with IOM staff indicate that while running the M&E tools, the field offices faced several issues with MiMOSA, who remains too centralised and too rigid to support efficient M&E functions, especially in operations with a large and fluid caseload. Several offices switched to using Kobo, a data collection system that was more easily adaptable in the field, if more or different survey questions were felt as needed. Introducing changes in MiMOSA is rather time-consuming; for example, the inclusion of Covid-related questions in MiMOSA has allegedly taken three months. At the same time, Kobo is not a data management system, and its use carries substantial data sensitivity concerns. In June 2022 IOM launched a new and secure institutional Kobo server for the M&E surveys (case management remains with MiMOSA). The requirement to ensure data privacy issues is clearly spelled out in IOM Return, Readmission, and Reintegration Policy: "The rights of migrants to privacy must be respected by putting in place strict safeguards for the handling of personal data of returnees, taking all reasonable and necessary precautions to preserve the confidentiality of personal data and the privacy of individuals." The KMH has played a substantial role in the establishment of the Technical Working Group gathering M&E and Information Management focal points, based at HQs and IOM regional offices, that developed a concept note for a revised data collection and data management system for return and reintegration programmes.

Technology plays a central role also in the Platform functions and in all activities implemented via the Platform, in close collaboration between HQ and the web developers in Manila. The IT system was used to index and systematise articles, documents and publications and allow their filtering, so that they can be easily and efficiently located online; reintegration initiatives in the map, as well as webinars, seminars and other events, including the discussions of the Community of Practice, are organised and accessible online; trainings are conducted using the IOM E-Campus platform, in a virtual classroom setting, in which IOM staff and participants engage with the training material and with each other online. After completing the training, participants provide their feedback via an online survey.

3.4.4 Progress with implementation and corrective measures adopted

The KMH has made steady progress after a challenging start. This is testament to a dedicated team committed to ensure the intervention maintains relevance and delivers tangible support, as planned.

Significant delays were recorded before 2020, due especially to the insufficient staff resources allocated to implement the KMH; for example, the setup of the Platform was planned for Spring 2019 and was launched in December 2019; the development of the SoPs was expected by the first quarter of 2018 and was only completed in 2020. This has generated effects on the time required to consolidate the M&E and training packages and on the initial recognition of the KMH by IOM field colleagues. The testing of the M&E tools started when the EU-IOM actions had already kicked-off and

had developed an ad hoc M&E framework, requiring them to adapt when IOM HQ requested to use the standardised M&E surveys. This had initially generated some levels of resistance and deviations from the M&E guidance.

Implementation gained good pace only after the NCE in 2020, when the KMH reached its full capacity, and a full team was in place. While indeed the implementation period of the Pilot Action is 70 months, this cannot be regarded as the duration of the KMH, which until the end of activities in December 2022 will have operated with sufficient capacity for approximately 24 months (staff recruitment was done between the end of 2020 and 2021). The expanded capacity of the KMH in 2020 has reflected in a sharp advancement in the implementation of activities, especially in 2021 and 2022.

The KMH team expects to complete the set of activities until December 2022. The activities being completed in the second half of 2022 include national roll outs of the trainings; an additional training on the reintegration of children and their families (with UNICEF) as part of the Reintegration handbook rollout; one cross-regional knowledge sharing workshop on the reintegration of victims of trafficking; additional webinars; completion of two research studies, on the impact of indebtedness on sustainable reintegration and on health-related needs and their impact in sustainable reintegration outcomes); completion and launch of the audio-visual materials and online stock library.

The state of the art of the implementation of activities under the responsibility of the KMH, as presented in the fifth progress report covering implementation until February 2022 and the monthly flash reports until April 2022, is as follows:

0.1.3 Establish and implement a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Action: completed.

1.2.2 Implement capacity building measures in targeted countries: until Q4 2022.

1.3.1 Monitoring data collection relevant to return and reintegration, based on harmonised indicators and tools developed by the KMH: ongoing as part of EU-IOM actions.

1.3.2 Monitoring data analysis to generate lessons learnt (activity added in the 2020 NCE; data collected under Activity 1.3.1 is analysed as part of Output 1.4): ongoing as part of EU-IOM actions.

1.4.1 Establish a KMH addressing return and reintegration in a development cooperation context: completed.

1.4.2 Set up an online portal and community of practice on return and reintegration in development cooperation contexts (including platform management, community moderation and webinars): completed (Platform's launch in December 2019); webinars until Q4 2022.

1.4.3 Support small-scale, demand-driven research on return and reintegration its dissemination: the Research Fund was established in 2017 to conduct research on understudied topics upon the request of the partner countries or the PSC.

1.4.4. Organisation of knowledge-sharing workshops: ongoing until Q4 2022. A technical workshop on sustainable reintegration was held in November 2018 in Addis Ababa, co-organised with the African Union. Three other workshops were held online as follows: Return and reintegration of children and their families organised with UNICEF and Save the Children (March 2021), Fostering and strengthening

interlinkages between sustainable development and reintegration programmes (December 2021), Lessons Learned from the EU-IOM Actions: Building Partnerships and Strengthening Systems for Sustainable Reintegration (May 2022). Additional workshop on Reintegration of victims of trafficking: new findings and lessons from practitioners is planned to take place in November 2022 in coordination with the COMPASS project. In addition, the KMH has supported various other workshops aiming to share knowledge and exchange practices on reintegration, for example, the workshop on reintegration under the Regional Conference on Migration in Puebla, Mexico in September 2022.

In addition, a training and coordination workshop for EU-IOM actions in Asia and the Middle East was co-facilitated by the KMH together with the IOM Regional Offices in Brussels and Bangkok in March 2019, in Bangkok, Thailand, to ensure alignment of approaches in the field of return and reintegration and foster synergies with similar initiatives in Africa. The KM and Data Officer presented IOM's return and reintegration frameworks and policies, the M&E tools developed for reintegration, and the information management systems. Similar events were supported by the Hub in other regions, especially the three JI windows.

1.4.5 Roll-out of Reintegration Handbook: ongoing until Q4 2022.

The roll out of trainings on the integrated approach to reintegration presented in the Reintegration Handbook started in 2019 and until February 2002, 18 training workshops had been conducted at the regional and national level, using the reintegration training curriculum. The first ToT was delivered in September-October 2020, a second in Jan-March 2022 and the last one is scheduled in September 2022. Two rounds of blended trainings were held in October-November 2021 in French and in May-June 2022 in English. Eight regional reintegration workshops were also organised, 4 virtual in 2021 and 4 in person in 2022. In 2022, the training curriculum was made available on the KMH Platform, a session on the reintegration of children and their families was included in the training package.

1.4.6. Develop, pilot and roll-out M&E training course for return and reintegration activities: the SoPs were finalised in 2020; an adapted version for the JI North of Africa window was prepared in 2021, trainings ongoing until Q4 2022.

The first two editions of the regional M&E Training of Trainers (ToT) were conducted in Dhaka, Bangladesh, in May/June 2022, and in Cairo in June/July 2022, and targeted IOM staff only; the third was conducted in September 2022 in Dakar, in French. The plan is that the ToTs are followed by at least 10 national trainings targeting external partners and stakeholders, until the end of 2022. The M&E training package includes a self-paced version available in English and French on E-Campus and I-learn since April 2022.

1.4.7. Production and dissemination of audio-visual material on return and reintegration: ongoing. Implementation is delayed comparing to the initial end date of August 2022 but they are expected to be completed and online by end of project.

1.4.8 Develop and update a strategy to promote the sustainability of the KMH: a concept note presenting the KMH Sustainability Strategy was developed to support a funding appeal and discussions, a full document is planned to be finalised until the end of the intervention.

1.4.9 Conduct a final evaluation of the KMH: implemented between July and October 2022.

3.4.5 Spending conformity

The spending flow is sufficiently in line with progress in implementation. The limited underspending noted when analysing the data presented in the fifth financial report until February 2022 reflects the fact that the reported values consider only the expenditures already incurred and not those already committed. The overview presented herewith looks at the Pilot Action as a whole and at its 15 million Euro budget, as the detail available in the budget does not support a precise disaggregation of the expenditures incurred for the KMH only.

Until February 2022, at 86% of the implementation period, the expenditures incurred were 73% of the total budget. Looking at individual subheadings, costs incurred for human resources were at 73% (forecast: 92% until December 2022), travel: 51% (forecast 101%), equipment and supplies: 81%, local office: 85%, other costs and services: 58% (forecast: 111%). Most of the catch up in the remaining 10 months of operations is related to the already committed costs for human resources and other costs and services, including new or completing knowledge products.

The last financial report includes a table on the financial forecast until the end of the intervention, presenting a realistic cost allocation comparing with the activity plan and expecting to use all budgeted costs until December 2022.

3.5 Effectiveness

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.5.1 Delivery of the planned outputs	🟩		
3.5.2 Quality of the outputs	🟩		
3.5.3 Progress towards the planned outcomes	🟩		
3.5.4 Core outcomes of the KMH		🟧	

3.5.1 Delivery of the planned outputs

As implementation progressed more efficiently after 2020, the delivery of outputs became timelier too. The KMH has managed to mitigate the initial delays of the Pilot Action and the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and is managing to complete, adapt or finetune good quality outputs. Based on a review of the documents shared by the KMH team and other IOM staff and stakeholders throughout the evaluation, as well as on the interviews conducted, the evaluation considers that the delivery of outputs is promising and that the vast majority will be completed by the end of the implementation period. The few targets that had not been met until August 2022 concern the research studies (3

completed out of 5 expected), the number of webinars (18 out of 20), workshops and events (4 out of 5), the number of facilitators in the reintegration roster (38 out of 40), the number of participants in reintegration and in M&E trainings, the videos. Considering the activity plan, the targets will be likely met by the end of the intervention.

The presentation of the start of the art in output delivery considers the performance indicators in the latest version of the logframe and their associated targets. As the KMH is part of the Pilot Action, the overview looks at all outputs in the logframe but considers quality aspects only for those more immediately associated to the KMH. Information is based on the fifth progress report, updates presented to the PSC, and discussions with the KMH team:

0.1.1 Completion of inception phase and identification of targeted migration corridors: completed during the Pilot Action's inception phase, 3 countries (rather than corridors) identified, South Africa, Malawi and Mozambique.

1.1.1 Number of assessments produced or updated: 4 over a target of 4, i.e. South Africa, Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia.

1.2.1 Number of capacity building activities and events organised during the Action: 28 (12 in South Africa, 7 in Malawi, 8 in Mozambique, 1 in Zambia) over a target of 25;

1.2.2 Number of institutions participating in coordination activities: 49 (33 state, 16 non-state) over a target of 38, with 64 persons (44 men, 20 women) participating; country breakdown available;

1.2.3 Percentage of individual stakeholders declaring increased knowledge on voluntary return and/or reintegration: 73% in South Africa, 96% in Malawi, 60% in Mozambique overall a cumulative target of 80%.

1.3 "Return and reintegration related data collection and analysis enhanced in the targeted countries": the referenced monitoring data are collected based on the harmonised indicators and tools completed by the KMH. The one report generating lessons learnt from monitoring data expected under indicator 1.3.1 looks at the experience of the Pilot Action and is being finalised.

1.4.1 Number of users of the online platform and community of practice counts 24,291 first time and 3,963 returning visitors, of 25,000 visitors targeted, roughly half from IOM;

1.4.2 Number of webinars organised by the KMH and hosted on the online platform and number of participants on average: 15 webinars have been organised with an average 132 people attending, of 20 online webinars for average 80 participants expected;

1.4.3 Number of knowledge sharing workshops and participants in support of the community of practice: 4 of 5 expected with an average participation of 60 people (AU-EU-UN Technical Workshop on Sustainable Reintegration of Migrants in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, November 2018, 64 participants; Online seminar on return and reintegration of children and their families, March 2021, in collaboration with UNICEF, 301 participants; Online seminar on Fostering and strengthening interlinkages between sustainable development and reintegration programmes, December 2021, 228 participants; Seminar organised to present the lessons learned in the EU-IOM Actions in May 2022); one last workshop is planned for Autumn 2022, on Victims of Trafficking;

1.4.4 Number of demand-driven research studies conducted: out of 5 expected, 3 have been completed (Monitoring Toolkit for Sustainable Reintegration of Children Returnees by Samuel Hall; Comparative Reintegration Outcomes between Forced and Voluntary Return and Through a Gender Perspective, counted as 2 studies, by Maastricht University/School of Governance) and 2 are ongoing (Study on the impact of debt on sustainable reintegration outcomes and Study on the impact of health-related needs on sustainable reintegration outcomes, both by Samuel Hall);

1.4.5 Number of knowledge products produced: 18 of 20 expected, i.e. 2 Knowledge Papers, with a third one being developed on returnee employment; 10 Good, Innovative and Promising Practices Factsheets, and 6 Knowledge Bites;

1.4.6 Number of facilitators who are part of the reintegration training programme facilitator roster; 38 facilitators in 17 countries of 40 expected;

1.4.7 Number of governmental and non-governmental actors trained through the reintegration training programme: 7,562 (303 men and 146 women) of 7,710 expected. The reintegration training programme has included 3 regional ToT trainings, for anglophone and francophone speakers, online and in person in Nairobi in 2022. National rollouts have started in September 2022, in collaboration with field colleagues to ensure adequate attendance local stakeholders.

1.4.8 Number of governmental and non-governmental actors trained through the M&E training course for return and reintegration activities for return and reintegration activities: 43 M&E and reintegration practitioners trained (18 men, 25 women) of 100 targeted;

1.4.9 Number of audio-visual material on return and reintegration available in video stock library to be used, re-edited and broadcasted by televisions, radio stations and web portals: development of the materials is ongoing.

2.1.1 Number of state and non-state actors involved in the provision of voluntary return assistance to migrants: 5 on 5 targeted;

2.1.2 Number of migrants assisted to return voluntarily to their countries of origin: 770 of 800 targeted (Malawi: 486, Mozambique: 284, 0 in South Africa); sex-disaggregation available;

2.1.3 Percentage of surveyed returnees satisfied with travel arrangements made for them: 99% of 80% targeted (98% in Malawi, 100% in Mozambique); sex-disaggregation available.

2.2.1 Number of stranded migrants assisted to return voluntarily to their countries of origin in the context of COVID-19: 1,164 of 1,200 targeted (111 Malawi, 2 Mozambique, 51 Zimbabwe). Disaggregated data by sex and vulnerability not found.

3.1.1 Number of stakeholders involved in the provision of reintegration assistance to returning migrants: 31 over 30 (25 in Malawi, 6 in Mozambique); sex-disaggregated values available, disaggregation by state and non-state stakeholders not found;

3.1.2 Number of beneficiaries who have received reintegration assistance: 701 over 800 (446 Malawi, 255 Mozambique); sex-disaggregated data available, values per type of support and level (individual, collective and community) not found;

3.1.3 Number of stranded migrants who have received reintegration assistance in the context of COVID-19: 141 on 200 (91 Malawi, 50 Mozambique); sex-disaggregated values available;

3.1.4 Percentage of beneficiaries declaring being satisfied with the reintegration assistance received from IOM: 80,5% of those surveyed in Malawi (212) and Mozambique (92), on a target of 70%.

3.2.1 Number of community- based reintegration initiatives implemented: 4 over 8 expected (4 each in Malawi and Mozambique). Disaggregated values by sex and country, type of initiative and beneficiary not found;

3.1.3 Percentage of surveyed community members reporting that they feel involved in the implementation of community-based reintegration: 25% on 70% expected; number of those surveyed not available, survey not conducted in Malawi for delays in implementation;

3.1.4 Percentage of participants in community-based initiatives surveyed that report satisfaction with the initiatives supported: 89% in in Mozambique (number of those surveyed not available), survey not conducted in Malawi, over a target of 70%.

3.5.2 Quality of the outputs

An assessment of the quality of the outputs delivered by the KMH is presented for each of its four components:

Ensuring coherent voluntary return and reintegration approaches: Capacity building is a central aspect of the KMH work and has a twofold aim: on the one hand, to promote understanding of the integrated approach to reintegration presented in IOM Reintegration Handbook and how this can be operationalised, on the other hand how to use the M&E package developed for return and reintegration operations. The quality of the reintegration programme trainings is good if judged by post-training surveys. The trainings are indeed appreciated by the participants interviewed for this evaluation, who confirmed that they are well designed, delivered with clear competence on adult training methodologies, a clear structure and materials that remain available online, on the Platform. The training curriculum is made in a modular way, to adapt to different audiences, and the ToT course broken down in several MOOCs. One mild element of criticism is that the online trainings are rather demanding in terms of duration, especially the ToTs (attendance 2-3 times a week), and some external participants perceived the content as being too centred on IOM integrated approach, while they could remain more open to reflect other studies and experiences on reintegration approaches.

Cross-regional harmonisation of M&E activities: The M&E Package piloted with KMH support was developed between 2017 and 2019, building on the work of previous projects. The standardisation process started in 2017 to respond to a strong call made by IOM field offices and partners to support more harmonised approaches to reintegration and in M&E functions. An important caveat when discussing the quality of the M&E outputs is to consider that some of the key outputs are pilot tested under the KMH, thinking especially at the M&E package. It is part of the concept of a pilot that inputs and comments are made to finetune the tools. Because these inputs and comments were discussed

with the evaluator and are constructive, they are presented in the report; they are not intended to suggest a negative assessment of the KMH contribution to develop or implement the M&E Package.

The KMH contributed the testing of these standardised tools and supports capacity development within and outside IOM. The M&E Package initially included 5 monitoring and satisfaction surveys for measuring return and reintegration assistance at different stages: (1) AVR programme monitoring survey (0-1 months after return); (2) AVR programme satisfaction survey (0-1 month after return); (3) Reintegration programme monitoring survey (9-11 months after return); (4) Reintegration programme satisfaction survey (9-11 months after return); (5) Reintegration sustainability survey (RSS) (12-18 months after return).

The RSS is based on 15 indicators and 32 questions on the economic, social and psychosocial dimensions of reintegration; they support a scoring system measuring reintegration in the 3 dimensions and 1 aggregated reintegration score providing a numerical measure of whether the integration of a particular individual receiving assistance was sustainable or not. While assessing sustainability of reintegration is critically important and useful for reporting, there is room for further developing the assessment system and address some of the fundamental questions needed to inform the approach and design of the actions, i.e. what are the elements that inform positive or negative outcomes. While indeed it is important that information on the beneficiary perceptions is available, scoring does not capture the reasons behind an outcome and offers limited support to identify and address gaps in the design of future actions. More in general, the indicators' matrix supports comparisons by sex and other variables but can be expanded to also support understanding of when reintegration is sustainable and under which circumstances.

In 2020, the KMH added a focus on community-based reintegration and capacity-building, i.e. capacity-building programme monitoring surveys for key stakeholders and community-based reintegration programme monitoring surveys for returnees, non-migrant community-members and key stakeholders. They were pilot tested in Afghanistan and Bangladesh between December 2020 and January 2021 (capacity-building programme monitoring surveys for key stakeholders) and in Ethiopia in February 2021, under the JI (community-based reintegration programme monitoring surveys for returnees, non-migrant community-members and key stakeholders). To further support standardisation in return and reintegration operations, in August 2017 IOM HQ with the KMH developed "Framework Standard Operating Procedures (SoP) for Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration Assistance", presenting basic concepts and principles and clarifying the processes and procedures related to return and reintegration, as well as potential roles and responsibilities of different actors involved.

Interviewed stakeholders have praised the quality of the trainings and the added value of having solid in-house competence on monitoring and evaluation combined with thematic expertise on return and reintegration.

The interviews of the evaluation expert indicate a shared appreciation for the effort (and KMH support therein) to standardise M&E in return and reintegration programmes and move towards having comparable data for global analysis. When discussing the weaknesses of the M&E Package, the main issues that surfaced were that the M&E surveys are rather extensive and time-consuming, against still

limited M&E resources and competence in the field and possibly in excess, considering that only a partial amount of the collected data is being analysed; they are also seen as rather repetitive, with some IOM field offices opting for merging the 2 satisfaction surveys into one, i.e. the Assisted Voluntary Return Programme Satisfaction and the Reintegration Programme surveys.

At the same time, the data collection system was understood to be insufficiently adaptable to reflect the specific realities of the contexts of operation, and the data management system too rigid when comparing to the constant changes in the operational contexts and information needs; any change in the questions becomes in MiMOSA a structural adjustment, it cannot be tuned to a specific local context. A practical in-between solution was adopted by some IOM field offices in using MiMOSA anytime possible and Kobo for the rest of the information, while also choosing core questions/indicators from the standardised surveys and making the rest of the data collected more context specific. This is also supported on preliminary grounds by the first Knowledge Bite of October 2020, which gives a first indication that a context-specific approach is necessary for the sustainability of reintegration. Finally, key informants within and outside IOM tend to agree that it would be important in the future to go beyond the assessment of individual reintegration outcomes and also consider reintegration approaches and models, including via the use of evidence collected through (the current or finetuned) M&E surveys.

Setting-up knowledge management tools: The Return and Reintegration Platform is a strategic component of the KMH. It is its increasingly well-known external face, through which the KMH is building its outreach capacity and therefore its relevance as provider of support to policymakers and practitioners worldwide.

The KMH Platform is the only global repository on return and reintegration, it is as such very appropriate that it has a global focus and global access, and that it offers support beyond IOM. The Platform is available and increasingly consulted beyond IOM, looking at records on the users. For IOM offices and the interviewed external stakeholders, having a dedicated Platform is important also to showcase and make their efforts more visible. The Platform indeed includes a repository of resources with over 700 documents, published by IOM and other organizations, that have been categorised and are easily searchable online, with an abstract available for each published document. The repository remains very user-friendly, and filters can be used to locate the resources of interest. They can be searched by category, publishing organization, language (publications in more than 10 languages are available), year of publication (as of 2000), country/region, thematic areas. They are all at easy disposal, free of charge, the documents produced by the KMH can be directly downloaded from the Platform's dedicated section, for the other documents there is a link redirecting to the document's source.

The webinars have served as an additional visibility and dissemination channels, allowing to present and discuss the KMH products, for example the research studies and other KMH products. Attendance is clearly growing: if attendance to webinars was in 2020 of an average 81 people per event, in 2021, the average became 144 and in 2022, 179 between IOM and external stakeholders, both practitioners and policymakers, presenting governments, UN agencies, academia, NGOs, among others. The recordings of the webinars are easily available on the Platform, organised by the same labels used for

the publications. Cumulating, among others, Community's members, participants to webinars and seminars, the KMH is now able to reach out to 3,000+ recipients of its communications.

An additional output delivered through the Platform, under the e-learning feature, are the cross-regional knowledge sharing seminars. These are more complex events lasting 2 to 3 days on specific unaddressed topics. The recipients of the invitations (sent through the KMH mailing list) receive information and can see the agenda and register online, also through the dedicated Platform's seminars section. There is wide participation from experts, practitioners and policymakers, civil society the EU, international organizations and academia, depending also on the topic.

The Platform is managed so to interconnect its different facets and exploit synergies across efforts and deliverables. There is a deliberate effort to bridge individual events with the development of the Community of Practice and overall use and visibility of the Platform and the KMH. For example, users can suggest topics for new webinars or research as well as propose the publication of documents (knowledge products or reintegration initiatives) they or others have developed/implemented by submitting a proposal through the Platform (received by 4 KMH staff). This has allowed the KMH Team to monitor interest by topic and access by stakeholders, identifying potentially interested to be part of the Community. The KMH team follows up on their request and also invites to subscribe to the newsletter and join the Community.

Producing knowledge products: The research and knowledge products reviewed for the evaluation are of very good quality, suggesting that the involvement of academia was a good choice, allowing the use of data from IOM field operations to inform new knowledge and reach new audiences, outside the circle of concerned practitioners and policymakers. There is probably room for more follow-up discussions and reflection on how the knowledge produced can translate into practice. The two research studies that have been completed and published are the Monitoring Toolkit for Sustainable Reintegration of Children Returnees (study on children), undertaken by Samuel Hall in collaboration with Save the children and UNICEF and presented in September 2021, and the Comparative Reintegration Outcomes between Forced and Voluntary Return and through a Gender Perspective (study on forced returns and gender) by the Maastricht University, released in December 2021. The study on children focuses on returning children and on the specific experiences and challenges they face during the reintegration process. The research activities presented in the study, which include field work and primary data collection facilitated by the KMH in Ethiopia, Georgia, Honduras, Iraq and Nigeria, have supported the development of useful and sensitive practitioners' tools for conducting surveys, interviews and focus groups, and a well-developed compilation of good practices. The report and tools are available in English, French and Spanish. To build on the study's content and follow up on its recommendations, the KMH has recruited a child protection expert in January 2022 to develop practical guidelines for the operationalization of the toolkit for monitoring the reintegration of child returnees. The study on forced returns and gender by the Maastricht University has a twofold focus on potential differences between forced and voluntary returns when it comes to reintegration outcomes and gender-sensitive elements in reintegration. The collaboration with the KMH has allowed access to datasets originating from return and reintegration actions implemented by IOM and on extensive field work, which have included surveys and in-depth interviews with a meaningful sample of returnees, their family members and other key informants in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, El

Salvador, the Gambia, Nigeria and Somalia. The study scrutinises economic, social and psychological elements. While the initial collection of data was challenged by the COVID-19 pandemic and data protection issues in obtaining access to data collected by IOM, the available study marks an important effort to step out of generalisations and differentiate reintegration experiences, proving that the nature of the return decision (voluntary or imposed) and gender elements tend to affect reintegration outcomes. Interviews with key informants from the research community have clearly indicated that the collaboration between scholars and IOM practitioners allow on the one hand, the generation of knowledge based on scientifically sound methodologies and its circulation beyond the practitioners' circles and on the other hand, the possibility for the scholars to access primary data that are commonly difficult to access. The Maastricht University is discussing with IOM the possibility to use the study's data in academic articles. Samuel Hall is working on two additional studies, starting in 2022, one focusing on the impact of debt on sustainable reintegration outcomes (study on debt) and the other on the impact of health-related needs on sustainable reintegration outcomes (study on health). Both studies address relevant knowledge gaps to deepen understanding of the existing factors and dynamics that influence reintegration outcomes. The study on debt looks at existing interlinkages between indebtment that the returnees may have contracted, their exposure to vulnerabilities and the sustainability of their return. The study on health considers health assistance services available to individual returnees, with a view to scrutinise the need to integrate a health focus in assistance to the returnees. In addition, KMH is collaborating with GIZ on a joint research project funded by BMZ and studying gender-related issues in reintegration, which builds on the findings of the study undertaken with the Maastricht University. The Knowledge Papers series aims at exploring reintegration aspects that have been insufficiently explored; they are done by the KMH with external consultants. The first issue, published online in April 2021 looks at "The use of microcredit schemes in migrant reintegration context", the second very good paper, issued in August 2021, reads "Fostering and strengthening interlinkages between sustainable development and reintegration programmes", an area that is often debated by practitioners, in research studies and in evaluation reports as in need of better understanding and operationalisation. Both papers were presented in online cross-regional seminars. Good reintegration practices put in place by IOM and other players are identified and presented in dedicated webinars and in dedicated factsheets, available on the KMH Platform. The Sustainable Reintegration Knowledge Bites series was launched in October 2020 and aims to present findings on reintegration outcomes and their sustainability based on the analysis of the Reintegration Sustainability Survey (RSS) data, targeting reintegration practitioners and policymakers. While the Knowledge Bites are simple, straightforward knowledge pieces, they scrutinise relevant aspects influencing reintegration outcomes, making data available to the wide community of researchers and practitioners and opening the door for more in-depth studies. As presented in the progress reports, the first Knowledge Bite analyses the factors influencing the sustainability of reintegration outcomes with the notable result that the provision of economic reintegration assistance contributes to returnees' higher average sustainable reintegration scores. The second Knowledge Bite explored additional factors that contribute to higher levels of sustainable reintegration and found that returnees who received assistance through referrals had lower reintegration sustainability scores and displayed lower levels of satisfaction with the reintegration assistance received. As for the third Knowledge Bite, it explores the reintegration outcomes and satisfaction levels of migrants assisted to

return from South Africa to Mozambique and Malawi under the Pilot Action. In addition, the fourth Knowledge Bite builds on findings from the second Knowledge Bite which found that returnees who received direct assistance had higher satisfaction levels and higher reintegration sustainability scores than those who received assistance through referrals. This study sought to complement these findings on referrals by providing insights into the reasons behind the negative effect of referrals on reintegration sustainability outcomes and satisfaction. Finally, the fifth Knowledge Bite aims to explore returnees' satisfaction with different types of reintegration assistance and whether there is a statistically significant relationship – positive or negative – between reintegration assistance received at different levels and respondents' individual reintegration outcomes. The sixth Knowledge Bite analyses data collected through the Returnee Longitudinal Study (RLS) in four countries of return, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Iraq and Pakistan, under the EU-funded project REMAP with a focus on psychosocial support.

3.5.3 Progress towards the planned outcomes

The overview of the outcomes contributed by the KMH is presented referring to the indicators and targets in the logframe, to support a consistent comparison between the outcomes planned at design stage and the results achieved. The quality of outcome statements and indicators however supports a very partial representation of the results of the KMH.

Until August 2022, targets had been achieved for all indicators but one, related to SO1, with 5 EU-IOM actions of 6 expected having adopted the SOPs. Information is based on the fifth progress report until February 2022:

1.1 Number of stakeholders strengthened through capacity building or operational support on voluntary return: 315 participants (2014 men, 111 women) from 6 state and 5 non-state institutions in South Africa (target: 50 people).

1.2 Number of stakeholders strengthened through capacity building or operational support on reintegration: 2,463 persons (302 men, 161 women) from 15 state and 2 non-state institutions in Mozambique (327), Malawi (96), Zambia (40); target: 2,200.

1.3 Number of coordination and referral mechanisms established for returnees: 3 coordination mechanisms established, 2 in Malawi and 1 in Mozambique, 0 in South Africa; target: 1 per country.

1.4 Number of EU-IOM actions having adapted the Framework SOPs for AVRR to their respective settings, for consultation and implementation: 5 of 6 expected, i.e. EU-IOM Joint Initiative for Migrant Protection and Reintegration in the Sahel and Lake Chad; in the Horn of Africa and in North Africa; Pilot Action on Voluntary Return and Sustainable, Community- Based Reintegration in Southern Africa; Prottasha Project in Bangladesh.

1.5 Number of EU-IOM actions using harmonized indicators for reporting on return and reintegration: 6 out of 6 expected (all selected EU-IOM actions have tested in full or in part the M&E surveys).

1.6 Percentage of key stakeholders surveyed who report having applied the knowledge acquired and skills developed or strengthened on sustainable reintegration policymaking and programming: 6.95%; baseline 60%, target 6.60%.

1.7 Percentage of key stakeholders surveyed who report having applied the knowledge acquired and skills developed or strengthened on monitoring and evaluation for return and reintegration: 7.80% (5 men and 9 women, a very small sample); baseline: 7%, target 7,60%.

2.1 Percentage of stakeholder declaring that they perceive the project as effectively supporting stranded migrants and reaching out to migrants who would otherwise not be in a position to return home: 90% on a target of 75%.

2.2 Percentage of migrants declaring that they have been able to return in a safe manner: 100% monitored migrants in Malawi and Mozambique (target: 80%);

3.1 Percentage of monitored beneficiaries reporting sufficient levels of economic self- sufficiency, social stability, psychosocial wellbeing in their community of return: 100% of monitored migrants in Malawi and Mozambique (target: 70%);

3.2 Percentage of surveyed migrants referred to state and non-state actors assisted: 71% of monitored migrants in Malawi and Mozambique (missing breakdowns by sex and age); target: 70%.

3.5.4 Core outcomes of the KMH

Going beyond the review of progress against the logframe indicators, the evaluation concludes that the KMH is concretely contributing to pave the way towards significant key achievements, in the understanding that this is a work in progress and that achieving full institutionalisation within IOM and improved practices by external stakeholders is a complex, lengthy process. The work of the KMH has already shown the added value of having a structure that goes beyond separate return and reintegration initiatives, aiming for stronger consistency in reintegration approaches and harmonised references to design more articulated reintegration actions and monitor the outcomes of reintegration assistance.

Looking at the first of two core objectives for this evaluation, the KMH has contributed and continues to contribute to the harmonisation of dignified voluntary return and sustainable reintegration approaches across EU-IOM actions. It offered critical support to promote a common approach to reintegration and set minimum standards in the monitoring of return and reintegration assistance, with an indicators' matrix for data collection and reporting, common SOPs and the addition of a reintegration module in MiMOSA; it offered hands-on support to IOM offices and to the dialogue between HQ and field offices, as well as good quality trainings to disseminate understanding of the integrated approach concept and how it can be operationalised and monitored. While benefits were more directly felt by smaller actions with less established capacities on reintegration and M&E, its contribution to standardisation and to strengthen data comparability cross-countries and cross-regions as well as accountability towards the donor is valued by all interviewed KIIs involved in the implementation of the EU-IOM actions. Starting from a situation where harmonised data on post-

return outcomes were lacking entirely, the KMH has supported a constructive effort to further develop, test and finetune an M&E Package devoted explicitly to monitor return and reintegration outcomes for those receiving assistance. The effort is based on a methodologically sound attempt to standardise the measurement of reintegration sustainability with the use of indicators, developed with a research centre (Samuel Hall). While the process leading to a revision of the M&E Package is ongoing, and feedback and inputs based on the field testing of the tools are being collected, the KMH has supported concrete steps, especially in IOM, to mainstream those indicators in return and reintegration operations. Complementary evidence is needed to also inform more strategic choices and see how lessons learned can be systematised and reflected into practice to generate impact, but the KMH has marked an important step towards a more articulated approach to reintegration and to expanding the knowledge base.

The findings are positive but more preliminary also in relation to the second key evaluation question, i.e. the extent to which the KMH has managed to foster a virtual community of practice. The KMH is the only accessible global reference on return and reintegration that can be accessed by all those interested in qualifying their actions or gaining a better understanding of return and reintegration topics, starting with practitioners and policymakers but also including academia and a less specialised audience. None of the KIIs outside IOM interviewed for this evaluation were aware of alternative reference hubs they could turn to. At the same time, the quality of its webinars, repository of references and capacity building trainings is appreciated within and outside IOM. While for some KIs, the Community of Practice could use more opportunities or more innovative tools to disseminate its knowledge pieces, available data indicate that the Community keeps growing and most of the interviewed informants regularly turn to it to attend a webinar or look for a paper or a good practice. For the time being, however, it is impossible to fully assess the extent to which the support offered by the KMH is translating into better practices, especially as the trainings are being rolled out and there will be no time to assess their outcomes and see whether traditional trainings are sufficient to support full understanding and appropriation of integrated approaches to reintegration and their translation into better policies and practices.

3.6 Impact

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.6.1 Influence on the choices of beneficiaries outside IOM			
3.6.2 Influence on IOM policies and practices			
3.6.3 Influence on EU policies and practices			

3.6.1 Influence on the choices of beneficiaries outside IOM

The intervention is ongoing, and it remains early for the KMH team to collect evidence to understand its long-term contributions. The preliminary assessment of the evaluation is based on qualitative information and discussions with the key informants to scrutinise the extent to which the KMH is contributing to the development of voluntary return and sustainable, community-based reintegration approaches in targeted partner countries. This chapter considers the influence on the choices of stakeholders outside IOM; the following chapters will separately consider the influence on the policies and actions of IOM and of the EU.

The assessment of the influence of the KMH to decrease fragmentation of approaches, tools and practices on return and reintegration, which are the identified core needs of the beneficiaries the KMH aims to address, is based on the interviews with non-IOM stakeholders. The interviews suggest that the KMH is gaining increasing recognition amongst a wider community of practitioners and less traditional audiences, including academia, and that it is concretely feeding a more articulated dialogue on reintegration. There is a growing number of people and organizations using the opportunities offered by the KMH to take part in informed discussions on return and reintegration. According to the key informants, this is contributing to expand the number of policymakers and practitioners that have a more established awareness that sustainable reintegration requires holistic and multidimensional approaches at the individual, community, and structural levels, with attention to benefits generated for the returnees and for the receiving communities.

It is important to clarify that if the Overall Objective remained the same in the intervention's design, the KMH is not directly engaged in supporting policy dialogue or policy development. While the Pilot Action was expected to focus on capacity building for governments, promoting the institutionalisation and integration of the return and reintegration process into existing national services and systems, under the KMH the main activities directly targeting government stakeholders are the regional and national trainings on the reintegration approach, as well as the webinars and seminars. The webinars have been increasingly followed by national counterparts, while national trainings are ongoing. There will be insufficient time until the end of the intervention to adequately assess the outcomes for non-IOM and national stakeholders, but webinars and trainings alone cannot be expected to institutionalise approaches and practices, without more direct and tailored support, as it was foreseen in the Pilot Action. The KMH's approach is to work in collaboration with and in support to the country and regional field offices, that maintain responsibility to assist the local counterparts with context-specific assistance.

Knowledge papers and research are contributing an increasing bulk of knowledge to address structural issues associated to reintegration, including the relationship between reintegration and development prospects, and the role of development donors and practitioners to support positive synergies. Unless the factors that push people to emigrate or flee in the first place are addressed, a considerable number of migrants will return to situations of vulnerability, as presented also in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. This is also an important element of concern for countries of origin, as returns may have significant implications on existing state and social structures, especially in big numbers.

3.6.2 Influence on IOM policies and practices

The KMH is helping a stronger awareness in IOM of the importance of M&E and KM functions and a progressive consolidation and harmonisation of its reintegration programmes. Reintegration remains an area of migration governance with limited established references.

Within IOM, this goes hand in hand with an increasing recognition of the importance of having a support hub at HQ level with the necessary sectoral expertise and technical competence to move towards a stronger harmonisation and qualification of reintegration practices and help IOM become a more established reference on return and reintegration, in line with its global mandate under the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda and the Global Compact for Migration. The IOM interviewed staff tend to agree that without the KMH, and the KMH collaboration with the JI, IOM would have not been able to develop an informed Return and Reintegration Strategy and position itself vis-à-vis its Member States and donors with the current credibility. One additional, if minor, confirmation comes from the KMH being included in the UN Network on Migration's repository of practices showcasing replicable practices to inspire those implementing the Global Compact for Migration.

The KMH has supported the dissemination of the integrated approach and the testing of common tools. As many as five EU-IOM actions have already adopted (and adapted) the KMH harmonised SOPs, and six EU-IOM actions have used and tested the common set of indicators for reporting on reintegration assistance and its outcomes. The ongoing, participated revision of the M&E Package with the field offices who have piloted the surveys is further facilitating internal ownership and their institutionalisation. The general attitude of the KMH team to remain open to discussions with the field and to facilitate the overcoming of institutional obstacles, e.g. with the information management system, has helped establish its credibility and the relevance of its HQ support function.

Looking specifically at the M&E Package, its completion and testing marks a considerable advancement in IOM's efforts to harmonise data collection, reporting and analysis; there is considerable support within IOM to further institutionalise it and a growing recognition of the strategic importance of having adequate HQ capacity to support the process, through the KMH.

The M&E Package was always intended to be tested and adapted to ensure its relevance and its revision process has started with regular exchanges with the concerned field offices. The KMH is currently leading an organised process of discussions with field offices, with monthly calls, on issues and challenges identified during the roll-out of the M&E Package and more in general, on M&E challenges in return and reintegration programmes and needs for KMH support. With the support of an external consultant, the KMH is working on a Roadmap to finetune the M&E tools, considering the size, applicability, and relevance of design of the M&E tools and system to support reintegration models and programming. In the opinion of various KIIs it would be important to go beyond monitoring the people receiving assistance and scoring whether their reintegration after receiving assistance was sustainable or not, and to also collect evidence or produce analysis that can help understand the processes and the factors that inform reintegration outcomes and their sustainability, weighting the impact of assistance at the individual and community level and as such supporting a verification of models, assumptions and approaches, beyond the monitoring of individual reintegration experiences.

The institutionalisation of the M&E Package depends also on the capacities of individual offices. An important limitation towards institutionalisation is the relatively recent and stabilising culture of M&E within IOM. The presence of M&E staff in IOM operations is not uniform, especially in smaller country offices. At the same time, the KMH surveys are rather time consuming and require internal competence to be correctly administered, not all the IOM offices have the capacity to appropriate them.

The HoA window for example has a large Research and Evaluation portfolio of approximately 2 million Euro which they used to fill knowledge gaps that had become apparent in their region. They studied among others the factors informing re-migration decisions and behavioural disorders amongst returning migrants. The JI offered an unprecedented opportunity to collect data on a huge caseload, which the regional office used for data analysis and relevant research. The available evidence is being used also to question unproven assumptions (that cash assistance favours re-emigration, for instance). The KMH has allowed to make the studies and knowledge products developed by the JI available to a wider community of return and reintegration practitioners and all IOM offices, including those that do not have the capacity and size to engage in similar knowledge development exercises.

If larger IOM operations provided constructive criticism, smaller IOM country offices without established competence or references on monitoring return and reintegration efforts conveyed that the direct support and the standard tools available through the KMH have critically improved the quality of their data and reporting, and their internal capacity after attending the KMH trainings. They too however have developed separate tools for data collection at the level of project activities, more tailored on their context and knowledge needs. There seems to be a confirmed need for finding a convenient balance between standardisation and contextualisation in data collection.

Initially, the KMH team was challenged by some level of internal resistance to collaborate, as they aimed to support institutional functions but were operating as an individual project. This has now improved and the technical support, knowledge resources, tools and visibility opportunities offered by the KMH is increasingly appreciated. The demand for support is also increasing, in particular in relation to capacity building (via trainings and webinars) and opportunities to present their practices and products and to discuss reintegration topics with colleagues in other countries or regions. Moreover, there are indications that the integrated approach to reintegration and the M&E Package are being increasingly used also in non-EU priority regions, including Latin America, and the KMH team was for example approached to support the design of the impact evaluation of the EU-IOM Joint Initiative Programme for Migrant Protection and Reintegration (Horn of Africa). Some of the new reintegration actions reflect the use of the M&E Package to develop their logframes, in many cases validated by the KMH team. This suggests a progressive institutionalisation of the M&E Package at least in IOM offices that have collaborated more closely with the KMH. In addition to supporting these positive findings, the discussions with the KIIs have supported the identification of elements of fragility and areas that will require further efforts to ensure the continuation, expansion, and appropriation of the KMH benefits within IOM, including reflection of the knowledge contributed by the KMH in the strategic content of the new actions.

3.6.3 Influence on EU policies and actions

The idea that to deliver on the international dimension of EU priorities there is a need for highly specialised knowledge and technical assistance and that it is important to support the generation of global knowledge in relation to global challenges and EU priorities, as well as its dissemination and use in partner countries, is explicitly reflected in the NDICI - Global Europe Thematic programmes (People).

As a specialised Hub on return and reintegration that was established with EU support, the KMH is relatively well known within the EU; representatives of DG INTPA, DG HOME and Frontex were interviewed for this evaluation. They receive the KMH newsletters and information on webinars and trainings organised by the KMH. The KMH has been also consulted on the EU Return and Reintegration Strategy and IOM, with the KMH, is contributing inputs to the M&E Package being developed by Frontex, with MPI support. Moreover, the Platform's repository is also relatively well known, and DG INTPA has in different occasions publicly voiced its recognition of the KMH contributions to improve the accountability of EU-IOM actions. When the JI, the most visible of the EU action on reintegration, was put in place, its three windows were designed and kicked-off in a "crisis" mode, with significant political pressure. The KMH is credited to have helped introducing harmonised references and support to collect evidence and report to the donor more consistently.

Inputs from IOM/KMH are also visible in several parts of the European Commission's 2021 Communication on Return and Reintegration, for example: "Research on understudied topics, migration trends and gathering knowledge from programmatic implementation are essential to inform policymakers as well as practitioners (…).The EU-IOM Knowledge Management Hub (KMH) Research Fund is addressing some of the identified knowledge gaps to better understand returnees needs and refine programmatic intervention."

This notwithstanding, the evaluation notes that the KMH did not receive requests for support or consultation on the design of the new return and reintegration programmes, by either EU services in Brussels or the EUDs. There is no evidence that the concerned EU services in Brussels have used the KMH tools or bulk of knowledge to reflect on their programming documents. This applies to DG INTPA and the EUDs but also to DG HOME and Frontex, although representatives from these entities have attended the KMH webinars and in some cases also its trainings.

While other organizations continue to provide support to the EU and its Member States, including ICMPD under ERRIN and the follow-up Return and Reintegration Facility, the KMH is the only facility with a global scope and a mission to qualify actions and sustainable outcomes in support to the wider community of practitioners and policymakers, including in the partner countries. One additional element discussed in the interviews with KIIs is that the KMH was established thanks to the support granted by DG DEVCO/INTPA and was designed to incorporate a development perspective, with due consideration of the principles of the Rights-Based Approach and Do No Harm embedded in development cooperation. At the same time, it pays due attention to the perspective of the partner countries, thanks to the cooperation with IOM country missions, and explicitly aims to develop their capacities to engage in sustainable efforts to reintegrate their returning citizens.

3.7 Communications and Visibility

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.7.1 Quality of C&V Strategy and products			
3.7.2 Visibility of the KMH			
3.7.3 Contributions to EU and IOM visibility			

3.7.1 Quality of C&V Strategy and products

The Pilot Action had developed a Communication and Visibility (C&V) Plan during its an inception phase. This was then revised in 2020, as part of the first amendment of the grant agreement between IOM and the EU, to elaborate on the target groups of the C&V activities and include new communications products to strengthen visibility of the KMH work.

Communication and visibility activities have three core workstreams. On the one hand, the KMH keeps its community of recipients regularly informed about the KMH activities, through the online Platform and via a mailing list reaching over 3,000 people, for example with newsletter issues; on the other hand, the KMH is developing audio-visual materials intended to promote the integrated approach to reintegration more globally; lastly, the KMH supports the visibility of the results and materials produced by IOM field offices and other stakeholders on return and reintegration topics, through their publication on the Platform and dedicated online events/webinars. At the same time, C&V efforts are also supporting the dissemination of references on IOM integrated approach to reintegration across IOM offices worldwide, as this may be now well established in field offices who have implemented large return and reintegration programmes, for example in Africa, but less so in other countries. A full-time Communications Officer supports the implementation of the C&V Plan, in close coordination with the Knowledge Management Officer in charge of the KMH Platform. The C&V targeted audiences, in line with the KMH work, include return and reintegration practitioners, government authorities, donors and other organizations concerned with return and reintegration topics, academia and research centres, the media and the wider general audience. The newsletters are regularly issued, and communications are generally well managed in the KMH.

The Platform is a central element of the C&V Plan. Its structure mirrors the work articulation of the KMH and includes a dedicated section for each of the 4 focus areas of the KMH, i.e. M&E, capacity building, research, outreach. Each component has an identified audience and the KMH team is effectively managing to reconduct all KMH activities and audiences to the Platform, ensuring its growing visibility and the dissemination of its benefits for IOM and importantly, for the community of practitioners and policymakers concerned with return and reintegration issues outside IOM.

Capacity building activities target practitioners and policymakers who are invited or manifest interest to attend the trainings organised by the KMH when they are informed of the opportunity. The training packages are available through the Platform for anyone's use (upon a simple request, so that the KMH team keeps track of their circulation and expanding its recipients) and the trainings have been attended by IOM staff, representatives of other organizations, including CSOs, and individual consultants. The KMH studies and other knowledge products have been advertised among the broadest KMH audience: all products are available through the Platform, stories are disseminated also via IOM global and regional Twitter channels and KMH LinkedIn page, new publications are presented to all recipients in newsletters and to practitioners specifically through the KMH Community of Practice and dedicated webinars.

Interviews with some of the KIIs have indicated some space for disseminating the KMH good quality products, including the knowledge products, beyond their dissemination event and availability on the Platform. At the same time, they have indicated as an important avenue for future consideration that the KMH could help monitor the extent to which knowledge products are translated into practice and support their actual translation into possible action points.

3.7.2 Visibility of the KMH

The central visibility and outreach capacity of the KMH is closely associated with the KMH Return and Reintegration Platform, launched in December 2019. The Platform is the most visible and best-known face of the KMH. It is supporting an increasing recognition of the KMH within and outside IOM and plays a critical part in supporting the KMH efforts to contribute to the development of voluntary return and sustainable, community-based reintegration approaches". While the adequate management of newsletters and other events and communications is ensuring that information about the KMH activities, products and openings to collaborations is disseminated to a growing number of recipients, in clear formats, the Platform is the main point of reference where those outside the KMH team look for information and knowledge references, and can concretely access the support and resources made available by the KMH. The launch of the Spanish version of the Platform in April 2022 has further strengthened its potential to expand in Spanish-speaking regions and countries.

While the KMH team only started growing at the end of 2020 and could count on a dedicated Communications Officer only in March 2021, there are clear indications that the KMH is expanding its visibility and positioning. Thanks to a dynamic management of the Platform and the collaboration with the Communications Officer, the Platform is clearly growing in terms of outreach capacity. The Platform's management benefits from a lively collaboration with the rest of the KMH team; all KMH activity streams feed its repository and expand its audiences, by inviting activity participants to join the KMH Community of Practice and adding them to the mailing list. The increasing number of Platform users is facilitated by a user-friendly structure, with well-organised and rich content. This is objectively measurable when considering its growth in terms of content and users. The Platform had more than 700 resources as of September 2022, categorised by thematic area, region/country, year and presenting organisation; the number of first-time visitors of the Platform has grown to reach more than 53,000 between its launch in December 2019 and September 2022; the geographical scope of

users is also rather wide, as they connected from more than 180 different countries and territories worldwide, primarily from Europe (47%), Asia and the Pacific (12%), Central, North America and the Caribbean (10%), West and Central Africa (10%), Middle East and North Africa (7%).

If the Platform sits at the centre of C&V efforts and achievements, it is noteworthy that all activities are implemented in a way that favours participation and networking beyond their immediate scope. For example, the ToTs were followed by a webinar bringing together the participants for discussing the training and provide an update on planned reintegration training workshops.

Collaborations with other international organizations, civil society, research centres and academia, and specialised individual consultants for the production of selected KMH knowledge products is helping their dissemination in other circuits and therefore overall visibility. The Maastricht University is in contact with KMH to discuss the possibility to use IOM data in academic articles (possibly in the Migration Journal) based on the two studies commissioned by the KMH, on "Comparative Reintegration Outcomes in Forced and Voluntary Returns" and "Gender-sensitive Sustainable Reintegration". One area in which there is room for more targeted efforts is a clearer understanding of the support the KMH can offer to EU counterparts in Brussels and in EUDs and to EU MS.

To further boost visibility, there are high expectations towards the KMH audio-visual products, for their potential in promoting a more nuanced narrative about sustainable reintegration and reaching the public, beyond the community of reintegration practitioners and policymakers. The production of high-quality audio-visual materials has been thoroughly discussed with DG INTPA as a central tool to enhance the visibility of the KMH and promote knowledge and understanding of the complexity of reintegration endeavours. Dissemination should be part of a dedicated campaign, supported by the setup of a dedicated online content video library. The selection of the Dutch media company Beyond Borders Media to support their production was finalised in April 2022. The agreed concept is based on the development of audio-visual materials that could target different audiences, across different streams and across a multi-channel dissemination strategy. These include: 2 stories presented for each of the 11 countries where the videos are being shot, mostly taken from the EU-IOM Actions across 6 thematic areas: i) Dialogue and partnerships; ii) Environment; iii) Development; iv) Mental health and psychosocial support, v) Community and Social cohesion, vi) Migrants in vulnerable situations; 5 podcast episodes covering topics related to the KMH research component or more broadly stemming from reintegration practices identified during the audio-visual fieldwork; high-resolution photos; 4 capacity-building videos facilitating the dissemination of the Modules of the Reintegration Handbook. The fieldwork ended in September 2022 and the expectation is for the videos to be completed in December 2022, by the end of the KMH implementation period. The identified dissemination channels are IOM global website and social media accounts, as well as IOM regional and country channels, in collaboration with field offices. Until September 2022, the dissemination strategy, including through EU and other channels, was under development. An external consultant has been hired to support the communication campaign; it remains however unlikely that until December 2022, these products can be adequately promoted among different audiences, when the contract will end, or that the team will be able to assess if and how they will be used, and to what benefits.

3.7.3 Contributions to EU and IOM visibility

The KMH is compliant with the C&V guidelines of the EU; the EU logo and mentioning of EU funds are visible on the Platform and on KMH products and communication materials, as well as in Requests for Proposals. The interviews with KIIs confirmed that they are fully aware of EU support.

On a more strategic level, communication strategies have insufficiently pursued opportunities to join voices between IOM and the EU in connection to the KMH and transform this joint EU-IOM global effort on return and reintegration into an advocacy opportunity on the need for integrated, development-prone efforts in reintegration. This remains an important missed opportunity for the KMH; while in fact it may be difficult for IOM to combine EU perspectives with its global mandate, the EU remains not only the donor of the KMH but also the main global donor in this domain and its stronger engagement could help promoting the support available through the KMH at other EU entities (thinking especially at geographical Units in DG INTPA, DG NEAR, EUDs, and DG HOME/Frontex) as well as the EU Member States.

There is evidence that the KMH is progressively positioning itself as a global knowledge reference on return and reintegration and that it is helping the positioning of IOM as a reference on return and reintegration topics, beyond field operations. The KMH was discussed with the KIIs inside and outside IOM as a main "place" to look for established good practices, learning opportunities and discussions/knowledge on less established reintegration issues. At the same time, there has been no indication that the KMH is perceived as a joint undertaking by IOM and the EU together.

3.8 Sustainability

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.8.1 Institutional sustainability of benefits			
3.8.2 Financial sustainability of benefits			

3.8.1 Institutional sustainability of benefits

The approach to reintegration promoted by the KMH has a strong system-building element. By design, the capacity building component of the KMH is expected to feed institutional sustainability and if it targets the broad spectrum of players concerned with reintegration, it is ultimately about strengthening national systems and having local public systems in the driver's seat on reintegration. While it is important to consider that the capacity building activities of the KMH are not directly associated to policy development goals, they support a better understanding of the implications of reintegration for individuals and local communities and promote an articulated approach, that targets

the economic, social and psychosocial dimensions of reintegration and aim for the sustainable reintegration of individuals and a more established capacity of the local systems to deliver using the same approach. The concept is entirely geared around a stronger institutional sustainability.

The interviews with the KIIs confirm their interest in and appreciation of the trainings and events organised by the KMH. The outreach to stakeholders outside IOM at global, regional and local level has been growing since 2020, looking at the increasing number of non-IOM participants. Measuring the institutional sustainability achieved, i.e. their level of appropriation of the support received, remains however a work in progress. Implementation of the workplan is ongoing, with several events scheduled for the last quarter of 2022. There will be no time to assess their outcomes in terms of the actual use of the acquired capacities by participants and to monitor or accompany the consolidation of ownership at the institutional level. As an example, the organisation of ToT sessions is a step towards stronger institutional sustainability, as it invests in the possibility that the acquired knowledge and capacities are socialised internally, but there will be no time until the end of the current contract to assess the extent to which one person participating in ToT trainings will be able to disseminate knowledge within their institutions or institutional system, and how far the knowledge contributed is used in policy decisions and practice, that would be the ultimate marker of institutional ownership.

Considering participation from the public sector, the assessment of the KMH's offer of opportunities remains positive; still, there is room to solicit participation more systematically, beyond individual events and training opportunities, including by means of a dedicated outreach strategy tailored on both host and return countries. The engagement of return countries is important not only to contribute to develop institutional capacities, but to also ensure that the KMH, in collaboration with IOM field offices, can correctly reflect the perspective of the countries of origin in its generation and dissemination of knowledge and capacities on return and reintegration.

The RSS can be administered at any point in time, including to set the monitoring baseline, and the M&E Package Guidance recommends administering it 12 to 18 months after return. Interviews with IOM field offices indicate that it is a common practice to administer the RSS six months after the receipt of assistance by the surveyed beneficiaries (irrespective of dates of return) to score the sustainability of individual reintegration. The assessment of long-term benefits tends to remain outside the scope of the KMH monitoring system. There is space to include in the monitoring and learning system a focus on longer-term effects as well as on the sustainability of benefits for communities and on local development prospects.

3.8.2 Financial sustainability of benefits

While the delivery of results is progressing well and relevant achievements can be expected from the KMH, maintaining the flow of benefits at the current levels will require external financial support.

The KMH team has been working on an Exit Strategy for the KMH since 2019 and while the team is ensuring adequate efforts, consultations with possible donors remain in a negotiation phase. The KMH team has developed a Concept Note proposing on the one hand to maintain the global support hub available to beneficiaries within and outside IOM and on the other hand, to offer additional modular

components, aiming for example to strengthen the protection angle. In addition, because IOM's core budget is very small and the organization is dependent on external support, a donor mobilisation plan was developed in April 2022. The Plan identifies EU entities (DG INTPA, DG NEAR, DG HOME) as well as EU MS (mostly Germany, the Netherlands, France), the UK, Switzerland and the US Government, as potentially interested in supporting the KMH beyond 2022.

There is an adequate informal flow of information to the PSC on how the Exit Strategy is developing, and some information is included in the regular KMH reports. For example, the Flash Report for April 2022 informs that the KMH participated in a meeting between IOM's Head of Return and Reintegration Unit and the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development of Germany (BMZ), who highlighted potential interest to support continuation of the KMH beyond December 2022.

At the level of deliverables, tools such as the Reintegration Handbook, the SOPs guiding the consultation and implementation process, as well as the M&E Package have a fair chance to become mandatory tools within IOM. Access to the audio-visual products being developed under the KMH will remain accessible at no cost if they will remain available online, but their adequate promotion and use beyond 2022 would require additional resources. The KMH Platform can remain online with limited costs, but it must be regularly updated and used as an outreach and knowledge dissemination tool, it is to remain meaningful and beneficial for the target groups, requiring competent human resources. It requires a continuous flow of resources.

More in general, the continued availability of the KMH's support is largely reliant on external financial support. At present, until funding to continue with sufficient capacity after 2022 is secured, a core challenge remains the retention of the competent team that is currently managing and feeding the KMH. This evaluation scrutinises the current financial sustainability prospects of the KMH, distinguishing between (i) the donor support needed for the continuation of the KMH as global support hub, and (ii) the continued institutionalisation across IOM of the integrated approach to reintegration, the M&E Package and KM functions to inform and qualify return and reintegration actions.

While transitioning to possibly more stable sources of funding, IOM is also taking concrete steps to cover for staff and other costs. More specifically, it is exploring possibilities to identify existing resources during the gap between the end of the current funding and the next phase, using part of the current contract's overheads to maintain the Platform operational, and the top-up of the COMPASS programme, funded by the Dutch Government, the 1-year project funded by Sweden "From Policy to Practice: Operationalizing a rights-based approach to return and reintegration", to engage some of the KMH staff and support the continuation of centralised activities on reintegration.

In addition, a decision was made to include in the in-development proposal of the Migrant Protection, Return and Reintegration (MPRR) programme, which is the follow-up to the JI in Africa, three KMH positions to ensure sufficient M&E and KM capacity.

The outreach to potential donors includes ongoing consultations with the Unit managing the intervention at DG INTPA to continue support to the Platform beyond 2022 (approximately 1 million

Euro for 3 years, as part of the Annual Action Programme 2023), which makes sense as the Unit manages INTPA's global actions on migration and forced displacement and the Platform is where the KMH provides support and makes resources available globally; among the EU Member States, the German BMZ, who is also funding research on gender and reintegration with the KMH, has expressed potential interest in supporting the KMH as of mid-2023.

3.9 Cross-cutting issues

Evaluation questions	Scoring		
3.9.1 Gender equality and human rights' outcomes			
3.9.2 Rights-Based Approach and Do No Harm principle			
3.9.3 Consideration of environmental and climate change issues			

3.9.1 Gender equality and human rights' outcomes

While gender equality issues and human rights' outcomes are not explicit elements of design in the KMH, its contributions reflect adequate gender and human rights' sensitivity. The activities and products of the KMH remain geared towards improving the quality of the assistance received by the returnees and the lives of the returning migrants and their communities of origin, with due consideration for the specific needs of people of all genders and those in vulnerable situations.

The design was not underpinned by a dedicated gender strategy and only a short paragraph in the DoA is dedicated to describing the intervention's approach in relation to gender-related needs, recognising that "women are exposed to gender-specific vulnerabilities in the migration process, including when they return to their countries of origin, and that their access and role in community-based interventions, reintegration processes and livelihood opportunities are important to recognise to ensure their benefits in reintegration programmes". At the same time, the KMH remains fully in line with IOM Gender Strategy and reflects the attention to gender perspectives and vulnerabilities that is mainstreamed in IOM operations, including in the provision of assistance to returning migrants. In the EU Action Document supporting the decision to finance the intervention, gender equality is identified as a significant objective (OECD-DAC marker 1). The logframe of the intervention correctly identifies the result statements for which disaggregation by sex would be relevant and the reports present sex-disaggregated data, in the table summarising progress against the logframe indicators and in the narrative describing the activities.

For the KMH, gender considerations are especially relevant when it comes to supporting the monitoring of outcomes of the return and reintegration assistance as well as analysis and knowledge, when missing. Potential KMH contributions to gender equality can be expected from the inclusion of

gender sensitivity elements in the training packages, for example, while the SOPs pay particular attention to individual vulnerability needs to be taken into consideration, including in relation to gender. The data collected through the monitoring surveys include information on the sex of the beneficiary and support a differentiated analysis of the outcomes by gender of the reintegration assistance received. Gender considerations also reflect on the composition of participants to the trainings and other events and on staff recruitment, with 7 women in the 9 people staff of the KMH.

The extent to which the work of the KMH is resulting in increased levels of equality or more gender-sensitive policies and programmes cannot be assessed by this evaluation and remains largely outside the scope of the KMH. Policy or programming decisions exceed the support role of the KMH. Having said this, the KMH has shown good initiative in identifying issues that require further evidence or knowledge and is contributing to the research study on gender considerations in reintegration assistance, in collaboration with BMZ/GIZ.

Like gender equality concerns, protection safeguards and human rights in general are not focus subjects of the KMH design but they are correctly addressed across its work. For example, due attention has been placed on the needs, rights, and vulnerabilities of children in reintegration processes, and a specific toolkit to monitor reintegration of children building on the Reintegration Sustainability Survey (RSS) as well as Save the Children Durable Solutions for Children Toolkit was developed under the KMH. These contributions were part of the research study Development of a Monitoring Toolkit and Review of Good Practices for the Sustainable Reintegration of Child Returnees in collaboration with Save the Children and Samuel Hall. Furthermore, the KMH has developed a new set of tools on the reintegration of children with UNICEF. At the same time, the training packages emphasise human rights considerations as critical elements towards sustainable reintegration outcomes.

3.9.2 Rights-Based Approach and No One Behind principle

The intervention adheres to the working principles of the rights-based approach (universality, indivisibility, equality and non-discrimination, participation, accountability). The intervention targets government authorities and other key return and reintegration players aiming to develop their capacity to assist their citizens as rights-holders, implementing policies and actions with sufficient protection safeguards, in line with international human rights instruments. The same is also in line with Objective 21 of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (Global Compact for Migration), calling on governments to cooperate "in facilitating safe and dignified return, as well as sustainable reintegration", and it is reflected in the guiding principles of IOM Policy on Return, Readmission and Reintegration. The Policy is intended to "guide IOM's work on return migration through a holistic, rights-based and sustainable development-oriented approach that facilitates safe and dignified return, readmission and sustainable reintegration, and ensures the protection of migrants' rights throughout the entire spectrum". Interviews pointed to a growing attention in IOM to streamline protection considerations across its operations, including on return and reintegration.

To mainstream its approach, the Policy calls among others for raising the level of accountability in return and reintegration actions. The support provided by the KMH in strengthening monitoring and learning functions is a significant contribution to strengthen the accountability of the system engaged in assisting the returnees. It is difficult to provide effective assistance when the needs of the target groups, including those of the partner countries and of the final beneficiaries (returning migrants and communities) are not sufficiently understood. Interviews with IOM field staff and EUDs suggested that the duty bearers in the partner countries were not always pleased with the reintegration assistance received under different streams of assistance and could be more strongly engaged.

From a more general angle, a rights-based approach is a cornerstone of development actions and an especially critical element in reintegration. Reintegration is a delicate process of reinsertion into society aiming for stable, durable prospects for the returning migrants, their families, and communities. Attention to avoid discriminations and prevent tensions over the assistance received by the returnees as well as to favour a positive attitude towards the reintegration of assisted individuals is paramount towards sustainable reintegration. The advice to involve communities in reintegration processes supported by the KMH is appropriate for promoting a fair distribution of effects in the community and pursue positive reintegration outcomes. In this sense, the KMH can be seen to correctly consider risks of societal conflict dynamics and community fragility. At the same time, sustainable reintegration is only possible if the local context offers sufficient opportunities for reintegration, which is to say, if there are viable local socio-economic conditions.

3.9.3 Environmental and climate change issues

The design of the KMH (and the Pilot Action) is not directly targeting environmental constrains and opportunities. At the same time, IOM recognises that climate change, environmental degradation and natural hazards pose severe threats to some communities and can negatively affect the reintegration of the returnees. This calls for a need to critically analyse context-specific conditions when tailoring reintegration assistance and there is space for more clearly target this element of "localisation" in KMH's efforts to support stronger return and reintegration actions.

Looking more specifically at the nexus between climate, environment and reintegration, this has not been addressed by the KMH with dedicated products beyond the webinar "Introducing environmentally sustainable reintegration: A two-fold strategy", but it is mentioned in some of its knowledge products, for example the 2021 Knowledge Paper, which devotes an entire chapter to it and invites programmes to support communities adapt to climate change and environmental degradation, mitigating risks by considering for instance to build small infrastructure or introduce sustainable agricultural techniques.

4. Key lessons learned

The evaluation findings corroborate the drawing of relevant lessons of a strategic nature, which can support the programming and design of return and reintegration actions in the future. As such, they look beyond the specific experience of the KMH:

Lesson learned 1: The need to ensure sustainable reintegration prospects for the returning migrants has received increasing attention in recent years. This however remains a complex undertaking; models and practices are being progressively refined but require further testing and learning to consolidate into established references. More in-depth knowledge is needed, among others, on the factors influencing long-term reintegration outcomes. At the same time, maintaining a clear orientation to achieving and measuring outcomes in the implementation and in the monitoring of return and reintegration programmes is critically important to be able to understand the variables at play and assess the validity of intervention models.

Lesson learned 2: The results of return and reintegration programmes are more sustainable when the programmes support the capacity of the partner countries to facilitate the social and economic integration of the returnees and operate within the local policy and support system. This entails the incorporation of a development perspective in return and reintegration programmes, with due consideration of the interlinkages between sustainable reintegration and local development dynamics as well as of the rights, vulnerabilities and specific needs of the returnees and their communities of return. There is widespread consensus amongst scholars and development practitioners that the achievement of sustainable reintegration depends also on wider cultural, social and economic factors in the contexts of return.

Lesson learned 3: To ensure adequate reflection of a development perspective in the design of return and reintegration programmes, it is essential that the partner countries are duly engaged in design and implementation, with due consideration of their perspective on return and reintegration issues and of their existing capacities.

Lesson learned 4: The sustainability of the current efforts for the return and reintegration of migrants requires a coordinated action between the players who implement return and reintegration programmes with a migration management perspective and those operating with a more development-oriented mindset. In the current EU landscape, there are clear potential complementarities between the assistance provided by Frontex and the EU Member States, usually via the Ministries of Interior, offering reintegration assistance to individual returnees for up to 12 months upon their return, and the work of development actors in countries of return, aiming for more structural impacts.

5. Conclusions

The Conclusions presented in this chapter address key findings concerning the KMH and its specific implementation experience:

1	**Relevance:** The design of the KMH remains a relevant response to the needs of the beneficiaries, within and outside IOM. The KMH is based on a solid reading of the existing needs in relation to the harmonisation and qualification of return and reintegration programmes and assistance. The targeting of stakeholders in the partner countries is especially critical for strengthening the capacity of local systems to deliver assistance and frame reintegration efforts as part of their policy framework, with adequate consideration for existing elements of fragility.
2	**Quality of intervention logic, monitoring and reporting:** The KMH builds on a consistent pattern of efforts put in place by IOM and other organizations to harmonise approaches, capacities and monitoring frameworks in return and reintegration programmes. The logframe was insubstantially modified when the KMH became the lead component of the Pilot Action in 2020 and in its current version, it does not fully support project management and monitoring functions. Reports are timely but remain prevailingly process oriented, also because the logframe and associated data collection system do not support the presentation of the KMH contributions to its planned outcomes and impact.
3	**Coherence and complementarities:** The KMH is successfully expanding collaborations and synergies with other programmes and with different types of organizations, from international organizations, to civil society, to academia. Dialogue and cooperation with IOM field offices implementing return and reintegration actions as well as with the wider community of concerned national, regional and international players are cornerstones of the KMH design. After 2020, with the KMH reaching full capacity in terms of staff, mix of competences and financial resources, collaborations with IOM offices and partnerships with other organizations have positively expanded. Despite DG INTPA's public appreciation of the contributions of the KMH, the relationship has not evolved into a strategic partnership based on common principles and mutual interests. There is room for clarifying the added value the KMH can have for the EU and the EUDs, as well as concerned EU MS, and further explore coherence and synergies between the knowledge-based, longer-term angle on reintegration supported by the KMH and other lines of support available to the EU and the EU MS.
4	**Efficiency:** The KMH is the only global support hub on return and reintegration, and it remains appropriate that it has a global focus and global access, offering support beyond IOM. IOM has significant capacity for managing the KMH considering (i) its global outreach through its office infrastructure worldwide; (ii) its global migration mandate, networks and recognition, including as the chair of the UN Migration Networks, which facilitates dissemination and attracts interest from potential beneficiaries outside IOM, including in

	the partner countries; (iii) a portfolio of return and reintegration actions assisting a large caseload, which offers on one hand the possibility to collect evidence and support an adequate learning process, and on the other hand calls for an established to maintain oversight of results and sustainability prospects; (iv) an explicit rights-based and vulnerability-sensitive approach to reintegration.
5	**Efficiency:** Within IOM, the KMH team has gained recognition for its contribution to inform M&E and KM functions in return and reintegration operations and support harmonisation and dialogue between IOM HQ and the field, with the necessary technical competence. The competence of the team is an important asset of the KMH; there is also crucial added value in having a team based at HQ who can provide support and foster exchanges and knowledge dissemination across countries, regions and interventions. The implementation mechanisms and the allocation of resources for managing the KMH are adequate for achieving the planned results. Implementation has gained pace after 2020 and the expectation is that the KMH will implement all planned activities and use all available funds until December 2022, after approximately 2 years of KMH work with full capacity.
6	**Effectiveness:** The pace of delivery and the quality of the outputs is very positive for all 4 components of the KMH and in many instances, they are progressively translating into meaningful outcomes. The availability and quality of the KMH support is marking an important step towards a more articulated understanding of reintegration and to expanding capacities and the available knowledge base. The KMH products and tools are already feeding global knowledge on return and reintegration through the KMH Platform. The institutional effort and the achievements of the KMH to move forward in the standardisation of M&E and towards more comparable data and more harmonised approaches is appreciated within IOM and by external stakeholders; the focus on understanding how the knowledge produced can be translated into reintegration concepts and practice can be strengthened; constructive criticism to further improve the quality of the M&E Package is part of a well-managed process of revision, involving the KMH and field offices managing reintegration actions.
7	**Impact:** There are indications that the integrated approach to reintegration and the M&E Package are being increasingly used by IOM also in non-EU priority regions, and that the M&E Package is used in the design of new EU-IOM actions. The long-term benefits of capacity-building activities for stakeholders outside IOM cannot be measured but the KMH is feeding a growing attention and capacity for making reintegration assistance more effective and sustainable. There is room for making the knowledge and expertise of the KMH more available to inform reintegration models and to make the body of knowledge generated by the KMH and others more readily available to support strategic, programmatic, and operational choices.
8	**Impact:** The EU, in Brussels and in the partner countries, is only marginally using the support or knowledge offered by the KMH, mostly limiting to searching data and good practices on the KMH Platform or addressing the KMH team for specific data.

9	**Communication and Visibility:** The Communication and Visibility Plan and activities are adequately designed. The core visibility asset of the KMH is the online Platform, which ensures the dissemination of benefits across IOM and to practitioners and policymakers concerned with return and reintegration issues outside IOM, with increasing numbers of users of the repository and of participants in webinars and seminars. There is evidence that the KMH is progressively positioning itself as a global point of reference on return and reintegration. The audio-visual products will be completed towards the end of the implementation period and while a dissemination campaign is foreseen, additional inputs will be necessary to ensure their continued promotion and use after the launch campaign.
10	**Sustainability:** The collaboration with IOM field offices, who can count on locally established networks and recognition, is instrumental to support participation in the partner countries. For the future, participation from the partner countries could be more systematically solicited and more tailored support expanded, beyond individual events and training opportunities. The relative added value of the KMH in supporting the establishment of fueller capacities in the partner countries is qualitatively confirmed but cannot be measured.
11	**Sustainability:** Within IOM, there are efforts to progressively institutionalise KM and M&E functions across its operations, but capacities remain limited, especially in the field. While this is understandable as part of a process of institutionalisation and adjustment, it remains an important element for the sustainability of the benefits supported by the KMH. There are indications that this is being addressed, with resources more frequently budgeted for these functions in the design of new reintegration actions; the inclusion of M&E positions directly associated to the KMH in the proposal of the MPRR is a positive indication of IOM commitment in this sense. The achievement of full capacity regarding M&E and KM functions requires a significant refocusing in the organization, which can be regarded as a work in progress, thanks also to the example set by the KMH.
12	**Sustainability:** Maintaining the flow of benefits generated with KMH support at the current levels will require external financial support. The finalisation of an Exit Strategy is in progress, as consultations with donors remain open, including with DG INTPA and selected EU Member States. In order to bridge the end of the current contract and the start of a possible new phase after 2022, IOM is taking steps to retain the capable KMH staff under other projects managed by IOM HQ or field offices, support the online Platform and continue technical work on return and reintegration; meanwhile, there are indications that the M&E Package, once the current revision will be completed, will become a mandatory tool to use across reintegration operations, to concretely harmonise design as well as data collection and management.
13	**Cross-cutting issues:** While the design of the Pilot Action and the KMH accords limited attention to gender equality and human rights issues, sensitivity to gender, rights and vulnerability issues is correctly reflected in the guidance and tools piloted with KMH support. There is room for more targeted efforts to address climate and environmental

issues in relation to returnee reintegration. Gender-disaggregated values are presented in the progress reports and adequate mainstreaming of rights-based principles and gender-sensitivity is reflected in the M&E and training packages completed and tested with the KMH.

6. Recommendations

The conclusions presented in the previous chapter inform the formulation of final recommendations. Of the eight recommendations presented herewith, five are actionable before the end of the implementation period and three look at the design of future actions. Each recommendation is explicitly linked to a conclusion:

Related to Conclusion (C)12	Before the end of the implementation period, complete the Exit Strategy and present tangible options, indicating the needs, support offered, necessary resources and sources of financial support. Consider distinguishing between on the one hand, the continued institutionalisation of M&E and KM functions within IOM and on the other hand, the available options for continuing the support offered by the KMH. Ensure that DG INTPA is regularly informed about the process and about the commitments taken by IOM to ensure sustainability of the KMH as well as the strengthening of M&E and KM functions across return and reintegration operations. As part of the Exit Strategy, consider discussing with DG INTPA and the EU MS involved in the consultations the possibility to pool funds (including in the framework of a Team Europe initiative in the next programming cycle) to support a global Facility feeding dialogue, a Community of Practice and evidence-based knowledge and providing on demand support to qualify return and reintegration efforts in target regions worldwide. From the EU perspective, this would be in line with the localisation and complementarity principles underpinning the NDICI 2021-2027.
Related to C3	Before the end of the implementation period and with DG INTPA support, organise a dedicated event to present the KMH and the support it offers to qualify the modelling and design of reintegration actions; invite representatives from DG NEAR, DG INTPA Geographical Units, EUDs, Frontex and EU MS with a view to discuss coherence with other existing lines of support and the KMH potential added value.
Related to C6	Before the end of the implementation period, complete a Roadmap with concrete proposals to revise the institutional M&E Package and consider ensuring that the revised Package (i) reflects adequate balance between harmonising data collection for a compact set of performance indicators supporting the aggregation of result values and the possibility to adapt the monitoring framework to specific contexts, ensuring that all information collected is available also at central level; (ii) supports the collection of information on how reintegration works and under which conditions it becomes more effective and sustainable; (iii) helps ensure that lessons learnt, emerging good practices and new knowledge are systematically documented and translated into actionable points.

Related to C6	Before the end of the implementation period, consider translating selected key knowledge products into actionable inputs and incorporating this effort as part of KM functions in the future.
Related to C9	Before the end of the implementation period, develop a calendar of events identifying existing opportunities in which the IOM audio-visual products can be presented and promoted beyond December 2022.
Related to C2	For the future, ensure that the design of the KMH is supported by a clear Theory of Change presenting the intervention logic and informing a univocal understanding of the causal links between the activities and the results expected at output, outcome and impact level. Ensure (i) a clear and straightforward formulation of the results and associated performance indicators; (ii) explicit emphasis on gender equality and rights-based goals; (iii) a data collection system supporting adequate results-orientation in implementation and oversight of progress towards the planned outcomes.
Related to C10	For the future, consider soliciting the participation and engagement of the partner countries beyond individual events and training opportunities, including by means of a dedicated outreach strategy tailored on both host and return countries.
Related to C11	For the future, require the use of the M&E package tested and refined with KMH support across IOM return and reintegration operations; continue consolidating M&E and KM functions in IOM reintegration programmes; consider the progressive standardisation of M&E and KM processes, for example requiring the incorporation of a research focus in the new actions; the generation of evidence-based good practice factsheets; standardised reporting at the end of each activity including information on the enabling factors and obstacles, and inputs for ensuring the sustainability of the results achieved, which would eventually inform the final exit strategy at the end of the action.

EU-IOM KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT HUB (KMH)